A

COMMENTARY

ON THE

HOLY SCRIPTURES:

CRITICAL DOCTRINAL AND HOMILETICAL,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MINISTERS AND STUDENTS,

BY

JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D.,

IN CONNECTION WITH A NUMBER OF EMINENT EUROPEAN DIVINES.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, AND EDITED, WITH ADDITIONS,

BY

PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.,

IN CONNECTION WITH AMERICAN DIVINES OF VARIOUS EVANGELICAL DENOMINATIONS.

VOL. VI. OF THE NEW TESTAMENT: CONTAINING THE TWO EPISTLES OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,
743 AND 745 BROADWAY.

THE

FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

CORINTHIANS.

BY

CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH KLING,

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY, AND LATE DEAN OF MARBACH ON THE NECKAR.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND REVISED GERMAN EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS,

BY

DANIEL W. POOR, D.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,
743 AND 745 BROADWAY.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

TO THE CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND HOMILETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE BIBLE.

GENERAL EDITORS:

Rev. JOHANN PETER LANGE, D.D.,
Consistorial Counselor and Professor of Theology in the University of Bonn.

Rev. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Sacred Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

I. CONTRIBUTORS TO THE GERMAN EDITION.

Rev. C. A. AUBERLEN, Ph.D., D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the University of Basle, Switzerland.

Rev. KARL CHR. W. F. BAHR, D.D.,
Ministerial Counselor at Carlsruhe.

Rev. KARL BRAUNE, D.D.,
General Superintendent at Altenburg, Saxony.

Rev. PAULUS CASSEL, Ph.D.,
Professor in Berlin.

Rev. CHR. FR. DAVID ERDMANN, D.D.,
Gen. Superintendent of Silesia, and Prof. Honorarius of Theology in the University of Breslau.

Rev. F. R. FAY,
Pastor in Crefeld, Prussia.

Rev. G. F. C. FRONMULLER, Ph.D.,
Pastor at Kemnath, Würtemberg.

Rev. KARL GEROK, D.D.,
Prelate and Chief Chaplain of the Court, Stuttgart.

Rev. PAUL KLEINERT, Ph.D., B.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in the University of Berlin.

Rev. CHRIST. FR. KLING, D.D.,
Dean of Marbach on the Neckar, Würtemberg.

Rev. GOTTHARD VICTOR LECHLER, D.D.,
Professor of Theology, and Superintendent at Leipzig.

Rev. CARL BERNHARD MOLL, D.D.,
General Superintendent in Königsberg.

Rev. C. W. EDWARD NAEGELSBACH, Ph.D.,
Dean at Bayreuth, Bavaria

Rev. J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the University of Utrecht.

Rev. C. J. RIGGENBACH, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the University of Basle.

Rev. OTTO SCHMOLLER, Ph.D., B.D.,
Urach, Würtemberg.

Rev. FR. JULIUS SCHROEDER, D.D.,
Pastor at Elberfeld, Prussia.

Rev. FR. W. SCHULTZ, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in Breslau.

Rev. OTTO ZOECKLER, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the University at Greifswald.

II. CONTRIBUTORS TO THE ANGLO-AMERICAN EDITION.

Rev. CHARLES A. AIKEN, Ph.D., D.D.,
Professor of Christian Ethics and Apologetics at Princeton, N. J.

Rev. SAMUEL RALPH ASBURY, M.A.,
Philadelphia.

Rev. GEORGE R. BLISS, D.D.,
Professor in Crozer Theological Seminary, Upland, Pa.

Rev. CHAS. A. BRIGGS, D.D.,
Professor of Oriental Languages in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Rev. TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D.,
Pastor of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church, New York.

Rev. THOMAS J. CONANT, D.D.,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rev. E. R. CRAVEN, D.D.,
Newark, N. J.

Rev. HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., LL.D.,
Chancellor of the University of New York.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS.

Rev. JOHN A. BROADUS, D.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis at Louisville, Ky.

Rev. CHAS. ELLIOTT, D.D.,
Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. L. J. EVANS, D.D.,
Professor of New Test. Exegesis in Lane Theol. Seminary, Cincinnati.

Rev. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D.,
Principal and Professor of Divinity in the Free Church College, Glasgow.

Rev. WILLIAM FINDLAY, M.A.,
Pastor of the Free Church, Larkhall, Scotland.

Rev. JOHN FORSYTH, D.D., LL.D.,
Chaplain and Prof. of Ethics and Law in U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.

Rev. FREDERIC GARDINER, D.D.,
Prof. of the Literature of the O. T. in Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Ct.

Rev. ABRAHAM GOSMAN, D.D.,
Lawrenceville, N. J.

Rev. W. HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Oriental Literature in the Theol. Seminary at Princeton, N. J.

Rev. JAMES B. HAMMOND, M.A.,
New York.

Rev. HORATIO B. HACKETT, D.D.,
Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.

Rev. CHESTER D. HARTRANFT, D.D.,
New Brunswick, N. J.

Rev. EDWIN HARWOOD, D.D.,
Rector of Trinity Church, New Haven, Conn.

Rev. W. H. HORNBLOWER, D.D.,
Professor of Sacred Rhetoric, etc., in the Theol. Seminary at Alleghany, Pa.

Rev. JOHN F. HURST, D.D.,
President of the Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

Rev. A. C. KENDRICK, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Greek in the University of Rochester, N. Y.

TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D.,
Professor of Oriental Languages in Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

Rev. JOHN LILLIE, D.D.,
Kingston, N. Y.

Rev. SAMUEL T. LOWRIE, D.D.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Rev. J. FRED. McCURDY, M.A.,
Asst Professor of the Hebrew Language in the Theol. Sem. at Princeton, N. J.

Rev. CHARLES M. MEAD, Ph.D.,
Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature in the Theol. Sem., Andover, Mass.

Rev. GEO. E. DAY, D.D.,
Professor in Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

Rev. J. ISADOR MOMBERT, D.D.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Rev. DUNLOP MOORE, D.D.,
New Brighton, Pa.

Miss EVELINA MOORE,
Newark, N. J.

JAMES G. MURPHY, LL.D.,
Professor in the General Assembly's and the Queen's College at Belfast.

Rev. HOWARD OSGOOD, D.D.,
Professor of the Interpretation of the Old Test. in the Theol. Sem., Rochester, N. Y.

Rev. JOSEPH PACKARD, D.D.
Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary at Alexandria, Va.

Rev. DANIEL W. POOR, D.D.,
Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary at San Francisco, Cal.

Rev. MATTHEW B. RIDDLE, D.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Theol. Seminary at Hartford, Conn.

Rev. CHAS. F. SCHAEFFER, D.D.,
Professor of Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary at Philadelphia.

Rev. WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Rev. CHAS. C. STARBUCK, M.A.,
Formerly Tutor in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass.

Rev. P. H. STEENSTRA,
Professor of Biblical Literature at Cambridge, Mass.

Rev. JAMES STRONG, D.D.,
Professor of Exegetical Theology in the Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

Rev. W. G. SUMNER, M.A.,
Professor in Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

Rev. C. H. TOY, D.D.,
Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Louisville, Ky.

Rev. E. A. WASHBURN, D.D., LL.D.,
Rector of Calvary Church, New York.

WILLIAM WELLS, M.A., LL.D.,
Professor of Modern Languages in Union College, New York.

Rev. C. P. WING, D.D.,
Carlisle, Pa.

Rev. E. D. YEOMANS, D.D.,
Orange, N. J.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

AFTER nearly four years of labor, remitted at intervals by reason of ill-health, I am able to lay before the public Dr. Kling's able Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians in something of an English dress. The difficulties of translating his involved and scholastic style, designed only for German students, into readable English, suited for the public at large, can be known only by such as have attempted a like task. To have translated literally, and have strictly followed his method, would have been to make the work a comparative failure. By the consent, therefore, of the principal Editor, Dr. Schaff, I have, without altering the meaning, introduced such modifications of method and style as seemed necessary to give the Commentary the widest circulation. The changes made have been mainly, in substituting an English text for the Greek, excepting where the latter was absolutely required to render the comment intelligible,—in intercalating this text through the body of the Commentary instead of putting a few catch-words at the head of the paragraphs,—in breaking up the majority of the ponderous sentences into their component parts (a few being left as specimens here and there to show what a German scholar is capable of in this direction),—and in omitting some portions of the homiletical and practical sections which seemed to be needlessly extended. The parts added by me, are all inserted in brackets, with the exception of the text in black letter, and the headings under the caption "Doctrinal and Ethical" which are italicized. All matter thus enclosed, which is not accredited to particular authors, must be ascribed to me. This general acknowledgment of responsibility I have preferred to make here, rather than insert Tr. or D. W. P. all down the page—say, as a whim of my own. The additions made by me, it will be seen, amount to over one quarter of the whole Commentary. The authors consulted have been mainly Alford, Stanley, Wordsworth, Hodge, Robertson, Bloomfield, Barnes, Poole, Scott, Whitby, Meyer, de Wette, Olshausen, Bengel, Calvin, and Chrysostom. Such portions of their several works as seemed calculated to shed light on the text, or to illustrate the course of Biblical Criticism, I have freely used. These frequent citations, while they have served to enrich the body of thought, naturally tended to break up the logical structure of the paragraphs; but the lack of continuity, wherever seen to exist, will be tolerated for the sake of the benefit derived.

To the homiletical sections I have added the plans of such sermons as I have found in my library, not being in circumstances freely to consult any other as I would gladly have done.

In consequence of my ill-health, Dr. C. P. Wing, who has been pleasantly associated with me in preparing the Second Epistle, kindly consented to assist in furnishing the critical notes on the text from chapter VII. to the end. In this he has been far more full and painstaking than I was in the earlier chapters; for which scholars will thank him. The portions added by him are very properly distinguished by his initials C. P. W.

With these explanations I submit the work to the candid judgment of the Christian public, in the hope that they will find it a serviceable addition to the abundant and exceedingly valuable Commentaries that have been already issued on this portion of the New Testament. If it will aid in leading any to the better understanding and appreciation of this most important portion of Scripture, giving them a tithe of the benefit I have enjoyed, it will be the largest count in my recompense for the labor spent on it. Severe criticism on the style of the translation I must deprecate in advance. If I have succeeded in putting Dr. Kling's exceedingly involved, prolix, cumbrous, yet thoughtful style into readable English, it is more than I dared to hope for after having enlisted in the work and clearly apprehended the nature of the task before me. In consequence of being obliged to recast the whole of the exegetical and critical part, and, as it were, work myself into a new method, some slight errors of punctuation and lettering will be found in the earlier chapters, for which I ask the reader's indulgence.

With the ever-growing conviction that no Commentary of uninspired man can ever exhaust the fullness of meaning contained in the Scriptures, and deeply conscious how far short this new effort falls below the attainable standard, I with diffidence present it to the Church as a tribute of humble reverence and affection for the Word of God, and a token of sincere desire that this Word may be more and more known, felt, and enjoyed by all believers, not only in its obvious scope and more general meaning, but also in the subtler implications and suggestions of its moods and tenses, its particles and order of language, being all informed by the Spirit of the Living One who is the Sum and Source of all Beauty, Goodness, and Truth.

D. W. POOR.

NEWARK, *March* 21, 1868.

The translation of this part of the *Biblework* is made from the second German edition, 1865, as revised by the Rev. Mr. HAUFF, of Gmünd, an intimate friend of Dr. KLING, who died a few weeks after the date of his preface to the first edition (March 1, 1861).

P. S.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF DR. KLING.

BY

THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

FRIEDRICH CHRISTIAN KLING, D. D., the author of the Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians in Dr. Lange's *Bibelwerk*, was born Nov. 4, 1800, at Altdorf, in the kingdom of Würtemberg, and died at Marbach in April, 1861. His father was a clergyman of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and destined him for the same calling. Young Kling passed through that thorough systematic course of classical, philosophical and theological training for which the Gymnasia, the lower Seminaries (Maulbroun, Schönthal, Blaubeuren and Urach), and the University of Würtemberg are unsurpassed even in Germany. After graduating in Tübingen he went to the University of Berlin, which was then at the height of its fame in the theological department. He attended chiefly the lectures of Schleiermacher and Neander, and enjoyed their personal friendship. His theological views were moulded by these celebrated divines, especially by Neander; but like most of their pupils, he advanced beyond them in the direction of a positive evangelical orthodoxy.

On his return to Würtemberg in 1824 he spent a few years as *Repetent* in the theological Seminary at Tübingen—an honorable position of tutor and assistant professor, to which a few of the best scholars of each graduating class are appointed, with the additional advantage of a literary journey at the expense of the government. In March, 1826, he was elected deacon (*i. e.* assistant minister) in the town of Waiblingen, where he spent six useful and happy years. He was married to a grand-daughter of the celebrated philosopher, Fr. H. Jacobi. While faithfully discharging his duties as pastor, he furnished frequent contributions to leading theological Reviews, which made his name favorably known throughout Germany.

In 1832 Dr. Kling received and accepted a call as professor of theology in the University of Marburg, where he labored successfully and acceptably for ten years. In 1842 he followed a call to the University of Bonn, and taught there till 1849 alongside of such eminent colleagues as Drs. Nitzsch, Bleek and Sack. The state of his health induced him to withdraw from the academic career to which he had devoted seventeen of his best years, to the more quiet and simple life of a country pastor at Ebersbach, in his native Würtemberg. When his health was restored, he entered upon a more extensive sphere of labor as Dean of Marbach on the Neckar (the birth-place of Schiller). His leisure hours he devoted to theological study till his peaceful death.

Dr. Kling was a gentleman of great simplicity and purity of character, plain and modest in appearance, gentle and amiable in temper, kind and affectionate in disposition, decidedly evan-

gelical, yet liberal in his views, of solid learning, sound and sober judgment, sincere and humble piety. As a pupil of Schleiermacher and Neander, he retained from the former a lively interest in the systematic arrangement and speculative construction of the doctrines of Christianity from the Christological and soteriological principle; while with Neander he shared a love of Scriptural simplicity, and taste for history and held to the motto: *Pectus est quod facit theologum.* He was no creative genius, opening new avenues of thought, but followed in the track of great and good men, yet with fine discrimination and independent judgment. He was not brilliant either as a lecturer or preacher, but very instructive, sound and winning, and was highly esteemed and beloved by all who knew him. I spent several days with him in the family of Dr. Krummacher at Elberfeld (now at Potsdam) in 1844, where, together with Dr. Krummacher and Dr. Sander, he assisted at my ordination on the eve of my departure for America; and I met him afterwards at Stuttgard and at a missionary festival at Basel in 1854. I well remember the impression which his sweet and lovely spirit, his simplicity and humility made upon all on those occasions, and how he reminded us of the beloved disciple.

Dr. Kling commenced his literary career in 1824 by publishing from manuscripts, at the suggestion of Neander, the sermons of Bertholdt, a powerful Franciscan revival preacher of the 13th century, who is said to have addressed crowds of from 60,000 to 200,000 people, hungry for the bread of Life. This work was favorably reviewed by the celebrated German philologist, Jacob Grimm, and opened a mine of theological lore which lay buried among the German writers of the middle age. Since that time he prepared no extensive work except the Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians, to which he devoted the last years of his life. He wrote the Preface a few weeks before his death. He had repeatedly lectured on these Epistles while professor at Marburg and Bonn, and published comments on the more difficult sections in the *Studien und Kritiken.* He laid himself out mainly in the exegetical and doctrinal sections, while the homiletical hints are mostly gathered from older sources. This Commentary was well received for its solid learning and Christian spirit; but the style is somewhat heavy and diffuse. Hence I allowed the translators full liberty to reproduce it freely in justice to the English idiom as well as the thoughts of the original. It is no disparagement of the author to say that the American translators have greatly improved his work by condensation and valuable additions and adaptation to the English reader. Every page gives proof of their independent scholarly labor. The German edition contains 417, the English 596 pages, and a good deal of the new matter is in very small type.

Dr. Kling was also a constant and highly esteemed contributor to the first theological Reviews of Germany, such as the *Studien und Kritiken*, the *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, the *Deutsche Zeitschrift*, etc., in which he took an active part in the leading exegetical, critical and doctrinal questions of the age. His essays and reviews were always marked by conscientious care, solidity, sound sense, and justice to all who differed from him. Among the many elaborate articles and discussions of his industrious pen we may mention those on Clement of Alexandria, Hasse's Anselm of Canterbury, the early life of Neander, Baur's view on the Epistle to the Romans, on several passages in the Corinthians, on Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church, on the relation of philosophy and theology,—all in ULLMANN AND UMBREIT'S *Studien und Kritiken.* He also furnished the articles on "Athanasius," "Augustine," "Bertholdt the Franciscan," "Hilary of Poictiers," "Marheinecke," "Möhler," "Christianity," "Conversion," "Justification," and other important subjects for HERZOG'S *"Theological Encyclopædia;"* but he died before the completion of this work, and found an honorable place in a supplementary volume (XIX p. 704-706) of this great storehouse of the modern evangelical theology of Germany. P. S.

THE

EPISTLES OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. THE POSITION AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THESE EPISTLES.

The Epistles to the Corinthians occupy the second place in the series ascribed to Paul, according to the order of Scripture. Preceding that to the Romans in the order of time by nearly a year, they rank next to it in importance, as it respects both their *contents*, and the *Church addressed.*

I. As to their contents. These are mainly of a practical kind. Unlike what we find so abundantly in the other Epistles of our author, we encounter here no discussions on the cardinal questions of Christianity, whether dogmatical or apologetic. Nothing is here said of the need of salvation, felt by the ancient world; nor of the supply of this need through Christ; nor of the relations of Christianity to the elder dispensation; nor of the nature of the Gospel salvation; nor of the way it fulfilled the law and the promise; nor of the great plan of God's kingdom in relation to both Jews and Gentiles; nor of the part these were to bear in successively drawing each other to a participation of divine grace. Topics of this sort here give place to others, more particularly called for by the peculiar condition of the Corinthian Church. Taking occasion from the circumstances immediately in view, Paul, in these Epistles, labors rather to exhibit the bearings of Christianity upon human conduct in its several relations to the church, to the state, to society in general, and to domestic life. And first of all, he begins with setting forth the varied condition of things in the Church, especially in their moral form and aspect. Under this head he treats of the position which church-members hold to their teachers; of their worthy maintenance of the grace which they have received; and of their high calling, both towards those who are Christians and those who are not,—alike at home and abroad,—but, above all, in the assemblies of the saints, whether convened in solemn festival, or for general edification. In short, Paul here solves the problem of preserving and restoring the purity of the Church as a body consecrated to God in Christ, by setting at work brotherly love, as well in the mutual furtherance of each other's spiritual welfare—especially through the right use of spiritual gifts, as in the friendly balancing of all inequalities of outward condition, by a ready generosity on the part of the rich. From this he goes on, taking occasion from the attempts of his opponents to undermine his Apostolical character and influence, to give various expositions of an apologetic and polemic kind respecting the Apostolic office, its value, and the proper recognition of it, especially in reference to himself and his position. One doctrinal question only is directly and thoroughly handled,—that of the resurrection of the dead (1 Cor. xv.); and this is so done that its connection with the fundamental

facts of Christianity, and its bearing upon the whole body of Christian truth, as well as its ethical elements, is made to appear in the clearest light.

That Epistles of so prëeminently ethical a character (whose teachings are, however, every where made to rest on their proper doctrinal basis) should be made to follow an Epistle like that to the Romans, was perfectly proper—all the more so, because of their importance in a twofold respect: 1. *Historically*, as illustrating to a remarkable degree the condition and circumstances of the Christian churches in the midst of the pagan world; 2. *Normally*, inasmuch as the Apostle so portrays the proper demeanor of a Christian Church and of those holding office in and for it, that churches and office-bearers may here find a mirror for themselves for all time to come.

II. Looking at the relative importance of the two churches (at Rome and at Corinth), it must be conceded, that the church of the former city, as being the capital of a world-wide empire, and furnishing the largest opportunity for the spread of the Gospel, stands prëeminent. Yet the church at Corinth, too, possessed a high degree of consequence, derived from the peculiar position and character of the city in which it was planted. Corinth, as is well known, was the metropolis of Achaia—a province that embraced in its bounds Hellas and the Peloponnesus. Situated on a narrow isthmus which just parted the Ionian Sea from the Peloponnesus, it commanded two celebrated harbors—the one looking toward the East, and the other toward the West. It thus became the centre of an extended and varied commerce. The arts and sciences also flourished there in unrivalled splendor. It was noted, too, as the centre of religious worship for the whole Greek nation. In it was gathered a population numbering from 400,000 to 500,000—comprising people from all parts of the world. Of these a large portion were Latins, the descendants of that colony which had been sent here by Julius Cæsar, about a century and a half previously, for the purpose of recovering it from the desolation and ruin which had been brought upon it by Mummius. An illustration of Paul's estimate of the importance of the place we have in the fact, that he labored here no less than a year and a half for the establishment of a church. In his view, it was a fit point from whence the Gospel might be made to diffuse its rays far and wide over the world, and where a church, once planted, might stand forth as an example for other churches scattered over the globe, whose members would naturally cluster here upon the errands of trade and commerce. And for this there were peculiar facilities arising from the manifold activity and cultivation of the people generally, which gave promise of a spiritual development no less rich and varied. But while Corinth presented peculiar advantages for a church, it also abounded in peculiar perils. No place was so noted for its luxury and licentiousness as Corinth. The infamous goddess Aphrodite was here worshipped with sensual rites of the grossest kind, having no less than three thousand priestesses of loose character ministering at her shrine. Indeed, so notorious was the dissipation of the people, that the word Corinthianise (*κορινθιάνιζειν*) was used to express conduct the most voluptuous and debauched. There was danger therefore lest in such a place the development of a Christian church would be obstructed by prevailing immoralities. No less great an evil was to be apprehended from the peculiar proneness of the Greek mind to intellectual conceit and party strife. In short, it may be said that in this one city there were concentrated in the fullest degree all those dangerous and corrupting influences which proceed from a thorough-going epicureanism, at once the most vicious and the most refined.

A church occupying so important a position, and at the same time so beset with temptations, naturally required a special care on the part of the Apostle. Of this the two Epistles before us give abundant evidence. The nearer the Apostle stood related to this church, founded by his labors, and the more it threatened to deviate from its true course or actually went astray, the more was

he, as its spiritual father, constrained to exert himself in its behalf and give vent to his own deep emotions of concern for its welfare; and the more energetically, too, did he find it necessary to assert the consciousness of the position which he held towards them. In the first of these Epistles it is only here and there that he gives us a glimpse into his inmost thoughts and feelings on the subject. But it is from the second that we ascertain far more of the real traits of his noble character. For here it is, that, with the most unrestrained candor, and borne on by emotions which carry him beyond himself, he pours forth his whole soul, showing them with the utmost frankness how he had felt and acted, labored and suffered in their behalf. At the same time, also, in reply to the attacks of his foes, he so conducts his self-defence, that not only *what* he says of himself, but also *the way* in which he says it, vividly presents to our view abundant evidences of his rare fidelity and truthfulness, shining forth, as these traits do, both in his deep humility and in his lofty bearing, in his simplicity and in his honesty, in his self-denial and in his love, in his magnanimity and in his boldness, in his ardent devotion and in his deliberate demeanor, in his exaltation of soul and in his quiet, resigned cross-bearing.

§ II. RISE AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CORINTHIAN CHURCH.

Upon his second missionary tour, after a divine providence had led Paul from Asia to Europe (Acts xvi. 7–9), and he had here amid various fortunes established churches at Philippi and Thessalonica, and Berea, and finally at Athens had encountered Grecian philosophy, and pride of learning, with the doctrine of a heavenly wisdom, Paul came on his way, about the year 52, to Corinth. The city was then in the height of its prosperity, puffed up with the pride of wealth and the vanity of carnal science, and captivated by a fondness for sophistical dialectics and pompous rhetoric; and Paul entered it, not in the lofty consciousness of his own strength, but in weakness and fear and much trembling, (Acts xviii. 1; 1 Cor. ii. 3) and with an humbling sense of the inadequacy of his own abilities to the great task before him. And his resolve was not to oppose human wisdom and eloquence with weapons of like character, but with the simple preaching of Christ crucified, in order that the faith of believers might stand in the power of God alone (1 Cor. ii. 1, 5; 2 Cor. x. 3, 4).

For the sake of support, he first joined in company, as a tent-maker, with one Aquila, a Jew of Asia Minor, who had been banished from Italy in consequence of the decree of Claudius Cæsar which drove all Jews from Rome (Acts xviii. 2, 3). This co-partnership proved also a fellowship in the faith. But whether Aquila and Priscilla, his wife, were already Christians at that time, or were converted by Paul, it is impossible to decide. His first intercourse on the themes of the Gospel was also with the Jews. To them he was directed by the prophecy and the promise of which they were the bearers. Among them he obtained an entrance and foothold in the character of a travelling brother, and as one learned in the Scriptures. On entering the synagogue, it was expected of him, as was customary, that he would speak a word by way of edification; and he improved the opportunity to announce, and lay before them for suitable proof the advent of the long-expected Messiah. Here, too, he found certain Greeks who had attached themselves to the Jewish communion, or who, at least, came occasionally into the synagogues as hearers. These, by means of their social position and family connections, formed a bridge of access to the rest of the Gentile community. To convince both these parties of the truth which he had to impart was therefore his chief labor. But here again, as often before, only a small number believed. And when, by the arrival of his helpers, Silas and Timothy, Paul gathered fresh strength for his work, a fierce opposition arose, which so kindled the indignation of the Apostle

that, shaking off the very dust from his mantle, and casting on them the guilt of their exclusion from the promised salvation, he declared himself henceforth at liberty to labor with a pure conscience among the heathen. From this time onward he delivered his discourses in the house of a proselyte, Justus by name, who dwelt hard by the synagogue. Here Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, joined him with all his house, and many others also, who believed and were baptized. But with the growth of the church, the opposition rose likewise, and waxed to such a degree that the Apostle began to despair, and needed a word of encouragement from the Lord. This was graciously vouchsafed him in a night vision—"Fear not, but speak boldly," &c. (Acts xviii. 9, 10). The result corresponded with the declaration. An attempt of the Jews to secure a judgment against Paul before the tribunal of the Proconsul Gallio so signally failed, that the accusers themselves were set upon and roughly handled by the Greeks without interference from the authorities. After remaining awhile longer in Corinth, Paul departed for Ephesus, attended by Aquila and Priscilla, whom he left behind at this latter place as he journeyed onward. These persons were destined henceforth to exert an important influence upon the development of the Corinthian Church. Meeting with the eloquent Apollos, an Alexandrian Jew, who had been a disciple of John and was well versed in Christianity, they took him and instructed him in the Gospel, and on his going to Corinth gave him letters of introduction to the disciples there. In this congenial sphere his talents soon found full scope, and by the assistance of divine grace he proved greatly useful to the infant Church through the skill with which he was able to convince the Jews, out of their own scriptures, that Jesus was the Christ (Acts xviii. 11, 28.). So far the narrative in the Book of Acts.

Our first Epistle gives us further glimpses into the after-condition and development of this Church. We here mark a gratifying progress on the whole. There appears among them a wealth of spiritual gifts, especially in the department of religious knowledge (chap. i. 5). But there is no steadfastness in the progress made. The old life of nature continues still to assert its power in various ways, and in different forms and degrees in different persons, according to their several peculiarities and relations, and that, too, to such an extent, that the Apostle denies them a proper spiritual character, and designates them as *σάρκινοι*: creatures of flesh, and *σαρκικοί*: carnal.[1]

One indication of this carnal temper was seen in the re-appearance of the old Greek *Party spirit*[2] under a Christian form. The Corinthian Church failed to abide unitedly in Christ. Following the fashion of the schools, they soon joined themselves to different human organs of the spirit of Christ, with a one-sided and exclusive devotion, maintaining and magnifying the peculiar excellencies of their favorite teachers in a contentious zeal, until at last they broke into factions, each separate tendency pushing itself to an extreme, and settling there.[3]

In chap. i. 12, four parties are enumerated,—those of Paul, of Apollos, of Cephas, and of Christ; and they are mentioned in the order of their rise. The occasion which gave them birth was the appearance of Apollos at Corinth. His mode of understanding and interpreting the Gospel was no doubt essentially the same as that of Paul. But while Paul made it a rule to preserve the utmost simplicity in his preaching, Apollos, on the contrary, gave full scope to his Alexandrine learning and to his well trained powers of eloquence and argument. These shining qualities so attracted a portion of the Church, that in their over-estimate of them, they exalted

[1] [The termination *ινος* denotes the material composition; *ικος*, the moral quality.]

[2] [The tendency to faction had long characterized the Greek race, and has been stigmatized as the peculiar malady (*νόσος*) of the old Greek commonwealths.—STANLEY.]

[3] [These factions were, however, not separations from the Church, but divisions in it.—STANLEY.]

Apollos above Paul, as a teacher of superior education and culture. In opposition, however, to such pride of "wisdom," Paul insisted upon that "demonstration of the Spirit and of Power" (ii. 1, 4; 2 Cor. xi. 6) which characterized his own discourses. Thus an opposition was developed. Over against the adherents of Apollos, there arose a party for Paul, who applauded the founder of the Church as their master, and wished to make him their head. But while between these two parties there existed hardly any essential difference, and the issue respected only the relative worth of the two leaders, it was otherwise with those who professed to follow Peter. In this case the antagonism turned altogether upon a diversity of views both in morals and religion. Inasmuch as there is no proof that Peter himself was ever at Corinth, we must ascribe the origin of this movement to the presence of Judaizing teachers, who were interested in setting up a strictly legalistic party, and who appealed to Peter's authority, as an Apostle who had been directly called of Christ, and had enjoyed personal communion with him.

But what does the Apostle mean when he speaks of some as saying that they were "of Christ?" If the language here used indicates a vicious partisanship, as would appear both from the connection and from the order of the words, how are we to understand it? It were natural to suppose here, that in view of the devotion manifested by the several parties just mentioned towards their favorite leaders, there were still others who felt opposed to all adherence to men, and were resolved to exalt Christ alone as the Head to whom *they* belonged, but who did this in so exclusive and partisan a manner, that instead of proving a uniting element in the Church, they only made the rents worse. If, now, we may assume with Osiander, that under the opposers whom the Apostle assails 2 Cor. x., this party be meant (v. 7), we should detect in them a Judaizing clique, (chap. xi. 22) whose leaders, intruding into this Church, arrogated to themselves Apostolic authority, while they rejected that of Paul (2 Cor. xi. 5, 15; xiii. 11). That they are to be linked with the Petrinists, or are to be regarded as a modification of this party, is an unwarrantable assumption, since in 1 Cor. i. 12, they are co-ordinate with these as a distinct body, and in the Second Epistle throughout, no further allusion to Peter occurs.[1]

As to the grounds on which they rested their special connection with Christ, opinions differ. No sufficient reasons exist for supposing with some that they appealed to a direct family relationship with Christ, or to an immediate personal acquaintance with him, or, with others (Schenkel, Dähne, Goldhorn), that they were a set of Gnosticizing theosophic mystics, who prided themselves upon visions and revelations which they professed to have received from God. Perhaps, with Thiersch, (*The Church in the Apostolic Age*, 2d ed. p. 144.) we might take them to have been personal disciples of Christ, tinged with Pharisaic notions, who had come from Palestine as well as from Rome to Corinth to exert here a dangerous hostility to Paul by stealing from him the hearts of the Church, but who had nevertheless so far unmasked themselves as to merit from Paul the epithets "false apostles" and "servants of Satan" (2 Cor. xi. 13.). But there is no evidence compelling us to such conclusions.[2]

[1] This also tells against Lechler in his "*Apostolic and post-apostolic Periods*" 2d Ed. 1857, p. 386, who says of the Petrinists: "But at the same time they assumed to themselves a pre-eminent and exclusively closer right to Christ himself on the ground of a former personal acquaintance with Jesus." If 2 Cor. x. 7 refers to the Christ party, it follows only that their leaders were Judaizers from Palestine, who found adherents in Corinth, and who, in opposition to all other parties, the Petrine included, designated themselves as "of Christ."

[2] [In opposition to the prevailing views of German critics it may be well here to state the conclusions which Dean Alford has given of his investigations on the subject of the parties at Corinth. "(1.) That these designations (I. 12) are *not used* as pointing to *actual parties formed* and subsisting among them but (2,) *as representing the* SPIRIT WITH WHICH THEY CONTENDED *against one another* being the sayings of *individuals* and *not* of parties. ("Each one of you saith)," *q. d.* 'You are all in the habit of alleging against one another, some your special attachment to Paul, some to Apollos, some to Cephas, others to no mere human teacher, but barely to Christ to the exclusion of us his apostles.' (3.) That these sayings,

The "yet carnal" character of the Corinthian church showed itself also in an incapacity rightly to apprehend and apply Christian truth in its purity and power, and to enjoy Christian liberty in its laws and limitations. They were carnal in their boasting over the gifts of knowledge existing in the church, *i. e.* their *pride of wisdom*, their vain self-satisfiedness, and consciousness of perfected attainment (chap. iii. 4).—Carnal, too, in the grossest sense, was it *for a member of the church to hold concubinage with his own stepmother;* and the church betrayed a lack of spiritual life in so far as it was wanting in earnestness, power and courage, sufficient to expel this impure and all-defiling element from the midst of it.—It was carnal also, only in a different direction, for church members *to go to law* one with another, and that, too, before heathen tribunals (chap. vi. 1–8), since in this there was manifested not only a lack of that yielding brotherly love which prefers to suffer wrong than to do wrong, but also a defective sense of the high dignity of Christians who are called to share hereafter in the judicial functions of their Lord, when he shall sit to judge the world.—The immaturity of their carnal state, and their defective sense of Christian liberty and obligation, appeared also in *the sphere of the sexual relations*, developing themselves in two opposite directions. On the one hand, there were some who insanely held that Christian liberty involved the right to gratify the sexual impulse in promiscuous intercourse with those who prostituted themselves for money, after a fashion allowed and religiously consecrated among the Pagans (whoredom)—as if the Christian were free to dispose as he chose of that body which God had redeemed unto himself (vi. 12 ff). On the other hand, there were those so fettered by legal scruples as to maintain that even marital intercourse was inconsistent with the sanctity of a Christian life, and who therefore insisted not only upon the duty of celibacy, but also upon the cessation of connubial intercourse between parties already married, yea even upon the dissolution of the marriage tie, in case of one of the parties still remained unconverted. Such austere notions betrayed a lack of sound religious prudence, an ignorance of human infirmity, as well as of that divinely ordained diversity in human constitutions which rendered what might be possible and meet for one person wholly unsuitable for another. They also indicated a want of confidence in the power of Christianity to draw those, who consented to remain with believing companions in the closest intimacies of the natural life, into a fellowship of the spirit also. And last of all, they evinced a want of insight into the Gospel rule of abiding in the vocation wherein a person is called—a rule which ceases to be valid only in case the unbelieving party insists on a separation.

In contrast with such asceticism there existed also in some quarters an unrestricted desire

---

while they are not to be made the basis of any hypothesis respecting *definite parties* at Corinth, *do* nevertheless *hint at matters of fact* and are *not merely* 'exempli gratia:' and (4,) that this view of the verse, which was taken by Chrys. Theodoret, Theophylact, Calvin is *borne* out, and indeed *necessitated* by ch. iv. 6, 'These things I have *in a figure* transferred to myself and Apollos for your sakes.'" In answer, however, to the argument adduced in support of Alford's view from this last text, as if it implied that Paul had only used the names of himself and Apollos instead of the real names of unknown leaders, by way of accommodation, and to avoid all personal altercation, Stanley well remarks, "This would not apply to the use of the name of Cephas, and it is clear that the Apostle in this instance [ch. iv. 6.] merely expresses his intention of *confining himself* to those who called themselves after his name and that of Apollos, in order to show that his censure was aimed, not only against his Judaizing opponents, but against the factious spirit itself, by which those who claimed to be his partisans were no less animated than those who claimed to be his friends."

The opinion that Paul's language was intended to designate parties actually existing in the Church is confirmed by the testimony of Clement, who in writing to this same Church less than fifty years later says, "The blessed Paul wrote to you about himself and Cephas and Apollos, because, then as well as now, you formed parties." See Stanley. Among American commentators Hodge and Barnes substantially agree with our Author. The former says, "The idea that the names of Paul and Apollos and Cephas are used figuratively, when other teachers were really intended, is so unnatural and has so little to sustain it that it is now almost universally repudiated.

"It is a remarkable fact," writes Stanley, "that the factions, once so formidable, have never been revived. Never has any disruption of the unity of Christianity appeared of equal importance; never has any disruption which once appeared of importance (with the exception, perhaps, of the Paschal controversy) been so completely healed."]

for marriage; as though celibacy were an evil and a disgrace. In reference to such a tendency the Apostle insisted only that in view of "the present distress" believers hold themselves free from earthly ties, and that in forming new connexions they take care to keep within the circle of Christian fellowship (chap. vii.).

A further antagonism of a similar kind was called for by the same cause in relation to *the use of meat that had been offered unto idols* (viii. ff.). On this point, likewise, two parties were formed; one strict, and the other liberal-minded. On the part of the former, there was a clinging to the external aspects of the act, or at least some remains of heathenish superstition in regard to an actual objective influence exerted by the idols upon the meats offered to them. On the part of the latter there was evinced indeed a more correct insight into the merits of the subject; but this was accompanied by an overweening pride, and a lack of self-denying love, which was shown in the reckless use they made of their liberty, by reason of which some were scandalized, and others were led to participate in heathen ceremonials in a manner utterly inconsistent with the proper observance of the most sacred feast of Christian worship. This lack of knowledge in regard to the privileges belonging to a Christian, as well as the lack of consideration and self-denial towards others, were alike indications of the "yet carnal" mind. In the one case faith was not live enough to beget a liberalizing knowledge; in the other case, it was not strong enough to produce brotherly love.

This same lack of decorum as well as of brotherly love, was also to be seen in the sphere of *public worship* (chap. xi.); the former, in that the women violated the custom, prevalent in the Churches of God, of appearing in the congregation veiled; the latter, in that the love-feasts to which the Lord's Supper was attached, were celebrated in a manner entirely at variance with the design for which they were instituted, which was to awaken and preserve a just sense of the unity and equality of all believers in Christ, for here the rich separated themselves from their poorer brethren, and kept the portions they brought, aside for their own use, so that the affluence of the one class and the poverty of the other were exhibited in painful contrast.

The "yet carnal" mind was furthermore manifest in relation to the *spiritual gifts* which abounded in the Church. There was a lack both of correct *insight* into the ground and purpose of these gifts and of determination to maintain a constant reference to this ground and purpose, in the use of them. In other words, there was wanting an humble recognition of dependence upon the one God, and Lord, and Spirit, for the existence of these gifts, and also a sincere and loving endeavour to employ them for the furtherance of the interests of the Church. Besides, there was mingled with this a foolish pride at the possession of such gifts, and an unreasoning over-estimate of those in particular which had in them something remarkable and astonishing, such as the gift of tongues. The ability to speak what was incomprehensible, except through an interpreter, in a state of ecstasy, was more highly prized than the ability to prophesy, even though this was better fitted for edification. It was also a token of carnal immaturity, that they were indisposed to repress the impulse to prophesy when it was operating to disturb the order of the congregation, and to hinder edification. With this there was associated also a display of vanity on the part of women in their desire to imitate the men in speaking in an inspired vein (chap. xii.–xiv.).

In addition to all these erroneous moral tendencies, there existed also a theoretic error, (easily passing over, however, into one of practice) which resulted from an adherence to the old heathenish habits of thought. It was an aversion to the doctrine of the glorification of the body (cf. Acts xvii. 32). There were persons in the Corinthian Church who denied the possibi-

lity of the resurrection of the dead, inasmuch as they could not see into the method of the process. (Chap. xv. 35). In this case they showed themselves guilty of gross ignorance, partly in relation to the consequences of such a denial (vv. 1–19), partly in relation to the whole system of God's counsels and ways, of which the resurrection formed an important part (vv. 20–28), partly in respect to the practical significance of the resurrection (ver. 29), partly in respect to God and His power (ver. 34), and partly in regard to the development of the life in Christ; which was in accordance with the analogies of the natural life, and with the precedent set by Christ himself (ver. 35 ff.).

§ III. LITERATURE.

Among the more general exegetical works on the New Testament, or on the Pauline epistles, must be mentioned first, the patristic commentaries of CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, THEOPHYLACT, and OECUMENIUS; then, those of the Reformers CALVIN, BEZA, FLACIUS, and others; then those subsequent to the period of the Reformation by GROTIUS and his learned opponent CALOVIUS; and last of all, the later commentaries by FLATT, OLSHAUSEN, DE WETTE, MEYER, BURGER, NEANDER, etc., and, as especially deserving of consideration, that by OSIANDER (Stuttg. 1858). With these we have compared also the Roman Catholic exposition of the two Epistles to the Corinthians by BISPING (2d ed., 1863). Besides these, honorable mention must be made of MELANCTHON (1 Cor., and a few chapters of 2d Cor.), W. MUSCULUS, ARETIUS, BULLINGER, SEB. SCHMID, MOSHEIM, S. J. BAUMGARTEN, SCHULZ, MORUS, EMMERLING, KRAUSS, HEYDENREICH (on 1st Cor.), and BILLROTH. To these may be added the collective works: CRITICI SACRI; POOL'S *Synopsis;* WOLF'S *Curæ;* STARKE'S *Bibel-Werk;* the BERLENBURGER BIBLE; C. H. RIEGER'S *Observations on the New Testament*, which naturally connect in spirit with the excellent *Gnomon* of BENGEL; GOSSNER'S *Spirit of the Life and Doctrine of Jesus Christ in the New Testament* (1818) drawn for the most part from the Berlenburger Bible and from Zinzendorf; HEUBNER'S *Practica. Exposition of the New Testament* (1858); W. F. BESSER'S *Bible-Lessons* (8th vol. 1862). Important aids to the exposition of these Epistles are furnished by the treatises on the Apostolic period (HESS, NEANDER, SCHAFF, LECHLER, LANGE, THIERSCH, and others); upon the Apostolic and Pauline doctrine (MESSNER, LUTTERBECK, USTERI, DÄHNE); upon the New Testament Theology (CHR. SCHMID and others). Comp. also BAUR, *The Apostle Paul* [2d ed. by Zeller, 1867, 2 vols.], and from the earlier time STORR'S *Notitiæ Historicæ* (in his *Opuscula*).

[Among the English and American works, those possessed of distinguished merit are, H. HAMMOND'S *Paraphrase of the New Testament, with Notes* (1684); M. HENRY'S *Exposition of the Old and New Testament* (begun in 1704); D. WHITBY'S *Paraphrase and Commentary on the New Testament* (1726); THOS. SCOTT'S *Commentary on the Bible* (1821); A. CLARKE'S *Commentary on the Bible* (1826); BLOOMFIELD'S *Commentary on the New Testament, and Critical Digest* (1826); BARNES'S *Commentary on the New Testament* (1837); HODGE'S *Commentary on the Corinthians* (1862); ALFORD'S *Greek Testament* (5th ed. 1865); STANLEY'S *Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (3d ed. 1865); F. W. ROBERTSON'S *Sermons on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians* (1860); WORDSWORTH'S *Greek Testament with Notes* (4th ed. 1866); besides *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul* by CONYBEARE and HOWSON (1853, and several editions since in England and America); EADIE'S *Paul the Preacher* (1860); and HOWSON'S *Hulsean Lectures on St. Paul, for* 1862.]

THE

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTIANS.

§ I. ITS GENUINENESS.

The genuineness of this Epistle is undoubted. The witnesses for it stretch far back into the remotest antiquity; and among the earliest are Polycarp, Ignatius, Clemens Romanus, Irenæus, Athenagoras, and Clemens Alexandrinus, [Lardner adds Barnabas and Hermas].

[As specimens of the testimony they adduce, take the following furnished by Lardner and Alford:

Barnabas (A. D. 71) has the following evident allusions to 1 Cor. iii. 16, in his Epistle ch. vi.: "The habitation of our heart is an holy temple to the Lord;" and in ch. xvi. "God truly dwells in our house, that is, in us. This is the spiritual temple built unto the Lord."

Clemens Rom. (A. D. 96) in his Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. xlvii. writes: "Take into your hands the Epistle of the blessed Paul the Apostle. What did he write unto you at the first, in the beginning of the Gospel? Verily he did by the Spirit admonish you concerning himself, and Cephas, and Apollos, because that even then ye did form parties." And then we have citations in xlviii. from 1 Cor. x. 24; in xxxvii. from 1 Cor. xii. 12; in xlix. from 1 Cor. xiii. 4; in xxiv. from 1 Cor. xv. 20.

Hermas (A. D. 100) in Sim. v. § 7 alludes to 1 Cor. vii. 11, "If therefore a man or woman perseveres in anything of this kind and repents not; depart from her, and live not with her; otherwise thou also shalt be partaker of her sin. *But it is therefore commanded*, that both the man and the woman should remain unmarried, because such persons may repent."

Ignatius (A. D. 107) in his Epistle to the Ephesians § 2. quotes from 1 Cor. i. 10, "That in one obedience ye may be perfectly joined together [in the same mind, and in the same judgment, and may all speak the same thing of the same thing"[1]]. And in ibid. § 18 from 1 Cor. i. 18; in Epistle to Rome § 5 from 1 Cor. iv. 4; in Epistle to the Magnes § 10 from 1 Cor. v. 7; in Epistle to Ephesians from 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, *etc.*

Polycarp (A. D. 108) in Epistle to the Phil. ch. xi. quotes from 1 Cor. vi. 2, "Do you not know that the saints shall judge the world? as St. Paul teaches. Another citation in ch. v. from 1 Cor. xi. 9.

Further illustration might be given, but the above are sufficient to show the strength of the evidence. Those interested in prosecuting the investigation are referred to Lardner and Tregelles and Alford].

The internal characteristics also allow no uncertainty on the subject. The boldest criticism of our day, that of the Tübingen school, has suffered it to go unchallenged, and puts these two Epistles beside those to the Romans and the Galatians as the genuine writings of St. Paul.

[The best exposition of these internal evidences is given us by Paley in his Horæ Paulinæ, ch. iii. Among these may be mentioned a minuteness of detail and characterization, also incidental allusions and omissions, such as could hardly be looked for in a forged document; and

[1] The part included in brackets Hefele rejects as spurious.

besides these numerous close, yet undesigned coincidences between the statements in the Epistle and portions of the narrative in the Book of Acts.

But aside from and beyond all these evidences is the style and tone of the Epistle itself. Its every line is instinct with the spirit of Paul. All the features of his great and unique character are too sharply impressed upon it to allow of any hesitation as to the authorship].

[§ II. PLACE AND TIME OF WRITING.

The subscription purports that this Epistle was written at Philippi. But this is directly contradicted by Paul's own statement in xvi. 8, where he says that he would "Tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost." Michaelis thinks that the mistake must have arisen from a mis-apprehension of *διέρχομαι* in xvi. 5, which being read in the present was made to mean "I am *now* passing through Macedonia," thus indicating his whereabouts at the time of writing. All modern critics agree in taking xvi. 8 as deciding the point of place.

As to the time, there is not the same unity of opinion, though Conybeare and Howson assert that "its date can be fixed with more precision than any other." Kling says "about the close of Paul's well-nigh three years' residence at Ephesus, some time before Pentecost, and shortly before Easter, after he had sent away Timothy and Erastus (iv. 17; Acts xix. 22), and had himself resolved to go through Macedonia and Achaia. (Acts xix. 21; 1 Cor. xvi. 8)." The editor of the second edition singularly adds, without any apparent sense of the contradiction, "that it is not to be put before the month Tisri (Sept.), the beginning of the Jewish year, since the Apostle must certainly have followed the Jewish reckoning, and not the Attic-Olympian." Whatever may have been meant by this, Kling's view as to the season of the year (Spring) is accepted by the majority of recent critics. (MEYER, DE WETTE, WORDS., ALF., HODGE, *etc.*)

But not so agreed are they as to the year itself. Kling puts it at A. D. 58, and so also Meyer. De Wette says 57 or 58. Alf.: "It is almost certain that it was written before Pentecost A. D. 57;" and so also Pearson, Mill and Wordsworth. According to Lardner's computation it was in the year 56. This was also the opinion of the French commentators, L'Enfant and Beausobre. This variation of two years is however a very slight one. The judgment of critics preponderates in favor of the year 57].

§ III. THE OCCASION AND DESIGN OF THE EPISTLE.

From what has been said in the general Introduction it is easy to infer what prompted the Apostle to write to the Corinthians, and what object he had in view. The moving cause was the whole condition of the church as unfolded in this Epistle. And in view of the evils which had broken out among them he felt constrained to attempt their suppression without delay, and that, too, by writing, as he had good reason for not wishing to defer his work in Macedonia The chief points he aimed at was to restore harmony, repress inordinate license, correct errors of faith and practice, and confirm them in their allegiance to their Divine Master. [To these we may add, to reëstablish his own authority and vindicate his own character and style of preaching from the attacks of enemies who had crept into the church during his absence, and assailed his Apostleship].

Already before this had he learned of some of the excesses into which several of the converts had fallen, and in an Epistle (now lost) had warned them against keeping company with fornicators, and urged the expulsion of such members from their communion. (1 Cor. v. 9, 11). And now again he had received further information, through persons arrived from Corinth, of the party-strifes which had sprung up among them. Besides this he had received a letter from the church (also lost) propounding various questions on points at issue in regard to which he was asked to decide. [Reason enough therefore was there for his writing; and from the abrupt manner in which he enters upon the case in hand, after his calm opening, which is not without indications of restrained feeling, we see how thoroughly his whole soul was roused to his work, and how strongly he felt the necessity upon him for plain and decided utterances. The result was an Epistle which forms one of the most important portions of Sacred Writ. Thus man's evil occasions are God's grandest opportunities for good].

§ IV. ITS STYLE.

[On this point we can do no better than give entire the statements of Alford in his Introduction.

"This Epistle ranks perhaps the foremost of all as to sublimity and earnest impassioned eloquence. Of the former, the description of the simplicity of the Gospel in ch. ii.—the concluding apostrophe of ch. iii. from ver. 16 to the end—the same in ch. vi. from ver. 9 to the end—the reminiscence of the shortness of the time ch. vii. 29–31—the whole argument in ch. xv. are examples unsurpassed in Scripture itself; and of the latter ch. iv. 8–15, and the whole of ch. ix., while the panegyric of love in ch. xiii. stands a pure and perfect gem, perhaps the noblest assemblage of thoughts in beautiful language extant in this world. About the whole Epistle there is a character of lofty and sustained solemnity, an absence of tortuousness of construction, and an apologetic plainness, which contrast remarkably with the personal portions of the second Epistle."

And all these qualities shine forth unconsciously, without effort, while in the earnest and direct prosecution of his purpose, yea, while entirely repudiating all attempts at rhetoric as utterly inconsistent with the simplicity of the Gospel. Here we have a beautiful illustration of the unconscious character of the truest eloquence.

"No Epistle," Alf. proceeds, "raises in us a higher estimate of the varied and wonderful gifts with which God was pleased to endow the man whom he selected for the Apostle of the Gentile world, or shows us how large a portion of the Spirit, who worketh in each man severally as He will, was given to him for our edification. The depths of the spiritual, the moral, the intellectual, physical world are open to him. He summons to his aid the analogies of nature. He enters minutely into the varieties of human infirmity and prejudice. He draws warning from the history of the chosen people; example from the Isthmian foot-race. He refers an apparently trifling question of costume to the first great proprieties and relations of Creation and Redemption. He praises, reproves, exhorts, and teaches. [He is tender, sarcastic, ironical]. Where he strikes, he heals. His large heart holding all, when he has grieved any, he grieves likewise; where it is in his power to give joy, he first overflows with joy himself. We may form some idea from this Epistle—better perhaps than from any one other, because this embraces the widest range of topics,—what marvellous power such a man must have had to persuade, to rebuke, to attract and fasten the affections of men."

§ V. CONTENTS.

The main thought of this Epistle is to be seen in the object aimed at (§ 3); its organic unfolding in the General Introduction in the development we have given of the history of the Church (§ 2).

The entire contents of the Epistle revolve round the one purpose of leading the Corinthian Church to realize its true idea, and to set aside all those faults and defects in knowledge and practice which obstructed its proper growth.

I. To this end, after the benediction connected with the address, the Apostle first alludes to the good beginning which the Corinthians had, on the whole, made in a sound church life, thankfully acknowledging the divine grace which had been vouchsafed to them in this respect, and their spiritual good estate as established therein. To this he adds the hope, grounded upon the truth of God, that they would continue steadfast unto the end (vv. 4–9).

II. From this he turns to reprove their defects and discords of which he had been informed, first, by word of mouth from members of the Church, and then by letters of inquiry sent to him touching these things.

A. These defects were, *first, a lack of sound Christian community of feeling.*

1. As it respects the *position of Church members towards Christ and his organs* (i. 11, ff.–iv.). He begins with rebuking the party spirit which was manifested towards himself, who had given no occasion for it, and towards Apollos; mainly in so far as this grew out of an inordinate estimate of human wisdom, learning and eloquence, an estimate which was wholly

inconsistent with the plan of salvation, with the character of those called to participate in it, and with the style of that preaching which was to lay the foundation of the Christian life. (i. 17–ii. 5.). This preaching, however, he maintains, involved a high divine wisdom, which remained a closed mystery only to such as were not spiritual. (ii. 6 ff.). This declaration he then applies to the Corinthian converts as being not yet spiritual (iii. 1 ff.) and leads them to a right estimate of those who were reverenced as party leaders, and of their doings (5 ff.), warning them at the same time against all destructive violations of the Church, which was the temple of God. (18 ff.). From this he proceeds to instruct them in regard to the lofty claims of Christians to the several means and instruments of salvation (21 ff.) and exhibits to them the proper standard for measuring the worth of Christ's servants, a worth which was to be manifest in due time, and the manifestation of which therefore was to be waited for in suspense of judgment (iv. 1 ff.). After he had thus set before them the contrast between their imagined self-sufficiency, and the actual condition of the Apostles (6 ff.) he passes from the severe into a paternal tone, points out the difference between a mere teacher and a spiritual father, and rebukes their arrogance towards the latter, which seemed to proceed from the assumption that he was unable to punish (iv.). With this he proceeds to notice a further defect in Christian community of feeling.

2. As it respects the *discipline of unworthy and corrupt Church members* (v.).

He here insists upon the excommunication of a member who had disgraced the Church by gross immorality, and the toleration of whom hitherto was a just cause for deepest shame. In this connection he corrects a misunderstanding of what he had said in a former letter in regard to intercourse with immoral persons.

3. As it respects the *demeanor of Church members in their civil relations toward each other* (vi. 1 ff.).

He rebukes the practice of Christians going to law with each other before heathen tribunals, especially when they were in the wrong, since unrighteousness belongs to the sins which exclude from God's kingdom, and from which therefore they as Christians had been purified.

4. As it respects *a becoming Christian deportment in the sexual relations* as opposed to heathenish fornication (vi. 12 ff.).

That this practice was by no means one morally indifferent, is shown from the relation of the body to Christ as the head of the Church, from its character as a dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit, and from the price paid for its ransom.

5. As it respects their *views of marriage* (the foundation of all social life), *and the conduct of the several parties in this relation* (vii.).

One inquiry in the letter of the Church had touched upon the relations of the marriage and the celibate state. Marriage and the bed undefiled he advised as a safeguard against fornication and as a relief to incontinence. Otherwise, to remain single were a noble thing (ver. 1 ff.). But the dissolution of existing marriage relations is discountenanced except in cases where the unbelieving party insisted upon it (ver. 10 ff.). The general rule laid down is for a person to abide in the condition wherein he is called (ver. 17 ff.). But the unmarried are advised to remain as they are, both on account of the existing distress which demanded an entire freedom of the spirit in regard to all possession and enjoyments, and for the sake of a more entire devotion to the Lord and His will. Nevertheless, the contracting of marriage is not condemned as sinful, and in some cases is approved (ver. 25 ff.).

6. As it regards the *conduct of the strong and liberal-minded towards the weak* in things indifferent; that is to say, a defect in self-denying love (viii.–x.).

The discussion here, which was called forth by an inquiry about the eating of *meat offered unto idols*, proceeds on the assumption, that mere knowledge without love, so far from furthering the life of the Church, only begets a corrupting pride (viii. 1 ff.). He then gives them to understand that an insight into the nothingness of gods, so called, was not so general as to divest all persons of a conscious relation to the idols in the eating of the meat offered to them. Hence to lead such persons to eat of this meat by the exercise of a liberty conformed to such an insight, when the mere eating was of no moral worth before God, was in fact a betrayal into sin, and so a beguiling to perdition. And this was entirely contrary to the love of Christ, who had made the

greatest sacrifice in their behalf (ver. 5 ff.). Here the Apostle shows them, by his own example, that the surrender of an acknowledged right for the sake of furthering the cause of Christ was the proper boast of the Christian, and the condition of obtaining an indestructible crown (ix.). He then warns them against all false confidence, in supposing those once received into the communion of God's people, and into a participation of the means of grace, could ever fail, while at the same time he points them comfortingly to the faithfulness of God in keeping them from temptation (x. 1 ff.); dissuades them from participating at idol altar-feasts, as inconsistent with a participation in Christian solemnities (ver. 14 ff.) and finally exhorts them to follow the rule of love, and do what was for the glory of God. (ver. 25 ff.).

7. As it respects *their deportment at the assemblies of the Church.*

a. Of women in the matter of dress. He pronounces the covering of their head in public as a custom that was in accordance with nature and suited to the position ordained of God for woman, while that of being uncovered was more suited to the man (xi. 1–16.).

b. Of the rich towards the poor in the observance of the Lord's Supper. He reproves the custom of the two classes separating at the love feasts, as contrary to the nature of the institution, and calculated to draw down upon it the judgment of God, because of the unworthy communion it occasioned (ver. 17 ff.).

c. Of the Church generally, and of those endowed with spiritual gifts in their improper estimate and use of these gifts (xii. to xiv.).

α In respect to these, he exhibits, first, their foundation and object and hence their unity in manifoldness, as designed for mutual helpfulness, suitably to the organic character of the Church (xii.).

β He next shows the measure of their worth and the rule of their use, *viz.*: Love which is described according to its qualities, and recommended and praised above all transient gifts, because of its eternal duration.

γ Finally, he compares the gifts of prophecy and of speaking with tongues in respect to their worth, as measured by their fitness to edify the Church; and sets forth the rules that are to regulate their use in accordance with their design and with what is seemly for the Church of God. (xiv.).

To these defects in true Christian community of feeling, there is added, still.

B. A defect in doctrinal knowledge and of steadfastness in respect to the article of the resurrection of the dead (xv.).

On this point the Apostle teaches them, 1. How the possibility of this fact is essentially presupposed in the resurrection of Christ, that well attested event on which the faith and hope of Christians rest (vv. 1–19); 2. What position it occupies in the carrying out of God's plan of salvation, (ver. 20 ff.); 3. What practical consequences its denial involves; 4. How the objections against it arising from its mode, and from the nature of the resurrection body, are groundless and irrational, (ver. 35 ff.); and 5. How it will be with those who survive at the moment of Christ's appearing (ver. 51 ff.).

III. The concluding portion of the Epistle (xvi.) is made up of instructions in regard to the the collection for the Christians at Jerusalem; of intimations in regard to his approaching visit; and hints respecting the treatment they were to give his friends and helpers; and, finally, of greetings and parting wishes accompanied with earnest exhortation.

Obs. The survey above given of the contents of this Epistle finds its proper supplement in the attempt made in Introd. § 2. to refer back all its faults to the lingering carnality of the Corinthian Church. These are but the various points of view from which to consider and expound it.

How nearly the contents of this Apostolic letter touch our Christendom, and *what practical bearing* it has for us is well expressed by old HEDINGER in the following powerful language, which we may well consider (comp.) STARKE, EINL. § 12 "A Christianity decayed in all the duties of life and its several relations, may see itself distinctly mirrored in this Epistle, and may perceive how, with the Corinthians, all their mistakes and idle fancies about the nature of true blessedness have not yet entirely died out. How sadly is the Church of the saints still tormented with rationalizing spirits, and with falsely-famous worldly-wise ones, who intrude

upon others that are truly spiritual their own self-coined conceits and rules! To what extent are multitudes still corrupted from the simplicity of the faith! How boldly do people judge of spiritual things according to the crooked standards of a carnal or political wisdom! How conceited and puffed up are many pastors and teachers through their vain learning! How merciless toward the weak! How tender in rebuking distinguished sinners! How common has fornication become! How grossly and wickedly do many conduct themselves both in married and single life! How careless are people about winning their neighbor's regard! How often is the Lord's Supper dishonored and disgraced, as if it were a common meal, by the unbelieving, the hypocritical, and the godless! And such, forsooth, will still pretend to be Christians! God grant that by the frequent perusal of this Epistle, yea, of the entire Scriptures, they may reform betimes! Furthermore, we may learn from this Epistle: 1. In Paul, his love and patience as evinced towards the faults of the Corinthians; his wisdom and foresight in convicting and reproving; his zeal against open offenders; his care that a great evil might be warded off in season. 2. But in the Corinthians, (*a*) How a good beginning may not hold out, and how easily persons may be turned from the simplicity which is in Christ, if they do not keep a wakeful watch over themselves; (*b*) What damage is done, if a person yields too much to his own reason, or relies on his secular wisdom, or allows himself to be ensnared by the artful words of carnal learning. 3. What a blessing it is to have a faithful teacher. 4. How necessary and useful church discipline is. 5. How difficult it is steadfastly to refrain from sins to which a person has been accustomed, and which he formerly considered not sinful. 6. How high an estimate should be put upon every believer, and what care should be taken not to offend the weak. 7. That Satan regards nothing as too sacred to be turned by him to the advantage of his kingdom and to the injury of Christ's Church, as (*e. g.*) spiritual gifts. 8. How dangerous it is to err in fundamental truths and how necessary to instruct others concerning them."

COMMENTARY.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

FIRST DIVISION.

THE GREETING; THANKS AND HOPE IN REFERENCE TO THEIR CHRISTIAN STATE IN GENERAL.

I. *Greeting.*

CHAPTER I. 1–3.

1 PAUL, called[1] *to be* an apostle [a chosen apostle] of Jesus Christ through the will
2 of God, and Sosthenes *our* [the] brother, Unto the church of God which is at Corinth,[2] to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called *to be* [chosen] saints, with all that in every place [*om.* in every place] call upon the name of Jesus Christ
3 our Lord, [in every place[3]] both theirs and ours: Grace *be* unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and *from* the Lord Jesus Christ.

[1] Ver. 1.—Κλητός: *called* or *chosen* is wanting in many good authorities (A. D. E. etc.) These, however, are not sufficient to warrant its omission, since it is more likely that the word was omitted as superfluous, in consequence of διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ (as it is not found in like connection in 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1), than that it should have been inserted from Rom. i. 1. [Cod. Sin. has it. In the text we follow the version of our author and translate κλητος as a verbal adjective "chosen." This is the nearest equivalent in English. "Called" would be more correct; but this word is appropriated to another meaning, and would therefore be ambiguous.]

[2] Ver. 2.—[Our author inserts the clause "which is at Corinth" after "Christ Jesus," an unnatural order, authorized by B. D. E. F. G. It. and which he vindicates on the ground that it were more natural to suppose that the order of the Received Text was a supposed improvement by transcribers, than that the clause in question should have been placed by design or error in those manuscripts after "sanctified in Christ Jesus." The valuable Cod. Sin., however, agrees with the Received Text, and we adhere to this against the decision of Alford, Stanley or others.]

[3] [We here conform to the unquestioned order of the Greek text, which alone yields the true meaning.—See below.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VERS. 1–3. These opening verses, according to ancient custom, combine to present in advance the address and greeting; that is, the designation of the parties concerned in their mutual relations, and likewise the benediction.

VER. 1. **Paul.**—Concerning his person and history, his importance to the Church and his labors, consult the general introduction to these Epistles [also Herzog's Real. Ency. art. Paul. Smith's Dict. of the Bible, do. Kitto's Bible Ency. do. Besser, "Paul the Apostle." Eadie, "Paul the Preacher." Howson, "Hulsean Lectures," for 1862. A. Monod, "Five Discourses on St. Paul." Ld. Lyttleton, "On the Conversion of St. Paul." Neander, "Planting and Training," etc.]

A chosen Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God.—The ordinary rendering, "called to be an Apostle," does not give sufficient prominence to the leading thought here, which is shown by the order of the words to lie in 'Apostle.' The sense is,—an Apostle by virtue of his calling; and this calling was that given him by Christ (Acts ix. 22–26), having for its deeper ground the will of God (comp. Gal. i. 15 ff.). Hence, neither of these designations is superfluous. The fact of "being called" is insisted on in contrariety to everything like arbitrary assumption of honor, or unwarrantable intrusion into office. "Καλεῖν: to call, like קָרָא is used to denote the way in which God specially appoints men to any particular end." NEANDER. And this was a matter which, in view of the parties at Corinth who refused to acknowledge Paul's

apostleship, and sought to put him below the twelve, directly called by Christ when on earth, it was in point to bring prominently forward; and no less important was it to show that this calling came through (*διὰ*) the Supreme Will. And there was the greater necessity for this, inasmuch as the office of which he claimed to be the bearer was highest in the divine economy. It was that of an ambassador of Jesus Christ, whose business it was to represent his Master, whose words and acts were to be regarded as Christ's words and acts, the honoring or contemning of whom was to be looked upon as the honoring or contemning of Christ, who, as Christ's commissioner, appointed to organize and govern the Church throughout the world, wielded an all-embracing power, and exercised a far-reaching authority, and who agreeably with such an appointment and such plenitude of authority was endowed with a wealth of spiritual gifts, such as is ordinarily distributed among several persons in a less degree.*

And Sosthenes the brother.—Although conscious of his high and well established position, he nevertheless does not present himself before the Church alone; but he takes into company one who officially stood far below him. Him, however, he designates as an equal—as a brother both to himself and the Church, in the unity of Christian faith and hope. "The disposition on the part of Paul to send out his Epistles in the name of one or more of the brethren happening to be with him (Gal. i. 2), may be taken either to imply that the persons mentioned had aided in the upbuilding of the churches concerned, or as an expression of their perfect agreement with what he wrote. It certainly is, at any rate, a testimony to that fellowship in the Spirit, which Paul so often inculcated, and which he was ever diligent both to cultivate in himself and to inculcate upon his readers." BURGER. Whether this Sosthenes was the ruler of the synagogue mentioned in Acts xviii. 17,—supposing him to be then already inclined to the cause of Christ, in case it was by the Jews that he was beaten, or that he was violently opposed to this cause, in case he was beaten by Greeks, (the readings which indicate the one or the other are neither of them original),—cannot be accurately ascertained. In any case, he must have been known and esteemed in the Church, so that it was not without its influence with them that he expressed his assent to the contents of the letter, and represented them before Paul. That he must have written the letter himself under Paul's dictation, as some suppose (Billroth, Hodge) (comp. xvi. 21), does not necessarily follow from this connection. Perhaps we might infer that he had been an official assistant of Paul; but even this is not expressly denoted by the term 'brother.'

VER. 2. Names and characterizes the party written to.—**Unto the Church of God.**—'The congregation,' or, 'the Church of God' is the Old Testament designation of Israel as a divinely gathered people. It means a people assembled before God and for God. The derivation of the word *ecclesia* points out the mode of its gathering. It was by means of a 'calling,'—a spiritual instrumentality. Hence its members are designated as "the called." In this a personal independence is presupposed. Salvation is offered, not enforced, and it is shared only by those who voluntarily accept and enter into it. Τοῦ θεοῦ: of God—Gen. of possession. The Corinthian Church is hereby emphatically declared to belong not to any human leader, but to God alone. The Church is *His*.—**Which is at Corinth** [The local designation of the Church. Geographical divisions are in the Church the only ones recognized in the New Testament, and the Church in one place or city is always spoken of as a unit. Though consisting of one or more distinct congregations, it was regarded as an organic whole under one general superintendency. It was otherwise when a province was in view, *e. g.*, the churches of Asia.—"Church at Corinth! that wicked city! what a joyful and striking paradox." Bengel.]—**to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus.**—By this the Church of God is distinctly characterized in its members as Christian. It is composed of persons who are sanctified, *i. e.*, separated from the mass of sinful humanity, the world, and devoted to the exclusive service of the true God [and whose guilt has been expiated by an atonement. Both ideas, those of consecration and expiation, are included in the word *ἁγιάζειν*: to sanctify]. This is not to be understood in a simply legal or theocratic sense (as in the case of the Jews, who were termed a holy nation because of their descent from Abraham and their divine government); nor yet in a purely objective sense, as implying the mere imputation of holiness; but in a real sense, as being the result of the operation of the Holy Ghost (comp. vi. 11; 1 Pet. i. 2). Yet this inward appropriation of salvation is not on this account to be considered as complete, but only as begun in its informing principle, and as existing in a germ which may be developed in various degrees.

In Christ Jesus.—These words denote the ground or soil whereon those who are sanctified stand, and from which they derive the power of sanctification. It is Jesus Christ, into whose fellowship they have entered by faith and baptism (comp. Gal. iii. 26 ff.; Rom. vi. 3), [and who is the only centre and bond of union for the Church]—**called or chosen saints.** This implies that they are consecrated to God and numbered among His peculiar people by virtue of a divine call, ["effectual call as distinguished from a merely external invitation." HODGE] (comp. Rom. x. 14; ix. 24, etc.); hence, that they, as well as the Apostle on his part (ver. 1), were also indebted for their high position to the Divine Will, which was made known to them in their call through the Gospel (Rom. x. 14; 2 Thess. ii. 14). "Paul here may have reminded them of their 'calling' as something which was alike for all, having in view already the parties whom he was soon to rebuke for giving undue prominence to the human instrumentality, and for insisting upon subjective diversities in a schismatic way." NEANDER. ["It is not to be inferred from this that the Corinthian professors were all true believers, or that these terms express

[* On the nature and extent of the apostolic office, consult articles under the word "Apostle," in Kitto's Enc., 2d ed.; Smith's Bib. Dict.; Herzog's Real. Enc.; also, Owen's Works, vol. iv. p. 433-445; Schaff, Hist. of Ap. Ch., Book iii. chap. 2; Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, ch. xiii.; Litton, The Church of Christ, Book ii., Part ii. ch. 1.]

nothing more than external consecration. Men are uniformly addressed in Scripture according to their profession." HODGE].

With all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place.—There is a difference of opinion as to the connection of these words. They might be joined to those just preceding, *e. g.*, 'who are called holy, as are all who, etc.' So taken, they would serve to remind the Corinthian converts of their fellowship with Christians in all places. So Bengel. Or they may be construed as enlarging the circle of those whom Paul intends to address. The former construction would not be unsuitable, since it would furnish a fit antidote to the narrow-minded tendency to division which showed itself in the church. But the latter is favored by the similar passage in 2 Cor. i. 1, which at the same time more exactly defines and explains the general statement we have here: 'in every place.' Then we should have immediately joined to this, as belonging to it, the closing words—**both theirs and ours.**—To connect these [as the E. V. does] with "our Lord," *q. d.* "their Lord and ours," is hardly admissible from the order of the Greek text, and is also unsuitable, because in that case the word "our" as connected with "Lord" would be understood not simply of Paul or Sosthenes, but also of the recipients of the letter included with them as well. (Comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 13).—Referred to the daughter churches of Corinth in Achaia, as suggested by 2 Cor. i. 1, these words yield the sense: "in every place which belongs as well to them—the Corinthians as the mother church—as also to us, the Apostle and his companions." So construed, the Apostle will here be understood as, on the one hand, conceding *to them* the right of the mother church, and impressing upon them the duty of taking a deeper interest in the daughter churches, and, on the other hand, as indicating *his* interest in these, and so winning them also to the reception of his doctrine and exhortation. [But is it not more natural to refer "theirs" to "those who call upon, etc.," and to include under "ours" both the parties writing and the parties written to? So Alford. Another interpretation has been proposed. "The Epistle is addressed to all Christians in Corinth and Achaia, wherever they might be. Every place is at once theirs and ours—their place of abode and my place of labor." See Hodge. "These words form a weighty and precious addition—made here doubtless to show the Corinthians that membership of God's Holy Catholic Church consisted not in being planted or presided over by Paul or Apollos or Cephas (or their successors), but in calling on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." Alf.].

Who call upon the name, etc.—ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα. By this is denoted, not the *being called* by the name of the Lord, as if the Greek verb were in the Passive, but, as every where in the Old and New Testament, the *calling* upon the name of the Lord, especially the invocation of His help as Lord. It is, accordingly, an act of divine worship, [and in a more extended sense, denotes a life of reverence towards God, and of habitual religious faith]. The term Lord, answering to the Hebrew יְהוָה or אֲדֹנָי: Jehovah or Adonai, here applied to Christ, indicates His plenipotence and truth, which is more fully set forth in Matth. xi. 27; xxviii. 18; John xviii. 2; and which rests partly upon His original sonship and His mediatorial agency in the creation (viii. 6; Col. i. 16 ff.; Heb. i. 2 ff.), and partly upon His redemptive office (vii. 22 ff.; Acts xx. 28; Tit. ii. 14).—The *name* indicates the being as revealed and known; hence the invocation presupposes faith—faith, preaching—and preaching, the word of God (Rom. x. 14 ff.). Those who called upon the name of Christ formed a contrast with those who blasphemed this name among the Jews. (Luke xxiii. 39; 1 Tim. i. 13; Acts xxvi. 9; comp. chap. xxii. 16). This same thought lies at the foundation even in places where instead of a name we have a mere description. The name of Jesus Christ expresses what He is, His entire personality together with His office and work. [On the import of names, especially as belonging to Deity: see Bush, Com. Ex. iii. 13.; Hengst. Com. Ps. viii. 2; ix. 12; Whately, Serm. Matth. i. 23].

VER. 3. The benediction, which elsewhere among the Greeks, and twice also in the New Testament (Jas. i. 1; Acts xv. 23) is woven with the address into one sentence, is here peculiarly extended.—**Grace** and **peace** constitute the sum total of Gospel blessings, the former being the ground and source of the latter. Χάρις properly denotes that which begets joy, viz. favor, grace, kindly feeling. It may be regarded either as a quiescent trait, the mere outshining of an inward goodness or amiability; or as an energy put in active exercise for the welfare of others. Among the Greeks the word was used also in connections which we should deem immoral. But in the language of revelation it denotes that supreme love and self-devotion which was manifested in its most perfect form by the Son of God. It is what we, in respect of the unworthiness of the object, denominate *grace*, by which is meant sometimes the mere feeling of kindness in the heart, and sometimes the beneficent act which is its result. Here, indeed, it means the peace of forgiveness and reconciliation, corresponding to the Hebrew שָׁלוֹם which includes the entire welfare of the individual both spiritual and physical, and the root of which is inward peace, the repose of the spirit in the sweet consciousness of being reconciled to God, and in the blessed assurance that we have God for our friend and have to expect from Him good alone. (Comp. Rom. viii. 1, 31–39). ["The wish of peace has a peculiar bearing here in view of the dissensions at Corinth." Ols.].

From God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.—That this clause is not to be translated "from God the Father of us, and of the Lord Jesus Christ," is clear from Gal. i. 3; not to say any thing of the impropriety of thus putting Jesus Christ in a subordinate position.—The co-ordination of Jesus with the Father is to be explained on the ground that the office of mediating grace and peace rests upon His divine sonship, and so upon His equality with God.—This is a truth already indicated in the appella-

tion "Lord," and which is inferred from viii. 6, and from the whole Pauline system of doctrine. ["Here it is to be remarked, that God is called our *Father* and Christ our *Lord*. God, as God, has not only created us, but renewed and adopted us. God in Christ has redeemed us. He is our owner and sovereign, to whom our allegiance is immediately due; who reigns in us, and rules over us, defending us from all our enemies. This is the peculiar form which piety assumes under the Gospel. All Christians regard God as their Father and Christ as their Lord." Hodge].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. From the fact that God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ are exhibited to us as the *common source* or *sum total* of all the blessings of salvation, it is to be seen that the Apostle, even while subordinating Christ to God (iii. 23; xi. 3; xv. 28), yet maintains such a mediation through Christ of the Divine grace, and of the blessings flowing from it, *as presupposes in Christ the Mediator a divine nature.* How the two things, subordination and equality of substance, agree, is a problem for the science of Christology. This is the mystery of love, which in the Father flows out in the fulness of the divine perfections; which in the Son keeps itself evermore as consciously dependent and recipient, and, accordingly, both thinks, purposes and does every thing with sole reference to the Father.

2. The equality of Christ with God is also indicated by *the calling upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.* Both this invocation and that derivation of all the blessings of salvation from the Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ conjointly, can be made consistent with the Old Testament teaching respecting God, only on the supposition of the essential divinity of Jesus Christ and His true equality with the Father.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

1. The consciousness of *being called to the ministry through the will of God* (ver. 1) is: 1. the ground of our confidence in appearing before a Christian congregation to instruct, exhort, reprove and comfort (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 4 ff.); 2. the spring of humble devotion to the service of the Lord, *a.* devoid of all arbitrary and self-willed activity, *b.* and in every thing observant of the Master's eye, and subject to His word; [3. an example for all engaged in any lawful vocation. The consciousness of being called to our work in the providence of God is necessary for the sanctification of our labors, by imparting to them a noble aim, a right impulse, and a true courage to do and endure valiantly for God, our true Master, in all things appointed unto us. After Robertson].

2. The main features of a true church (ver. 2) are, 1. that it is an assemblage before and for God; 2. that it consists of such as are consecrated to God in Jesus Christ; 3. that it is thus consecrated through the mighty creative will of God; 4. that its members are such as call upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ; [5. that these things may exist in connection with many glaring faults in true professing believers, and with many false professions of faith, which yet do not necessarily vitiate the claim to be called a true church].

3. The proper fellowship between the office and the church rests, 1. in that the former works out for the latter the benefits of salvation which come from God and Jesus Christ in the way of blessing; 2. in that the latter receives these benefits from the ministration of blessing with earnest and hearty desires.

4. VERS. 2, 3: BESSER:—How must the Apostolic greeting shame many congregations who assemble to hear this Epistle read, and yet come there with discordant sentiments and divided tongues! "The name *ἐκκλησία*: church," says Chrysostom, "is a name not of separation, but of union and harmony."

[5. VER. 2: BENGEL:—The consideration of the church universal frees the mind from party bias, and sways it to obedience.]

II. *Gratitude and hope in respect to their Christian state in general.*

CHAPTER I. 4–9.

4 I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is [was[1]] given
5 you by [in: *ἐν*] Jesus Christ; That in every thing ye are [were] enriched by [in] him,
6 in all utterance, and *in* all knowledge; Even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed
7 in you: So that ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus
8 Christ: Who shall also confirm you unto the end, *that ye may be* blameless in the day
9 of our Lord Jesus Christ. God *is* faithful, by [through] whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

[1] Ver. 4. *δοθείσῃ*: was given, viz., at the time of conversion].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

This opening, in which the Apostle expresses his *thanks* to God for the abundance of spiritual gifts possessed by the Corinthian Church, and his *hope* in their steadfastness and further prosperity in all good, should by no means be regarded as a simple rhetorical *captatio benevolentiæ*, as a mere bit of flattery designed to win his readers, so that they might the better accept his subsequent exhortations and rebukes, and keep themselves well disposed in spite of the unpleasant things he had to say, and submit to be the more readily guided to the ends he had in view. What Paul here says is preëminently the truth. It comes from his heart. He does feel a sincere joy that so much good exists in the church and that it affords such ground of hope for the future. It is a conviction which proceeds from his fatherly disposition (comp. iv. 15). Nor are we to regard it as any self-deception or fond fancy of his. For however great may have been the faults of individuals, the work of Divine grace had nevertheless been begun in all the plenitude of spiritual gifts, and his confidence in the continued operation of the Lord confirming their hearts, and in the faithfulness of God towards them, was verily well grounded. Both these things are presupposed in his exhortation and rebuke. First, objectively: in so far as the expectation of any good results from his efforts rested only upon the existence of some good already in the church and upon God's faithfulness and coöperation. Again, subjectively: in so far as the acknowledgment of previous successes and the hope of yet greater ones, generally inspire confidence and render persons favorably disposed to receive exhortation and rebuke as given kindly and intelligently, and infuse into them courage to undertake the work of reform; and this courage is of the right kind since it refers all good back to God as the source. And in this style of address there is something more than cool human calculation. It is acting in perfect conformity with the true laws of the mind, and above all with the law of that love "which believeth all things and hopeth all things," but which nevertheless secures the same results that worldly prudence is wont to calculate for in a selfish way. "The Corinthian Church was well trained and instructed and established in the faith; but it was not yet entirely simple-minded and pure in heart; there was much worldly vanity and party spirit still among them. So in every church there is to be found a mixture of what is praiseworthy and blameworthy. The praise of the better class piques even the worse, and is a means of inciting them to merit that praise, too. And the reproof of the bad ought to affect the better class likewise, awakening in them regrets that there are such persons by their side and in their communion as deserve reproof, and it should prompt them to remove the evil. Every church is one organic whole, by reason of which the several members exert an influence upon each other and share in that which others have and are." Heubner, p. 213. "This introduction, breathing blessing and praise, gratitude and confidence, exhibits the spiritual shepherd in apostolic simplicity and truth. All goodness in the church he denominates a work of grace, and he sets in prospect the consummation of the salvation begun as only grace likewise, and he does it in a manner at once humbling and animating. He looks at the church in its germ, in the strength of its better elements which may be rendered a source of blessing to others, and so, wisely preparing the way, he passes over from the bright to the darker side." Osiander.

Ver. 4. **I thank.**—An expression of acknowledgment and joy towards God as the Author of all good.—**My God.**—As in Rom. i. 8 and elsewhere,—of course not in an exclusive sense, but as an avowal of his own personal communion with God and direct interest in Him; a personal attestation of his religious position, without any sinister design, but yet in a manner calculated to elicit respect and confidence in what he is about to say.—**Always.**—This cannot mean that he was always engaged in audible thanksgiving, or that this feeling of gratitude was also definitely present in his consciousness; but only that he bore this church perpetually upon his heart with grateful emotions to God—a meaning which the word in the Greek also carries.—**On your behalf for the grace of God.**—The personal object for whom and the reason on account of which the thanks were given. [*χάρις*: grace, the disposition in God, for *χαρίσματα*: the blessings flowing from it—"a metonymy which has passed so completely into our common parlance, as to be almost lost sight of as such."—Alf. Wordsworth, however, distinguishes here, *χάρισμα* is a special gift to be used for *general edification*. *χάρις* is grace generally for *personal sanctification*. Tongues, miracles, healing are *χαρίσματα*. *χάρις* is given in order that *χαρίσματα* may be rightly used."].—**Which was given you in Jesus Christ.**—Comp. also ver. 2.—Christ is here regarded, in a sort, as the place, where the grace of God is manifested (comp. 2 Cor. v. 19) so that he who enters there becomes partaker of it. But this entrance is faith, by which the believer is in Christ and comes into vital communion with Him.

Ver. 5. Extends the thought and shows wherein the manifested grace consists.—**That ye were enriched in him**—*i. e.*, as being in Christ and having constant communion with Him; and this enriching is the work of God's grace.—**In every thing.**—A general statement, which is at once more particularly defined and limited.—**In all doctrine.**—Thus ought *λόγος* to be translated with Luther [in which Calvin, Alf., de Wette, Billroth, Meyer concur, understanding by it: doctrine preached to the Corinthians], and not: "utterance," as though the reference were to powers of eloquence or the gift of tongues [so Bengel, Stanley and Wordsworth; "and which interpretation," Hodge says, "gives good sense and is the one generally adopted." Meyer: "All manner of external endowments for speaking;" excluding however any allusion to gift of tongues, as inconsistent with the subordinate value attached to this in chap. xiv. This view is sustained by xii. 8; 2 Cor. viii. 7; xi. 6. In this case *γνώσις*; *knowledge*, would denote the inward endowment. The order of the words appears to support Kling's view. "Truth

preached, (*i. e.*) 'doctrine,' must precede 'truth apprehended,' *i. e.* 'knowledge.'" But the analogous passages in the two Epistles go to prove Meyer's view and the correctness of the English version also].—**In all knowledge.**—By this he means: the general acceptance of the doctrines that had been communicated to them on every side, and a comprehensive insight into their truth. This statement does not conflict with the fact of peculiar defects in individuals.

VER. 6. Further confirms and illustrates the foregoing. **Inasmuch as**—*καθώς*: [not correlation: "according as," but as in appended clauses denoting explanation, *quoniam, si quidem*, since. Winer's Gr. LIII. 8].—**The testimony of Christ.**—Christ may here be taken either as the subject, the one testifying, or as the object, the one testified of. The one does not exclude the other. In the former case the phrase would mean, the proclamation of the Divine plan of salvation in all its parts (its grounds, aims and relations; its beginning, mediation, execution and consummation), obtained by a direct insight into the heart of God, into His inmost thought and purpose (comp. Jn. i. 18; vi. 46). But in this testimony of Christ, which sounded forth from the Apostles also, and so included their preaching, there is involved also the other idea, Christ's own personal testimony, and the testimony of His Apostles likewise, to His divine Sonship and His mediatoral office. It makes little difference whether we construe it in the one way or the other. ["The former is the higher and therefore the better sense. It is good to contemplate the Gospel as that system of truth which the Eternal Logos or Revealer has made known." HODGE. Yet, it must be said, usage favors the latter acceptation. "The testimony of Christ" is the witness borne concerning Christ by His Apostles of which the New Testament is the record, and in this instance by Paul. So Calv., Alf., Stan., Meyer]. "That the word *μαρτύριον*, testimony, and not *διδασκαλία*, instruction, is here chosen, does not rest upon a simple Hebraism, but is well explained on the ground that the gospel has not to do first and primarily with a system of ideas, but with an announcement of facts, the power of which a person must experience in himself." NEANDER. The same expression occurs in 2 Tim. i. 18.—**was confirmed in you.**—Others render: 'was established among you' (Mark xvi. 20; Rom. xv. 8; Heb. ii. 4), whether it be by signs and miracles or by extraordinary operations of the Gospel.—Rückert: 'by its effects on you.' But this neither suits the connection with what precedes, nor what is afterwards (ver. 7) mentioned as the result of it. The former indicates that the testimony of Christ was confirmed in their hearts, inwardly rooted there. And this happens partly through a comprehensive knowledge, so that thus the words "in all knowledge" would be further illustrated, and partly as its presupposed condition, inasmuch as it is effected by faith, which is the root of all knowledge, and is to be regarded as a becoming fixed and remaining steadfast in the truth. Respecting their steadfastness in this respect see xvi. 1; 2 Cor. i. 24.

VER. 7. The consequence.—**So that ye come behind in no gift.**—The deep and fixed rooting of the gospel in the soul results in a rich unfolding of spiritual life, of which he now proceeds to speak. By "gift" we are to understand a result of the operation of divine grace. Rom. v. 16 expresses by it the work of grace as a whole. Here we are to understand it of the particular operations by which the members of the Church were variously qualified to labor for the edification of the body of Christ, either by instruction, or exhortation, or rule, or service, inasmuch as the native talents of individuals requisite for such labors are awakened and sanctified by divine grace (comp. xii.). When such talents fall within the sphere of moral effort, and are exercised in furthering the welfare of the Church and in glorifying God, they acquire an ethical character, and the gifts appear as Christian virtues. That such were the gifts alluded to seems to be intimated in what follows—**Waiting for the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ.**—This constant expectation of our Lord's second coming (Rom. viii. 19 etc.), when He shall be revealed in his glory unto all (Col. iii. 4), is one of the characteristic features of primitive Christianity (comp. Phil. iii. 20; 1 Thess. i. 10; Tit. ii. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 8). Hence the clause has been taken as a simple paraphrase of the word: Christians. But this is by no means allowable here.—The connection of this participial clause with the preceding one has been variously interpreted. Luther somewhat loosely: "And are waiting," "only waiting" in the sense, that they were all ready; in which sense we might translate it: "And can wait" or: "can comfortably wait;" But this would conflict with the entire contents of the Epistle. To take it as ironical, (Mosheim) in the way of a slant at their self-sufficiency, would be inconsistent with the friendly winning style of the introduction. And no less so, to suppose that he intended to alarm, by the suggestion of a coming judgment (Chrysostom), or to rebuke the sceptics of whom mention is made in chap. xv. More correct it would be, undoubtedly, to adopt the closer connection and translate: "while ye are waiting," or, "ye who are expecting," etc. The train of thought is this, that they, in this state of waiting, did not cease to make advances in every Christian qualification. So considered, the fact of "not coming behind" obtains the sense of: not falling short from any lack of earnest moral endeavor. There was a self-cultivation on the part of the spiritually quickened in consequence of their establishment in the faith (ver. 6). [But it must be added also that in the very mention of their waiting attitude, a commendation is intended. For this very "waiting," as Alford well says, was "the greatest proof of maturity and richness of the spiritual life; implying the coëxistence and coöperation of *faith*, whereby they believed the promise of Christ—*hope*, whereby they looked on to its fulfilment, and *love*, whereby that anticipation was lit up with earnest desire." But it may be asked, Were the Corinthians looking for Christ's second advent as an event likely to occur in their day, and which some of them might expect to witness? This question must be answered in the affirmative. As Trench has well remarked, "It is a necessary element of the doctrine concerning the second coming of Christ, that it should be possi-

ble at *any time.*" And all the hints given us throughout the Epistles (comp. 1 Thess. iv. 13—v. 10; Phil. iii. 20; Tit. ii. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 8) show that the hope of seeing Christ appear, while yet in the flesh, was an influential and inspiring sentiment, pervading the whole early Church. It was a powerful motive to watchfulness and patient endurance. And that it should so operate was one design of the secrecy which veiled it. "*Latet ultimus dies, ut observetur omnes dies*" (Aug.). That such was the case with the Corinthians seems to be intimated in the use of the word expressive of their mental attitude, *ἀπεκδεχο μένους*: waiting it out, as persons expecting to see what they are waiting for].*

The earnest endeavor of the Church (or at least its better portion, its kernel) just recognized, leads the Apostle, in spite of all existing defects in individuals, to cherish the *hope* which he expresses in

VER. 8. **Who shall also confirm you.**—To whom does the relative "who" refer? Most naturally to Christ, mentioned just before in ver. 7. But in this case it is remarkable that in the next clause instead of saying "in *His* day," he uses again the whole name and title of Christ. Hence the "who" might be referred back to "God" (ver. 9), whose gracious doings are spoken of in vv. 5 and 6, and to whom the confirmation in the faith is ascribed (2 Cor. i. 21; Rom. xvi. 25). The effect then of the Divine confirmation of the testimony of Christ in them would be regarded as awakening the hope also that God would establish them still further.† The reference however to Christ must still be maintained. The use of the full phrase "in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ," must be regarded only as the adoption of a solemn formula, elsewhere also employed, to designate the time of the second advent (comp. 2 Tim. i. 18). In 2 Thess. iii. 3 we have likewise the work of confirming believers ascribed to Christ. And this is mentioned here in correspondence with what is said of their not coming behind in any gift and of their patient waiting. It involves also what follows.—**Unto the end.**—*i. e.*, as the connection requires, not the end of the present life of individuals, but the end of the present dispensation, which terminates at the second advent, when the new era (*αἰὼν μέλλων*) will come in. —"**Blameless.**"—A short *constructio prægnans* —*εἰς τὸ εἶναι ὑμᾶς*: that ye may be, [which is supplied in the E. V. "Compare the expressions *διδάσκειν σοφὸν, αὐξάνειν μέγαν*, to teach a man so as to become wise, to increase him so as to be great; Kühner, § 417, 3. This is called by grammarians a proleptic use of the adjective." Words. See Winer, Gram. Part iii. § lxvi. 3. g.]. By the term 'blameless' we understand such as are liable to no accusation; and this not simply putatively, but, since he is speaking of their condition at the appearing of Christ, in the sense of an actual or perfected holiness, so that the All-seeing Judge Himself will have nothing to lay to their charge (comp. Eph. v. 27). Meyer. "This blamelessness is conditioned upon perseverance in the faith by which our justification is appropriated, and therefore is imputed; nevertheless by virtue of the moral nature and power of faith, as well as by virtue of the sanctification through the Holy Ghost, it is entirely of a moral nature (Rom. vi. 1 ff.; viii. 1 ff.). Hence the person who is *ἀνέγκλητος*: blameless, appears at the revelation of Christ not indeed as *ἀναμάρτητος*: sinless, but as a "new creature in Christ" (2 Cor. v. 17) who having been Divinely restored (Eph. ii. 10) and progressively sanctified (1 Thess. v. 23) has worked out his own salvation in the moral power of a new life (Phil. ii. 12). [But here a question arises. Is this promise absolute or conditional? Conybeare and Howson add the gloss, "*He will do His part* to confirm you." Hammond puts in the qualification, "God will make good His promise if you do not fail yourselves." A. Clark inquires "But can it be said that God will keep what is either not intrusted to Him? or, after being intrusted, is taken away?" But such limitations seem to take from the promise its blessedness and comfort, for if this promise be of any value, it is the fact that it furnishes a guarantee against that greatest of dangers, the fickleness of the human will. It is in view of this danger, so manifest in the Corinthians, that Paul expresses his assurance of their steadfastness as grounded in the confirming grace of God. It were better therefore to take the promise absolutely. "Those to whom God gives the renewing influence of the Spirit, He thereby pledges himself to save; for the 'first fruits of the spirit' are of the nature of a pledge." Hodge.]

VER. 9. Refers the hope expressed in ver. 8 to its deepest ground.—**God is faithful.**—He will not drop the work He has begun after the fashion of weak inconstant men; but persevering in love He will carry out that which was commenced in love, even unto its goal. (Comp. Phil. i. 6; 1 Thess. v. 24; 2 Thess. iii. 3; Rom. xi. 29)—["Here, on this fidelity of God, and not on the strength of the believers' purpose to persevere, nor on any assumption that the principle of religion in their hearts was indestructible, was the confidence of the Apostle in their steadfastness grounded." Hodge. This faithfulness of God is pledged in three directions: 1. to Himself in the purpose formed; 2. to Christ in the covenant made with Him, Is. liii.; and 3. to believers]. —**Through whom.**—*δι οὗ*: a popular expression. We can speak of God as a mediating as well as a principal cause. (Rom. xi. 36). His Providence it is that through a great variety of arrangements and coöperating circumstances mediates the call, viz., the presentation of the Gospel to them, and also its effect in their hearts. —**Ye were called unto the fellowship of His Son,** &c.—This calling of God is the com-

[* Neander believed that in the minds of the Apostles, especially in Paul, a progressive development in Eschatology took place. The second advent at first seemed close at hand and possible in their day, but as they became more enlightened as to the future by the illuminations of the Spirit, it stood at a farther remove. Neander "Plant and Train, of the Christian Church," p. 484.]

† [The reasons for referring "Who" to God, ver. 4, are well given by Stanley "1. *καὶ βεβαιώσει*: *also confirm*, evidently refers back to *ἐβεβαιώθη*: *was confirmed*, in ver. 6." 2. "In the day of the Lord Jesus Christ," would else be: "in His day." 3. *ὁ θεός*; God is the general subject of the whole sentence, and therefore repeated in ver. 9. "God is faithful. For the sense comp. Phil i. 6." To these may be added 4. from Hodge: "vocation and perseverance are in the work of redemption specially referred to the Father." The same position is taken by Calvin, Alford, Billroth, Olshausen, de Wette, Osiander and others.]

mencement of His work. Its goal is a participation as a son in the glory of his Lord (Comp. Rom. viii. 21, 23; 2 Thess. ii. 14). The fellowship with Jesus Christ embraces our entire condition, into which we are transferred through the power of the word when heard and received, and through the sacraments, extending from childhood on until we come into the inheritance of the glory which is to be revealed in Him and in us also." Burger.

But does not ver. 9 compel us to take God as the subject in ver. 8? [Certainly; one would suppose so]. By no means [!]. The truth of God is a pledge that Christ will confirm us. For it is precisely because we have been called through the unchangeable loving will of the Father to have part in Him, the glorified Son of God, and therefore to be made conformable unto Him that He whose will is ever one with the Father can do no other than confirm us. [Rather far fetched].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. That Jesus Christ is the living sanctuary, whence all the manifestations of Divine grace are made, and all gifts are imparted, rests upon the character of His person. In Him it pleased God that all fulness should dwell—yea, that the fulness of the Godhead should dwell in Him bodily (Col. i. 19; ii. 9). From this it follows that believers are complete in Him. (Col. ii. 10).

2. The actual participation in this fulness is conditioned on the confirmation of this "testimony of Christ" in the heart through a lively faith, which involves a union with Christ and results in energetic endeavors, awakened in prospect of Christ's glorious advent, to be behind in no gift, in order that the Church of Christ may become a well-equipped organic whole, and so ripen on to perfection.

3. To this actual confirmation of the truth in the heart there corresponds the work of Christ, resting upon the faithfulness of God who has called us unto the fellowship of His Son, for the confirmation of His own unto the end that they may be found blameless at His appearing, and prepared to participate in His glory as a bride adorned for the bridegroom (Rev. xxi. 2, 9; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 2; Col. i. 12).

[4. The nature of the believers' calling: 1. As to its *condition*. It is a fellowship with Christ through faith in character, in sufferings, and in glory. 2. As to its *permanence*, endurance unto the end; kept by the power of a faithful God. 3. As to its *activity*, a cultivation of Divine gifts in the service of Christ.]

[5. The second advent of Christ is possible for any generation, and ought constantly to be looked for, desired and prayed for.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

1. A proper joy at the prosperity of a church: *a.* expresses itself in thanks to God, (ver. 4); *b.* is occasioned by the grace of God manifested to it in Jesus Christ; [*c.* and should fill every minister's heart even as it did Paul's, compensating him for all the toil and suffering of his ministry].

2. The wealth of a church in doctrine, [or utterance] and knowledge, *a.* has its ground in Christ, (ver. 5); *b.* is obtained through the confirmation of his testimony in it.

3. The right waiting for the coming of Christ allows us to remain neither idle nor unfruitful, but inspires us with an earnest zeal constantly to appropriate and improve every spiritual gift.

4. Our hope for the perfection of Christians is our confidence in Christ [or God], who will confirm them blameless unto the end, and it is founded upon the faithfulness of God who has called us to the fellowship of His Son. (ver. 9.)

[5. The test of a true or false Christian is his waiting for or dreading the revelation of Christ. Bengel].

Heubner: Ver. 4: 1. *Gratitude* is something more than prayer. He who does nothing but always pray, is and appears ever unsatisfied. 2. God must become *our* God, *i. e.*, we should not only acknowledge Him as God in general, but we should also recognize Him as our own God from all the experiences of life. This is true egotism. 3. A teacher has no blessing except what comes from God. Ver. 5: 1. Wealth in that which is needful for salvation is true permanent wealth. 2. The amount the Apostles accomplished in their churches ought to shame us. They were obliged to quarry their churches out of the rough rock. We find Christians ready made to our hand, yet how little we achieve. Ver. 7: Christian life in a church is to be known by the awakening of all good Christian energies. Every one should be ready to serve the holy cause of Christ with his gift. Ver. 8: Unblamableness at Christ's judgment should be the goal of a Christian.

[Ver. 4. There is a bright side even to the most disheartening circumstances of the church. It is our duty to consider these first and take courage].

[Vers. 4–9. The rebukes of a minister, when steeped in love and prefaced by commendation descend like an excellent oil that doth not break the head].

SECOND DIVISION.

REPROOF OF DEFECTS AND FAULTS.

I. *Exhortation to unity and rebuke of party spirit.*

CHAPTER I. 10–17.

10 Now [But[1]] I beseech [exhort[2]] you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus
Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and *that* there be no divisions among you;
but [rather[3]] *that* ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind [γνώμῃ sentiment]
11 and in the same judgment. For it hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren,
by them *which* [who] *are of the house* of Chloe, that there are contentions among
12 you. Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos;
13 and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for[4] you?
14 or were ye baptized in [into: εἰς] the name of Paul? I thank God that I baptized
15 none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; Lest any [In order that no one[5]] should say
16 that I had baptized in [ye were baptized into[6]] mine own name. And I baptized
also the household of Stephanas; besides I know not whether I baptized any other.
17 For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel:

[1] Ver. 10.—["δέ: *but*, introduces a contrast to the thankful assurance just expressed."—Alf.]
[2] Ver. 10.—[παρακαλῶ; "obsecro—a mixture of entreaty and command."—Stanley.]
[3] Ver. 10.—[δὲ: *but rather*.—Hartung, Partikellehre, i. 171.]
[4] Ver. 13.—["Instead of ὑπὲρ some MSS. B. D.* have περί, but ὑπὲρ is in A. C. D.***E. F. G. I. and also in Cod. Sin."—Words.]
[5] Ver. 15.—[ἵνα μή τις εἴπῃ; ἵνα carries here a telic force.]
[6] Ver. 15.—Instead of ἐβάπτισα, which is to be accounted for from its occurring in the next verse, Lachmann and Tischendorf [and Alford and Wordsworth] in accordance with the best authorities read ἐβαπτίσθητε.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The connection may be understood thus: I thank my God for his work of grace among you, and in view of his faithfulness am confident that the work, Christ [or God's] has begun, he will perfect. You, nevertheless, I exhort, that ye consider carefully what is required for the fulfilment of this work, and remove whatsoever shall hinder it.

VER. 1. The Exhortation.—**I exhort you brethren.**—A friendly, winning address, which, as an evidence of his fellowship in the faith and his equality with them in it, imparts to his exhortation the character of an entreaty. This is also implied in the Greek παρακαλῶ. "Paul often adds the term: brother, when he has an earnest word to utter." (vii. 29; x. 1; xiv. 20). MEYER. The δε: *but*, introduces the transition from his exhibition of the bright side of the church to the reproof of its dark side. It is as if he said: "For much in you I have to thank God, but there is much in you which I have to censure." NEANDER.—**By the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.**—It is thus he strengthens his exhortation and presents a motive for compliance.—["The name of Christ was the bond of union and the most holy thing by which they could be adjured." STANLEY.]. The force of it lay in this, that they all acknowledged Jesus Christ to be their Lord, and so professed themselves to belong to one and the same Master; and in this the obligation to unity was unmistakably indicated. Similar instances are found in Rom. xv. 30; xii. 1; 2 Cor. x. 1.—The contents and aim of the exhortation are expressed in the several clauses which set forth the same leading thoughts in several relations [and they are introduced by ἵνα: *in order that*, which points not only to the *import* but also to the *intent* of the exhortation. See WINER, LIII. 6.]—**That ye all speak the same thing.**—By this he means: give expression to their inward accord and harmony of sentiment. It is precisely the opposite of the conduct mentioned in v. 12. They were with one voice to avow their allegiance to the one Lord, to the exclusion of all divisive party-watchwords. This is obvious from the following negative clause—**that there be no divisions among you.**—Inasmuch as he is not treating here of "dissentions in doctrine, but of divisions arising from adherence to different leaders, and from peculiar modes of apprehending and applying doctrine," we are not to regard him as insisting upon "an exact uniformity of profession in the essential points of doctrine and life." [The word used for divisions is σχίσματα, lit.: schisms. These, "in their ecclesiastical sense, are unauthorized separations from the church. But those which existed at Corinth were not of the nature of hostile sects refusing communion with each other, but such as may exist in the bosom of the same church, consisting in alienation of feeling and party strifes." HODGE.]—**But rather that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.**—The inward positive side implied in the previous negative one. [The original word for "joined together" is from καταρτίζειν: *to repair, to mend, to reunite* and *make perfect* what has been broken. It were natural therefore to suppose an allusion

here to the broken condition of the church which needed to be reunited and to translate the word as in the text literally. So Alf. and Hodge and Stanley, who says that "*καταρτιστήρ* was the acknowledged phrase in classical Greek for a reconciler of factions." Calvin takes the word to signify: "fitly joined together, just as the members of the human body are joined in most admirable symmetry," thus furnishing a picture of what the church should be. Kling however, following the Vulgate and Theoph. prefers the derivative sense of: perfect, and makes it= *τέλειοι*.] That wherein they were to be united is given in two words *νοΐ* and *γνώμῃ*. The *former* "embraces that peculiar mode of thought and of viewing life which lays the foundations for the moral judgment and moral self-determination. So in 1 Tim. vi. 5; 2 Tim. iii. 8. Comp. BECK, *Bibl. Seelenlehre*, § 51; DELITZSCH, *Bibl. Psychol.* § 139. The *latter* is *power of knowledge, understanding, spirit*, also *sense, disposition*, as well as *insight* obtained, *view, opinion, conviction*, also *resolve, design, aim; view expressed=counsel, proposition*. The two must here be distinguished. Only it cannot be readily decided which denotes the side of thought and judgment, and which that of will and disposition. Since, however, *γνώμη* is used elsewhere in this Epistle to signify *view*, and *counsel* (see vii. 25, 40, also 2 Cor. viii. 10), perhaps it would be best to take it here also in a theoretic acceptation= view, conviction. ["In the New Testament it always means *judgment* and *opinion*. When the two words are used together, the former is most naturally understood of *feeling*, a sense in which the word *mind* is often used by us." HODGE. "Disposition and opinion." ALFORD].

VER. 11. Explains the occasion and motives for the exhortation, while the disgrace of it is softened by the fraternal address.—**For it hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren, by them of Chloe.**—Sad reports had reached him, and he names his authorities in advance. What relation these persons sustained to Chloe, whether children, or servants, or other members of her household, cannot be ascertained from the text, "Paul names his informants without reserve in order to obviate suspicion." BESSER. "Concealment and mystery sow distrust and destroy love." BURGER. This Chloe must at all events have been a woman well known to the Corinthian brethren, either as a resident at Corinth, so that her people had come from thence to Corinth, or as a resident at Ephesus, so that these persons had learned of the state of things at Corinth during a visit there.—**that there are contentions among you.**—*ἔριδες*: *discords, wranglings*, which would inevitably lead to separations, to a rent in the Church, if not arrested in season. [Here he sets forth in severer phrase what he had more gently intimated in the word "schisms" above, and shows its evil and bitter character.]

VER. 12. Fuller explanation. **Now this I mean.**—*τοῦτο*: *this*, as commonly, points to what follows (vii. 29; xv. 50), not to what precedes. **That every one of you saith:** (*i.e.*) has one or other of the following speeches in his mouth. A like use of *ἕκαστος*; *every one*, appears in xiv. 26. [WINER says, "There is no brachilogy here. In these four statements Paul intended to comprehend all the declarations current in the chapter regarding religious partisanship. Each adherent of the respective sections used one of the following expressions"]. "Saith boastfully." BENGEL. He here vividly sets before us the several partisans, as they step out side by side, or in opposing ranks, each announcing the name of the leader he followed. It is as if he saw or heard them thus arraying themselves "As they were wont to do at the school, so here they acted in the Church." BESSER.—**I am of Paul,**—(*i. e.*) I belong to him as my head or spiritual father. The Genitive of ownership or dependence. The order of mention is most readily explained by supposing it to correspond with that of the rise of the parties. According to NEANDER, Paul follows the order of particular relationship, since the Apollos-party was only a fraction of the Pauline. The idea of a climax (BENGEL), Paul in his humiliation putting himself at the bottom, is superfluous and improbable. Altogether groundless, however, and without any indication in its favor, yea, directly contrary to ver. 14, is the opinion of the old expositors, that Paul used these names at random by way of a cover to the real leaders whom he had in mind. See the statement made respecting these parties and their rise in § 2 of the Introduction. The *Pauline* party naturally stands first, since the Church depended on Paul as its founder, and that portion which clave to Paul and his ways, (after a fraction had defected to Apollos), must be regarded as the original party.—**I of Apollos,**—(a shortened form for Apollonius). He was just as little disposed to act the part of leader, as was Paul. This may be seen from the fact that notwithstanding the urgent solicitation of Paul, he positively declined to visit Corinth at that time. This was no doubt with a view to avoid giving any fresh fuel to the strife which had already sprung up. (Comp. iv. 6; xvi. 12). Respecting him see Acts xviii. 24 etc.; xix. 1; also OSIANDER on our passage [and SMITH, *Bible Dict.*]. That he was a humble man, one who did not pride himself upon his culture, one of the few "wise after the flesh," who had been early called (i. 26) and "had sanctified their science by faith in Christ, to whom they made it subservient," is clear from his willingness to be instructed by those simple mechanics, Aquila and Priscilla. Far from wishing to outbid Paul for influence and popularity, he labored only to confirm believers by a cautious reference to the Prophecies of the Old Testament. We find him once more mentioned commendatorily in Titus iii. 13. Highly probable is the suggestion, first made by Luther, and afterwards ably advocated by Bleek, that he was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Osiander calls this Epistle a most noble monument, both of his genius, which harmoniously combined human culture and Divine illumination, and of his style of doctrine, which was directed mainly to the work of atonement, and to the illustration of the fulfilment of the Old Covenant in the New, &c.—**I of Cephas,**—(*i c.*) Peter, without doubt. It was his Aramean name, found also at ix. 5; xv. 5; Gal. ii. 9. Whether the party following him adopted this name, because they derived it through Jewish emissaries out of Syria, or be-

cause it seemed to them more sacred as coming from the mouth of our Lord (Jno. i. 42), or because the Shibboleth of a vernacular word sounded more imposingly, we are not able to decide. It is more probable that the Jewish name was the more common one with Paul. Only once in Gal. ii. 7 ff, do we find him using the Greek name: Peter.—**I of Christ.**—As a supplement to what was said in the Introduction on this point, see Meyer in loco. We here give the main particulars. First, according to a fair exegesis it must be maintained that the parties were four in number. Alike needless and inadmissible is the attempt to resolve them, either into two essentially identical pairs (as Baur does, who distinguishes between that "of Paul" and that "of Apollos" only in form, and takes that "of Christ" to be the same as that "of Peter," which only assumed this cognomen because it deemed a genuine Apostleship dependent on personal connection with Christ, or which, as Beeker thinks, consisted of native Jewish converts connected with the Petrinists that had come in from abroad, but had called themselves Christians because they had been converted by Paul and Apollos); or into two main parties: that of the Apostles and that of Christ, the three first adhering to Apostles or Apostolic teachers, and the fourth going back immediately to Christ (as Neander and others do); or into three parties, in such a way as either to set that "of Christ" as the only rightly disposed one, in contrast with the others as sectarian, see iii. 23, (as Schott and the Greek expositors); or to assign the designation "of Christ" to the three parties in common who all professed themselves Christ's, but who desired to have their participation in him regarded as dependent on their connection with this or that teacher (as Rābiger: "I belong indeed to Christ, but it is as a Pauliner and am nevertheless a true Christian"). But Calovius hit the truth long ago, when he said "even those who called themselves Christians from Christ were guilty of schism, since they separated themselves from the rest in a schismatic spirit and insisted on appropriating this term to themselves alone." To this we may add what Flacius writes, "Under the pretext of Christ's name they scorned all teachers and would have nothing to do with them, pretending that they were wise enough for themselves without the aid of other instructors. For there was sin on both sides, either by exalting Church teachers too much or by appreciating them too little." As soon as the knowledge of Christ came to be established in the Church, there may have been persons, who, in opposition to an over-estimate of all human instrumentalities, held to an independent Christianity, and so were easily brought to look away from these instrumentalities altogether, and with utter contempt of their worth and authority, fell into the way of asserting their exclusive dependence upon Christ, and so, priding themselves on this point, got to regard themselves as his sole genuine disciples, and tried to pass for such. To seek for this class exclusively among Jewish or among Gentile converts ("the philosophically educated to whom Christ appeared like a second perhaps higher Socrates, and who, despising the Apostolic form of the doctrine of Christ, sought to refine it by philosophical criticism." NEANDER) is altogether unwarranted. The few philosophically educated Gentile converts could easily have satisfied themselves with the tendencies of the Apollos party. Nor are we justified in tracing to these the beginning of Gnosticism or Ebionitism, or in charging upon them a looseness in morals and a denial of the doctrine of the resurrection. According to Roman Catholic expositors, the party "of Apollos" were in danger of falling into a false spiritualism which volatilized the positive contents of Christianity; the party "of Peter" contained the germs of the later sect of Ebionites; and the type of the party of Christ was an ecclesiastical liberalism.

VER. 13. The reproof, in the form of questions which expose the absurdity of the partisanship just charged.—**Is Christ divided?**—There is a doubt whether this should be read as a question or as a simple declaration. Meyer and others [likewise Stahley following Lachmann] take it as an emphatic assertion of the lamentable results of the aforenamed divisions: "Christ has been divided! torn up into various sect-Christs instead of being entirely and undividedly the Christ common to all!" Since each of the exclusive parties claimed to have him, their conduct was virtually a rending of Christ. But ever since Chrysostom, commentators have generally regarded the words as a question. This would be more conformable to the analogy of the other clauses, and be just as forcible. Besides the subsequent question is of different import, so that it is not to be expected he would connect the second to the first with an *or*, as in the case of the third which is but a correlate to the second. This is what BENGEL means. "The cross and baptism claim us for Christ. The correlatives are, redemption and self-consecration."—To the sound consciousness of a true Christian who knows but one Christ, the bond of universal fellowship, such partisanship is a contradiction. It involves a division of Christ against himself, since the parties, who exclude each other, all think to have him. Hence the question, "Is Christ divided? Is there a Pauline, an Apollonian, a Petrine, a Christian Christ?" Thus we apply the question to all parties alike; and not merely to the fourth, as BAUR does, who takes Paul to imply, that the name of Christ employed as a party designation was the most significant evidence, that they, by their sectarianism, had rent Christ in pieces. Every party, he says, must still, as a Christian party, have thought to have Christ. If then there were but one proper Christ-party, it followed that the one Christ, in whom all distinctions ought to vanish, was rent asunder (Tüb. Zeitschrift, 1836, s. 4). It is clear in this case that the clause is not to be taken as a question. Under the term Christ, we are to undertsand not the Church as a mystical body of Christ (Estius, Olsh.), still less Christian doctrine, the Gospel (Grotius), but the Person of Christ, as the Head of the Church, in opposition to all party leaders. This is evident from the following questions, in which the exclusive right of Christ as Lord over His redeemed ones, and their obligations to Him as having been baptized into His name, are set forth: **Was Paul crucified for you?**—Lit: Paul surely was not crucified

for you; was He? [The question is introduced here with the negative Particle *μή*. Meyer adduces this as an argument to prove that the previous clause which is without *μή*, is consequently to be read differently, as a declaration. To this Alford replies, "that the *μή* introduces a new *form* of interrogation respecting a new person, viz. Paul; and that it was natural for solemnity's sake to express the other question differently. In *μεμέρισται ὁ χριστός* the majesty of Christ's person is set against the unworthy insinuatiou conveyed in: "is divided"—in *μὴ Παῦλος ἐσταυρώθη ὑπερ ὑμῶν*, the meanness of the individual Paul is set against the triumph of Divine love implied in "was crucified for you."] With the strictest impartiality, which here appears as the truest prudence, he rebukes first the partisan attachment to his owu person, and makes those, who set him up as their leader, to feel his painful disapproval of their course. Such persons while boasting of their connection with him, were assigning to him a position which belonged to Christ alone. They were acting on the supposition that *he* had suffered for them, an act which was the ground of their belonging to Christ, who through His sacrifice for sinners had acquired the right to their undivided devotion (comp. 2 Cor. v. 15). [If (as Socinianism alleges) the sufferings of Christ were merely exemplary, there would be no such absurdity or simplicity, as St. Paul here assumes to exist, in comparing the sufferings of Christ to the sufferings of Paul" Words]. To this ground of *claim* there corresponds the question expressing and confirming their personal objection —**Or were ye baptized unto the name of Paul?**—That is: was the name of Paul called over you at your baptism, as though he were the person to whom you pledged yourselves, and in whom ye believed and whom you professed as your Lord and Saviour? This is certainly the sense, although "the baptism into the name" may be regarded primarily as submersion into it as a person's life-element; so also as an introduction into fellowship with the party named as into an essential ground of salvation; or as immersion in reference to him, so that the obligation to profess faith in that which is expressed by the name is indicated (comp. on Matth. xxviii. 19). "The fact that Paul puts his name for all the rest proves how ingenuously he was opposed to all this party spirit, and how humbly he was anxious that Christ's name should not be prejudiced through his own" Neander.

Vers. 14-16. **I thank God that I baptized none of you.**—The Apostle recognizes as a thank-worthy Providence that he had been kept, for the most part, from administering baptism, since he had thereby obviated all appearance of intention to bind the baptized to his own person, an appearance which certainly would have arisen had he here acted contrary to his usual custom elsewhere;—**but Crispus**, the ruler of the synagogue, converted through Paul (Acts xviii. 8),—**and Gaius**, certainly not the one of Derby (Acts xx. 4), but the same as that Gaius mentioned in Rom. xv. 23, a man of distinction, who entertained Paul, and with him the Church, either by furnishing his house as a place for meeting, or by receiving there such of the Church as wished to visit Paul—**in order that no one should say**—By this is expressed not the design of the Apostle, but the *Divine intention* in ordering his conduct in such a way.—While writing he recalls another exception, "perhaps from information derived from Stephanas himself, who was with him."—**And I baptized also the household of Stephanas**—the family whom in xvi. 15 he calls "the first fruits of Achaia." *οἶκος* includes also the domestics. ["Under the old dispensation, whenever any one professed Judaism, or entered into covenant with God, as one of his people, all his children and dependents, that is, all to whom he stood in a representative relation, were included in the covenant, and received its sign. In like manner, under the Gospel, when a Jew or Gentile joined the Church, his children received baptism and were recognized as members of the Christian Church" Hodge]. In order to avoid all blame for want of frankness he adds, **besides I know not whether I baptized any other.**—["Inspiration, although it rendered him infallible, did not make him omniscient"]. It will be seen that he baptized only the first converts, afterwards, when these multiplied, he transferred the business to helpers, possibly also to deacons, to whose functions this in course belonged. In like manner Peter (Acts x. 48). On this point he next proceeds to explain himself more fully by stating the veiw he took of his office.

Ver. 17.*a* **For Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the Gospel.**—*Sent: ἀπέστειλεν* a plain allusion here to his office as *ἀπόστολος*. The appointment to this office did indeed include the work of baptizing (Matth. xxviii. 19). But in Mark xvi. 15, as well as in Luke xxiv. 47; Acts i. 8, and John xv. 27, the work of preaching, of bearing testimony concerning Christ, appears to be the chief calling of an Apostle. And so it was in the calling of Paul (Acts ix. 15; xxii. 15; xxvi. 16–18 comp. Gal. i. 16). The preaching which awakened faith, was the proper entrance upon the work of Christ, who indeed never Himself baptized but only through His disciples (John iv. 2). ["The main thing in the commission was to make disciples. To recognize them as such by baptism, was subordinate, though commanded, and not to be safely neglected. In the Apostolic form of religion, truth stood immeasurably above external rites. The Apostasy of the Church consisted in making rites more important than the truth" Hodge].—Whether we are to assume here, as Calvin does, an ironical hit intended at the opposers, who employed the easier function to gain adherents, may be doubted. The supposition that they did so, is, at least, uncertain. The word *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι: to evangelize*, in classic usage, and commonly in the Old Testament, like בָּשַׂר employed to denote the announcement of all sorts of good news, is in the New Testament used solely in regard to "the good tidings," by way of preëminence, the proclamation of salvation in Christ, and the fulfilment of the promises and the perfect revelation of divino grace before prepared (Is. xl. 9; lii. 7; lx. 6; lxi. 1, &c.—The contrast in "not,"—"but," is not to be weakened into a comparative, "not so much as." Baptism

was not the object of his commission, although it was allowed to him. (Acts ix. 15, 20; xxii. 15; xxvi. 16–18.)

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The Church is essentially *one*, as a body subject to Jesus Christ, the one perfect Lord and Head, who has an absolute right over all its members by virtue of His complete self-offering in their behalf, and to whom they are absolutely bound by being taken up into fellowship with Him, as the element of their life and the sole ground of their salvation. It can properly be divided no more than Christ Himself can be divided. [This unity consists of oneness of sentiment, of conviction and of speech. That is, there must be an inward and an outward unity, an invisible and a visible unity; the former manifesting itself in the later, the latter sustained by the former. The pretence of the one is not sufficient without the other.—See this whole matter exhaustively discussed by BAXTER on "Catholic Unity," "Reasons for Christian Unity and Concord," "The Catholic Church Described," *Practical Works*, vol. iv.; LITTON "*On the Church of Christ*," B. ii. part ii. chap. 1; JOHN M. MASON, *Complete Works*, vol. ii. p. 265; *Emmon's Works*, vol. ii. sec. 13].

2. All *sectarianism* arising out of an inordinate preference for favorite teachers *is a sin*. It ruptures this unity by limiting Christ's right over us and our subjection to Him. It concedes to a mere man, to his peculiar opinions and ways and doctrines, something of that power and importance which belong to Christ alone; inasmuch as it binds men, and would fain bind all, to these objects, as if on these our whole salvation depended; causes them to move in these as the very element of their existence; draws to these their entire devotion, and so makes a human personality with all its individuality and singularity an essential mediator of spiritual life, which comes alone by truth and grace.

3. The *proper view of Christ and of the instrumentalities He employs in their relation to Him is the true antidote against schismatical tendencies*. Christ is the fountain-head of truth and grace, in whom all fulness dwells, and from whom all believers, whether teachers or taught, derive their spiritual excellencies. Where this truth is recognized, there there can be no inordinate devotion to human agencies. These agencies can be regarded only as the various imperfect rays of the One Light, which, so far from detaining us by themselves, should conduct us up to the source from whence they stream. Yet just as little does it become us to despise these human agencies, and withdraw into our own particular knowledge and experience of Christ, as though we were sufficient unto ourselves. Rather it must appear to us that, the more superabundant and glorious the fulness of Christ is, the greater must be the necessity for numerous and manifold vessels to take it up, from various sides and according to their several capacities, and to present it to others in ways suited to their manifold necessities, so that persons shall be most easily led, one through one and another through another, into a participation of the riches of Christ, according to their several aptitudes and needs.

But the more this is done in truth the more open does a person gradually become to other aspects of Christ and to other organs of His. And this will lead us, on the one hand, to a just estimate of these organs themselves, and, on the other hand, to modesty of deportment and to a loving regard for such as were first led to Christ and edified by this or that teacher. And while the interested adherence to one particular aspect of Christ leads to a division of the one Christ in our feelings, and then to a rupture of the Church into parties, which deny to each other the full and proper enjoyment of salvation, and shut themselves up against each other in those aspects of the life and character of Christ which have been exhibited to them through the several organs they have chosen, the procedure we have been advocating conducts at last to a perfect unity of conviction and sentiment, which, precluding all division, makes itself known in unity of speech, wherein the manifold voices confessing the one all-embracing, all-sufficing Christ, blend in harmony. This is a catholicity which is to be found as little in Romish Christianity as in the coagulations of a Lutheran or Calvanistic specialty.

4. [*Sectarianism; its nature and origin;* a historical survey of it in its existing aspects]. "The tendency to sectarianism lies in human selfishness and stubbornness of opinion, in conceit and egoism. Sectarianism does not consist in holding fast to our profession for conscience sake, but in using our own form of doctrine or religion as a means for exalting ourselves and for ruling over or opposing others. And this is not confined to leaders alone. That sectary who does not feel strong or courageous enough to take the lead, will at least join himself with ambitious devotion to some other person better able to do it, in whose honor and glory he may share. But Christianity refuses to be sectarian at all. How then, it may be asked, do existing divisions comport with it? They arise, under the Providence of God, out of the diversity of human opinions. Only, these denominations ought not to hate one another, but they ought to plant themselves on the one common ground, Christ, and recognize each other there.—The one Christ can have but one doctrine and one church. But under the hands of men Christianity disintegrates into parties. From this arises a necessity for our choosing that party which seems to us the purest and most Christian. Parties were unavoidable. God suffered them that they might become instrumental in exciting Christians to greater zeal, to mutual purification, and to the exercise of kindly forbearance towards each other. Toleration is a word which should not be spoken among Christians; for toleration is a very proud, intolerant word." Heubner.

Our confessions (Greek, Romish, Evangelical, with all their divisions) are, on the one hand, historical necessities; they resulted from the gradual working out of Christian ideas or principles, such as the Theocratic, the Hierarchical, and the Protestant, which is the principle of freedom, subject only to the word of God. On the

other hand, they result from the disturbance occasioned by sin in the development of Christian truth and life. This is true even in respect to their national forms: the Greek, the Roman, the German, and the mixture of the latter with Roman and other elements. Hence the petrifaction of the first principle (theocratic) in the Oriental Greek Church; of the second (the hierarchical) in the Occidental Romish Church, so that the third (the Protestant) came to an independent form in the sphere of German life, differencing itself only according to national peculiarities. In one place there was a rigid adherence to the letter, accompanied with great intellectual acumen and force of will; and in another larger freedom prevailed, associated with greater breadth and depth of spirit and sentiment. But on the part of both (the Reformed and the Lutheran) communions, the influence of the two first principles was again felt, and the result was a stiffening of life and form, which showed itself in the former case in an ever-increasingly superficial adherence to the letter of the Bible, and in the latter case in an external induration of a form of doctrine,—which was originally free, and which asserted the freedom of the religious personality (justification by faith),—until at last in both spheres a false freedom usurped the throne, a subjectivity emancipated from all obligations to the word of God; in other words, rationalism. And now the only proper return to unity can be effected by attaining unto the knowledge of the truth of the several principles above mentioned, and by fusing down in our living consciousness the stiff forms of the past, and with these the truth of all that has been transmitted to us, through a deeper penetration into the word, or rather into Christ Himself, who is the kernel and substance of the written Word; and through a more humble, self-denying appropriation of Him in our lives. Such a return is at the same time an advance towards the true union, which the spirit of God will create by the harmonious combination of diversities.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

1. *The Apostolic exhortation to unity*, addressed to a church torn by factions, and suited to Christendom at the present time. 1. Its matter: *a.* To speak the same thing, unity of confession; *b.* on the ground of unity of sentiment and views. 2. The motive of such unity: the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; a due regard for the interest all have in Him according as He has given Himself to be known, experienced and enjoyed by them (vv. 10–13).

2. *The wrong of parties in Christendom*; *a.* so far as they subordinate Christ to human leaders or put these literally into His place; *b.* so far as they are servilely dependent on such leaders and take pride in them; *c.* so far as they exclude, scorn and hate each other; *d.* so far as they boast of their partisanship in vain self-sufficiency, and seek to glorify themselves and their leaders in it (vv. 12, 13).

3. *The proper conduct of a teacher towards such as are devoted to him: a.* that he perpetually points them away from himself to Christ (v. 10), while he never forgets that he and they alike are indebted to Christ for everything (v. 13); *b.* that he ever keeps in view the main object of his calling, to preach Christ (v. 17).

Vers. 13, 14. As the Corinthians made it a matter of great moment *by whom* they were baptized, instead of considering *into whom* they had been baptized, so now multitudes put a greater stress upon the party *by whom* they are confirmed, that *into what* and *to what* they are confirmed. (*Bibl. Wörterb.*, II. § 79.)

Starke: Ver. 10. The noblest virtue which can befit Christians is brotherly union through the bond of love (Col. iii. 14), and this because of Christ's command (Jno. xiii. 34) and of his prayer (Jno. xvii. 11), after the example of the Apostolic Church (Acts iv. 32) and the manifold exhortations of the Apostles (Phil. ii. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 8; Eph. iv. 2). Lange:—The unity of the church is certainly much insisted on and very important. Yet we must take care not to prescribe one for another a form or a name according to our own opinions, especially in incidentals which do not belong to the fundamentals of faith. In these respects there must be variety of judgment. It is enough if we agree in all matters essential to salvation. Heb. (v. 11):—What a shame! Rending asunder the body of Christ! Who perpetrates the mischief? Not the peacemakers, not the confessors and friends of Christ, but the zealots without knowledge; those who love profane and vain babblings; impure spirits who preach Christ of contention. O man, study the precept which inculcates the restoration of the erring in a spirit of meekness (Gal. vi. 1) and exercise thyself therein. Ver. 11.—Teachers should not believe every report, but should ascertain facts before they reprove. To give information at proper quarters from a desire to effect reform is no sin; only let care be taken not to exaggerate. Ver. 12.—Honor is due to ministers, but they must not be served as lords. To call oneself Lutheran by way of distinction from the Papists or those belonging to other denominations, without adhering to Luther as authority, is not improper; but to do this in a sectarian spirit is just as wrong as it was for the Corinthians to say, "I am of Paul." Ver. 13.—The death of Christ is alone meritorious; no saint can merit anything for himself, much less have his merits imputed to others. Vers. 14, 15.—The care of God's Providence over us can best be recognized in the issues of events, which is then to be acknowledged with reverence and gratitude even in the smallest particulars.

Ver. 10. Burger: "Speak the same thing;" unnecessary, capricious deviation from the established forms of doctrine is a violation of the spirit of unity and love.

["There are many sore *divisions* at this day in the world among and between the professors of the Christian religion, both about the doctrine and worship of the Gospel, as also the discipline thereof. That these *divisions* are evil in themselves and the cause of great evils, hinderances of the Gospel, and all the effects thereof in the world, is acknowledged by all; and it is doubtless a thing to be greatly lamented that the generality of those who are called Christians are departed from the great rule of 'keeping the

unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.' He who doth not pray always, who is not ready with his utmost endeavor to remedy this evil, to remove this great obstruction of the benefit of the Gospel is scarce worthy the name of a Christian." JOHN OWEN.]

[VER. 13. CALVIN: "Paul crucified for you!"—This passage militates against the wicked contrivance of Papists by which they attempt to bolster up their system of indulgences. For it is from the blood of Christ *and the martyrs* that they make up that imaginary treasure of the church which they pretend is dealt out by means of indulgences. Here, however, Paul in strong terms denies that any one but Christ has been crucified for us. The martyrs, it is true, died for our benefit, but (as Leo* observes) it was to furnish an example of perseverance, not to procure for us gifts of righteousness."]

VERS. 14–17. [If the doctrine of baptismal regeneration be correct, Paul was instrumental in saving but few souls. Certainly the commission of modern Romish missionary seems to read the reverse of St. Paul's. He is sent to baptize, not to preach the Gospel.]

II. THE TRUE METHOD OF PREACHING.

A. Repugnant to the predelictions of both Greeks and Jews.

CHAPTER. I. 17–25.

17 Not with [in ἐν] wisdom of words, [discourse[1]] lest the cross of Christ should be made
18 of none effect. For the preaching [discourse] of the cross is to them that perish,
19 foolishness; but unto us which are saved, it is the power of God. For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of
20 the prudent. Where *is* the wise? where *is* the scribe? where *is* the disputer of this
21 world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this[2] world [the world]? For after that [since][3] in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased
22 God by the foolishness of preaching[4] to save them that believe. For [since both][5]
23 the [*om.* the] Jews require a sign, [signs][6] and the [*om.* the] Greeks seek after wisdom: But we [on the contrary][7] preach Christ crucified, unto the [*om.* the] Jews a
24 stumblingblock, and unto the [*om.* the] Greeks [Gentiles ἔθνεσι][8] foolishness; But unto them which are called, [these, the called][9] both Jews and Greeks, Christ the
25 power of God, and the wisdom of God. Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men.

[1] Ver. 17.—[ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου might be rendered: in philosophic discourse.]
[2] Ver. 20.—The τούτου of the received text is undoubtedly transferred from the preceding. Lachmann and Tischendorf reject it according to the best authorities.
[3] Ver. 21.—[ἐπειδή is not temporal but illative.—Alf.]
[4] Ver. 21.—[κηρύγματος: passive noun, the thing preached both in contents and in form.]
[5] Ver. 22.—ἐπειδή καὶ. it may be rendered: "For both," but Kling translates as above.]
[6] Ver. 22.—The plural σημεῖα is better attested: whether it is internally the more probable may be doubted.
[7] Ver. 23.—[δὲ after ἐπειδή expresses contrariety.]
[8] Ver. 23.—ἔθνεσι is decidedly better attested than the received Ἕλλησι which arose out of vers. 22 and 24.
[9] Ver. 24.—["αὐτοις δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς; the αὐτοῖς serves to identify the called with the believers, ver. 21."—Alf.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

[*The connection.*—From the mention of his commission, especially to preach the Gospel, the Apostle takes occasion, as it were incidentally, to set forth the manner in which this work was to be done. The topic thus introduced has however a direct bearing upon the previous one, for he handles it in a way both to vindicate his own course to which some had taken exception, and also to rebuke those tendencies, which, in their antagonism to a pure Gospel, had engendered contention and schism. Of the mode of transition to this theme Bengel remarks: "I doubt whether it would be approved by the rules of Corinthian eloquence. Therefore the Apostle in this very passage is furnishing a specimen, so to speak, of *apostolic folly*, and yet the whole is arranged with the greatest wisdom."]

VERS. 17*b*–21. [The proper mode of preaching described first negatively].—**Not in wisdom of speech.**—*οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου.* It is better to join this clause to the word "preach" just preceding, than to the main statement "Christ sent me." [As to the meaning there are three distinct interpretations. 1. That of Calvin and others, who place the stress on "speech," and understand by the phrase ornate and artificial discourse in contrast with plain homely speech. The objection to this is that it fails to give due weight to the word "wisdom," which is used by the Apostle in a strict sense throughout the chapter, and is the special object of his animad-

* Leo the great ad Palæstinos, Ep. 81. See the passage cited in full, *Calvin's Inst.* (Lib. III. cap. v. § 1.).

version. 2. That of Olshausen, who takes it to denote "word-wisdom," *i. e.*, "a wisdom in appearance and not in reality," an interpretation which de Wette justly styles "sonderbar." 3. That of Storr and Flatt, de Wette and Hodge, who, taking the emphasis to be on "wisdom," and understanding it of the *subject-matter*, suppose the Apostle to be repudiating here all connection with heathen philosophy. But to this it may be replied that such repudiation was wholly gratuitous, for no one would imagine that in preaching the Gospel he would be likely to employ the speculations of a secular wisdom. 4. That of Meyer and Kling, who while emphasizing "wisdom," understand it as referring to the *form* of discourse. According to this, what the Apostle asserts is that he was not to preach the Gospel in a philosophical manner, making it a matter of science rather than a vital power for the heart and conscience. In such a case the Genitive would be used analogously to the Hebrew construction, where the first noun in construction qualifies the second. Hence "wisdom of discourse" would be=philosophic discourse. See Nordheimer *Heb. Grammar* B. III. ch. v. § 801. 2.] So Neander "Σοφία λόγου=σοφία ἐν τῷ λέγειν, not wisdom absolutely, but the wisdom of dialectic demonstration." Indeed it is not to be denied that in the course of this paragraph both σοφία and λόγος are used also in relation to the subject matter, and that this is always more or less affected by the mode of exposition. Unquestionably it makes a difference whether the subject matter is first vitally apprehended by the spirit and then creates its own form of expression for itself, or whether a form foreign and unsuitable is forced upon it, drawn from other spheres of life and thought; in other words whether the Gospel is proclaimed naturally in its divine excellence and simplicity, or whether, taken up under the conceptions of an alien philosophy, and arrayed in the rhetoric and dialectics of a people still unsanctified (like the Greeks for example), it be thus presented to the mind. An instance of the latter kind occurred not only in the Gnosis of the heretics, but also to a certain degree in that of the Alexandrian Church of a later period. And probably it was with an eye to the beginning of such a tendency in the party of Apollos that the Apostle affirmed that, according to the will of the Great Commissioner, it devolved on him not to preach the Gospel "in wisdom of speech." And the expression means nothing else than: not in the style of a philosopher trained in the rhetoric and dialectics of the schools, [but in that of a witness, bearing testimony to the great facts in and through which God had chosen to reveal himself. The reason for this was], **lest the Cross of Christ be made of none effect.**—Κενωθῇ, *become empty, void;* here according to the connection: be robbed of its power and influence. By "the Cross of Christ" we understand that death of Christ upon the cross by which we are redeemed and reconciled to God. This is the centre and kernel of all Gospel preaching, by the power of which sinners are delivered from the tyranny of sin, and restored to a new and divine life. And this cross, he says, would be bereft of all efficiency for such results were it set forth in the forms of philosophy, inasmuch as in this way it would serve only to call out the assent of the intellect or awaken an aesthetic pleasure, while the flesh, that is, the corrupt natural life of the selfish heart, would remain unaffected. But let the cross only be held up before that heart in its divine simplicity, and it would then display an energy destructive of this life. Through it the flesh with its affections and lusts would be crucified. (Gal. v. 24). But although this blessed result is obtained by means of preaching or doctrine, yet it does not follow from this that we are to make "the cross" here equivalent to "the doctrine of the cross, or to the doctrine of Christ crucified." Rather the relation which this clause sustains to the foregoing implies that here we are to understand *the simple fact itself held up in its own native majesty and power.* [Whatever obscures or diverts attention from this deprives it to that extent of its power].

Ver. 18. [The position thus taken he proceeds to explain and substantiate from obvious facts.—**For the preaching** (lit: word λόγος) **of the cross is to them that perish folly, but to those that are saved, ourselves, it is the power of God.**—Here the force of the argument is to be found in the second member of the antithesis. The first is introduced merely as a concession to a supposed objection. The Corinthians might retort, "The cross of Christ rendered without effect by wisdom of speech! Why, your method of preaching is not half so taking and effectual as the one you denounce." This the Apostle concedes, but limits its applicability only to a certain class, to those who are in the way of sin and are going to destruction. 'These,' he says, 'are blind. They have no sense of sin, and see not therefore the wisdom of the cross. To them it is folly. But while to them I acknowledged it is such as you say, yet to those who are in the way of salvation, the cross is a thing of power. They see its meaning. They feel its disenthralling and life-giving influences. And it is by what you see of its effect among these that you must judge of it"]. Accordingly that to which this divine power is ascribed, "the word of the cross," must be regarded as Gospel-preaching in its simplest and most unadorned style, the earnest exhibition of the great act of redeeming love directly to the heart, without human accessories. It is not the *doctrine about the cross*, but the word which presents the cross itself in its concrete form and in its plain and pungent application to human conditions. It is of this he predicates a divine power. But this power is manifested only among such as are saved—a thought which is brightened by the foregoing contrast. In both clauses the sign of the Dative "to" means "in their judgment." But in the one case it is a judgment proceeding from a blinded mind, in the other a judgment founded upon blessed experience. In reference to the first see 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4; to both 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16. To the former it seems absurd to have the fact of Christ's death nakedly held before them as the ground of all salvation—to hear a voice from the cross calling unto them "Look unto me and be saved," because they see no rational connection between cause and effect here.

These are "the lost," *i. e.*, they are excluded from all participation in the blessedness and glory of God's kingdom, and are doomed to bitter anguish and disgrace. (See 2 Thess. i. 9; Rev. xxi. 8; xxii. 15; Mark ix. 43). In contrast with this appears the state of salvation, that is, a deliverance from this doom, (see Luke vi. 9; Matth. xviii. 11; Jas. iv. 12) which includes also a share in the blessedness and glory of God's kingdom. (Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 18; Rom. v. 10; viii. 24). There are here, then, two classes of persons contrasted in relation to their final lot. For the purpose of designating them P. uses the present participles (*ἀπολλυμένοις* —*σωζομένοις*) as the ones best suited, since time is not taken into account. It is therefore not "the present for the future" for the purpose of indicating the certainty of the contemplated, nor yet does the present note the progressive development in the condition of the parties. Nor yet would it be in place here to introduce the idea of predestination, as Rückert does, taking the terms to denote the divinely appointed destiny of two classes, for with Paul this idea never occurs in any such way as to exclude the idea of a free self-determination, (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 10; Acts xiii. 46) since to all profounder contemplation the work of God and the act of man in the genesis and development of faith are inseparably one. "This only must be conceded that the Apostle's mode of expression is grounded upon a *τρόπος παιδείας*; a mode of teaching peculiar to him. Paul delights to refer back everything at once to the divine superintendence. Only in this reference the human receptivity or non-receptivity is at the same time included." NEANDER. On "the power of God" see Rom. i. 6 where the Gospel is said to be "the power of God to every one that believeth." The contrast between "folly" and "power" is certainly not a strict one, but nevertheless a true one. As the former implies that the Gospel is, according to the judgment of those that perish, a weak thing, so does the latter imply that it is to the others, a manifestation of divine wisdom; or, as the idea of folly excludes that of power, so does the idea of power presuppose that of wisdom.

VER. 19. Confirmation adduced from Scripture. **"For it is written** ["This formula with its following citations is found only in those Epistles of Paul which were addressed to churches in which there was a large admixture of Jewish converts. It does not occur in those written to the Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, which were composed almost entirely of Gentile converts. This coincidence between the History in Acts and the character of the Epistles is evidence of the genuineness of both." WORDS.] **I will destroy the wisdom of the wise and bring to naught the prudence of the prudent.**"—This Divine declaration is taken from a prophecy of Isaiah, which culminates in an announcement of salvation through the Messiah (Is. xxix. 14, comp. ver. 17 ff.), and, as the result and penalty of the hypocritical conduct of the Jewish people, proclaims the downfall of the wisdom of their wise ones and the vanishing of the understanding of the prudent, so that this wisdom and understanding should contribute nothing towards their deliverance in the day of evil. This judicial threatening on the part of God was incontrovertibly fulfilled in the times of the New Testament. The wisdom of the ungodly proves unfit for apprehending the Gospel-salvation. In reference to this it loses all its availability and appears as nothing worth. The citation is not literal, though, according to the sense, exact. [It is taken from LXX. with slight variation: *ἀθετήσω* for *κρύψω*, and *αὐτοῦ* omitted twice. "The prophet makes use of neuter verbs, while Paul turns them into the active form by making them have a reference to God. They are however perfectly the same in meaning. "Wisdom perishes," but it is by the Lord's destroying it. "Prudence vanishes," but it is by the Lord's covering it over and effacing it.—The application of this to the subject in hand is this: The Lord has been wont to punish the arrogance of those who, depending on their own judgment, think to be leaders to themselves and others; and if this happened among a people whose wisdom the other nations had occasion to admire, what will become of others?" CALVIN]. In reference to this subject see the words of Christ: Matth. xi. 25 ss.; also chap. xv. 7, 8.

VER. 20. [The Apostle's triumphant challenge for disproof of this declaration.—**Where is a wise? where is a scribe? where is a disputer of this world?**—The designations here are all anarthrous, and Meyer, de Wette, Kling, all translate as above. Alford, Stanley, Hodge, Barnes, insert the article. The difference in meaning is plain, though not important. In the one case the inquiry is after the person mentioned, *q. d.*, 'Where is a wise man to be found?' as though he were not. In the other the question is, 'What has become of him conceding that he exists?' The latter better suits the drift of the text. —There is a question also as to whether these words likewise are cited from the Old Testament. There is something like them to be found in Is. xxxiii. 18, uttered "in a burst of triumph over the defeat of Sennacherib," and Stanley considers them as taken from thence. But as the Apostle is here evidently speaking in his own name, we can regard his language as no more than an undesigned imitation of that of the Prophet—a lingering echo of it freely reproduced to suit a present purpose. He is here appealing in his own name to existing facts by way of confirmation. Where is the wise? etc. So CALVIN]. They have vanished. They pass for nothing in the Divine economy. So far as it is concerned, they are as if they had never been. His mode of challenge occurs also elsewhere with Paul (xv. 55; Rom. iii. 27, 29, 31.)—The last attributive: "of this world," belongs, although not grammatically, (since the questions are rapid and abrupt), yet logically, to all the three terms, and describes those mentioned as belonging to the lower stage of human development, the Præ-Messianic period. This old world, so far as it seeks to maintain itself still, even after that which is perfect has come in Christ, shows itself to be perverse and at enmity with God; yea, as in itself evil, because pervaded with error and sin. Comp. Gal. i. 4, "from the present evil world." Here the term rendered "world" is *αἰών* and more properly denotes *a period of time, an age* of the world.

The antithesis to this is *αἰὼν ἐκεῖνος* or *μέλλων*: that age, or: the coming age. (הַבָּא עוֹלָם). This is a course of existence founded on the redemptive work of Christ, and includes in itself all the impulsive forces and power of the new life. Until the end of "this age," the "coming age," will be in a germinal state, enclosed and restricted within the envelope of the present; but then it will burst into open manifestation as the sole reality. The *αἰὼν οὗτος*: *present age*, is identical with *ὁ κόσμος*: *this world*. The only distinction is that the latter designates the sphere of life itself as one essentially godless and corrupt in its on-goings, especially the human race as alienated from the life of God, while the former indicates the period of time through which it continues. Hence in Eph. ii. 2 we see the two united in one phrase. *αἰὼν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*: the course of this world. The present age, as the period of the rule of sin and error, has for its god or governing principle the devil, as in 2 Cor. iv. 4 he is denominated 'the god of this world,' and in Jno. xii. 31 'the archor or ruler of this world.' In so far now as the Jews also in their hostility to the perfect revelation of God in Christ, by which they became blinded to the nature of earlier revelations, also (2 Cor. iii. 14 ff.) belonged to this corrupt age, and inasmuch as in the progress of this discussion the Jewish element also is brought up to view, we shall be obliged to understand by the "wise" here mentioned, Jewish as well as Pagan sages, (not the one or the other exclusively); and since the Apostle afterwards speaks of wisdom only, it may be well perhaps to take the term "wise" in a general sense as denoting all those who were devoted to the higher science, or at least pretended to be such; and the other two terms as specific, "the scribe" denoting the wisdom-seekers among the Jews—and "the disputer," the like among the Greeks. Such appropriation of the terms is supported by the fact that according to the uniform usage of the New Testament (Acts xix. 35 alone excepted) "scribe" is the designation of the Jewish learned class. But the other term, *συζητητής*, which is best translated: "disputer" (comp. *συζητεῖν* Mark viii. 11 ff.; *συζήτησις* Acts xv. 2. 7; xxviii. 29), and hence denotes a class of persons who make disputing their business and have facility in it, can be only incidentally applied to the Sophists then widely spread throughout the Hellenic world. So MEYER. But would it not be more suited to the rhetorical character of the passage to make no such disposition of terms, but merely to abide by the general fact that the Apostle had in his eye men who boasted of their learning and science and ready abilities, and as masters of the truth looked down contemptuously upon the masses—men who were to be found among the Jews as well as among the Greeks,—and that only in the word "scribe" there is a prevailing reference to the Jew? [Stanley, who takes ver. 20 as a modified citation from Is. xxxiii. 18, says "These expressions acquire additional force by a comparison with the Rabbinical belief that the cessation of Rabbinical wisdom was to be one of the signs of the Messiah's coming (see the quotations from the Mishna in Wetstein *ad loc.*), and that this was expressly foretold in Is. xxxiii. 18. Analogous to this was the belief of Christians that the oracles of the heathen world ceased on the birth of Christ"].

The challenge is strengthened by a further question—**hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?**—*i. e.* actually demonstrated that it is not what it professes to be; but rather, folly—unreason, stupidity, incapacity for knowledge in relation to the highest matters. ["We must here carefully notice these two things that the knowledge of all the sciences is mere smoke, where the heavenly science is wanting; and man with all his acuteness is as stupid for obtaining of himself a knowledge of the mysteries of God as an ass is unqualified for understanding musical harmonies.—Paul (however) does not expressly condemn either man's natural perspicuity, or wisdom acquired from practice and experience, or the cultivation of mind obtained by learning; but only declares that all this is of no avail for acquiring spiritual wisdom.—We must restrict what he here teaches to the specialties of the case in hand." CALVIN].

VER. 21.—Shows why and how it was that God had made foolish the wisdom of this world. —**For since in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God through the foolishness of preaching** [*κήρυγμα*, not *κήρυξις*, not so much the preaching as the thing preached, though not without an implication of the former] **to save them that believe.**—The relation of the premise to the conclusion is that of a sequence, divinely ordained in the way of punishment [rather of mercy], so that in the first man's guilt [rather guilty impotence, see below], is assigned as the ground of what is stated in the other. From this we perceive the incorrectness of Rückert's view, who, snuffing predestination everywhere, explains the phrase "in the wisdom of God" to mean: "in virtue of God's wisdom, its leading and appointment." Neither does it consist with the relation of the two clauses to explain it of the wisdom of God's plan of salvation in the Gospel (Mosheim and others); for the refusal to recognize this wisdom was not anything to which the divine determination spoken of in the second clause could be referred, as to something definitely concluded upon. To this it must be added that from the very beginning, before the disposition of men in relation to it could be ascertained, the preaching of the Gospel had for the world the appearance of folly. The case is entirely different in chap. ii. 6. Rather we must here understand a reference to something prior to Christ, to certain exhibitions of Divine wisdom previous to the revelation made in Christ, in and through which man could or ought to have discerned God,—to its sway in nature and history, and indeed not merely to that revelation alluded to in Rom. i. 18 ff; Acts xiv. 17; xvii. 24 ff, but also to the ordinances of this wisdom in the guidance of the covenant-people, who, because of their unbelief (with the exception of the "election." Rom. xi. 7), belonged together with the world. Neander, on the contrary, discovers here only a contrast instituted between revelation and the religion of reason, and regards the wisdom of the Greeks as the particular object

of whose relation to Christianity the Apostle is treating. But this interpretation is opposed by the fact that in the vv. 22–24 closely connected by *ἐπειδή*: *since*, with v. 21, Paul three times expressly states that by "the world," in v. 21, not only the heathen but also the Jews are intended. But does not the declaration in reference to the heathen that, they "did not know God" conflict with Rom. i. 21 where it said that 'when they knew God they glorified him not as God?' We must here distinguish between that sense of a God forced upon the mind by a revelation of God, a merely passive religious notion, the ineffectualness of which is set forth even in the passage above referred to, and that living knowledge of God, which involves communion with Him, and which is the thing here denied of the world and which, had the world possessed, it would have qualified the world for the comprehension of that more perfect revelation in Christ which was to be the fulfilment and consummation of all that had gone before, so that had *this* knowledge existed such a decree of God as is affirmed in the second clause would not have been made, nor would the preaching of the Gospel have been to them foolishness. The "wisdom" then, "through" which the world knew not God (*διὰ τῆς σοφίας*), denotes that intelligence by means of which the knowledge of God ought to have been attained, but was not. It is the appropriate organ of the human mind, sharpened by culture, through which God is perceived and recognized as He displays Himself in His wisdom; in other words, the eye for discerning God's light. But this proved itself disqualified for its proper end, since the world, the possessor of this wisdom, had become alienated from the truth and love of God, and hence perverted and darkened by error and sin. The translation, "*on account of* their wisdom," as though this was the cause of their not perceiving God would require the accusative (*διὰ τὴν σοφίαν*). It might still be questioned whether the phrase "through wisdom" does not refer like the previous one to the wisdom of God, so that it has its corresponding antithesis in the phrase, "through the foolishness of preaching." This is Bengel's view. "*In the wisdom of God, i. e. because* the wisdom of God was so great. *By wisdom*, namely, that of preaching, as is evident from the antithesis, *by the foolishness of preaching*." So, too, Fritsche (Hall, Lit. Zeit. 1840). "After that, in the wisdom of God, *i. e.* while God allowed His wisdom to shine forth, the world did not recognize God, through the wisdom made available for them by God, then God resolved to choose means of directly the opposite kind. In setting forth the antithesis here, it occurred to him to emphasize strongly the wisdom of God, which failed of attaining its end." But all things considered, the view carried out by us merits the preference, and the repetition of "the wisdom of God" must always appear somewhat artificial.*

The judgment [rather the merciful pleasure] of God towards a world not recognizing Him in consequence of its own sin, is introduced by the phrase *εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεός*,—**God was pleased**—hence "concluded," "determined." It indicates here not so much the freedom or pure favor, from which the resolve proceeded, as the suitableness of his proceeding to the end contemplated, or to the circumstances of the case. We find it first among the later Scripture writers, and most commonly in the Sept. In the New Testament it occurs chiefly in Paul (Rom. xv. 26; Gal. i. 15 ff.). In reference to the expression and thought comp. Luke x. 21. The world had shown itself incapable of discerning God in His wisdom through its wisdom. Therefore God found it good no more to appeal to human wisdom by the manifestations of His wisdom, but **by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe**,—*i. e.*, by a proclamation, the contents of which carried the impress of folly, or must need appear foolish to the world as it was. This was to deliver from sin and wrath, and introduce to everlasting blessedness those who should believe in what was declared. In other words, the determination was, to appeal to faith instead of to reason. [So Hodge: "The foolishness of preaching means the preaching of foolisness, *i. e.*, the cross." But is there not an allusion to the nature of the preaching itself as being distinct from philosophical disquisition in the simplicity of its method. Preaching is heralding, proclaiming facts and messages, a foolish matter for those who delight in the subtleties and arguments of philosophy.] From this it is clear [?] that the phrase "through foolishness of preaching" does not furnish, as might ap-

*[Kling has hardly done justice to the view which he calls Rückerts, and stigmatizes as Predestinationism. There certainly is no little plausibility, and much fair ground in Scripture for interpreting, "in the wisdom of God" to mean "according to the wise ordination or arrangement of God." All the movements of the ante-Christian period were unquestionably so disposed by Providence as to prepare the way for the coming, and the reception of Christ. And why may it not have been a part of the Divine plan to allow the world to try its own wisdom, and test its capacities to the utmost, in order that its utter inefficiency for discovering God, and finding out a means of salvation, might be fully proved and thus that consciousness of ignorance and inability be awakened, which is one of the first conditions of simple faith in revelation? Paul hinted at this very truth in his speech at Athens (Acts xvii. 26, 27). "And hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth; and hath *determined* the *times* before *appointed*, and the bounds of their habitation; that they *should seek the Lord, if happily they might feel after Him and find Him*, though He be not far from every one of us." This interpretation carries therefore a legitimate and Scriptural sense, and it is preferred by Alf., Barnes, Poole, and most American sermonizers.

But there is still another interpretation, worthy of consideration, as having the advantage of giving to the important word "wisdom" a uniformity of meaning throughout the entire passage. What Paul is here controverting is the fondness for philosophic speculation so characteristic of the Greeks, and which in the Corinthian Church was threatening to destroy the practical nature of Christianity, and turn it into another scheme of philosophy. This tendency, or rather its products, the Apostle calls "wisdom" (*σοφία*), and it is, as he says, something he would not indulge in, however pleasing to the Corinthian temper. One reason for this was, the utter inefficiency of all philosophy in the *matter of religion*. He does not condemn it absolutely, but relatively to the ends in view. This, therefore, it became him distinctly to state, which he does in verses 20, 21, may be paraphrased thus: "For since in its speculations concerning God, the word through speculation and philosophy did not know God, it pleased God through "the announcement of the simple facts of the Gospel, which to a speculative mind seems like folly: to save those who accept them in mere faith." We thus take *σοφία=φιλοσοφία*, make *τοῦ θεοῦ* the objective Genitive, and interpret the whole phrase "in the wisdom of God," as denoting *the sphere of thought in reference to which the Apostle was speaking*. This was in fact theosophy, a word compounded of just the ones here associated. The antithesis then in the two clauses would be between philosophy and preaching, between scientific knowledge and faith, accepting the simple proclamation of the Gospel].

pear to be the case at first sight, the contrast to the phrase "this wisdom,"* but to the other, "in the wisdom of God;" and the antithesis to "this wisdom" is to be sought in "them that believe." Faith is pure receptivity, and as such is directly the opposite of all endeavors after knowledge by the unaided powers of the intellect, such as are peculiar to human wisdom. It is the humble acceptance and appropriation of the testimony concerning Christ crucified, in spite of all the objections which the understanding of the natural man may urge against the doctrine of salvation, and in the utter renunciation of one's own opinions, and in the entire repudiation of predominant theories. In the act of believing there are united, therefore, both humility and courage. Finally, there is still another correspondence in the words "know" and "save." Knowledge ought to lead to salvation (comp. Jno. xvii. 3). Not knowing, therefore, hindered the obtaining of salvation.

Vers. 22–24. Mode in which the Apostle fulfilled the good pleasure of God expressed in ver. 21.—**Since both Jews require signs and Greeks seek after wisdom, we therefore on the contrary preach Christ crucified.**—[So KLING translates the passage. But there is a question here as to the construction. This verse, like the previous one, begins with *ἐπειδή*. It may therefore be taken as a parallel to that, (so Hodge, Meyer), resuming the thought and amplifying it (so Stanley), and like the preceding having a protasis † and apodosis (as Kling); or it may be joined by *ἐπειδή* directly to the previous clause, and regarded as explanatory of what is said of the "foolishness of preaching" being the means of saving believers (so Alford, Calvin, Rückert, de Wette). In this case the second clause instead of being an apodosis would be directly dependent on *ἐπειδή*, and the rendering would be:—**Since, or seeing that, while both Jews require signs and Greeks seek after wisdom, we on the other hand preach Christ,** etc.—This seems to us the most natural rendering. See Winer, P. iii. § lxv. 6. But Kling rejects it as "the less suitable." According to his view], what the protasis states is the result of "not knowing God" (ver. 21); what the apodosis states is the judicial procedure corresponding to it as carried out in "the foolishness of preaching," viz., a refusal to yield to vain demands for wisdom, and the counter preaching which appears to those making these demands as absurd, but which to believers proves to be the power of God and the wisdom of God. The *ἐπειδή* introduces a case well known and made out: *since indeed;* the *δέ* (after *ἡμεῖς*) is used also elsewhere in the apodosis after *ἐπεί* and *ἐπειδή* to make the antithetic relation of this clause the more prominent: *therefore, on the contrary* (comp. MEYER on this passage). This construction is favored by the parallelism between the protasis and apodosis in ver. 21, and those here found. The *καί,—καί*: *both,—and*, unite here classes alike in one respect, *i. e.*, in the unwarrantableness of their demands, but otherwise diverse, and they belong not exclusively to the subjects mentioned (Jews and Greeks), but serve to connect the two clauses in one whole: "since it is so, that both Jews require signs and Greeks seek wisdom." Jews and Greeks here represent two classes of men according to their peculiar characteristics. Hence they are mentioned without the article. It is as if he said "since people like the Jews seek, etc." The Greeks here as in Rom. i. 16, and elsewhere, stand as *pars pro toto*, for the Gentiles generally, who, according to the most probable reading, are mentioned afterwards in ver. 23. They are the people who best represent the whole multitude of nations (*ἔθνη*) found outside of the covenant relation with God, and who, in respect of culture and language, prepared the whole civilized world for Christianity; just as the Jews, scattered among them all, did the same thing in respect of religion, being freighted with the promise which was to be fulfilled in Christ. It was among these two nations that Christianity had its first sphere of operations,—the Jews, who had the first claim to announce the fulfilment of that promise which had been preserved, and of that hope which had been awakened by them (comp. Acts xiii. 46; iii. 25; Rom. i. 16; xv. 8), and the Greeks, who had carried out the work of human culture in science and art, and had, as it were, taken the whole civilized world in possession, and so had furnished the most perfect form for the human appropriation of the truth of revelation, and so the richest receptivity for the life and truth which were in Christ, and which were fitted to ensure them the most perfect satisfaction. But in both alike did Christianity encounter peculiar obstructions. The *Jews* clave to the external form of revelation, the miracle; and they did this to such a degree as to insist on having it before their eyes in its most striking, dazzling form, as the condition of their acceptance of the truth. They thus betrayed their fundamental unbelief and disaffection for the truth which rebuked their sin, humbled their pride, and demanded of them entire self-denial. This is what is meant by their "seeking after a sign," or, according to another reading, "signs." (Comp. Jno. iv. 48; and Matt. xii .38; xvi. 4; Luke xi. 16; Jno. ii. 18; vi. 30). (Meyer, Ed. 3.) "*Signs*, that is, miraculous tokens, by which Jesus, whom the Apostles asserted to be risen from the dead and ascended on high, should prove Himself to be the Messiah. These they still called for, inasmuch as the miracles of His earthly career had lost for them all evidencing power, in consequence of His crucifixion"). The Greeks, on their part, had been captivated by the outward show and glitter of their civilization. Whatever did not appear before them under the name of a new philosophy (comp. Acts xvii. 19 ff.), or was not sustained by philosophic proof, or was not set forth with logical and rhetorical art, this they refused to accredit; and by insisting on wisdom only in a form agreeable to them, they likewise betrayed their unbelief and their aversion to that Divine truth which re-

[* One would suppose that the naturalness and indeed inevitableness of this contrast would have shown the incorrectness of Kling's interpretation. (See Winer, part iii. sect. 47. d.) Paul means here to set the simple "testimony of Jesus" over against "philosophy" or "wisdom," and the method of faith over against the method of reason. In all that follows he is correct.]

[† Rob. in Lex. observes that *ἐπειδή* is never used in the protasis.]

quired a mortification of their vain self, with all its pride of science and art, and which demanded a humble surrender to a revelation in Christ that infinitely surpassed all their attainments. Thus on both sides, in modes diverse and conditioned by their peculiar histories, did the same opposition arise to the preaching of the Gospel which held up to their faith the one Christ, who was declared to have secured the salvation of mankind, and built up the way to regal glory, not through wondrous miracles, according to the demand of the Jew, nor through such wisdom as wisdom-seekers sought, but by suffering the shameful death of a malefactor. Thus did the preaching of the Apostles and their associates (*ἡμεῖς*) concerning a crucified Messiah, their public proclamation of this fact and its significance in all simplicity, prove **for the Jews a stumbling block**, *i. e.*, an offence, a hinderance to faith, the occasion of a fall, something causing them to err (comp. *πρόσκομμα* Rom. ix. 32 ff.). A person hanging on the accursed tree presented such a contrast to all their desires for some glorious exhibition of power (such as destruction to their enemies, etc.), that they could do no otherwise than reject Him. ["They could have tolerated Christ on the mount, but not Christ on the cross."—A. Butler].—**For the Greeks (Gentiles) foolishness.**—That salvation could come to the world through a crucified Jew appeared to them plainly absurd. It was an instrumentality utterly inadequate to the end proposed. Thus while to the Jews such a person was an object of horror, as one accursed of God, to the Gentiles he was an object only for scorn and contempt. (Comp. Acts xxiii. 18–32; Luke xxiii. 36–41). To this, however, there is a noble contrast.

But unto these—the called—Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God.—This clause might be taken to depend on "we preach," so that this would be repeated in thought, and "Christ the wisdom of God" form an antithesis to "Christ crucified" with its adjuncts: We preach Christ as crucified, who for the Jew is a stumbling block, etc., but to those who are called we preach Christ as the power of God. Bengel appears to suggest this, when to "Christ" he adds "with his cross, death, life, kingdom," and says further, "When the offence of the cross is overcome, the whole mystery of Christ lies open."—But the course of thought would be more simple if we put "Christ crucified" directly in opposition with what precedes: "We preach a crucified Messiah who to the Jews is a stumbling block, etc.—but to them who are called, Christ—the power of God." By it then is signified, that He, the crucified one, at whom the Jews stumble, is to the called, the Anointed of God, (Messiah, Christ),—the One in whom the promise of a heavenly king is fulfilled, the Power of God, etc. This corresponds also to the expression respecting the "word of the cross" in ver. 18. The *αὐτοῖς*: **to these** serves to give prominence to "the called" as the chief persons in the case, who occupy a positive relation to "the crucified," and enjoy an experience corresponding to it. It points at the same time to those already mentioned, to "them that believe," ver. 21, and to the "saved," ver. 18; and while the first of these terms designates their subjective position towards the Gospel, the second shows the advantage they derive from it. The term "called" indicates the Divine ground on which they stand. (On *κλητός*: called, comp. ver. 2). By the addition of: **both Jews and Greeks** he gives us to understand that in the purpose of grace denoted in their calling the separation hitherto existing between these parties had been removed. (Comp. Rom. ix. 24 and x. 12).—**the power of God and the wisdom of God.**—Here we have the antithesis to "stumbling block" and "foolishness." While the Jews were asking how a person crucified and accursed could possibly be the Saviour of Israel, how one so utterly devoid of strength could be able to overthrow all hostile power, and the Greeks were deeming it absurd to expect salvation from one who came to so miserable an end, the chosen of God were, on the contrary, experiencing and confessing that from this very crucified Redeemer there issued a Divine power, the power of a heavenly life and peace, a renewing, sanctifying, beatific power, such as could be found in nothing creaturely, and that accordingly Christ was the possessor of such a Divine power, that in Him there existed a Divine wisdom that was capable of solving the hardest problems, of lighting up the darkness that rested on the ways of God, of fulfilling God's noblest purposes of bringing men back from all their wanderings into the path of life and of introducing them at last to their final destination.

Ver. 25. A general proposition, substantiating what has just been said.—**Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God mightier than men.**—The phrase "foolishness of God" is not to be taken too abstractly, as if it meant the Divine folly. The Apostle is evidently here speaking from a human point of view and implies merely that which appears foolishness in God. He here has in mind God's dealings with men in the Gospel, such as the procuring of salvation through the crucifixion of Christ, and other things connected therewith, which in the judgment of self-styled wise men of this world, who measure every thing by the measure of their fancied wisdom, appeared contrary to reason. Now of this apparent foolishness of God he affirms that it surpassed in real wisdom all men however wise they seemed to be in their own sight, or were held to be by others, or whatever they might be able to reason out or imagine. In a similar manner we must interpret the following expressson, **the weakness of God**—By this he means a Divine scheme which seemed weak to those who held merely to physical force and boasted in that (for instance, the procuring of redemption through one subjecting himself to the humiliation of death on the cross), but which in fact **is stronger than men**, *i. e.*, exerts a mightier power than they with all their imagined strength and prowess. Bengel adds: "Although they may appear to themselves both wise and strong, and wish to be the standards of wisdom and strength." Thus interpreted, it would be needless to construe the words "than men" as involving a figure of speech in which a comparison instituted with a person or thing as a whole, properly applies only

to a part of it, or to some quality in it, as though they meant: "than the wisdom of men," or "than the strength of men." Both interpretations, however, amount to the same thing.—There is still another construction suggested by what follows, viz.: that by the foolishness and the weakness of God are meant the *persons themselves* who are "called" (ver. 24), who experience Christ crucified as "the wisdom of God and the power of God," so that they in consequence become Divinely wise and strong, and are thus enabled as the foolishness and weakness belonging to God to surpass men, *i. e.* that portion of the race who remain out of Christ in wisdom and power. "The thought is this—Human nature delights in doing great things. God, on the contrary, in His earthly dispensations always appears weak and small at the first, and not until afterwards reveals the overwhelming power that is concealed in His instrumentalities." NEANDER.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Christ and His cross — Christ crucified.*— This is the clear light from Heaven, which comes to scatter all the darkness of man's sinful life. This is the key to all the riddles of a history that has been deranged and confused by falsehood and sin. All God's revelations in the Old Testament, his ordinances, institutions, promises, judgments and blessings here reach their fulfilment and find their real explanation. All the hints of truth current among heathen nations—all their sighing and striving after the knowledge of God and communion with Him, all attempts to get rid of the consciousness of guilt, to atone for sin and to effect a perfect restoration to Divine favor—all the labor of the wise to discover a clue for the great labyrinth of human life—in short every thing which glimmered as a ray of light here and there in this darkness, obtains in Christ its proper goal; and in so far as it at last leads to the apprehension of this perfect light and salvation, it has been not in vain. Here is the "*power of* God" which in place of a thousand-fold yet vain endeavor on the part of man is able to insure a true Divine life, an undisturbed peace, an all pervading sanctification—spreading from the inmost centre of a heart that embraces the holy, forgiving love of God,—and an invincible patience and steadfastness combined with the serenest tranquillity amid all the plagues, diseases, adversities and conflicts which may assail us from within and without. Here, too, is the *wisdom* of God. From this the deepest problems of human knowledge and human activity receive light, so that they can be recognized in their truth and in the goal to which they tend; and right methods of solution for them may be attained. Here the eternal thoughts of God, and the thoughts of man which spring up responsive to these out of the inmost truth of the human heart through the operation of the all-enlightening Logos, encounter each other. Here redeeming love with its wondrous plan of forgiveness and regeneration meets the manifold devices and strivings of man for the removal of guilt and, the acquisition of the chief good, and gives them a perfect satisfaction.

2. *Christ and His cross — as confronting the world.*—But the more this revelation of God in a crucified Saviour surpasses all the doings of man hitherto, the less can it be measured by the standard of truth and goodness existing among men, the less can it come within the scope of their ordinary conceptions. Where, therefore, the heart has not been renewed by a surrender to the truth foreshadowed by its mysterious need and corresponding to it, and so no change has been wrought in the whole course of thought, there this revelation remains an incomprehensible mystery; and where to the indolence, which refuses to stir out of the old beaten track, there is added an arrogant pride, which, with arbitrary exaggeration and embellishments insists on making what already exists the measure of the new and rejects whatever does not suit the demands thus originated, there, it is certain, that the revelation of God will be violently opposed. And this will be so much the more sure to occur, when, for the sake of presenting a contrast with the vain parade of carnal self in adhering to what is externally imposing and brilliant, and in cleaving to its own productions which seem so beautiful and fair, the revealed truth and grace are constrained to show themselves in an unpretending form, putting contempt upon the proud display of might by assuming a lowly aspect of weakness and setting at naught a lofty pretentious wisdom by wearing the guise of foolishness in order to lift humanity thereby out of the vanity of its conceited claims, and out of the arbitrariness of its own devices and endeavors, into the experience of a true divine power and wisdom.—But the cross and its preaching, which prove such a stumbling block and foolishness to those who are bound up in their vain conceit becomes to those who obey the heavenly calling in faith and who in the mortification of self with all its foolish conceits and pretensions yield themselves to the influences of the grace and truth in Christ, and in so doing experience its enlightening, sanctifying and beatific power, the wisdom of God and the power of God. Thus it happens that men with all their wisdom and power remain far inferior to what belongeth unto God, however foolish and weak it may seem.

3. "VERS. 22–24 afford us *a point of observation* which enables us *to survey Church History* in clearest light. The Apostles found two distinct tendencies setting in in strong hostility to the Gospel, the desire for miracles, and the conceit of wisdom. These two tendencies show themselves repeatedly through all times. A false, one-sided supernaturalism and a false one-sided rationalism are ever in rivalry with each other either to resist the Gospel in open enmity or to disturb and corrupt it by secretly insinuating themselves into it. It may be said that all external opposition and all internal peril to the Gospel resolve themselves at last into these two opposite principles. So long as a pure Gospel withstands and excludes these it will succeed in satisfying the genuine human needs lying at their foundation and in thus quieting them on both sides. This proves itself to be the true wonder-working power before which all other miracles must pale, and the true wisdom of God before which all other wisdom must be put to shame, and thus

does it exhibit itself in both ways as the absolute Religion." NEANDER.

4. [Since it is "to the called" that the Gospel proves "the power of God and the wisdom of God," by bringing them at last to believe and be saved, it follows that the difference in the effects produced by the Gospel, so that on the one hand it appears to some as an offence and to others as foolishness, but to others still as a means of salvation, is all owing to the calling of God—his effectual calling.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

1. *The cross of Christ is made of none effect by cunning words or the wisdom of speech.*—For the wisdom of speech is 1, on the one hand scholastic wisdom which *a.* culminates only in knowledge, not in reformation; *b.* gives no satisfaction on the chief point, Religion; *c.* being in constant strife with itself evermore corrupts rather than improves; 2. On the other hand an artificial rhetoric, which springs not from the heart or from zeal for a cause known to be true, but aims only to dazzle and please, and by this means to persuade. But a mode of proceeding so altogether unworthy of heavenly truth robs the cross of Christ of its peculiar power; since *a.* the attention is turned away from the subject to the speaker, and so the heart is diverted and betrayed into vanity; *b.* and everything is viewed according to its fitness to delight; *c.* and the effect is ascribed not to the power of the truth presented but to the eloquence displayed. After HEUBNER.

2. *The preaching of the cross.* 1, *is foolishness for those who are lost.* *a.* Who are these? They are such as are hardened in their own guilt—such as follow their own perverted sense and will not accept of truth or consent to self-humiliation, so that humanly judging there is nothing to be hoped for from them. *b.* Why is the preaching of the cross foolishness for them? Because to the world, which insists on its own importance, everything appears absurd which fells its pride, destroys its meritoriousness and conflicts with its wisdom and righteousness. 2, *is a wisdom of God unto us who are called.*—The believer who permits himself to be saved, awakened and enlightened by the spirit of God, finds in the cross a divinely derived and divinely operating power, which draws the heart into peace with itself and with God, fills it with holy love, and strengthens it with a new power of life; and he recognizes therein a wisdom far surpassing all human thought and sense. After HEUBNER.

3. *The vanity of scholastic wisdom or the judgment of God upon conceited worldly wisdom.*—1. It effects nothing, because it aims only at show and not at improvement. 2. God allows it to be betrayed into folly and shame, because it seeks to be wise and strong without God, without prayer and piety. 3. Christianity exposes it in all its barrenness, since, while Christianity renews humanity, worldly wisdom perishes in its own schools, and is unable to maintain its own progress. After HEUBNER.

4. *The causes of the rejection of the Crucified.*—1. The Jewish desire for whatever was striking, imposing and externally mighty; 2. The Gentile conceit of wisdom and a vain misculture; 3. The pride of both which sought to comprehend God, but which would not enter into the apparently weak and foolish ways and means of his economy. After HEUBNER.

5. *The preaching of the cross* has with those who are saved a *threefold* effect. 1. It *shames*, inasmuch as man crucified Christ with his sins; for a long time did not recognize him; did not honor or thank him; and was willing so long to tolerate the sins which nailed Him to the cross. 2. It *humbles*, by reminding us of Christ's own love, in that He, the Great God, died for us poor worms, and did so much for us when we were utterly worthless. It *inclines* us also to benevolence towards all men who differ from us only in this, that we are sinners saved, while they can and may yet be saved. 3. It *awakens*, gives power and life, so that we not only are ready and inclined, but also are enabled to love God, and to prove our love by works.

6. The Cross of Christ is *an offence* to all men who think that a good life will ensure them a happy end. These are the enemies of the Cross in the midst of Christendom. They worship it externally; they take pride in it, but in fact they hate the doctrine of the Cross. They cannot accept the truth that Christ has become our Redeemer and that we are saved out of sheer mercy, so that the holiest, the most pious, the most liberal, the most upright man is just as far from Heaven as the most miserable sinner, and that there is but one way for all. To the wise and prudent the cross of Christ is *foolishness.* The truth that Christ died for us they regard as a fable. There are persons even among [nominal] believers who take it as a compliment if they are said not to believe. Yet should one accuse them of holding the truth, and yet of living in untruthfulness, disobedience and ingratitude towards God, it would be the same as if he pronounced them deliberate villains. Oh! could they but once hear the Gospel in a way to pierce their hearts they would certainly ask, What shall we do? Let the doctrine of the Cross be once made vital in the soul, then would there be no need of exhortation, alarm and threatening in view of this or that judgment. It would be sufficient to say, "The Saviour died for me." If we are in trouble for our sins, and the hope of salvation vanishes, and the voice comes, "Christ has died and earned salvation for us," how the heart not only seizes but holds fast to the declaration! How the truth penetrates like a divine power into the soul which can never be lost or forgotten! Then are our sins buried in the depths of the sea; they can no more tyrannize over us. Then we *need* sin no more. Such is the effect of the Word of the Cross in them that believe. GOSSNER.

HEDINGER:—Power, wit, all human work and counsel corrupts faith, misleads in the church, and hinders the efficacy of the means of grace. In divine things, the more foolish anything seems to the world, the better it is. "Wisdom, wisdom, ready understanding, science, learning out of a thousand books!" Such is the cry of the world. An evil sound is it in the churches and in the schools. *One* thing is needful—*one* book, *one* Christ.

STARKE:—The Gospel has a differencing effect according to the character of the persons who hear and use it. Mankind are divided into two classes: 1. *Unbelievers;* they are such as live on, without caring for their salvation, either in security or hypocrisy; each word and work of theirs is a step toward Hell. 2. *Believers;* they are those who are in daily concern about their salvation; and this is with them so vital a point that even when unmoved by efforts from abroad, while in the midst of their labors or talk, they are not easily repelled from it (ver. 18). Wisdom is in itself something divine, and before the fall the image of God in man consisted in it (Col. iii. 10); and even now the inclination to know and learn something is a remnant in us of this divine image. But if our natural wisdom profits us but little now, and is every where scandalized, this is the fault, not of wisdom, but of our corrupted reason and understanding. None of the loftiest and most learned of this world ought to be ashamed of the simplicity of the Gospel, for God Himself, the highest and wisest of all, let Himself down to it. Sufficient is it for us that an infinite power resides in the Cross to deliver us out of all our deep depravity. (ver. 21).—God can never suit people. One will have it this way and another that. Shame on you! God does as it pleases Him (Matth. xi. 16 ff.). Men always delight in what is strange, lofty, conspicuous. Instead of desiring that God's name alone should be praised they seek themselves in every thing. They look either at power, wealth, faculty, or at learning, prudence, dexterity. Both are means to greatness, but they prove hinderances in the kingdom of God. (ver. 22).—God will remain unsurpassed in His words and works (Ps. lxxviii. 41), but their wisdom and strength are vain. The world makes wisdom to consist in much learning which secures honor and regard. But a believer considers it the height of wisdom to know that he is a poor sinner, becomes justified and saved only in deepest humility. The greatest power consists in being able to overcome ourselves and the kingdom of Satan. God can put to shame all the devices of the craftiest and all the might of the greatest in this world. Why wilt thou fear? Look to God! He can and will give thee enough for all things (ver. 25).

H. RIEGER:—Let him who would even now, by the preaching of the Cross, awaken a sense of the Cross in the hearts of men, and thereby coöperate for their salvation, not seek for assistance from the fickle arts of worldly wisdom, but let him observe what renders himself humble and subdued, and what he can thus convey with a tender spirit to others, and let him shun every thing which on the contrary tends to puff himself up and wherewith he is tempted to court the favor of men.

[SPENCER: (ver. 21).—"Some Christian ministers sometimes think to do Christianity a very good service by philosophizing it to make it keep up with the times. In all this they do Christianity no other service than rob it of its power by robbing it of its peculiarity, and do no other service to the 'philosophic minds' which they say they would influence, than just to mislead them and keep them away from true faith in Christ and reliance on his great atonement.

Every thing is coming to be *philosophized.* Many a minister in the pulpit—shame on him—betrays his trust to the Bible and his God by teaching religion very much as if it were a new matter of reason, and human progress, and human discovery, instead of taking God's Word as his authority and instructor, and uttering in the ears of the people like the old prophets, *Thus saith the Lord God.* Beware of such proceedings. They tend to infidelity. Learn duty from God. The Bible is safe. Philosophy is blind."]

[ROBERTSON:—"Men bow before talent even if unassociated with goodness, but between these two we must make an everlasting distinction. When once the idolatry of talent enters, then farewell to spirituality; when men ask their teachers, not for that which will make them more humble and God-like, but for the excitement of an intellectual banquet, then farewell to Christian progress. Here also St. Paul again stood firm. Not Wisdom, but Christ crucified. St. Paul might have complied with these requirements of his converts, and then he would have gained admiration and love, he would have been the leader of a party, but then he would have been false to his Master—he would have been preferring self to Christ."]

THE TRUE METHOD OF PREACHING.

(CONTINUED).

B. As suited to the character of the called and the ends contemplated.

CHAPTER I 26–31.

26 For ye [*om.* ye] see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the
27 flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, *are called:* But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of

28 the world to confound the things which are mighty; And base things of the world,
and things which are despised, hath God chosen, *yea*, and [*om.* yea, and][1] things
29 which are not, to bring to nought things that are: That no flesh should glory in his
30 presence [the presence of God].[2] But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God
[*om.* of God], is [has been] made unto us wisdom, [from God, ἀπὸ θεοῦ][3] and [both]
31 righteousness and sanctification, and redemption: That according as it is written, He
that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

[1] VER. 28.—The καὶ before τὰ μὴ ὄντα is not original. ["A mistaken supplement of the sense."—Alf.]
[2] VER. 29.—Instead of the rec. αὐτοῦ the best authorities read τοῦ θεοῦ which is repeated by way of emphasis.
[3] VER. 30.—The best attested order of words is σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ. That in the Rec. ἡμῖν σοφία is to be explained from the tendency to take σοφία ἀπὸ θεου together in relation (Meyer). [See below].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

[The connection. Kling here, as usual, follows Meyer in considering these verses as confirmatory of what immediately precedes ver. 24. It were better, however, with de Wette and Hodge, to regard the Apostle as introducing here a new argument in support of the general position taken in the previous section. It is an argument drawn from facts directly under their eye. In proof of what he had said of the true method of preaching and the utter vanity of the worldly wisdom they were tempted to prize, they could see for themselves what course the Gospel had in the main actually taken among them who were its converts and what were the ends subserved by this. Accordingly he begins by directing attention to the character of the called, first described negatively].

VER. 26. **For look at your calling, brethren.**—The verb βλέπετε may be taken in the Indicative [as in the E. V.]; but the Imperative corresponds better with the animated style of the Apostle (see x. 18; Phil. iii. 2). ["And is required by the emphatic position which the verb occupies in the sentence" ALF. So also Words., Wickliffe, Tyndale, and the Rheims version]. Nor is this at all inconsistent, as Bengel asserts, with the use of the "for," since this is to be found elsewhere also in imperative clauses. [Βλέπειν: "*to consider, take to heart*, is employed to express a more intent, earnest, spiritual contemplation than ὁρᾶν. The one denotes mental vision, the other bodily sight." W. WEBSTER]. (Heb. xii. 3). The "calling" which they are requested to observe is not their secular vocation, or their external circumstances [Olshausen], in which they were found when called of the Lord. Nothing is said of this in the subsequent context. Nor yet can we admit Bengel's explanation: "the state in which the heavenly calling proves an offence to you." This anticipates a thought which is not mentioned till afterwards. It is more correct to understand it of the Divine call, both as to the act itself, and the method God pursued in calling them, especially in respect to the persons whom he had chosen and their condition. [This is seen in the very use of terms. "He does not say τὴν κλῆσιν ὑμετέραν, nor τὴν ὑμῶν κλῆσιν but τὴν κλῆσιν ὑμῶν: *the calling of you.*" WORDS.]. What this was he proceeds to state—**how that not many wise men after the flesh.**—The "flesh" here denotes the purely human state or course of action, as utterly devoid of Divine influence or coöperation. It is the sensuous and selfish life, possessed by sin. Hence a wisdom which is suited to this life, which moves according to its ways instead of after the methods of that Divine spiritual principle from which all true higher knowledge springs, is "a wisdom of this age," "of the world" (ver. 20), earthly, godless, and hostile to God. Such is its essential character. Yet without pushing the matter so far, we might simply abide by the idea of what is purely human. (Comp. *Herzog's Theol. Real. Ency.* under the word "Fleisch").*—To attach this qualification to the remaining predicates, would be superfluous. These of themselves indicate what is external, worldly, and belonging to the lower extra-christian life.—**not many mighty,** δυνατοί: *persons of consequence in civil life, influential, powerful, whether it be by wealth or any other means,*—**not many noble,** εὐγενεῖς: *of distinguished descent, well-born.* In highly-civilized, aristocratic Corinth, all this was regarded of great importance.—**are called.**—There is no verb in the original with which the above nominatives can agree, and it is best to supply the defect [as in the E. V.] "are called" from the word "calling" in the first clause. Others prefer "are," and take it either as the sole predicate of the clause: "There are not many wise, etc., among you;" or they unite with it the adjectives as predicates: "Many are not wise, etc." [Some of the Fathers thought that the persons employed to dispense this calling were here meant. So THEODORET. "God endorsed the nations in the evangelical net of Galilean fishermen." Also AUGUSTINE. "Christ caught orators by fishermen, not fishermen by orators." WORDSWORTH]. The supplying of "are called," suits as well with the preceding words, "your calling," as with the following, "hath chosen." "In the early centuries it was often flung at Christianity (by Celsus and others) that its converts were, for the most part, common people, women and slaves." Paul here not only confesses the fact, but also discovers in it one cause of glory for the Gospel; for it is precisely in this that the Gospel displays itself to be the power of God and the wisdom of God, that starting from such humble beginnings it had nevertheless both outwardly and inwardly overcome the world.

VERS. 27, 28. The positive aspect of the case. **But the foolish things of this world.**—Luther translates "in the eyes of the world," as though the Genitive in the original were that of

* [See also for a masterly analysis of the Ethical import of this word. Müller on Sin. 2 Book, 2 Chap. Also Sartorius, "Von der heiligen Liebe."]

estitmaion. But Paul is here speaking of things not as they *seem*, but as they *are;* and here, as well as in the subsequent Epistles, we have the actual quality indicated. "The foolish things" (*τὰ μωρά*), the neuter for the sake of greater generalization. We have here a strong contrast to "the wise," *i. e.* whatever is lacking in higher cultivation and insight, including, too, the additional thought of being deemed foolish, contracted and simple.—**hath God chosen,** an expression which is repeated three times with great emphasis. It denotes the Divine purpose which is made known in the calling; or that Divine decision in virtue of which a separation is effected among fallen mankind, and certain individuals are selected out of it to become a possession of God in Christ, and are so made blessed (comp. *ἐκλέγεσθαι* Eph. i. 4; Is. xv. 19). The expression belongs to the Theocratic language of the Old Testament (comp. בָּחַר Deut. xiv. 2 ff.). "Foreknowledge" and "Predestination" are cognate terms, Rom. viii. 29; 2 Tim. i. 9, yet so, however, that the word "choose" here designates the free, eternal gracious will of God, as carried out in time, and therefore includes the "calling" in itself.—The object of such a choice is **to confound the wise** *i. e.* the wise after the flesh. By the fact that He selected the "foolish," persons destitute of superior culture, to enjoy holy and blessed communion with Him, the wisdom in which "the wise" boasted, is exposed in all its insufficiency and worthlessness. Or we may say with de Wette, "the wise were put to shame by being compelled to see the foolish obtaining that which was denied to them." In the latter case, it is implied that "the wise" are conscious of the preference made, "and so were stung to reform" (Osiander). But this is not sustained by the context as the parallel expression "bring to nought" shows. The jubilant contrast proceeds.—**and the weak things of this world,** *i. e.* the weak of every kind, bodily, mentally, politically. —**God hath chosen to confound the things which are mighty.**—The antithesis here is introduced by the neuter: *τὰ ἰσχυρά*, denoting the category in general, although persons are meant. That any thing contemptuous was intended by this use of the neuter, is not probable, since he just before spoke of a kindred class, "the wise," in the masculine. The "confounding" is seen in the fact that "the weak things," by virtue of the indwelling "power of God," evince an energy and an overcoming power which is denied to the strong of this world.—In the third set of contrasts there appears an expansion of thought on the one side, with which there is nothing to correspond on the other.—**And the base things of the world, and the despised things hath God chosen — the things which are as good as not, in order that He may bring to nought the things that are.**—Here we have the antithesis only to the last expression of the first series: "*the* things that are" (*τὰ ὄντα*). [This is readily accounted for, if the omission of the *καί* as sustained by the best authorities (see critical notes) be correct. In that case the *τὰ μὴ ὄντα*: the *things which are not* instead of being an addition to the previous specifications, would stand in opposition with them, as a sort of summary of their meaning, and so be the main word requiring the offset on the other side]. Observe also the order of thought in the specifications. "base things,"—*ἀγενῆ*: of low origin. To this is added as a natural consequence: "despised things"— *τὰ ἐξουθενημένα*: regarded as nothing. Then below both, as putting the matter in its strongest possible aspect, there comes the *τὰ μὴ ὄντα* (to be distinguished from *τὰ οὐκ ὄντα* inasmuch as the *μή* is not an absolute, but a subjective negative. Winer, § 59, 3): that which in the opinion of men is as good as non-existent. — In the antithetic *τὰ ὄντα*, some would insert a *τί*, making it read: things that are somewhat, of some importance. But this we are as little warranted in doing as in making *τὰ μὴ ὄντα*=*τὰ μηθὲν ὄντα*: things which are of no account, are nothing. What Paul here sets in contrast with the former are things which have being, are real, which are regarded as existing, and "which continue to make themselves pass for sole realities." And for these things the verb "confound" would no longer suit. So we have another "bring to naught:" *καταργήσῃ· make null, deprive of all validity.* This is a much stronger expression, and it puts its object, relatively to the highest good to be enjoyed, out of existence.* The truth of the assertion has been well brought out by Neander: "In its scorned professors, the Gospel has in fact displayed a power of action and endurance, which far transcends the measure of the natural man. They alone never bowed to the despotism of the Roman Emperor. To them also the Gospel has imparted a steadfastness of conviction, which the proud philosophy of the Greeks never possessed; and a Christian mechanic, as Justin Martyr and Tertullian have affirmed, was able to answer questions which the Greek philosopher asked in vain."

[* Whitby discovers an allusion in the above designations to the Jews and Gentiles. His observations are valuable. "The Jews looked upon themselves as the only *εὐγενεῖς*, persons of true nobility, as being of the stock of Abraham. 'Even the poorest Israelite,' saith R. Akibah, 'is to be looked upon as a gentleman, as being the son of Abraham, &c.;' but the Gentiles they horribly despised, as the base people of the earth, not fit to be conversed with, they being styled in their law, *οὐκέθνος: not a nation; λαὸς ὁ τεχθησομενος, a people that shall be born,* Ps. xxii. 31; *ὁ κτιζόμενος, that should be created in the generation to come,* Ps. cii. 19, and so yet had no being, Deut. xxxi. 21. *οὐ λαὸς, not a people,* Hos. i. 10; and it being said by the prophet, that *all the Heathens are as nothing, and were accounted as nothing,* Is. xl. 17, they still account them as such. Hence, Mordecai prays, *Lord, give not thy sceptre τοῖς μὴ οὖσι, to them that are not,* Esth. iv. 11; and Esdras. *As for the people which also came of Adam, thou hast said they are nothing. And now, O Lord, these Heathens who have ever been reputed as nothing, have begun to be lords over us.* 2 Esdras vi. 56–57. Thus Abraham is said to be the father of the Gentiles, *before that God who calleth things which are not as if they were,* Rom. iv. 17: and Clemens Rom. saith of the Gentiles, "He called us who were not, and would that of no being we should have a being." So filthy are the Gentiles represented here by *things that are not, things base, things accounted as nothing.* See also 1 Cor. vi. 4. And this is the ancient exposition of Origen, who, speaking of the rejection of the Jews, or the calling of the Gentiles, and God's provoking the Jews *to jealousy by them that were not a nation,* he confirms this from these words: "God hath chosen the base things of the world, and things which *are not,* that he might abolish the things which *were* before, that Israel, according to the flesh, might glory before God." *Philocal c. p.* 3. Now, however much we may feel constrained to take these designations in question in their more natural and broader acceptation as above, it is very evident that they were derived from the Theocratic usus loquendi.]

VER. 29. The reason of the above mentioned peculiarity of God's procedure in "calling" men.—**that no flesh should boast in the presence of God.**—*μη καυχήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ*, lit.: *that all flesh should not boast.* A Hebraism. The negative belongs to the verb, and =that all flesh should give up their boasting. The sense is: "no man should boast that he, out of his own endeavors, or position, or worth, had contributed any thing to the great achievements of the Gospel." NEANDER. It is a question whether we are to take the word "flesh" as simply denoting humanity in general, or are to associate with this the ideas of guilt and transientness which are also conveyed by it. As a general rule the expression occurs in this way only when the one or the other of these ideas is implied in the context. "Flesh beautiful, yet frail" says Bengel.—["Here then we see that God by confounding the mighty, and the wise, and the great, does not design to elate with pride the weak, the illiterate, and the abject, but brings down all of them together to one level." CALVIN].

VER. 30. The ground in the Divine economy on which this end is obtained and the glory of salvation secured to God alone.—**But of him ye are in Christ Jesus.**—A two-fold construction and exposition is here possible. Either the first five words may be taken as a sentence by itself, stating the fact of their origin in God: "Of him are ye." The subsequent words, "in Christ Jesus," would then assert the ground of their being from God—of their Divine Sonship, and this too in such a manner as to carry the emphasis. Such a construction is supported by the fact that the important relative clause which follows is joined directly to it. Or the words "ye are in Christ Jesus" may be taken together as denoting their being in fellowship with Christ, and then "of Him" assigns the cause of this fact,—shows how they came to be in Christ. The latter construction is not contrary to usage, and at least is not more forced than to suppose the word "are" to be employed as a pregnant construction for 'have sprung' or 'been born,' as Osiander does. We might compare with this Eph. ii. 8, "And that," *to wit*, being saved, "not of yourselves," which is the same as 'and ye are not saved of yourselves,'—stated in the positive form, 'ye are saved of God,' *i. e.* He is the author of your salvation. So here: He is the author of your being in Christ Jesus. This is sustained also by the "from God" (*ἀπὸ θεοῦ*) in the relative clause which evidently refers back to "of Him" (*ἐξ αὐτοῦ*) and imparts to the thought additional emphasis* by repetition. In relation to the truth conveyed see Jno. vi. 44, 37, 65. The preference accordingly is to be given to the second construction. In this way, on the one hand, we preserve the Pauline expression "to be in Christ," and avoid one which never elsewhere occurs—*ἐκ θεοῦ εἶναι*: "to be from God." By this explanation we would be compelled to refer *ἐν κυρίῳ*: "in the Lord" (ver. 31), to God and not to Christ, contrary to Pauline usage. But this need present no difficulty, since these words in ver. 31 are not Paul's, but a citation from the Old Testament. — **Who was made wisdom unto us from God, both righteousness and sanctification and redemption.***—Here we have the rich treasure of blessings contained for us in Christ all laid open, revealing the largeness of our indebtedness to God, for what of real worth we have and are. "From God" is not to be connected with "wisdom" as indicating the source whence it came, but with "was made" as showing the author of the act. (*ἐγενήθη*, a later Doric form for *ἐγένετο*, not passive). This is the order of thought presented in the German [as well as in the English] version. The fact that Christ has been made to us "wisdom" depends on God; and not only "wisdom," but also the other particulars specified. Observe, too, he here passes over into the first person plural, "unto us," including therein himself as he frequently does elsewhere when specially moved by a sense of his fellowship with his readers in the salvation of Christ. The position of "wisdom," coming in as it does before the words "unto us from God," and thus separated from the remaining predicates, is not to be explained on the ground that "wisdom" is the leading thought to which the others are subordinated. Such a construction is neither called for by the *τε καί*, which only serves to connect "righteousness" and "sanctification" a little more closely, nor by the nature of the conceptions expressed by the other terms, which designate rather coördinate aspects of the one great scheme of salvation entirely distinct from wisdom, and therefore not capable of being included under it. Rather we may say that in consequence of the course of thought thus far pursued, the idea of "wisdom" pressed foremost upon his mind, and so came in where it did; or that he put the qualifying word common to the several members of the sentence right in among them as a word of connection (Osiander.) It is natural to look for some antithesis to what precedes in these four specifications, "wisdom," etc. But it can only be called a mistake in Bengel when he attempts to find a contrast, as in "wisdom" to "the foolish things;" so also in "righteousness" to "the weak things," in "sanctification" to "the base things," and in "redemption" to "the despised things."†—When it is affirmed

[* A question might then arise: why *ἐξ* was not repeated and instead we have *ἀπὸ*. See below].

[* We have here given the exact order of the Greek in order to render the exposition more intelligible.]

[† We here insert the arguments in favor of the interpretation which Kling has simply set aside without refuting, and which seems worthy of consideration as best fitted to dispose of some of the difficulties under which his view labors—and also as fraught with valuable suggestions. This other interpretation has in its favor, that it takes in the thought as it flows upon the mind in the order of the words, "who is made unto us a wisdom from God—both righteousness and sanctification and redemption." In a collocation of words so peculiar, it were natural to take the last three terms as an after thought exegetical of the main one—and such an addition was needed. Wisdom was what Paul had been disparaging throughout this section. But it was the wisdom of man. Now he glories in Christ as having been made unto us wisdom. It was necessary therefore to difference this from what he had been condemning. So he adds *ἀπό θεοῦ*—not *ἐξ*, as in the previous clause where he wishes to express the *cause* of an act; but *ἀπό*: *from* denoting derivation, showing whence this wisdom came. It is no objection to this that the article *τῆ* is not mentioned before *ἀπό*, since the omission is quite in Paul's style. Eph. iii. 13. (See Alf.: also 15). Then to characterize this wisdom, to exhibit its distinguishing peculiarities as practical and suited

that "Christ was made to us wisdom," by this we are to understand that in Him, in His person, the fulness of which was unfolded in His history, the mystery of the Divine plan of salvation has been disclosed, and with this an insight been afforded us into the dispensations and judgments of God, and we are enabled to recognize and lay hold upon that which shall conduct us to the goal of our noblest longings (comp. ii. 7 ff.; Col. i. 9 ff.; 26 ff.; iii. 2; iii. 10; Phil. i. 9 ff.; Eph. v. 8 ff. etc.). As closely related ideas, "righeousness" and "sanctification" are so joined as to form a distinct whole: *δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμός*. The first reminds us of 2 Cor. v. 21—"that we might be made the righteousness of God in him;" and of Jer. xxiii. 6—"The Lord our righteousness;" and also of the saying of Christ himself in Matth. iii. 15, as well as of Acts xiii. 38; Is. liii. 11; Gal. ii. 16, 17; Rom. i. 17; iii. 21 ff. In the language of Holy Writ righteousness denotes that conduct which comports with the law of God or the disposition suitable to it. This existed in Christ in absolute perfection; and it existed in Him as the second Adam (xv. 4, 7), the son of man, the head representing the whole body, and in behalf of the entire sinful race, whose obligations to the law He had fulfilled by a life of perfect obedience, and whose debt to justice He has cancelled by submiting to the penalty threatened upon sin in a voluntary sacrifice of Himself even unto death, thereby complying with the behests of the Father and revealing His holy and compassionate love towards the fallen. In this way has He become righteousness for us, that we may be counted righteous before God and enter into the possession of the rights and privileges which belong to this state of righteousness—that is, be adopted into the Divine family. This, regarded as an act of God, is expressed by the terms *δικαιοῦν δικαίωσις: to justify, justification;* and the pardon of sin, as the negative side of justification, includes also, for its corresponding positive side, God's cordial acceptance of us as pleasing in His sight. But in this judicial portion of Christ's redeeming work there lies also, at the same time, an element of moral change—of sanctification (*ἁγιασμός*), and the intimate connection between these two things is expressed by the *τε καί*. ("In this conjunction there is implied at once distinction and equality, an intimation of similarity, as though the one were consequent upon the other." OSIANDER. In order that the relation to God, in which our justification places us, may be subjectively sustained, so that we may say "the judgment of God is according to truth," there must be an inward connection between the Head and the members who participated in the righteousness of their Head: This connection is effected by the love of Christ awakening faith in us. This love at once destroys in the subject of it all disposition to live for himself, as the moving spring of his existence, all ambitious aspiring, and transports him into a state of mind that leads him to live and to become every thing in Christ alone. And this is *faith*, humble, earnest faith, that works in us repentance as its result. In this emancipation of the individual from the thraldom of selfishness (an emancipation which is at the same time a deliverance from every thing to which selfishness binds us, even the idols of flesh and sense, and the world), and in this union to Christ as the sole worthy and worth-giving Saviour, lies the germ of our "sanctification." By this we understand becoming godly-minded—the consecration of our whole life in all its elements unto God—the offering up of self unto the Most High, so that all labor becomes a Divine service, the springs of which are joy in the Lord and the witness of the Spirit to our adoption and final salvation. This *ἁγιασμός: holiness*, may be regarded either as progressive—*sanctification*, or as a fixed quality—*sanctity*. The latter is the prevailing usage in the New Testament (Rom. vi. 19–22; 1 Thess. iv. 3, 4, 7; 1 Tim. ii. 15; Heb. xii. 14 etc.). It is to be so taken here. In reference to the thing itself see Jno. xvii. 19, and the juxtaposition of "ye are justified" and "ye are sanctified" in 1 Cor. vi. 11. But while all are agreed as to the meaning of these foregoing terms as a whole, it is not so in regard to the last one, "and redemption" (*ἀπολύτρωσις*). Are we (with Meyer) to take this as denoting the work of Christ through which our salvation is achieved (as in Rom. iii. 24; Eph. i. 7), so that it is for us an object of faith? or (according to the Catholic expositors) as our final deliverance from death and all the evils and temptations of sin (as in Rom. viii. 23; Eph. i. 14), and so as an object of hope? The latter interpretation corresponds better with the position of the word, since it will hardly do, after having mentioned "righteousness and sanctification," to go back again to the negative idea of deliverance from guilt, which is already involved in the term righteousness. On the other hand, its position renders the addition of any explanatory term like that found in Rom. viii. 23; Eph. i. 14; iv. 30, unnecessary. Comp. for a fuller development of the thought Rom. viii. 10, 11, and 21–24. —Here then is the final stage of our salvation a deliverance from the bondage of corruption unto the glorious liberty of the sons of God. That in this, as well as in the foregoing instances, Christ exhibits himself as the "power of God" victorious over the power of sin and its terrible consequence, death, is a proximate thought, so that here again those two chief predicates, "wisdom and power," recur to view, only the second with greater prominence. But in the case of "sanctification," as well as of "redemption," it is implied that Christ is in Himself what He has be-

for man's deepest deeds, instead of being merely speculative, he subjoins the three great points it contemplated. And here is where wisdom of the Gospel far surpasses that of secular philosophy. It gives him in Christ pardon, holiness, triumphant deliverance from woe to glory. Here then we find 1, an adequate reason for the order of the words; 2, not a repetition but a distinct thought in *ἀπὸ θεοῦ*, and so a reason for the change of preposition: 3, not a digression from the main course of thought as must be supposed in the other interpretation, which Stanley admits, but a glorious consummation of it, displaying the infinite superiority of the wisdom from God over all human wisdom; 4, an epoxegesis quite in the manner of Paul. Rom. i. 12. Since writing the above I see that the view above given is adopted, though not argued out, by Butler in his sermons on our text. It is substantiated also by the Syriac, Vul., and Rheims versions. Neander's testimony may be added: "In these last three conceptions (righteousness, sanctification and redemption), there are presented to us the practical contents of the wisdom (from God), by which it is distinguished from the wisdom of this world."]

come for us; that He in all His life and walk was entirely severed from all fellowship with sin and wholly consecrated to God, *i. e.* holy, and as such was the principle of our sanctification; that He arose victorious from the grave and the whole realm of sin, and at once ascended up on high, exalted over all, and as such carries in Himself the power by which our redemption is to be achieved. (Comp. xv. 26, 55; Eph. ii. 6).

VER. 31. The final cause of the peculiar method of God's call and the plan of His salvation by the free gift of an all-sufficient Saviour.—**In order that, according as it is written, he that boasteth, in the Lord let him boast.**—Here is where the argument conducts us. There must be a boasting, a glorying; not, however, in oneself before God, but in God as the author of all our advantages and blessings. And this boasting is the expression of a lofty emotion of joy and confidence. If by the term "Lord" Christ were meant, it should be explained as an exultation in His fellowship, in possessing a share in His salvation. But the relation to ver. 29 points rather to God, the original source of all salvation. And such an application would not militate against Paul's usage, because, as has already been remarked, the passage is a citation from the Old Testament (Jer. ix. 23), particular prominence being given to the chief thought by holding fast to the original form. Hence the anacoluthon, *ἵνα—καυχάσθω*, instead of *καυχᾶται*. If anything were to be supplied it would be *γένηται*. For a similar case see Rom. xv. 3.

DOGMATICAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *God's thoughts and ways entirely unlike those of the natural man.*—What is great and glorious in the sight of men, God sets at naught. What men slight as mean and contemptible, God prizes, or makes it precious. Man's propensity is to exalt himself, and hold in honor whatever is the product of his own powers and bears the mark of mental or physical superiority, or can be used to personal advantage, or is of noble origin, while he treats all that is crude and powerless and vulgar, just as if it had no existence. God, on the other hand, in His work of redeeming vain man, especially at its very commencement, proceeds on methods quite the reverse. Here we see the Son of the Highest, who is in the form of God, the Fulness of Divine life and wisdom and power, and, as the perfect image of the Father, is infinitely exalted above the most eminent of created beings, yea, is the very substance and vital principle of all the excellence and power which these beings possess—we see Him emptying Himself of His glory, entering into a state of creaturely dependence, assuming the form of a servant, coming into association with a sinful race although Himself sinless, bearing in holy sympathy all their burdens and trials on His own heart, and sharing in their condemnation and suffering and death, even to the ignominious death of the cross. Thus, at the very start, did Divine Power and Wisdom and Holiness exhibit themselves as weakness, foolishness and sin; Life and Light, as death and darkness; Riches inexhaustible, as deepest poverty; the All in All, as nothing; Essential Being, as not being. Thus in His fundamental act did God confront and confound the vain conceit of men who aspired to resemble Him in power, wisdom and blessedness. And this initial procedure has shaped the whole method of salvation ordained in the Gospel. As the condition of pardon and acceptance God requires of men the absolute renunciation of their own wisdom, power and sufficiency, and a disposition to ascribe all honor and glory unto God, who has thus manifested Himself to them in Christ, and to regard His workmanship in them as alone possessing worth. But since this requirement is exceedingly difficult for such as have distinction in this world, it happens that among the saved there are found not many wise, mighty and noble; but the Divine calling proves effectual rather in the sphere of the rude, the weak, the ignoble and the lowly, inasmuch as it is among these that the disposition to accept salvation exists in the highest degree or is most readily awakened. Thus it cometh to pass that while the wise and the noble and the mighty of earth are passed by and deemed unfit for heavenly honors, the foolish are lifted up into the light of Divine wisdom, the weak are clothed with Divine power, the ignoble are invested with the highest nobility, those who are as if they were not, attain consideration as the only real personages, and by the contrast the pomp and pride of earth are put to shame. The reason of this is that there may be no boasting before God. To this there is the opposite.

2. *Unto God the Lord be all glory*—He is the author of all benefits which come to us through Christ, and as He is the author so is He their final cause. Of Him and to Him are all things.

And these benefits appertain to all the aspects and relations of man's being and life as connected with God and His kingdom, viz. the intellectual, the legal, the moral and the physical. *First, Wisdom.* This in its highest form is the knowledge of God, and such a knowledge we have imparted in the revelation of His Gospel—a knowledge of His character, His works and ways, of the economy of His kingdom in its preparation, establishment, spread and final consummation, by means of which the thoughtful spirit may be led to choose the way of life, and to advance from the first appropriation of salvation in faith on to its full fruition in glory. Of this *wisdom* Christ is made to us the substance and the illuminating principle. The *second* is *Righteousness, i. e.*, restoration of fellowship with God by the satisfaction of all the law's demand, and the cancelling of all obligations incurred, so that the sinner can on this ground, be accounted *righteous* in the sight of God, and be reinstated in his forfeited rights, and have free access to the Father as one of His family. This righteousness Christ has been made unto us by His having fulfilled all the claims of the law, both in doing and in suffering, both by yielding a perfect obedience and by assuming the curse out of His free, infinite love, so that we, being found in Him, may be made partakers of His merits. The *third*, inseparably connected with the preceding, is the *Sanctification* of human life in all its inward and outward movements so far as they

are determined by man's own will. This is effected by the shedding abroad of the love of God in the heart through the indwelling Spirit, who, consequent upon the work of Christ, comes to appropriate to us His righteousness and to assure us of his pardoning grace. And when, notwithstanding all past sins, we become thoroughly conscious of this love to us, there is awakened in our souls a love in return which shows itself in perfect confidence and in entire devotion to God, and in the utter renunciation of all selfish and worldly affections. And this is holiness. But this holiness perfects itself gradually, in the daily exercise of repentance and faith, and love more and more takes possession of the whole life to the complete regulation of all our faculties and relations, so far as they can be determined by it. And this Christ is made, unto us by virtue of His holiness passing over into our hearts through the Holy Ghost, whom He hath given unto us, and who transforms us into a likeness to His all-perfect character. *Finally, Redemption.* —This is the destruction of all our enemies, even to the last, which is death, so that not only is the *spirit* life because of righteousness, but God, who hath raised from the dead the Lord Jesus Christ, will quicken our mortal *bodies* through the Spirit that dwelleth in us. Thus is man, in respect to his entire organism, delivered from the bondage of corruption, and introduced into the glorious liberty of the children of God. And all this is done through the power and after the type of Christ, who, Himself victor over death, has become the principle of life eternal for all who believe in Him. As they die with Him, so also will they reign with Him. In this that profound saying is fulfilled, that corporeity is the end of the ways of God; in other words, that the deliverance of our whole organization from the ban of death, and our introduction into the fulness and power of an indestructible life is the consummation of God's work of restoring fallen man; a work which was begun in his deliverance from the condemnation of sin. Short and good, Olearius: *Christus est sapientia in verbo, quoad doctrinam, justibia in merito, quoad fidem; sanctificatio in spiritu, quoad vitam; redemptio in novissimo adventu, quoad salutem æternam.*

3. [*The efficiency of faith in the matter of salvation.*—This consists not in any virtue or meritoriousness of the act itself but in the fulness of blessings contained in the Being whom it appropriates or to whom it unites us. It enlightens because it lets in the light of Christ's wisdom; it justifies because it appropriates the righteousness of Christ; it sanctifies because it puts us into fellowship with Christ's holy life, and it proves our victory over death and the grave by associating us with Him who, as the Captain of our salvation, has proved himself the mighty conqueror. Thus while the wisdom and the power of this world are limited by the weakness and imperfection of human faculties, faith proves its superiority over both by taking to itself the fulness of Him who filleth all in all.]

4. [*Christ cannot be divided* in the benefits accruing from Him. We cannot have Him for our wisdom or for our righteousness without at the same time having Him for our sanctification and our redemption. The lack of any one of these benefits proves the absence of them all.—Christ is a perfect whole, and His work a perfect whole, and to be accepted at all He must be accepted as a whole.]

5. [*The surpassing excellence* of God's method of salvation is seen in the fact that he presents to us not a dead system of doctrines nor lifeless instrumentalities to be acquired and improved by us, but a living agency, a person, infinite, ever-present, ever-active, all-wise, all-powerful, all-good, who acts upon us while we act on Him, and saves us by an efficiency of his own.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

1. [*The method of preaching the Gospel must be adapted to the nature of the Divine calling.*—1. As to the subjects thereof. The preaching should be of such a kind, and be set forth in such a manner, as to reach the poor, the illiterate and the weak. One sign that the kingdom of God has come is that the poor have the Gospel preached unto them. As it was in the beginning so must it still be. God's calling has not changed its nature. But in thus suiting the Gospel to the humble, we are not to set aside the noble and learned as though excluded from salvation. At the manger in Bethlehem the worship of the shepherds was followed by the worship of the wise men from the East; among the disciples there was a Joseph of Arimathea; the vacancy in the Apostleship made by the fall of Judas was filled by a Paul; among the converts at Corinth was Erastus the chamberlain and the wealthy Gaius. 2. As to the ends it has in view, viz: the humbling of man's pride and the promoting of God's glory.—The aim at such an end must be seen in the style and manner of the preacher himself and in the effects which he seeks to produce. 3. As to its contents.—This must be Christ in all His fulness and in His manifold adaptations to the wants of the sinner; Christ Himself, not a system of doctrines, nor a code of precepts, but the living person.]

2. *The reason why not many wise are called.* 1. Not because God puts contempt on human wisdom, on rank or fortune, or upon man's natural faculties and powers, for these are His gifts and were designed for good, 2, but on account of men's guilt. They abuse these gifts into an occasion for withdrawing themselves from the grace of God, and setting up for themselves to the darkening of their own understandings and the ruin of all their own interests through their weakness and insufficiency. SPENER in STARKE.

3. *Three classes of persons,* the *wise,* the *strong* and the *noble,* are the *special foes* of God's kingdom, partly because they think that God's grace detracts from their power and consequence, and partly because they imagine themselves to be already in a blessed condition (John ix. 39–41). STARKE.

4. The fact that a majority of its professors at first were of humble rank *redounds to the honor of Christianity.* From this it is seen: 1. That it esteems all men alike. 2. That it owes its rise and spread not to human might and art, but to God. 3. That it requires not learning but an honest heart that is anxious for its own salvation.

—A miserable hull often conceals a precious kernel. HEUBNER.

5. *The obligations which spring from these truths.* —The poor and needy owe Christianity their profoundest gratitude for being so honored by it. [At the same time they must be careful not to arrogate any superiority in the sight of God over those who are above them in learning or birth or ability. Pride in ignorance and meanness is no less abominable in the sight of God than pride in greatness, wealth and learning.] On the contrary, the rich and the noble have occasion to humble themselves. Christianity owes them nothing, and they should be mindful of the danger of being beguiled from it.

6. *The proud and self-sufficient must be humbled.*—The Saviour did not become the Son of David until the princely glory of David's house had departed and his descendants had come to the saw-horse. This was to show that the loftiness of this world must be brought low, if it would enter the kingdom of God. [The heights of earthly promotion and glory lift us no whit nearer Heaven.—It is easier to step there from the lowly vale of humiliation and sorrow.] God's kingdom is a cross-kingdom. GOSSNER.

7. *Cheer for the lowly.*—What the world rejects that God lifts up and transforms into a sanctuary. Art thou small and despicable in the sight of men, rejoice at it and consider that God looks down especially upon thee (Ps. cxiii. 6–8 and cxxxviii. 6).

8. *Instruction for the high.*—To God belongs all the glory. If then God is to display his power in thee and make something out of thee, thou must consent to become as nothing. Everything in Christianity turns upon this one quality of humility. The blessedness of the children of God is that they possess nothing, the glory of which does not belong to God.

9. *What incomparable riches in Christ!* — Believest thou in Him? Then thou possessest Him. Let earth's trifles pass. Thou hast Christ, and with Him thou hast all things.—He is thine in all his offices.—As a Prophet, he is our wisdom; as High-Priest, he is our righteousness; as King, he is our sanctification; and in all three offices, he is our complete redemption. HEDIEGER.

10. J. SPENCER. VER. 21. *The superiority of Christianity over human science, on the subject of religion.* I. Demonstrated as to *a.* a future state; *b.* Human duty; *c.* The character of God; *d.* The pardon of the sinners. II. Application; *a.* Guard against a so-called *philosophical* style of reasoning; *b.* Cling to the great distinctive doctrines of the Gospel; *c.* Prize the pure Gospel; *d.* Heedlessness of sinners, strange. J. BARROW. ver. 23. *The doctrine of the Gospel—the doctrine of the cross.* 1. As a suffering—in appearance criminal. 2. As most bitter and painful. 3. As most ignominious and shameful. 4. As agreeable and advantageous to the intents of the passion. 5. As completory of ancient significations and predictions. 6. As apt to excite devotion, and enforce the practice of duty. II. BUSHNELL. ver. 23. *The power of God in self-sacrifice.* I. God is morally passible; a part of His glory is to be *compassionate.* II. This compassion exhibited in Christ's passion on the cross. III. The power of it as seen in the effect it has to subdue enmity. It conquers evil by enduring evil.—C. H. SPURGEON. Vv. 23 and 24. *Christ crucified.* I. The Gospel rejected. II. The Gospel accepted. III. The Gospel admired. ANONYMOUS. Vv. 26–29. *The Christian calling.* I. Its nature; *a.* Not many mighty, wise and noble; but *b.* The foolish, the weak, the base, are called. II. The reason: *a.* Not that God is unwilling that the great, and wise, and noble should be saved; but *b.* Because the foolish, the weak, the base, are more ready to feel their need and accept grace; and *c.* that the glory of God may be the more signalized. III. In its bearings; *a.* Shows us the perilous position of the mighty, and noble, and wise; they are in danger of being passed by and confounded; *b.* Teaches us not to disparage the foolish, the weak and the base; *c.* The foolish, the weak and the base are not to be proud against the opposite class, as though any better in God's sight; *d.* The true preparation for God's kingdom is an entire emptying of self; *e.* The purport of the calling, the glory of God.—JON. EDWARDS. Vv. 29–31. *God glorified in man's dependence.* I. This dependence absolute and universal; *a.* As they have all their good of God; *a.* of his grace; *β.* of his power; *b.* As they have all *through* God; *c.* As they have all *in* God both their objective good and their subjective good. II. God is glorified in it. *a.* In that it affords greater occasion and obligation to take notice of and acknowledge God's perfections and all-sufficiency; *b.* In that it is hereby demonstrated how great God's glory is as compared with the creature's. III. Use of the doctrine; *a.* It shows us God's marvellous wisdom in the work of redemption; *b.* Those systems of doctrine, that are opposed to this absolute and universal dependence on God, do derogate from God's glory, and so thwart the design of the contrivance for our redemption; *c.* We learn the efficiency of faith; *d.* Our duty is to exalt God above, and ascribe to Him all the glory of redemption. A. BUTLER. ver. 30. *Christ the source of all blessings.*

C. As Illustrated by the Apostle's Example.

CHAPTER II. 1–5.

1 And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of
2 wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony[1] of God. For I determined not to know[2]
3 any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. And I was with you in

4

4 weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching *was*
not with enticing words of man's [*om.* man's[3]] wisdom, but in demonstration of the
5 Spirit and of power: That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in
the power of God.

[1] Ver. 1.—Instead of *μαρτύριον*, others, according to good and ancient authorities [A. C. Cod. Sin. Syr.], read *μυστήριον*. But it is more probable that this arose from a gloss suited to ver. 7, than that *μαρτύριον* could have crept in here from i. 6; at the same time only a few authorities read *μαρτύριον τοῦ χριστοῦ*.

[2] Ver. 2.—The received *τοῦ εἰδέναι τι* is not well authenticated, and the order *τὶ εἰδέναι* is confirmed by B. C. D. E. Δ. and many other decisive authorities. [Wordsworth says: "*τὶ*, which is emphatic, is rightly placed before *εἰδέναι* by B. C. D E. and by Griesbach, Scholz., Lach., Alf., Meyer. Indeed *εἰδέναι τί ἐν ὑμιν* would have been liable to an inconvenient interpretation: to know *what* is in you."]

[3] Ver. 4.—The received *ἀνθρωπίνης* has the balance of authorities against it [and is omitted by Griesb., Scholz. Lach., Tisch., Meyer.] Other variations in this ver. (*e.g.*) *πιθανοῖς* for *πειθοῖς*, etc., can hardly be regarded as any thing more than conjectures of an older or a later date. (See below.)

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The connection.—Paul here affirms his own conduct to have been in strict accordance with the nature of the Divine calling. [His views were sustained by his practice and at the same time justified that practice.] "As the Lord chose no one among you on account of his wisdom, so I did not come to you with wisdom."—BURGER.

VER. 1. **And I.**—*κἀγω*: "I also." So God has dealt with you, and I have conformed to his method. [Or: "I also, like all true Christian preachers."—DE WETTE. Or: "I accordingly," consistently with the revealed purpose of God just mentioned."—HODGE.] The connection with the preceding paragraph is close and direct, though a remoter reference to i. 17, 23 is not thereby excluded.—**on coming to you, brethren, came not.**—He has in view here his first long residence at Corinth, although a second shorter visit had been paid them just before writing this Epistle. The repetition "coming," "I came," is not foreign to classic usage, nor is it mere tautology. The former expresses the fact of his appearing among them [or the occasion of which he was about to speak,] while the second with its qualifying adjuncts states the way and mode of his appearance.—**with excellency of speech and of wisdom.**—["As speech and wisdom (*λόγος* and *σοφία*) are here distinguished, the former probably refers to the manner or form, and the latter to the matter of his preaching. It was neither as a rhetorician nor as a philosopher that he appeared before them."—HODGE. In i. 17 what he disavowed was wisdom of speech (*σοφία λόγου*), the emphasis being on "wisdom." Here, the two are distinguished as separate elements, and the idea of rhetoric is added to that of philosophy.] This clause some make the sole adjunct to "I came," leaving the rest of the sentence distinct, as adducing the proof of his appearing as he did, *q. d.*, 'I came to you thus and so, inasmuch as I proclaimed,' etc. ["This mode is generally preferred not only because of the position of the words, but also because of the sense."—HODGE; and so Alford, Stanley and others.] But the whole clause is to be taken together, and the adjunct before us to be connected with—**proclaiming to you the testimony of God.**—The sense is 'I did not come preaching with highly wrought eloquence and philosophic subtilities.' To take the present participle here in a future sense is neither necessary nor suitable, since he is here speaking not of intention but simply of his mode of conduct. The matter of his preaching is "the testimony of God." This is essentially the same as "the testimony of Christ," i. 6, and what was there said holds good also here. It is the testimony which God bears concerning Christ (1 Jno. v. 9), or the revelation of his plan of salvation which He makes out of His own consciousness, originally through Christ, and then through the Apostles. This is what it is incumbent on the servant of God simply to proclaim. In this work there is no need of rhetorical ornament and philosophic art. The very object of the proclamation itself precludes the applicability of eloquence and wisdom. (Comp. Osi.) ["The Gospel is in its essence not a theory, or an abstraction, or a comment, or an image of the fancy, but it is history, and indeed, Divine history. The preaching of the Gospel is therefore a proclamation of the doings of God, and especially of that one great act of love, viz., the sending of His own Son to die for the sins of the world. This may become a matter for theory and science in the bosom of the Church after faith in it has become established, but even then it is only as a development from faith. Science can never beget faith. Faith comes only through the regenerating power of God's Spirit, who reveals Himself efficiently and in the most direct manner through the proclamation of the Gospel story." OLSHAUSEN.]

VER. 2. His conduct in the particular abovementioned shown to be deliberate—the result of a settled purpose. **For**—confirmatory—**I did not determine.**—[The negative particle, by its position here, is more naturally connected with the main verb. So Alf., who interprets: "the only thing that I made it definitely my business to know, was;" and Meyer says that the common connection of the "not" with "any thing" (*τι*), as in our E. V., is contrary to the phraseology. But Stanley translates: "I determined to know nothing," making *οὐκ ἔκρινα* like *οὐ φημι*. The difference of import is somewhat. In the one case, Paul tells us how far his mind was made up, that his determination did not go beyond one point; in the other case, his determination was a positive one, covering the whole ground and excluding from that all but one thing.] *κρίνειν* with the inf.=*to conclude* upon, *resolved*, *decide*, as in 2 Cor. ii. 1; 1 Rom. xiv. 13.—**to know any thing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified**—*i. e.* to mingle any other sort of knowledge with the preaching of Christ. His one sole aim was to portray before their eyes this one person, and

that too in His deepest humiliation, as He had suffered for them the shameful death of the cross. [So far from seeking to conceal his ignominy, so offensive to the worldly spirit, he would make it prominent and glory in it.] Hence it was that he would not indulge in any rhetorical or dialectic arts, in any high-flown discourse or philosophic argumentation. In this way certainly he might fail to attract the educated classes, so called, but he would be the better able to bring to light men's actual religious needs and satisfaction. And this, with him, was the great point, for which he was willing to renounce every attainment in which he excelled, for he knew that those who wilfully neglected the revelation he brought could be gained by no reasonings from the light of nature. (See Bengel *in loco.*) [Furthermore, it must be observed, that it would be to mistake entirely the drift of the Apostle's discourse, were we to take the name of Christ here, according to the fashion of many divines, as put by metonymy for the whole system of divinity, or for the doctrine of the Atonement. The purpose of Paul here is to avoid theorizing of all kinds, and to adhere rigidly to Christianity in its most concrete form as seen in the person and work of its founder. In his view, preaching was to act the part of a herald, to proclaim, not opinions, but the facts and messages as intrusted to him, and to let them speak for themselves. Hence we are here to take his language most literally. What he resolved on proclaiming to the Corinthians was Christ in His person and work, as the living revelation of the Father, as the Truth and the Life, as the One in whom were hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, as the source of all salvation and blessing, whom to believe in, love and serve was life eternal. His Gospel was not theory or science, but history, and the glory of this history is, to use the words of Olshausen, that "it lives and repeats itself in the Church as a whole and in every member of the Church. It therefore never grows old any more than God himself can become antiquated; and it maintains itself to this day in all that fulness of power which it manifested in the first establishment of the Church."—"To *know* any thing." There is a force in the use of the word "know," instead of "preach," or "teach," which is not to be overlooked. It shows that his determination covered not only the range of his words and acts but also of his thoughts. He meant that Christ should fill his consciousness.].

VER. 3. "Describes the preacher, as the former verse did his theme." Bengel.—**And I was with you,** ἐγενόμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς. This might be rendered: I came to you, as 2 Jno. xii. (according to the better reading). But Paul is here speaking not of his coming, but of his residence among them (ver. 4). In like manner γενέσθαι πρός occurs also in xvi. 10. (πρός: *before, in presence of,* xvi. 6, 7; Gal. i. 18; Jno. i. 1.) How he was with them he proceeds to state in three substantives. *a.* **in weakness.** Since he is here speaking of his personal bearing, we are not to understand by this any physical infirmity, such as weak organs, or feeble chest, or ungainliness of form [as Stanley]; nor yet any sickness, or feebleness, bringing with it depression of spirits [as Rückert and Stier], though this would be more plausible; and, least of all, any thing happening from without, like persecutions, and sufferings inflicted by others [as Chrysostom], which would be inconsistent with the use of the singular number. In view of the expressions of Paul himself (2 Cor. x. 1, 10; xii. 10; iv. 7–12) it were better to refer this to inward weakness, but not so much to any sense of defect in science and education (so de Wette, Osi.), as to a feeling of utter inadequacy for the greatness of the work and for the resistance he would have to encounter (see Acts xviii. 9, ff.). [Bengel says: "opposed to power (ver. 4). We must not suppose that the Apostles were always in an agreeable frame of mind or quite free from perturbations.] *b.* **in fear and** *c.* **in great trembling.**—Terms expressive of great timidity as contrasted with a bold and confident demeanor maintained by the overweening consciousness of his own abilities, "such as appeared in the eyes of ancient Paganism to be the highest morality." NEANDER. It has been justly observed that such anxiety, arising from a sense of insufficiency for the work on hand, is a marked characteristic of the most distinguished servants of God (see Osiander). The interpretation of Olshausen and others is less consistent with the idea expressed in the foregoing term ("in weakness.") They understand Paul as intimating a modest fear lest he should corrupt the Divine truth with a mixture of human elements, and fail in the proper discharge of his duty. The sense of the phrase, "in fear and trembling," which is a proverbial one (Gen. ix. 2; Ex. xv. 16; Is. xix. 16) is determined by the connection. Elsewhere, as in Eph. vi. 5; 2 Cor. vii. 15, it denotes: *sollicita reverentia*; or, as Bengel: "A fear which abounds so as to effect even the body in its gestures and movements."

VER. 4. Describes the mode of preaching.—**And my speech and my preaching.**—The "and" in ver. 3 and the "and" in ver. 4 are not so related as to be rendered: "As well I myself—as also my speech." But the first of these conjunctions simply joins ver. 3 to the preceding, and the second, ver. 4 to ver. 3, putting the matters stated in harmonious connection. On account of the repetition of "my," we are not at liberty to take the two words here as identical, nor yet are they so related as to indicate the first the form and the second the substance of his preaching [so Stanley]. It were better to distinguish them as denoting, the first (λόγος), his private discourse, and the second (κήρυγμα), his public discourse [so Olsh., Rück., and most others]; or, the first, discourse in general, and the second, discourse in particular, *viz.*, the proclamation of the Gospel [so Hodge]. Less probable is the opinion of de Wette [adopted by Alf.], who takes the two words as designating the same thing but in distinct aspects; the former his style and course of argument, the latter his announcement of Gospel facts and conviction of their certainty.*—**was not.**—The verb here has to be supplied; either ἐγένετο for ver. 3, or

*[Why de Wette's view should be termed "less probable," when it is in perfect consistency with the use of the terms thus far, it is difficult to see.]

ἦν, meaning: was not furnished with (Luke iv. 32); or: did not consist in. The character of his speech and preaching is described, 1, negatively—**not in the persuasive words of wisdom,** οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις.—[ἀνθρωπίνης: *man's*, is a gloss, inserted most probably through a failure to perceive that the word thus far has been used in a strict and single sense, and from the consequent opinion that it needed some qualification. "Wisdom" is, all through, "synonymous with philosophy."] The adjective πειθοῖς has, from the earliest times, proved a stumbling block. It is found no where else in all Greek literature, though its use is warranted by analogous forms, as φειδός from φείδομαι. But the explanation, which would take πειθοῖς as a substantive, in the sense of: *persuasions*, and put σοφίας λόγοις in apposition, is inadmissible, if only for this reason, that the plural of πειθώ no where occurs. Hence have arisen manifold conjectures for changing the ordinary reading, none of which are well grounded, not even the suggestion so acutely maintained by Semler, Rincke, Fritzche, that the original read thus: οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖ σοφίας in fitting antithesis to ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος, since it is decisive against this, that this reading no where appears alone without λόγοις or λόγων. Even in the ordinary reading, "wisdom" may be regarded as expressing the main idea, inasmuch as ver. 5 demands this. πειθός, otherwise πιθανός [and as Meyer suggests, "probably a word in common, oral use."] =*convincing, winning, enticing*, comp. πιθανολογία, Col. ii. 4. [*Corinthia verba, pro exquisitis, et magnopere elaboratis et ad ostentationem nitidis.* WETSTEIN *ad loc.*] 2, positively—**but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.**—"Demonstration" stands in strong contrast with "persuasive words," since the word is often used elsewhere also to denote strong, cogent proof in opposition to winning speech. The way in which it is to be taken here, depends upon the manner in which we construe the associated genatives. These express either the object of the demonstration or its subject. In the former case the phrase would mean the practical exhibition of the spirit, as the source of spiritual life, renewing, enlightening and sanctifying, and of the power which resides in this spirit and which it imparts to man. In the latter case, the Spirit must be regarded as dwelling in the Apostle himself, and working through him, displaying His power in the facts he proclaimed, by rendering them effective to salvation. What ability he had to convince and convert would thus be ascribed to the living energy of the Spirit whose minister he was. In this way, as Neander says, "the demonstration furnished by the *Spirit* would be in contrast with that presented through words, and the demonstration of *power* with that of logical argumentation. It is the testimony of the Spirit which alone Paul admits as valid." This interpretation is to be preferred, since in the antithetic clause "wisdom" is to be regarded as the subject or source whence the persuasive words originate, or which begets and presents them. Hardly deserving of more than mention are expositions like that which takes "Spirit and power" as equivalent to: powerful spirit, or which explains the "demonstration of the Spirit" to consist in the proof afforded by prophecies, and that "of power" in the miracles Paul wrought (Origen and Grotius). Even were prophecy and miracle to be thought of in this connection still they could not by any means have been exclusively intended. In any case, the reference must primarily have been to that moral power from above which ever accompanied the preaching of the Apostle, and which acted upon the hearts and consciences of his hearers, awakening, agitating and quickening them to a new life. In all this there was a demonstration of a higher sort, more influential for faith than the strongest arguments of philosophy.

VER. 5. Expressive of ultimate intent both of God in sending Him to preach as He did, and of Himself acting in compliance with it,—**that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.**—The end of preaching is faith in Christ. But if this faith was grounded upon human wisdom and its arguments and persuasions, which were only a superficial assent, then would the foundation be loose. It could remain only until assailed by strong arguments of a contrary sort. But if, on the other hand, faith rested upon a Divine demonstration, which while it convinced, converted also, and so took possession of the whole man, it was then fixed and immovable, and could victoriously withstand all the assaults of human power and art.

["Longinus alludes to the abrupt and unsystematic style on which the Apostle prides himself. 'Paul of Tarsus was the first who maintained positive assertion without elaborate proof.'"—STANLEY].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The nature of faith in Christ.*—It is a trustful surrender of soul to Him; a conviction concerning Him, which involves at the same time a union with His person, even as He is offered unto us for our salvation—hence, with Him as "the crucified." It is a reception of Him in such a way that He dwells in us and we in Him. But this pre-supposes a renunciation of all self-confidence, and of all trust in any thing creaturely and human, whether it be in the line of action, or permission, or of suffering, as available before God for working out or earning salvation, or for establishing and restoring our fellowship with God. It is an act which can proceed only from a mind renewed and strengthened by the might of Divine love, since God's Spirit and power are operative in it, showing and convincing the sinner on the one hand of his own guilt and insufficiency for himself, and on the other hand of the holy and compassionate love of God, His saving righteousness and His almighty grace in Christ; and this, too, in a way to take down all boasting, and beget an implicit reliance upon God alone.

2. *The sole means to produce faith.*—This is a style of preaching which presents the great facts of redemption directly to the heart in their simple Divine energy, without the accessories of human science and art. In such preaching, God's Spirit and power can bear testimony, and glorify Christ, and bring to man's consciousness

the greatness, and holiness, and wisdom, and glory of His redeeming love in such a manner as to qualify the heart for an exercise of faith. Wheresoever, on the contrary, human rhetoric with its artifices, and human philosophy with its speculations, are mingled up with Gospel truth, there offered some obstruction is to the operation of the Divine power; there some purely human influence, such as the charm of style or of fine reasoning, it may be, supersedes the Divine influence, and we fail of being drawn into the sphere of the truth itself, "as it is in Jesus;" there human selfishness and pride still have free scope. As the result, we have instead of a firm and lasting faith, only a feeble, sickly *opinion*, which is ever ready to yield to counter-influences, or to changed humors, or to new systems of thought; which does not carry in itself the life of man in Christ, or of Christ in man; which is not heavenly, but earthly, not deeply rooted, but superficial, and ever ready to vanish away.

3. *The mood and attitude of the Christian preacher.* He who clearly perceives what faith is, and what is requisite for it, and what depends on it; who sees what barriers of every kind, especially of false culture and foolish pride, oppose themselves to it; who understands how the pure and artless preaching of Christ alone has power to awaken faith, and yet what prejudices there are against such preaching, and how little it is acceptable to men, especially to the highly educated classes, and to those who either practise or tolerate the grosser or more refined forms of wickedness, and how the whole life and being of a man strives against the truth which seeks to slay their selfishness and their sensuality,—a person who comprehends all this as he ought, will recognize and feel it to be a task transcending all human ability, and too difficult for him in the imperfection of his spiritual life, to go abroad into the world, especially into the circle of the refined and learned, as a simple preacher of Christ crucified, and there maintain his stand. The persons he there meets, seek their satisfaction in art, and science, and learning; they take delight in luxury and sensual enjoyment; and the knowledge of this fact abates confidence, takes away boasting, begets timidity, awakens anxiety, yea bows a man to the very dust with a sense of his own weakness. But for this very reason does he become all the more suitable an instrument for Christ. The more emptied he is of self, the more can God impart to him of His spirit and power, and work in him and through him, the more will he be disposed to cherish a holy courage and confidence in God. With "the foolishness of preaching" he will be ready to encounter a world full of obstacles, and find himself strong enough to overthrow all its bulwarks, while he will feel ashamed to resort to secular arts for gaining an entrance for himself. And the earnest endeavor of every one, through whom God achieves exploits, is to become just such a simple instrument of the Spirit in subduing the hearts of men through the word of truth, and winning them to Christ.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[1. *Paul the pattern of an Evangelical preacher.* On entering Corinth Paul was confronting his severest task. He had just left Athens, where, notwithstanding his brilliant audience and great speech on Mars Hill, he had met with comparatively small success. We read of no Church having been founded there. And now he is to offer the Gospel in a city that presented in many respects far greater obstacles than Athens did. In addition to the pride of philosophy there was to be encountered here a degree of luxury and vice no where else to be found. And if there was failure at Athens, how much more the likelihood of failure at Corinth? It is in view of these discouragements, that the picture which the Apostle has given us of himself obtains its peculiar interest. The main features of it are 1. His inward feelings. He is not bold, defiant, self-assured, as an earthly warrior pushing up to an assault. On the contrary, he is much cast down, conscious of weakness, full of fear. To the outward sight, there is every thing against him. But while the flesh trembles, the spirit has courage to go on, being trustful in God. 2. His determination as to the course to be pursued. *a.* He will not cater to the tastes of the Corinthians, and think to win them by gratifying these. Fine oratory and subtle philosophy, however capable of these, he lays aside. They are not the means for winning faith, for saving souls. *b.* He will simply proclaim the testimony of God, holding up Christ in all His glory, and in all His shame, as the only means which God hath appointed to make man wise and holy, believing that however much this might scandalize the natural heart, it was the demonstration of God's spirit and power which would alone prove mighty for the overthrow of Satan, and the setting up of God's kingdom. 3. His aim. The faith he might awaken should rest in nothing he might say or do of himself, but solely in the exhibition which God should make of Himself through the Son whom He had set forth, and whom Paul was intent on holding up before the minds of men even to the utter hiding of himself from view].

2. Heubner:—The Christian must first unlearn in order to learn. To preach Christ the Crucified is to put Him and His atoning work at the top, to set all truth in connection with these, and to derive all good from these (ver. 2). Self-diffidence in a preacher helps more than self-confidence. It is a great thing to stand in place of God and proclaim His word in presence of angels and men (ver. 3). Christianity is sufficient for itself and needs no adventitious aids. No preacher should so far humble himself as to seek these, nor should the people expect them. What is the demonstration of the Spirit and of power? (ver. 4). It is the conviction of sin and of the need of a Saviour, which the Spirit works in the heart through the Gospel. This is something which no man can effect of himself. Hence what the preacher has preëminently to strive for, is that the Spirit may operate through his word; and the hearers, that they may experience this heavenly power. In order that the preacher may make "demonstration of the Spirit," he must have the Spirit. A faith which rests upon regard for a philosopher is 1, impure—a man's name is put for Christ's; 2, unsafe and fickle—human systems crowd each other out; 3, inoperative—the Spirit of God is not its source; 4, not

genuine—science has no faith-begetting power. Therefore a Christian's faith should not rest upon scholastic wisdom, but on the power of God renewing the heart. What a person has experienced within cannot be argued out.

HEDINGER:—Christ Crucified the preacher's Alpha and Omega. Away with finery and feathers! Let the Spirit of God speak in thee. He knows how to hit the heart (ver. 2). Those conductors to salvation who have been proved in the furnace of affliction are the best approved. To the mariner on a wild sea, experience is every thing. To have only studied maps at school will prove of little account (ver. 3).

GOSSNER:—The death of Christ must be recognized and credited. This is what captivates the heart, and kindles the fire that burns. Faith in the Son of God is the greatest miracle of grace. It is a great consolation that here and there one soul that hears us is made to experience the power of Christ's blood for the forgiveness of sins. He who preaches Christ crucified must himself be ready for a crucifixion. Paul trembled while preaching that which blessed the world. Many false teachers, who betray the world and lull it into a death sleep, speak with bold front and without sense of danger.

RIEGER:—It is a question whether ministers do not try too much to conceal their weakness and fear, and are not too assiduous in filling up the gaps and pauses with artificial efforts; whether they do not shrink too much from the criticism of the world, when it insists so strenuously upon calmness, fluency and ease in a speaker. But where there is life, there will be fluctuations. Living growth has to break through obstructions.

[CHALMERS:—A minister has no ground to hope for fruit from his exertions until in himself he has no hope; until he has learned to put no faith in the point and energy of his sentences—until he feel that a man may be mighty to compel the attention, and mighty to regale the imagination, and mighty to silence the gainsayers, and yet not mighty to the pulling down of strongholds].

[THOLUCK. VERS. 1–5. *Paul a type of the true preacher.* I. Contents of his sermon, ver. 2. II. Tone of the preacher. THEREMIN. ver. 2. *The knowledge of Christ the crucified.* It includes a threefold knowledge. I. What man is. II. What God is. III. What man should be. CHALMERS. vers. 4, 5. *The necessity of the Spirit to give effect to the preaching of the Gospel.* I. Success of the teacher dependent on God in the ordinary branches of learning. II. The specialty in the work of the Christian teacher.]

III.—THE GOSPEL, WHICH ABJURES HUMAN WISDOM, HAS NEVERTHELESS A WISDOM OF ITS OWN.

CHAPTER II. 6–16.

6 Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect: yet not the wisdom [a wis-
7 dom not] of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to naught: But we
speak the wisdom of God [God's wisdom][1] in a mystery, *even* the hidden *wisdom*,
8 which God ordained before the world unto our glory; Which none of the princes of
this world knew: for had they known *it*, they would not have crucified the Lord of
9 glory. But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered
into the heart of man, the things which[2] God hath prepared for them that love him.
10 But God hath revealed *them* unto us[3] by his[4] Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things,
11 yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth (οἶδεν) the things of a man,
save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth [ἔγνωκεν][5]
12 no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world,
but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given
13 to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom
teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost [the Spirit][6] teacheth; comparing spiritual things
14 with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for
they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know *them*, because they are spiritually
15 discerned [judged of]. But he that is spiritual judgeth[7] [of] all things[8], yet he him-
16 self is judged of [by] no man. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he
may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ[9].

[1] Ver. 7.—[*θεοῦ σοφίαν*, so in all the best authorities, A. B. C. D. E. F. Cod. Sin., instead of *σοφίαν θεοῦ*. The emphasis being on *θεοῦ*. Then *σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ* come together, forming one complex idea.]

[2] Ver. 9.—*ἃ* is better than *ὅσα* [the former, as it is found in A. B. C., Meyer, Stanley and Lach. prefer. But the Text. Rec. is supported by D. E. F. G. Cod. Sin. and is adhered to by Words. and Alf.]

[3] Ver. 10.—[The proper order, supported by all the best authorities, is *ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεός*. The emphasis is on the first words. "*To us*, however, hath God *revealed* them."]

[4] Ver. 10.—Many good authorities omit αὐτοῦ: his. The omission is more explicable on the ground of what follows (τὰ γὰρ πνεῦμα) than the omission of αὐτοῦ. [Yet it is omitted by A. B. C. Cod. Sin., doubted by Alf., rejected by Stanley.]

[5] Ver. 11.—Instead of οἶδεν. So the best MSS. and editions. ["There is a difference between the two words οἶδεν and ἔγνωκεν." The former simply means "knoweth;" the latter "to know by acquisition." Words. Yet we have in iii. 20 κύριος γινώσκει.]

[6] Ver. 13.—ἁγίου, holy, is not well attested. A Gloss. [Omitted by A. B. C. D[1]. F. G. Cod. Sin. and rejected by Words., Alf., Meyer.]

[7] Ver. 15.—μὲν after ἀνακρίνει is not original: has been inserted on account of the δὲ in the following clause [yet it is found in B. D[3]. E. J. Cod. Sin., and is retained by Words., De Wette.]

[8] Ver. 15.—τά before πάντα is well supported. The omission is probably to be explained from the fact that some thought it necessary to take πάντα as accusative masc. in antithesis to οὐδενός. (Some have it πάντας.) [Τά is not found in B. D[2]. E. J. Cod. Sin.]

[9] Lach. instead of χριστοῦ reads κυριοῦ. This is neither paramountly supported nor internally probable. [So also Stanley; but Meyer, Alf., Words., sustained by A. C. Cod. Sin., adhere to the received text. Meyer regards it as a mechanical repetition of νοῦν κυριοῦ above.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

[In this section we have the other side of the matter under discussion. In view of Paul's repudiation of "wisdom," it might be inferred by the Corinthians that Christianity was a narrow, partial, one-sided religion, suited only to one particular portion of human nature; that while it professed to be the friend of true piety and sound morals, it was at the same time a foe to science and free thought; yea, that it stood in entire antagonism to that which both universal opinion and the declarations of the Old Testament esteemed "more precious than rubies," and was the ally of ignorance and barbarism. Such inferences it was important to obviate for the credit of Christianity, and in the interest of truth. Hence the Apostle goes on to state that the Gospel, which ignored human wisdom, and in some of its aspects carried the appearance of folly, did not abjure all pretense to wisdom, nor put contempt on the human intellect. He shows furthermore that while he deemed it expedient to confine himself when with the Corinthians to simple preaching, there was a sermonizing which went beyond this, and before fit audience could expatiate largely on the deep things of God].

Ver. 6. **Wisdom however we do speak.**—[The δέ here as is in the E. V. is to be taken as strongly antithetic]. Σοφίαν—the higher religious wisdom of Christianity. By this we are to understand not what merely concerns the form of discourse, such as an inspired way of speaking; nor yet what concerns its subject matter, such as the future relations and events of the Kingdom of the Messiah, to which the immediate context is said to point. (Meyer). The correct view has been given by Osiander, and Bengel says: "Wisdom here denotes not all Christian doctrine, but its sublime and secret principles (*capita sublimia et arcana*);" he also puts λαλεῖν, *to speak*, in antithesis with κηρύσσειν, *to preach*, making the former to mean private instruction and the latter public speaking. But his interpretation of the word "wisdom" is too atomistic, and of the word "speak" too restricted. There is no reference here to any system of secret doctrine. [What he does mean will be more fully considered hereafter, when all the characteristics given of it have been surveyed]. But traces of this true wisdom are to be seen in several of Paul's Epistles, especially in those to the Romans, Ephesians and Colossians, also in 1 Cor. xv. Its foundation is Christ (i. 30; comp. Col. ii. 3).—**among them that are perfect,** ἐν τοῖς τελείοις,—the audience for this wisdom. The "perfect" stand opposed to the beginners, "the babes in Christ" (iii. i.), and are identical with "the spiritual." He means that what he had not been able to deliver to the Corinthians in the immaturity of their Christian life, because they could not as yet apprehend it, he did announce among those of riper Christian experience. Thus we see that wisdom is the same as that which he calls "meat" (iii. 2) as contrasted with "milk." The same antithesis appears in xiv. 20; Eph. iv. 13 ff.; Heb. v. 11–14. To the Corinthians, as they were, he could only communicate what was suited to their yet weak powers of apprehension, *viz.*, the great facts of redemption, with their immediate practical consequences, with their christological presuppositions and their theological foundations. And this was done in the simple form of preaching, or of bare statement that the things were so, or had been so, or would be so as declared, accompanied by Scripture proofs, such as are found in the book of Acts, and with applications to the inner and outward life of the hearers. But where, on the other hand, a greater maturity of Christian life and a capacity for the deeper comprehension of truth existed, there he was able to set all this forth in their fundamental proofs and in their intimate connections. There he was able to unfold the whole Divine economy in accordance with its eternal principles and its progress through time and its fixed laws and in relation to its final consummation, so that that which Grecian wisdom was in search of within its own sphere was actually attained in a way that was incomparably higher and Divine, and better fitted to satisfy the deepest needs of a thoughtful spirit.

The interpretation we have here given, which would seem to be decisively confirmed by what follows, is opposed by another on the ground, 1, that it is one entirely foreign to the Apostle, since he nowhere in his Epistle contemplated "the perfect" as his readers (but how of Phil. iii. 15: Let us therefore as many as be perfect, etc)? 2, that it is in contradiction with ver. 2, (where, however, he is only speaking of the first proclamation of the Gospel); and the sense given is this: that the simple, scandalizing doctrine of Christ crucified contains in itself the profoundest wisdom, encloses a Divine mystery which is intelligible only to the perfect. But this explanation, which is conveyed also in Luther's translation, 1, has no sure grammatical support, since the preposition ἐν carries the idea of "in the judgment of," only when the persons are mentioned, who appear to decide a case by their own opinions (comp. Passow Wörterbuch, I. 2, p. 910), and especially in connection with such verbs as denote *to be* and *to appear;* 2, it

does not correspond with usage elsewhere to understand "the perfect" to mean true Christians who seek true wisdom in Christ, or as Calvin does: "those who possess a sound and unbiased judgment."—[The view just given is in the main that which is advocated by Calvin, Olsh. and Hodge, who in favor of it argues, "1. that those who regarded Paul's doctrine as foolishness were not the babes in Christ, but the unrenewed, "the wise of this world;" consequently those to whom it was wisdom were not advanced Christians, but believers as such. Throughout the whole context the opposition is between "the called," or converted, and the unconverted, and not between one class of believers and another class. 2. If "the perfect" here means advanced Christians, as distinguished from babes in Christ, then the wisdom which Paul preached was not the Gospel as such, but its higher doctrines. But this cannot be, because it is the doctrine of the cross, of Christ crucified, which he declares to be the power of God and the wisdom of God, i. 24. And the description given in the following part of this chapter of the wisdom here intended, refers not to the higher doctrine of the Gospel, but to the Gospel itself. The contrast is between the wisdom of the world and the wisdom of God, and not between the rudimental and the higher doctrines of the Gospel. Besides, what are these higher doctrines which Paul preached only to the élite of the Church? No one knows. Some say one thing and some another. But there are no higher doctrines than those taught in this Epistle and in those to the Romans and Ephesians, all addressed to the mass of the people. The New Testament makes no distinction between (*πίστις* and *γνῶσις*) higher and lower doctrines. It does indeed speak of a distinction between milk and strong meat, but that is a distinction, not between kinds of doctrine, but between one mode of instruction and another. In catechisms designed for children the Church pours out all the treasures of her knowledge, but in the form of milk, *i. e.*, in a form adapted to the weakest capacities. For all these reasons, we conclude that by "the perfect" the Apostle means the competent, the people of God as distinguished from the men of the world; and by wisdom, not any higher doctrines, but the simple Gospel, which is the wisdom of God as distinguished from the wisdom of men." The argument is not convincing. It seems obvious on the very face of his exposition, that the Apostle is here making a distinction between that simple "preaching" of Gospel facts which he had been adhering to among the Corinthians, and what he calls "wisdom" which he had thus far held in reserve at Corinth by reason of the incapacity of the converts there to apprehend it. And surely the distinction is one which is practically observed by all preachers. There is a Christianity embodied in facts which a child may learn and profit by; and there is a philosophy of Christianity, a system of doctrine, a theology, which is dispensed only to those of mature intellect and experience. And so far from admitting the custom of the Church in teaching children the Assembly's Catechism, which surely cannot be called "milk," as a valid argument in support of the exposition, it may be a question whether the custom itself does not fall under condemnation through the Apostle's argument. The contrast is indeed between the wisdom of the world and the wisdom of God; but there is also another contrast indicated by the "however" with which the verse is introduced—a contrast between *κήρυγμα* and *σοφία*, preaching and wisdom]. Accordingly we hold to the first exposition as the only one well established: "In order to obviate all misapprehension of his language, Paul here asserts that the Gospel does include in itself the true wisdom. It is altogether foreign to his intent to set up an opposition here between reason and revelation. On the contrary he here distinctly expresses the validity of a demand for a science that is to be unfolded out of Christianity; a science which must be the sole, true and all-satisfying science." NEANDER.—**but a wisdom not of this world.**—He here distinguishes that profounder development of the fulness of Christian truth designated as "wisdom" from all that which passes for such in the world without. It was not anything which sprang up in the natural progress of the race, either before or apart from Christ. The *δέ* as in Rom. iii. 22. "Like the German *aber*, it is used in particular when something is annexed in illustration as the complement of a sentence. That by "this world," he does not mean simply the great mass of mankind, the commonality only, but has in mind especially its leaders as those to whom this Christian wisdom was utterly foreign, is shown in the added words—**nor of the princes of this world.**—Does he mean by this the demons mentioned in Eph. vi. 12, as *κοσμοκράτορας*? Hardly. *Ἀρχων* with this sense appears only in the Sing. John xii. 31; Eph. ii. 2. And in any case these are not intended in ver. 8. According to Bengel the expression embraces the leaders both of the Jews and of the Greeks. Not simply influential, learned men, philosophers; also not merely the members of the Jewish Sanhedrim, but all those of high station in general, the multitude of those who bear sway either by their authority or by the respect which they command. These are described as persons **who come to naught.**—That is, they are bereft of all authority and consideration in the kingdom of God, in the world to come. He is not speaking here of their being overcome by the higher wisdom and power of Christianity, but of the utter destruction of their importance as leaders in that higher economy, at the institution of which everything which springs out of this lower order of things is done away, however respectable it may appear.

VER. 7. Now comes the positive part of the description, which is introduced by an emphatic repetition.—**But we speak God's wisdom,** *i. e.*, a wisdom which He has, and which He has imparted to us.—**in a mystery.**—It is doubtful with what this should be connected. Certainly not with the following participle, "hidden," which would be hardly grammatical and also tautological, but rather either with "we speak" or with "wisdom." The first is to be preferred, because in connecting it with "wisdom" the article in the Greek should be put before it for the sake of distinctness; and then the sense would be: we speak the wisdom of God as a

mystery, *i. e.*, as "something which does not proceed from the human understanding, but from the Divine revelation."—NEANDER. Or "handling it as a mystery."—MEYER. Not however in the sense of any esoteric communications analagous to the Grecian mysteries to which neither here nor yet in the expression "perfect" (= initiated) is any allusion to be sought. But does not the explanatory participle following, *viz.*, "the hidden," which certainly relates to wisdom, require us to connect the words "in a mystery" with "wisdom?" The article after the anarthrous *σοφίαν* is neither necessary nor admissible if we translate it: "a wisdom consisting in mystery" [although, as Meyer says, "its omission would be at the cost of perspicuity." Paul would, in that case, have expressed himself ambiguously which he might easily have avoided by the use of the article." But, it may be asked, whether it is not quite in the Apostle's style to put nouns in relation through a preposition in this way? Is not the *σοφίαν ἐν μυστήρῳ* exactly analogous with *σοφία ἀπὸ θεοῦ* in i. 30. What is meant by "speaking a thing in a mystery," we cannot comprehend, unless it is speaking it secretly or in a dark and obscure manner. Such must be the meaning of the term when made to qualify a verb. But certainly this was not what Paul intended to say, nor is it in accordance with the use of the term in the N. T. Here "mystery" denotes not a quality or condition of obscurity but a fact or truth which is made known by revelation. Hence it would exactly express the very thing in which Paul's mission consisted, and instead of being connected with "speak" seems to us most naturally associated by the preposition "in" with "wisdom." This view would seem to follow from Kling's definition of the word "mystery."] This in the N. T., and especially in Paul's phraseology, denotes something unknown to man—shut out from his comprehension, and which is made known only through Divine revelation. It is used in particular of the Divine purpose of redemption, especially in respect to the participation of the Gentiles in the salvation wrought by Christ (Eph. iii. 3 ff.; Col. i. 26 ff.) of the final restoration of Israel (Rom. xi. 24), and of the physical change which is to take place at the resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 51).—**the hidden** means either that which was concealed or *is* concealed. It is the first, when a statement is added of the thing having been made known as in Rom. xvi. 25; Eph. iii. 9; Col. i. 26. But it is the second, when it is meant, that the thing in question is withdrawn from human knowledge. In our passage, where the fact of concealment is first enlarged upon (ver. 8), and then afterwards a revelation to the elect of God is spoken of in contrast with a concealment from others, the latter meaning is to be preferred.—**which God ordained.**—This expression shows still more conclusively that "wisdom" is to be understood in an objective sense, not of the knowledge of the enlightened and of the doctrine flowing from it as such, but of its subject matter, that which elsewhere is called "a mystery;" the Divine plan of salvation itself, in reference to the wisdom revealed therein; or we may say, the work of redemption including in itself its chief end and the sure means of accomplishing it.—**before the ages.**—He here goes back to the original ground of this redemptive scheme in the eternal purpose of God formed before the world was (comp. Rom. viii. 29 ff; and Eph. i. 5). The supplying of "to make known," or "to reveal," for the purpose of filling out a supposed elipsis, is not necessary. On the expression, "before the ages," compare the similar expressions in (Rom. xvi. 25; Eph. i. 4; iii. 9, 10; Col. i. 26; 2 Tim. i. 9). "God determined on redemption before creation, *i. e.*, already at the very foundation of creation there existed a Divine purpose to establish a kingdom of God in the world and therefore He made it." NEANDER.—**unto our glory.**—From the eternal ground of salvation he here turns to its final end, which also stretches forward into eternity. The glory he here speaks of is not the glory of the Church of the New Testament as compared with the Old, but as everywhere with Paul, when discoursing of believers, it denotes their full restoration to the Divine image. It is the state of redemption completed, wherein the spiritual life shines out in the effulgence of an incorruptible state. (Comp. Rom. v. 2; viii. 18, 21; ix. 23; Col. i. 27; iii. 4; 1 Thes. ii. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 10.) What is said in 2 Cor. iii. 18 does not justify us in including here that inward glorifying of the soul which is involved in our regeneration, and which takes place in this life. If, with Meyer, we interpret the wisdom of God to mean "His spiritual philosophy which He has revealed to His ministers," then we must understand this clause thus: which God has fore-ordained so that it should redound to our glory. This glory, which stands in contrast with the utter evanishment of this world's princes, is supposed by some to be that destined to be revealed at the coming of Christ in which Christians are to be partakers through that Divine wisdom. But is this thought Pauline? It may be doubtful. Unquestionably, however, this thought is, that God's eternal purpose, which comprises His plan of salvation, or in other words His wisdom, which proposes salvation for its object and devises the best means for its accomplishment, has for its final end our glorification. (Com. Rom. viii. 29 ff.)

VER. 8. Shows more fully how thoroughly hidden this wisdom was—**which none of the princes of this world (or age) knew.**—[The relative "which" is taken by Billroth and Stanley and others to refer to "glory." "That which belonged to eternity and was before the ages, was not likely to be known to those who lived in time or in this age," and this is still further justified by supposing an allusion to this in the expression "Lord of glory."] But we are neither compelled nor justified in adopting this construction. The main thought of the passage is "God's wisdom," and it is to this that the relatives refer both in this and in the previous verse. What the Apostle here brings to view is the concealment in which God's wisdom was kept, by showing how entirely it remained unknown and unsuspected by even the leaders of this world, who were deemed persons of keen insight and took the management of affairs, and the argument for this was,—**they would not otherwise have crucified the Lord of glory.**—For it was through Him that this Divine

wisdom, which devised the plan of salvation and aimed at the glorification of believers, was made known and carried out. And this, it were fair to suppose, they would not have done could they have seen the fulness of Divine wisdom and power which shone in him and which was flowing out upon others. "Paul here contemplates those who directly took part in the crucifixion as the representatives of that worldly spirit which was exhibited in the Greek philosophy. They acted in the name and in the entire spirit of the ancient world."—NEANDER. "The Lord of glory."—So also in Jas. ii. 1. This expression is not to be taken as equivalent to 'glorious Lord,' but, as in the analogous expressions, "Father of glory" (Eph. i. 17); "The God of glory" (Acts vii. 2), "The Lord is the possessor of glory." The genitive case used here in the Greek is the genitive of possession. "Lord of glory" is a title of Divinity. It means possessor of Divine excellence. "Who is the King of glory? The Lord of hosts, he is the King of glory" (Ps. xxiv. 10; Acts vii. 2; Jas. ii. 1; Eph. i. 17). The person crucified, therefore, was a Divine person. Hence the deed was evidence of inconceivable blindness and wickedness. It was one that could only have been done through ignorance. "And now, brethren," said the Apostle Peter to the Jews, "I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers," Acts iii. 17. The fact, that the princes of this world were so blind as not to see that Christ was the Lord of glory, Paul cites as proof of their ignorance of the wisdom of God. Had they known the one, they would have known the other. This passage illustrates a very important principle or usage of Scripture. We see that the person of Christ may be designated from his Divine nature, when what is affirmed of Him is true only of his human nature. The Lord of glory was crucified; the Son of God was born of a woman; He who was equal with God humbled Himself to be obedient unto death. In like manner we speak of the birth or death of a man without meaning that the soul is born or dies, and the Scriptures speak of the birth and death of the Son of God without meaning that the Divine nature is subject to these changes. It is also plain that to predicate ignorance, subjection, suffering, death, or any other limitation of the Son of God, is no more inconsistent with the Divinity of the person so designated, than to predicate birth and death of a man is inconsistent with the immateriality and immortality of the human soul. Whatever is true either of the soul or body may be predicated of a man as a person, and whatever is true of either the Divine or human nature of Christ may be predicated of Christ as a person. We need not hesitate therefore to say with Paul, the Lord of glory was crucified; or even in accordance with the received text in Acts xx. 28, "God purchased the Church with His blood." The person who died was truly God, although the Divine nature no more died than the soul of man does when the breath leaves his body."—HODGE].

VER. 9. Confirmatory citation.—**But, as it has been written, what things eye hath not seen, and ear hath not heard, and into the heart of man have not entered, what things God hath prepared for them that love Him.**"—[We have here given a literal translation of this passage as nearly as possible in the order of the Greek text]. The first point to be considered here is the connection both logical and grammatical. This has been attempted in various ways. One is, by supplying a supposed ellipsis after "but," either by inserting the words "it has happened," so as to make it read, "but it has happened as is written" (Bengel); in which case a demonstrative clause would have been required after the relative clause; or by inserting "we speak," taken from ver. 7. It would be more correct, however, without supplying any thing, to go back directly to ver. 7, and connect there, and to find in ver. 9 an expansion and enhancement of what is said in ver. 8. "which none of the princes knew," so that ἀλλά instead of being translated "but" might be rendered "yea, rather." [This rendering is adopted by Stanley]. The reading would then be, "we speak God's wisdom, which none of the princes knew, yea, which no eye hath seen." In this case the clause, "for if they had known they would not have crucified, *etc.*" would be taken as a sort of parenthesis, in order to facilitate the connection with what precedes. We would then connect ver. 10, "but God hath revealed them to us" directly with the previous words, "what things he hath prepared," inserting only a comma after "him." In this case, only, the repetition of the name "God" would appear strange, and would have to be regarded as done for the sake of emphasis. If this does not suit, then we may either assume an anacoluthon, so that in this break the sentence would seem to lose itself in mystery and distance inaudible (so de Wette and Osi.), or we may find the sentence completed in ver. 10, the proper antecedent being introduced with δέ, but, as in ch. i. 23, to signify the antithesis there to ver. 8. It would then read "but what eye hath not seen, etc.;" these, "on the contrary, God hath revealed to us" (so Meyer and Alford).—Since the last mentioned mode of connection seems forced, and the reason assigned for the anacoluthon is not very clear, we prefer to assume a climax as above stated, introduced by "yea, rather," without joining ver. 10 directly to the preceding clause. [Hodge prefers the anacoluthon, and very justly says, in reference to this citation and to that in chap. i. ver. 31, "in quoting the Old Testament the Apostle frequently cites the words as they stand, without so modifying them as to make them grammatically cohere with the context."].—There is yet another difficulty to be considered. Whence is the citation taken? Since no passage in the Old Testament is found exactly corresponding to it, the patristic expositors supposed that the words were taken, either from some Old Testament Scripture now entirely lost, or from some apocryphal prophecy; and Z. Chrys. asserts that he had read these words in the apocalypse of Esaias. Grotius, however, supposes that they were taken from the writings of the Rabbis who had preserved them out of an old tradition. But in opposition to these opinions it must be regarded as settled that Paul uses the formula "as it is written" only in introducing citations from the Old Testament. Accordingly Meyer has adopted the solution that Paul quoted an apocryphal passage

under the idea that the words were in the Old Testament. But before we resort to any such explanation, it is to be seen whether the dissimilarity between our passage and the Old Testament texts in question is so great, as to prevent us from supposing that he quoted freely here, as he has also done elsewhere, and as other New Testament writers have also occasionally done. Certainly Paul could hardly have had in mind Isa. lii. 15. "For that which hath not been told them should they see, and that which they had not heard, should they consider;" nor yet lxv. 17; "For behold I create new heavens, and a new earth, and the former should not be remembered nor come into mind," unless perhaps the last clause, in the ring of the expression. But he may have had in mind Isa. lxiv. 4, according to the original text: "For since the world have men not heard, nor perceived, nor hath an eye seen, O God, besides Thee; he will do it for him who waits upon Him"* — here there is a transition from the second person to the third, as is frequently the case in prophetic diction — since the formula, "as it is written," admits of a free quotation, and Paul is not always precise in adhering to the words (i. 19, 31; xiv. 21; Rom. ix. 33). We therefore unhesitatingly accord with Osiander in maintaining a reference here to Isa. lxiv. 4. The sense common to both passages is, that God has prepared for His people who wait for Him, things far exceeding all human experince or observation. ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀναβαίνειν Heb. עָלָה עַל לֵב lit. *to come upon the heart, to become a matter of experience and thought.*—In the word, "prepare" we have the carrying out of the "fore-ordination" mentioned in ver. 7.—But what does the Apostle mean by "the things prepared?" Meyer says the salvation of the Messianic kingdom (comp. Matth. xxv. 34.) Very well, but not simply in its future glories. What is intended is the whole work of redemption in all its essential particulars, from the foundation laid for it in Christ, on unto its final consummation. They are the benefits never before known or imagined, and far transcending all conception and surmise which are contained in God's revelation, and the glory aimed at and procured by it. "They are the gracious gifts and disclosures of blessedness, an insight into which, and an enjoyment of which are afforded us even here in faith, whose full fruition is reserved for a higher world." Osiander. That deliverance from exile to which the passage in Isaiah primarily refers, is in truth only a faint image of that which is to be considered as the literal fulfilment of all such expression (comp. also Matth. xiii. 17).

Vers. 10–12. The revelation of this wisdom and its means.—**But to us God hath revealed them through His Spirit.**—"To us," that is, Paul himself and his fellow-Apostles; for of Christians in general he is not speaking. See vers. 6 and 16—also iii. 1. [So Hodge; Stanley, however, says "believers generally, but with a special reference to himself"]. The communication here is not of an external, but of an internal sort. (Comp. the expression, "to reveal *in* me," Gal. i. 15). This is clear also from the agency employed. This agency is the Spirit, who executes God's purposes of redemption and is the means of enlightening them in the knowledge of their nature. He does this work so far as He is "freely given of God," ver. 12. The possibility of this revelation by the Spirit is shown in the following words—**for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.**—"The Spirit" here is evidently, by reason of the connection, the same as "His Spirit" in the previous clause. Only there He is introduced as proceeding outwards and working ad extra, but here and in what follows as imminent or existing within the Godhead. An analogous expression occurs respecting the Son of God in Jno. i. 18, where the phrase "who is in the bosom of the Father" corresponds with "the Spirit searcheth all things," *etc.*; and the word "declare" with "hath revealed by His Spirit." The ability to make known the thoughts of God unto the Apostles is here grounded upon the knowledge the Spirit has of these things in their inmost source and profoundest depths. This is expressed by ἐρευνᾷν: lit. *to explore, to search through and through;* but here, and wherever else it is used of Divine knowledge, it denotes the result of that exploring, *i. e.* a complete and thorough knowledge (comp. cxxxix. 1; Rom. viii. 27=καρδιογνώστης of Acts i. 24; xv. 8 and Rev. ii. 23. Chrys. ἀκριβὴς γνῶσις κατάληψις.) Βάθη θεοῦ: inmost recesses of God, the otherwise unexplorable depths where His thoughts and volitions have free play, the hidden mystery of His personality which correspond to those mysteries of His kingdom and of all His works and ways which the Spirit reveals. The image is drawn from the sea, whose depths are supposed to be unfathomable and bottomless. (Ps. xxxvi. 7; xcii. 6; Job. xi. 8). Meyer says: "The entire abounding fulness which God has in Himself, every thing which goes to make up His being, His attributes, thoughts, plans, decrees." (Not the latter exclusively). See also the phrase "depths of Satan," Rev. ii. 24. That such must be the office of the Spirit, and of Him alone, is now illustrated by an analogy.—Ver. 11. **For who of men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God no one knoweth save the Spirit of God.**—The logic is this: "The Spirit and only He can know the depths of God. For as the spirit of man which is in him can alone know what is of him, so only the Spirit of God can know what is of God." The Apostle puts the first member of the comparison in the form of a question. "Who of men

[* The margin of the E. V. renders the last part of this verse, "neither hath seen a God besides Thee, that doeth so for him, etc." This version is given by Ewald, de Wette, and Lowth. It is found also in the lxx. Luther's version, following the Vulgate, gives it as in the English text. Unquestionably the former are correct in putting "God" in the accusative case. It is also noteworthy that the clause "nor perceived by the ear," is not in the lxx., and Lowth thinks either that this passage has been corrupted by the Jews, or that Paul quotes from some apocryhal book, either "The Ascension of Esaias," or "The Apocalypse of Elias," in both of which the passage is found as cited by Paul. It will be seen, likewise, that this clause is omitted by Paul, and that he has inserted another phrase instead—"Neither have entered into the heart of man;" και επι καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ουκ ανέβη; and these words are so similar to οὐ μὴ επέλθῃ αυτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν found in the lxx. Is. lxv. 17, that one can hardly avoid the belief that the two passages were blended together in the Apostle's mind, and were freely quoted to suit his case.]

knoweth, etc.?" Here the gen., *ἀνθρώπων, of men*, is not superfluous. The ignorance here implied is not an absolute one, inasmuch as God is to be excepted from it (Osi.); or, we may say, it carries a prominent emphasis: "no MAN knows what is of man" (Meyer)—*τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, not *βάθη*: "the things of a man" in general; not his "depths." According to the context, the things alluded to must be limited to those of his inner life, his secret thoughts and purposes. The "spirit" of man is the breath of God in him, "the candle of the Lord searching all the inward parts of his belly" (Prov. xx. 27), the inner eye or light (Matth. vi. 23), that whereby he becomes evident to himself, recognizes his own distinct individuality, is conscious of himself, and of his thoughts and acts as belonging to himself, the Divine image in man, the principle of his personality. (See Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychologie*, S. 116 ff.; Beck, *Bibl. Seelenlehre*, S. 947). By the words "which is *in* him," the spirit, as the principle of self-consciousness, is distinguished from the spirit in others, as the principle of objective knowledge. A like additional qualification to "the Spirit of God" would be out of place, either because God is absolutely one, or because His Spirit is also dispensed to others, as seen in the next verse: "which is *from* God" (Meyer). De Wette says: "Paul conceives of the Spirit not as being *in God*, as though He were the principle of God's self-consciousness; but he very wisely says merely "the Spirit of God" in order that he might thus hold the way open for saying afterwards "the Spirit *from* God." The substance of the comparison is this: as the knowledge of the inward man is possible only through self-consciousness, so is the knowledge of God possible only through the consciousness of God obtained by means of the Holy Spirit. De Wette, however, overlooks an important element in the Apostle's course of thought, in that the Apostle makes the immanent beholding of the depths of God on the part of the Spirit the ground of his function as a revealer. But the Spirit of God (in accordance with the analogy of the human spirit which is derived from Him and is his image) is the principle of the Divine self-knowledge, the ground of God's life as a self-conscious existence—that whereby God is personal life, is the One who is eternally and absolutely cognizant of Himself in all His thoughts, volitions and decrees, in His doing and working, —the One who is revealed unto Himself and then reveals Him abroad to others—the One who sees through Himself and also shines through the human spirit and so qualifies it for looking into the work of God. ["The analogies of Scripture, however, are not to be pressed beyond the point they are intended to illustrate. The point here is the knowledge of the Spirit. He knows what is in God as we know what is in ourselves. It is not to be inferred from this that the Spirit of God bears in other points the same relation to God that our spirits do to us." HODGE.] Having thus shown the ability of the Spirit to reveal the things of God, he reaffirms and corroborates the declaration of ver. 10.—**Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is from God.**—The expression is antithetic. But what are we to understand by "the spirit of the world?" Certainly not any mental peculiarity; as most imagine, (Beza: ingenium humanum, [Barnes and others]: doctrina humana; [de Wette and Stanley: spirit of human wisdom; Hodge: a paraphrase for human reason]), since the thing contrasted with it cannot be explained in this manner. Neither can it be construed ironically, as denoting an utter want of that which is spiritual, or that show of spirit which the world calls spirit (see Osi.), nor yet as the finite spirit, in so far as it sets up independently for itself (Billroth). But it means that principle which controls the world in its thought and volition, and which is elsewhere termed "the prince of this world (Jno. xii. 31); also "the god of this world" (comp. Eph. ii. 2; vi. 11 ff.; 1 Jno. iv. 3; v. 19). Meyer says: "The diabolic spirit under whose control the world is held, and which profane humanity possesses." Osiander discovers in it "a demonic element, blending in with, however, and manifesting itself in connection with splendid natural powers—a principle of selfish curiosity which excites and stimulates the mental faculties to knowledge, but does not overcome their weakness, and which, while alienated from God, ever remains involved, not merely in weakness and ignorance, but also in perverseness and error."—**but**—Inasmuch as he is treating no more of operations imminent in the Godhead, but of acts of external revelation, the subject in contrast is denominated—**the Spirit which is from God.**—"He brings to view the spirit as having been already bestowed." NEANDER. This spirit, coming as it does from God, and the bestowment of which conditions the knowledge of Divine things, and which belongs only to the children of God (comp. Rom. v. 5; viii. 9 ff.; 14 ff.; Jno. xv. 26), is to be entirely distinguished from the "spirit of man" which belongs to us as men, and makes us akin to God (Acts xvii. 29), and which constitutes our personality (ver. 11), and which is the immediate organ of the Spirit of God, needing, however to be renewed, and, because of its weakness, requiring to be strengthened. (Eph. iv. 23; Rom. vii. 22 ff.; 1 Thess. v. 23; comp. Matth. ii. 15, 16). The object of the bestowment of the Spirit is—**that we might know the things which are freely given to us by God.**—These things are the same as those spoken of in ver. 9 as having been "prepared" for us (comp. i. 30; Rom. viii. 24; vi. 23; Eph. ii. 8, 9). *τὰ χαρισθέντα*, (from *χαρίζεσθαι*, as Rom. viii. 32)=gifts of free grace. By these are meant the blessings of God's kingdom which Christians already possess in faith and hope, but which they will enjoy in full perfection when the kingdom of God has been set up in glory. [Hodge very singularly says: "not so. The connection is with ver. 10, and the subject is the wisdom of God, the Gospel as distinguished from the wisdom of this world." But what are the topics of this Gospel but the spiritual blessings here seen and known in part, but afterwards to be known as we also are known? A distinction here is untenable]. The persons to whom they are given (*ἡμῖν*) are Christians generally, as must appear from the very nature of the case [and the knowledge they obtain is "the assurance of confidence." CALVIN. Those who receive the Spirit

not only have a clear apprehension of the blessings God hath provided, but discern them as "freely given unto them." This must be so, as knowledge in the Scriptures is one with experience. There is no real perception without possession].

VER. 13. Having indicated the source of Gospel-wisdom, Paul proceeds to show how he proclaimed it, taking up the thought of ver. 4.—**Which things we also speak.**—That the *speaking* here is directly connected with the fact of having received of the spirit from the purpose of knowing and declaring, and proceeds from it, and is of a sort corresponding to the nature of the objects received, is shown by word, *καί*: "also." How he spake is exhibited antithetically.—**Not in words taught of human wisdom,** *οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις*.—The Gen. here is governed not by *λόγοις* but by *διδακτοῖς*. (Comp. *διδακτοὶ θεοῦ*, taught of God, Jno. vi. 45). [Most of the older English versions and Calvin construe the other way. Wiclif: not in wise wordes of mannes wisdom. Tyndale: not in the connyuge wordes of mannes wysdome. Rheims: not in learned wordes of humane wisedom. Cranmer and Geneva translate very nearly as the authorized version]. He means not in an artificial style of discourse, fashioned after the rules of scholastic rhetoric and dialetics, **but in those taught of Spirit.**—*Πνεύματος* without the article as in ver. 4, because it is to be taken qualitatively as denoting a principle higher than that of human wisdom. We are not here to suppose that any actual dictation of the language is intended, but only an operation of the Spirit upon the mind, "which strongly pervades and controls even the speech and modes of exhibition;" in short a simple discourse which proceeds directly from a heart possessed by the Spirit of God. [Hodge says: "This is verbal inspiration, or the doctrine that the writers of the Scriptures were controlled by the Spirit of God in the choice of the words which they employed in communicating divine truth. This has been stigmatized as the mechanical theory of inspiration. It is objected to this, that it leaves the diversity of style which marks the different portions of the Bible, unaccounted for. But if God can control the thoughts of a man without making him a machine, why not also his language?—rendering every writer infallible in the use of his characteristic style? If the language of the Bible be not inspired, then we have the truth communicated through the discoloring and distorting medium of human imperfection. Paul's direct assertion is that the words he used were taught by the Holy Ghost." Wordsworth adds: "Here is a sufficient reply to the assertions of those who allege that the inspiration vouchsafed to St. Paul was limited to a *general* perception of divine truth and that he was left himself without divine guidance as to the *form* in which that truth was to be expressed. A caution also is thus supplied against the notion that there are *verbal inaccuracies*, and *blemishes*, and *defects* in St. Paul's representations of the supernatural truths which he was commissioned to deliver. Comp. Hooker, II. viii. 6, and Serm. v. 4; also Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, Vol. V. pp. 336–341"]. This is clear from the explanatory clause [which we render—**Combining spiritual things with spiritual.**]—*πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες*. The interpretation of this depends on the explanation we give to *συγκρίνοντες*. This signifies originally, *to combine together with judicious selection*, then *to unite in general, to join*, the opposite of *διακρίνειν*; with this then comes the idea *to hold together, i. e.*, by way of comparison (2 Cor. x. 12), [this is the meaning adopted in the E. V.]; out of this there follows the idea of *measuring, estimating* according to something; and then of *interpreting* or *expounding*, as it is used in Gen. xl. 8 and Dan. v. 12 in reference to dreams, in which cases the signification *to judge* must be referred back to the idea of holding together the various elements of the process so as to get a proper view of them. At any rate there is nothing in these last passages to justify our taking the word in the text to mean unqualifiedly *to explain* [as Stanley does] whether we take *πνευματικοῖς* as Masculine [rendering as Bengel, Rückert, Stanley: "to spiritual men"] (which is by no means required by the ver. 14, since a new paragraph opens there), or as Neuter; rendering it "by spiritual things," meaning thereby either the Old Testament types used to explain the New Testament (as Chrysostom and others), or the testimonies of the Prophets, which, being inspired by the Spirit, are the fit illustrations of the things which Christ has revealed by His Spirit (as Grotius and others), both which ideas are remote from the connection, or "with spiritual words" (as Elsner and others). [Wordsworth interprets this clause comprehensively. "Blending spiritual things with spiritual," *i. e.*, not adulterating them with foreign admixtures (2 Cor. ii. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 2) also "combining." for the purpose of comparing and explaining, *e.g.*, the things of the New Testament by the Old Testament, or one spiritual truth by another]. Nor yet do we agree with Neander's view, "that which has been communicated to us by the Divine Spirit we explain in a form which is suited to that communication." The only correct interpretation is to take *συγκρίνειν* in its original import, and *πνευματικοῖς* as Neuter, and to render as above, carrying the meaning: uniting the spiritual matters which are the subject of our discourse (*λαλοῦμεν*, ver. 12) with words and forms that are taught of the Spirit. So Castalio, Calvin, Osiander, Meyer. [Hodge and Barnes]. Thus understood the clause serves to illustrate still further the suitableness of the style of discourse just before advocated, and as Osiander rightly observes, contains no tautology, since rather "the thought is here stated in the form of a fundamental principle, and is taken up and set forth with stronger emphasis."*

[*The view given, but not advocated by Bengel and Stanley, seems deserving of more attention than Kling has bestowed upon it, and may fairly dispute the ground with that he has given. Συγκρίνειν, whatever may be its classical meaning, is used in the LXX. in six places at least, with the unquestioned signification of: to explain, to make that which was mysteriously hinted in visions clear to ordinary minds. This was what Joseph did to the chief butler and chief baker, and to Pharaoh, and what Daniel did to Belshazzar. And Paul is here speaking of dealing with things of like nature, *i. e.*, supernaturally revealed, which eye had not seen, etc. And what more natural than for him to use

VER. 14. [Explains the reason why this higher spiritual wisdom is not indiscriminately imparted, but "spoken only to the perfect." It is seen in the incapacity of multitudes to apprehend it, and to discern "the Divine impress it bears both on its contents and style of delivery." It is an inability arising from "their essential character, which is as opposed to the Gospel as it is in every respect harmoniously consistent with itself."].—**But the natural** (or psychical†) **man.**—*ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος.* Here we have the character described. Luther explains it thus: "the natural man is one who, though he stands *apart from grace*, is still endowed to the fullest degree with understanding, sense, capacity and art." He is the opposite of "the spiritual man," see Jude ver. 19. *ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες*, lit.: "psychical, not having the spirit." *ψυχή*: *Psyche, soul*, Latin, *anima*, is the intermediate between *πνευμα, spirit*, and *σωμα, body* (1 Thess. v. 23). It is the personal life of the individual (Ichleben) arising from the entrance of the spirit into the earthly organ of the body as its breath of life, in which personal life the spiritual and the sensuous elements are combined, the one entering into the other. The spiritual element, by becoming psychical or natural, forms a power of consciousness and volition, sinks into the life of sensation and impulse and embodies itself in the man and becomes organic. The sensuous element on the other hand (which taken out of the world of sense the soul fills with its life of sensation and impulse), being possessed by the spiritual power, becomes itself spiritualized in conscious self-directed activity and made capable of intelligent knowledge and volition. By reason of this its double nature, the soul becomes dependent on springs of life that belong as well to the world of sense as to the spiritual world. But, with particular individuals, the soul exercises a free choice in regard to the degree and order in which from time to time these influences from above and below shall be appropriated and employed. It depends on its pleasure whether it shall isolate itself, and, with this, sever its own spiritual part from the Divine life of the Spirit, or whether it shall receive this life into itself. Now in separating from the life of the spirit, man, as a natural or psychical creature, gets divested of his spiritual character and becomes fleshly. There is, indeed, in him still a spiritual element: but then it no longer rules as a controlling principle, regulating his impulses and desires. On the contrary, being in subjection to the soul (*ψυχή*), the spirit becomes more and more subservient to the soul's perverse and carnal tendencies, from whence there springs deceit, falsehood, defilement in spirit, through contact with corresponding evil, and also that earthly and worldly wisdom spoken of in Jas. iii. 15. The soul, in itself robbed of the spiritual element, as a personal life (as spirit), is also unable to work out the spiritual things into a clear, intelligent apprehension by a free conscious effort of its own. Hence the mere soul-man, in other words the psychical or natural man, has neither inclination nor eye for the spiritual. He is closed up against all higher wisdom as if it were but folly. (Comp. Beck, *Bibl. Seelenlehre*, § 14 ff, 33 ff; *Lehrwiss*, §§ 207 and 213. From all this it will be seen that the translation "sensuous," "*sinnlich*," is not exhaustive. With this there is included also the idea of the selfish. Besides, both the intellectual and ethical aspects are also to be taken into account. See Osiander, de Wette, Meyer*.—The ethical side of "the psychical man," *viz.*, his disinclination towards the higher sphere of life, appears in what is affirmed of him.—**receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God.**—For *δέχεσθαι* here is not=*to understand*, which thought is afterwards expressed by *γνῶναι*, but it means: *to accept, to receive*, as always in the N. T. (Luke viii. 13; Acts viii. 13; xi. 1; xvii. 11; 1 Thess. i. 6; ii. 13, etc.). *οὐ δέχεται=ἀπωθεῖται*, Acts xiii. 46. "He *will not* accept them, although they are offered."—BENGEL. The phrase, "the things of the Spirit of God," combines what was distinguished in ver. 13, the Divinely spiritual both in form and substance. The reason of this rejection is explained,—**because they are foolishness unto him.**—"Whereas," adds Bengel, "he is seeking after wisdom." And these things seem foolish, because they conflict with his narrow, foregone conclusions and prejudices.—

συγκρίνειν in precisely the same sense as in the former cases. The allusion is almost palpable. Rendering the word then *explaining*, the train of thought requires that we take *πνευματικοῖς* as Dative Mas: . to spiritual persons. Here, then, we see the Apostle reverting back to the thought with which the paragraph opens, "that of speaking wisdom among the perfect." "The spiritual things" here are the contents of this wisdom, "the perfect" are "the spiritual." And thus we have a hinge on which the course of thought passes easily over into what follows, and the δε of ver. 14 has its natural antithetic force. "Explaining spiritual things to the spiritual, but the natural man," etc. This, it is interesting to note, is the first construction given of this passage in an English version. Wiclif renders: "Maken a liknesse of spiritual things to goostli men, for a bestell man persuyued not through thingis," etc. Here, however, we have a new meaning to *συγκρίνοντες*, equivalent to: making spiritual things match with spiritual men. And is this the meaning of the Rhemish version: "comparing spiritual things to the spiritual?" This evidently is a literal transferring of the Vulgate "comparantes," which is derived from "compare," and has for its first meaning *to match to pair*. Calvin has still another interpretation: "adapting spiritual words to spiritual things," which Beza substantially adopts. Here there is simply an inversion of ideas.]

[† It is to be regretted that there are no adjectives in English which distinctly preserve the important distinctions observed in Scripture between body, soul, and spirit. Much obscurity oftentimes arises in consequence, and we fail to perceive the profound philosophy which underlies Paul's doctrine. The adjective corresponding to the noun soul our translators render "natural." This is not a bad translation if we bear in mind the equivocal use of the word nature: that it either may mean, the course of things as they are, or the course of things as they ought to be," and that it is in the former sense the text takes it.]

[* See also Owen, vol. iii. p. 257, where, basing his exposition on 1 Cor. xv. 44, he says: "The *ψυχικός (i.e.)* the natural man, is one that hath all that is or can be derived from the first Adam, one endowed with a rational soul and who hath the use and exercise of all his rational faculties." He takes strong ground against those "who tell us that by this 'natural man' is intended 'a man given up to his pleasures and guided by his brutish affections and no other.'" See his citations from Augustine and Chrysostom to the same effect. A profound analysis of this important subject, in all its connections, is given also in Müller on Sin, vol. i. p. 457, vol. ii. p. 367. Calvin: "The natural man (*i.e.*) not merely the man of *gross* passions, but whoever is taught only by his own faculties." And Bengel quotes Ephraim Cyrus: "The Apostle calls men who live according to nature *natural*, *ψυχικούς*, those who live contrary to nature, *carnal*, *σαρκικους*; but those are *spiritual*, *πνευματικοί*, who even change their nature after the spirit." An able disquisition on the "Tripartite Nature of Man," in all its bearings on Christian doctrine has lately been issued by Rev. J. B. Heard, of England.]

and he is not able to know them.—This clause is either to be joined to the previous one, as assigning an additional reason for the natural man's not receiving spiritual things, *q. d.*, "he considers it absurd, without being able to understand it" (Meyer, [Alford, Stanley, Tischendorf]); or to be taken as parallel to the clause, "he receiveth it not," and expressing the intellectual side of the case in an independent manner, so that the following words stand related to it alone ([Calvin, Hodge, Barnes, and others, in accordance with l e. v.]). The first is the more correct. The natural man contemns spiritual things through prejudice and lack of apprehension,—**because they are spiritually judged of.**—The reason here assigned bears upon both the previous clauses which together explain why the Gospel is rejected. It appears all foolish and incomprehensible, alike from the fact that it requires to be looked at in a way for which the natural man in unfitted. ἀνακρίνειν, *to judge of*, as in iv. 3; ix. 3; xiv. 24. It denotes the result of investigation and proof, which it primarily in fact signifies (Acts xvii. 11; iv. 9; xii. 19.) πνευματικῶς: *spiritually* (*i. e.*) either by the spirit of man (not soul: ψυχή) quickened and filled by the Spirit of God, or in a spiritual manner, so that the Holy Spirit, whose are the things to be judged of, both as to form and substance, directs likewise in the judgment of them by His illumiuating grace. In either case, the sense is essentially the same, although the latter comports better with the use of the word "spirit" in the context. [While it is the office of the Spirit to take of the things of Christ and show them unto us, it is His also to purge the mental vision so that it can see the objects presented, for the eye of the natural man is blinded by the god of this world, and to him, however presented, the Gospel is hidden. Hence the manifestation towards the man must be supplemented by a change in him, rendering him spiritually minded, and so producing "a congeniality between the perceiver and the thing perceived."]

VER. 15. Presents a contrast.—**But the spiritual man.** *i. e.* he who, in conformity with the image of God (Col. iii. 10), has been renewed to an existence in the Spirit, Who, in turn lives in him as his life and to a constant exercise of his power in the strength of the Spirit; in other words, he who has the Spirit as rule, guidance and might (Beck, *Scelenl.* S. 35 ff.);—**judgeth of all the things**—τὰ πάντα [see Crit. obs.] *all the things.* By these we are to understand in accordance with the context, at least for the most part, or preeminently the things of the Spirit which the natural man is not in a condition to judge of. This reference is indicated yet more distinctly by the article τά: the [if genuine]. Besides the saying of Beck (*Lehrwiss S.* 210) here holds good. "Only by being made spiritual is a man capacitated for the apprehension of spiritual objects. Such as God and Divine things, and only by the energy thus obtained is he able critically to test, and spiritually to govern all the remaining portion of his being as something inferior and subservient to the Spirit." So also Meyer (ed. 3) [only giving the passage a much broader scope, since he refers the "all things" not simply to those of the Spirit, but includes under it "all objects which come within the sphere of his judgment"]. "On all this can the spiritual man pass a correct estimate by means of a judgment enlightened and controlled by the Holy Ghost." [In illustration of this, Meyer alludes to instances of Paul's nice spiritual discrimination, exhibited "in matters not belonging to doctrine, and under the most varied conditions, *e. g.* in his wise improvement of circumstances amid persecutions and prosecutions, and during his last voyage, *etc.*, also in his judgments respecting marriage cases, judicial causes, slavery, and the like; in all which he understood how to place every thing under the level of a higher spiritual point of view with wonderful clearness, certainty and impartiality; also in his estimate of different personages, etc." But it may be fairly questioned whether Meyer does not here go beyond the proper scope of the passage. The object in view throughout the whole of it is a Divinely revealed spiritual "wisdom," which transcended the apprehension of "the natural man;" and it is not easy to see how affairs altogether prudential could be brought into the account]. The acceptation of πάντα as Acc. Sing. Masc. is against the previous context (see Meyer).—**But he himself is judged of by no man.**—The previous clause leads us to supply here, "who is not spiritual." For such as these the position of the spiritual man is too high. They cannot comprehend the inner life, or pronounce suitable judgment upon it. "Undoubtedly Paul said this with special allusion to such in the Corinthian Church as took the liberty of criticising him." NEANDER. Of course what is affirmed in this verse of the spiritual in general, must in particular cases be limited according to the measure and degree of perfection attained in the spiritual life (comp. Calvin and Osiander). One proof of the sense perverting exegesis of the Romish Church may be seen in their reference of this passage to the hierarchy and its judicial office in doubtful questions (Corn. a Lapide, Estius).

VER. 16. Proof of the foregoing.—**For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him?**—The question is taken from Is. xl. 13: according to the lxx., with the omission of the words καὶ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο· "and who hath become his counsellor," which come in between the words "Lord" and "that." The "mind of the Lord" is here identical with "the mind of Christ" in the following clause. We might, indeed, on looking at the passage in Isaiah, refer it to God; but since the words are introduced freely without a formula of citation, there is no necessity for this, and the identification of them with "the mind of Christ," is more in accordance with the course of thought. The νοῦς, *mind*, is the spirit as the source of thoughts, counsels, plans. The spirit, not however, as shut up within itself, but, so far as what is contained therein, is imparted and operates abroad. Hence it is not absolutely the same as πνεῦμα, *spirit* (as Billroth and Neander). ["This is rather the substratum of the νοῦς,—*mind*, and which being imparted to the man, makes his mind one with the mind of Christ." MEYER]. Ὅς συμβιβάσει = ὥστε συμβιβάζειν [Buttmann, § 143, I., or Kühner § 334, 2]. Συμβιβάζειν, *to bring together*, metaphorically, *to put one's self to rights, to*

make oneself intelligible; and hence transitively, *to prove, to instruct;* elsewhere with τι, in the Hellenic idiom, also with a personal object; *to teach some one.* [This use of the word, Alford says belongs to the lxx; in the New Testament it means *to conclude, to prove, to confirm*]. The object in this case is not any spiritual truth, but the Lord, — **but we have the mind of Christ.**—["We," the Apostles, himself included, and in the view of his issue with the Church, perhaps emphasized. Of course other spiritual persons are not excluded, but they are not now brought into the account]. Hence, ἔχομεν, not=*perspectum habemus.* The word denotes that inward possession which is founded upon communion with Christ, upon having "put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 27).—The thought now brought out is this, the judgment of the spiritual man on the part of him who is not spiritual, would require such a knowledge of the mind of the Lord as would qualify a person to instruct the Lord Himself, since the persons who are to be judged are such as have the mind of Christ, inasmuch as His Spirit dwelling in them, and directing their thought, fashions them to His mind, and identifies their thinking with His thinking. ["Syllogistically stated, the argument would stand thus: no one can instruct the Lord. We have the mind of the Lord. Therefore no one can instruct and judge us." Hodge.]

[Obs. We are now prepared to consider what this wisdom is, that is spoken of in this passage, according to the characteristics given by the Apostle. 1. It is a system of objective truth analogous to that taught by the Greek philosophers, and destined to supplant it: the true σοφία sent to supersede the false. 2. It is one that can be advantageously taught only to persons who by a practical faith in the rudimental facts of Christianity, have made some advances in the Divine life. 3. It is a wisdom beyond the reach of human reason or conjecture to discover—a veritable mystery preserved in God's keeping until He should choose to make it known. 4. It is one which has been revealed by the Holy Spirit out of the depths of the Godhead; hence 5. It must comprise such things as are found there, and carry the mark of the Divine personality, viz.: the nature, attributes, and constitution of the Divine Being, His plans and purposes as Creator, His laws as the Supreme Ruler, His aims and methods, and decrees, and works as Redeemer; all these more particularly as bearing upon man, and shedding light upon his condition and destiny. And these are truths both ontological and ethical; truths for the intellect and moral sense at once; truths spiritual and eternal in their highest and broadest sense. 6. The forms in which this wisdom is communicated, are also Divinely cast. They are they the words and illustrations suggested to the minds of the Apostles by the Holy Ghost, who inspired them, and which must ever constitute the best statements of this wisdom. It is a wisdom whose truth and excellence are not directly obvious to the natural man. In order to discern intuitively its force and beauty, and to perceive its Divine character, there is required the spiritual eye that is conformed to the light of the glory of God as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ, and can by direct vision recognize its truth and heavenly source.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

[1. *There is and must be a Divine philosophy in Christianity.* The historical facts on which the Gospel rests embody living and eternal truths, which it is the life and joy of the spiritual man to contemplate and explore. In Jesus, the Son of man, there is incarnated the Word of God the Logos, from whom emanate all those Divine archetypal ideas which inform and regulate the whole created universe. By Him all things consist. His province it is also, as the Son of God, the Father's express image, to reveal that Father in the glory of His perfections, in His laws, purposes and workings, and thus to exhibit the principles on which the world is governed. Moreover, as the Son of Man, it is His office to show what man properly is in his true ideal, and what are the problems of his destiny. Still further, as the Son of God and the Son of man combined to constitute the mediatorial King, He becomes the centre of all human history, the Head of that kingdom with reference to which all things in the world are controlled and governed. Christianity, therefore, carries in itself the substance of all sound theology, and anthropology, and ethics, and historical science. Jesus Himself being the absolute Truth and Life, in Him there must be hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and these treasures it will be the province of an enlightened intelligence to explore, and bring forth, and make known to the apprehension of mankind as that which is alone worthy of study and fitted to nourish alike the mind and heart. Thus it will be found in the end that the researches of right reason are directly in the line of faith's leading—that the scheme of Christianity as set forth in the doctrines of the Gospel is in accordance with true science—yea, its very substance—and that "religion passes out of the ken of reason only when the eye of reason has reached its horizon, and that faith is but its continuation," revealing to the devout worshipper the things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath entered into the heart of man to conceive].

[2. *This Divine philosophy is distinctly apprehended only by a renewed sanctified intelligence.* Here life and light coincide. We believe in order that we may understand, and experience becomes the only fit guide and teacher. Sin and the remains of sin prove a disqualification for knowledge and beget folly. Hence it is that the communication of this Divine wisdom is suited only to such as have made attainments in piety, and must be measured out in proportion to their attainments by a wise economy. Christ being our light, so far as He is our life, it must follow] that with the unfolding of this new life in us, and to the degree in which the principle of this life, even the Divine Spirit, mortifies the works of the flesh and breaks down our narrow-minded selfishness, and clears our intelligence of all prejudices, and emancipates us from human authorities, and from our self-complacency, and from our delight in whatsoever flatters and pleases self, will this Divine wisdom dawn with

ever-growing clearness upon our apprehensions, and our understanding of God's thoughts and ways become enlarged, and our susceptibility for still further disclosures be increased. If on the awakened conscience of the sinner there arises at the start the light of God's pardoning and restoring grace beaming from the person of Christ evidently crucified before his eyes, and under its radiance he sees the follies of the past and the obligations of the future, and learns his indebtedness to redeeming love, and experiences its saving and gladdening influences, and feels in himself the quickening of a new and higher principle with all its uplifting powers and emotions, then in all this there will be laid the foundation of a knowledge of Christ, and what He is, and what is the nature of the life that proceeds from Him, to which each day's experience and reflection will constantly contribute. As his piety matures, the more he will come to understand something of the riches that are to be found in Christ—of His relations to the Godhead as the Eternal and Only-Begotten of the Father—of His relations to humanity as its Prince and Head—of the atonement founded upon the intimate union of His two natures—of the method and means by which His redeeming work was begun and is carried on and will be perfected at last—of the operations of the Holy Spirit in the instrumentalities of the Gospel—of the gifts of grace—of the foundation and increase of the Church—of God's superintendence over the race in guiding it to a participation in the blessings of his salvation—of the way in which these things condition each other, and how they all come to rest upon the decree of the all-wise and merciful God which infinitely exceeds all human imaginings, and to the realization of which the whole history of the race in all its main branches, both before and after Christ, must tend—of the manner in which God will consummate His redeeming work, both in its direct progress and in its remoter connection with what precedes, and in its resemblances to the work of creation (1 Cor. xv.), and finally of the immanent relations of the Godhead which lie at the foundation of this whole process. These are some of the truths which will gradually unfold their glorious meanings upon the mind of the growing Christian, making his path shine brighter and brighter until the perfect day. Mere beginners cannot be expected to comprehend them. They transcend the apprehension even of the most distinguished sages of the world, and range beyond the scope of man's natural experience and observation—yea, beyond the flights of human imagination and hope. But to the sincere believer they are made known with ever greater clearness through the illumination of the Holy Spirit.

3. *The office of the Holy Spirit as the revealer rests upon essential distinctions in the being of God.* His external operations and His indwelling in the hearts of men are owing to an earlier and independent existence in the Godhead, by virtue of which He is called "the Spirit of God" in a manner analogous to "the spirit of man which is in man." Hence he must be supposed to exist in God not merely as a power or an attribute, but as an essential *life-factor in the Divine nature*, maintaining at the same time that independence which is already seen to follow from His independent activity abroad, and from the perfection of the Divine nature. He is *God's proper self*, as certainly as man's spirit is his own self; yet not however the entire God, just as the spirit of man is not the entire man. More exactly defined in the light of ver. 11, He is God *as looking through and recognizing Himself*, even as we may define the Logos to be God imaging and expressing Himself objectively. And if the Divine fiat which creates life abroad is, when contemplated inwardly as the Logos, a self-subsistent and creative Life, so is the Divine cognition which illuminates and creates truth abroad—when contemplated inwardly as Spirit, *an independent and creative truth or light*. God's being and begetting as Spirit, *i. e.*, the Spirit *in* God and the Spirit *from* God, is Truth—is the Light and the Father of Lights. On the ground of these essential distinctions within the being of God, there is ascribed to the Spirit in ver. 18 a vision and a knowledge, which not only penetrates all God's works in their profoundest depths, and comprises in its scope all creaturely perception and all the mysteries of the kingdom of God (ver. 9), but also comprehends the inmost secrets of the Divine personality and most hidden attributes of God's own self. And precisely because He is this inwardly illuminated inmost self of God, and the all-penetrating vision of God, is He the Truth. Spirit is God (Jno. iv. 24) as being a personality which is in itself invisible, but which is conscious of itself in the whole circumference of its being and which thoroughly discerns and reveals every thing external to itself. And the Lord is that Spirit, in so far as He taketh away the veil from the heart and discloses His glory unto the believer, from one degree of splendor unto another, until the fulness of His light shines upon them (2 Cor. iii. 17 ff.; cf. iv. 6)." Accordingly inasmuch as God is throughout transparent to Himself, and manifest in His own peculiar and hidden self, shining through every thing, and glorifying all who are devoted to Him in Himself, He is Light in Himself, Light through Himself on all abroad, and Light to Himself. This is the inward significance of the Divine Spirit, and such is He in godlike self-subsistence as the living and creative truth," *etc.* (Beck, Lehre., S. 103 ff.).

4. While the psychical (ψυχικός) man imprisoned as he is in his own natural selfishness, living and moving ever outside of the sphere of God's enlightening Spirit, has no sense to receive the Divine spiritual communications so that they all appear to him irrational and absurd, the spiritual (πνευματικός) man, who has received the Spirit of God and is controlled by him, carries in himself a standard for determining that which is of the Spirit; so that he is able to estimate it, both according to its substance and its form of expression, and is therefore qualified to judge of everything which comes within his sphere, by this the highest measure of all true worth. But he himself is exalted above the judgment of the unspiritual. Persons of this sort are capable of comprehending or instructing him so far as he is governed in his conduct by the Divine spirit, about as little as they are in condition to know the mind of Christ, which the spiritual man hath,

and so to instruct Christ Himself. But the spiritual man judgeth of all things, because he hath received the anointing of the Holy One, even Christ, and knoweth all things (1 John ii. 21, 22). These are they who are "taught of God." (θεοδίδακτοι, Jno. vi. 45.) This exalted state is maintained in the same manner in which it is won, in true, humble self-denial, in poverty of spirit, in steadfast, determined mortification of all selfish desires and unrestrained devotion to do what is good and wise, and in that simple-hearted abandonment which allows the Spirit of God to work in the heart, to will and to do of his own good pleasure. So far as these qualities fail, and self is suffered to hold sway, the man is betrayed into spiritual pride and into gross errors which arise from commingling and confounding what is human with what is Divine.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

1. RIEGER: *The great distinction between the wisdom of this world and the wisdom of God.*—1. *a.* The former changes its opinions and principles well nigh faster than its fashions. *b.* It is ambitious to give the tone to that which shall be esteemed proper and conducive to the public good, and to fill every sphere with its own taste and judgment so as to be in favor with the princes of this world. *c.* But, alas! those to whom it so devotes itself soon fade and pass away but too apparently. The greater part of them outlive their own credit for wisdom, and a false garnish of their youth is soon succeeded by the lustrelessness of an old age which is all the more wretched from the contrast. 2. *a.* The hidden wisdom of God emerges out of eternity, and is on this account liable to no change. *b.* Its benefits also stretch onward into eternity, and when the work of redemption shall be completed it will be found in glory long after the fashion of this world has utterly vanished. *c.* Its instruction flows with such purity that only those who lay the foundation for it in the fear of God are introduced therein, step by step, along the path of obedience. *d.* Against its demands the heart of man is so apt to be hardened that it is a rare thing for one of the princes of this world to attain unto the knowledge of it (vv. 6–8).

2. *The mystery of the Divine wisdom.*—What is here held up to faith transcends the sight and hearing, the knowledge and understanding of men (*c. g.*) the manifestation of the Son of God in this world, the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven declared by Him, His sufferings, death, and resurrection, the setting up of His Church through the power of the Holy Spirit dispensed in such lowly vessels, the ways and judgments of God with His people on earth hitherto and the numerous humiliations of the cross which yet issue in the clearer victory of the truth. Nothing of all this could have entered the heart of man, had it not been first declared by the Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, and afterwards more fully disclosed by the Spirit (ver. 9).

3. *The revelation through the Spirit of God.*—1. Its indispensableness to the knowledge of God, because God is alone, and is known only to Himself, therefore less capable of being "searched out" than men are by each other, since they possess a common nature. 2. Its sufficiency; what the Spirit searches out and can consequently impart is perfectly substantiated, since He as certainly belongs to the being of God as our spirit belongs to our human nature, and knows every thing respecting God with as much certainty as our consciousness reports to us what is in us. 3. Its contents and operation; what God has in mercy ordained respecting us, the reason why He has made us His children, and what He prepared for us for all eternity, this we learn from the Spirit of God. He teaches it; He awakens also our desires for it; He works faith in us, and He establishes and quiets the heart in this knowledge (vv. 10–12).

4. *The preaching that is acceptable to God.*—*a.* Is one that follows the lead of the Spirit, and *b.* It is attainable by the diligent perusal of the words of the Apostle, learned from the Holy Ghost, by inquiring into their meaning, and also by submitting our hearts and minds to the discipline and guidance of the Spirit. In other respects at the same time we are not to omit reflection upon the suitable construction of the discourse and the right use of all human aids, yet aiming, however, always to keep aloof from all that is purely our own, or is prized by the world, or is extravagant in diction, and to bring forth whatever is impressive and soberly considered, according as the Spirit of God has expressed it to us in the Scriptures. *c.* But even for this reason, can the true preacher not expect to please every person; for in preaching spiritual doctrines he is obliged to direct his attention largely to the spiritually-minded, who are assisted in the apprehension of his message by the help of the Spirit working in them also (ver. 13).

5. *The natural man neither receives nor apprehends what the Holy Spirit teaches in the Gospel.*—Such is every person who rests in his own natural powers and has not bowed his heart to the influences of the Holy Ghost, since in his love of self he trusts too much to his own understanding, whose insight and evidence he over-values, and is thereby betrayed into an aversion to Divine things. But such corruption is not simply a bondage to carnal lusts. It is also a wisdom that is after the flesh (vv. 12, 13); and the words of human wisdom excite an opposition to the doctrines taught by the Spirit, as well as to the simplicity of preaching. But this has its degrees: *a*, strong prejudice even to the avowed rejection of Divine truths; *b*, neglect of spiritual things, so as not to deem it worth while to lay aside prejudices and candidly to confer with any one in reference to them; *c*, assent to the truth, but without any strong faith wrought by the Spirit of God to the entire change of mind, hence accompanied still by hostility to the light, and by an incapacity to judge spiritual things spiritually.

6. *The spiritual man: a, his ability to judge; b, his elevation above the judgment of others.*—*a*, He who has been brought by the Spirit of God to the knowledge, faith and obedience of the truth, and daily learns, under Divine tuition, the things which are given us of God, judges everything which is presented to him appertaining to the knowledge and service of God, not indeed with entire infallibility, yet according to correct grounds. *b*, But in this he

is neither subject to the judgment of any man, nor bound to allow himself to be governed by it. For with the force of the declaration, "Who has known the mind of the Lord? but we have the mind of Christ," he can swing himself clear of all human judgments and repose in that which Christ has revealed. But it must be remembered, that in order to be able properly to boast that we have the mind of Christ there must be in us daily communion with the word of God, an entire indifference to human glory, fervency in prayer, and a patient love towards others. O God, teach me by thy Spirit, for thus it is I live.

7. STARKE:—The longer and more truly a Christian serves God, the more spiritual wisdom he obtains (ver. 6). Christ and everything that is in and with Him, is an incomprehensible mystery; fail but to explore it, and thou art but a fool; but believe what is revealed to thee of it, and it is enough for thy salvation (ver. 7). Wonder not that the greatest in the world, the most gifted, the wisest, do not only not accept Christ, but on the contrary altogether torture and crucify Him. They understand no better, and think themselves able by means of their reason to comprehend the faith and religion of Christ, just as they do everything else (ver. 8). The royal dignity of the children of God is shown in the fact, that they perceive and spiritually judge all things, especially the internal state of the godless, while they themselves are wholly unknown to the latter; and hence it is that they will one day become, as it were, occupants of the great judgment seat as Christ's associate judges in the world's assize (Lg.). Oh, how unqualified is the unconverted teacher for the office of the Spirit, especially for judging correctly of the true state of the souls of his hearers (Lange), (ver. 15). The mind of Christ is the mind of the Father and of the Holy Ghost, and it is revealed in the Scriptures. Whoever then wishes to know the mind of Christ need not climb on high and seek it from far (Rom. x. 7), but let him hold fast to the revealed word. There he will learn what God means and what he intends to do with us (ver. 16).

8. HEDINGER:—Listen how a man ought to preach: Not in the stilted phraseology of romance, nor in the use of wretched wit; but he should utter the mysteries of God in the form of sound words (1 Tim. vi. 3), and as the Holy Ghost lays them to the heart and brings them to the tongue of His faithful servants (Matt. x. 20). (Ver. 13).—Is he that judges unregenerate? What better is he than a blind man undertaking to judge of colors? Is he regenerate? Then he has a mind akin to that he judges. And although opinions in reference to topics that are aside from Christ, the foundation (iii. 11), may be divided, yet will he pass no judgment on these contrary to love and mildness, much less set himself up to be the lord and judge of another's faith, in an arrogant, unbecoming manner (ver. 15).

9. GOSSNER:—It is not well to communicate everything to all. There are truths which can fitly be expressed only in certain circumstances and in certain degrees (ver. 6). Only to those who have come to the just consideration of their sin and misery will the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world, become the foundation and centre from which everything proceeds and to which everything returns (vv. 7, 8). Best of all is it to preserve everything in a pure, still heart, and let there be for every pulse a thanksgiving and for every breath a song, until all come together at last, and we can praise our Redeemer for everything with one accord in the right place and in society of the right persons (ver. 9). A glance into the deep things of God might awaken in us proud thoughts, as if it were possible for us to scan the Divine Majesty. But within this depth there is nothing else to be discovered but infinite love; that love whereby God condescended so low and stooped to commune with wicked, fallen, degraded humanity. These are the deepest depths and the most indescribable mysteries of the Godhead. This is what the natural man cannot understand—that God should make Himself so small. A glance into this mystery therefore does not elate, but it humbles (ver. 10). As we are obliged to learn men through men, so can we learn God only through God, or through His Spirit (ver. 11). The spirit of the world is at bottom the evil spirit, Satan, the god of this world, who has his seat in the hearts of the children of disobedience, and rules the world from thence. He must be expelled by the Spirit of God. He who has this Divine Spirit knows out of his own experience and inward observation what is given to him of God. He believes not at random, but what he believes that he knows, possesses, and enjoys (ver. 12). If a preacher surrenders his whole heart and mind and conduct to God, he will become so possessed by the Holy Ghost that it will be obvious to all that the Spirit speaks through him (ver. 13). There are honorable people with whom we can converse on many truths of Christianity, such as the omnipresence of God, etc., and they will hear and understand gladly. But as soon as we speak a word concerning the Saviour and His meritorious sufferings and death, then they say: "Ah, that I don't understand; that is too high for me." This doctrine does not suit one who has not the Holy Spirit. To the old man in us it is only foolishness (ver. 14). If we "have the mind of Christ," think as He thinks, will as He wills, put all matters before us as He puts them, then will it be granted us to understand the mysteries of the kingdom of God (ver. 16).

9. HEUBNER:—The man who is enlightened by the Spirit is able to estimate and judge all things, even the moral worth of the principles and acts of the unconverted, and the vanity of the earthly mind with its pursuits, because he knows what sin is from his own experience, and has torn himself loose from it, and because in the knowledge of the will of God, the absolute Good, he has a standard to measure everything else according to its real value (ver. 15).

10. On vv. 10–12. Schleier. *Serm. 5th coll.* Vol. 2d. From what the Apostle has said of the inmost nature and origin of the Spirit of God, it follows 1. that the operations of the Spirit are unique in their kind; 2. that every thing which comes to us from the Spirit is perfectly certain and reliable; 3. that it is amply sufficient for all our spiritual needs. On 1. To all other

ters the world arouses us by means of our common understanding; but to "search the deep things of God," and to cry "Abba Father," this is vouchsafed to us only by the Spirit when He descends into our spirits. On 2. Since the knowledge imparted by the Spirit, respecting what is in God is as eternal and unchanging as the Spirit of God Himself, the conviction thus obtained that "God is Love" becomes also the deepest and most reliable truth of our existence, *etc.* On 3. There is nothing wanting to our most blessed communion with God,—if only the Holy Spirit reveal to us the love of God as the innermost depth of his nature,—if only we are made to see that benevolent purpose of God, which has been actuating his paternal heart towards the race from the beginning,—if only it become evident to us that all the wounds of our nature may be healed through the fulness of the Godhead which dwells in Christ as He has become partaker of our nature,—and if only through Him the Spirit of God, who is poured out upon all who believe in Christ as a quickening and strengthening power, glorifies the Saviour in their view and causes them to realize the presence of Christ in Him.

11. [We must be cautious not to pervert these statements into arguments for the disparagement of human reason and learning in the matters of religion. See this point argued in extenso by Richard Hooker (III. viii. 4–11). So Wordsworth].

12. [Tholuck. vers. 6–13. *Apostolic Preaching.* I. Its source—derived: *a.* not from the teaching of men, but *b.* from the revelation of the Divine Spirit. II. Its form: *a.* not a demonstration of the human understanding, but a witness of the Divine Spirit; *b.* not the product of an acquired eloquence, but the offspring of a Divine necessity. Vers. 12–14. *Apostolic preaching.* I. It proceeds *out* of the Spirit of God in the preacher. II. It addresses itself *to* the Spirit of God in the hearer.—R. South. Ver. 7. *Christianity mysterious,* and the wisdom of God in making it so.* I. The Gospel is the wisdom of God. II. It is this wisdom in a mystery. The reasons of the mystery: *a.* the nature and quality of the things treated of, being surpassingly great, spiritual and strange; *b.* the ends designed with relation to their influence on the mind in impressing with awe and reverence, and humbling pride, and engaging our closer search, and reserving fuller knowledge as a source of blessedness hereafter. Inferences: 1. The reasonableness of relying on the judgment of the Church and on spiritual teachers. The unreasonableness of making intelligibleness the measure of faith. 3. The vanity and presumption of pretending to clear up all mysteries in religion.—J. Spencer: Ver. 7. *Wisdom of God in mystery.** I. The matter of mysteriousness which the Apostle had in mind. *Christ slain for us.* II. This mysteriousness is wisdom, as being what might be expected in accordance with other mysteries, such as: *a.* Sin; *b.* Incarnation; *c.* Christ's person and history; *d.* The mode of God's treatment of Christ; *e.* The mode of the believer's restoration to God.—J. Barrow: Ver. 6. *The Excellency of the Christian Religion* as suited for "the perfect:" 1, in the character it gives of God; 2, in the description it gives of man; 3, in the rule it prescribes; 4, in the service it appoints; 5, in the living example it affords; 6, in the solid grounds it gives us to build on; 7, in the help it affords; 8, in the way it satisfies conscience; 9, in the simplicity of its communication.—F. W. Robertson: Vers. 9, 10. *God's Revelation of heaven.* I. Inability of the lower parts of human nature, the natural man, to apprehend the higher truth: *a.* "Eye hath not seen"—not by sensation; *b.* "Ear hath not heard"—not by hearing; *c.* "Neither have entered the heart"—not by imagination or affection. II. The Nature and Laws of Revelation: *a,* by a Spirit to a spirit; *b,* on the condition of Love.—N. Emmons: Ver. 12. The peculiar spirit of Christians. II. Describe the Spirit. II. Show the peculiar knowledge it gives.

[* An evident misapprehension of the word "mystery," as used in the text.]

[* A mistake, as above.]

IV. THE UNFITNESS OF THE CORINTHIANS TO RECEIVE TRUE WISDOM.

Chapter III. 1–4.

And I, [I also[1]] brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto
2 carnal, [fleshy[2]] *even* as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and [*om.*
and[3]] not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able *to bear it,* neither [nay, not even[4]] yet
3 now are ye able. For ye are yet carnal: for whereas *there is* among you envying, and
4 strife, and divisions, [*om.* divisions[5]] are ye not carnal, and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I *am* of Apollos; are ye not carnal [men[6]]?

[1] Ver. 1.—The Rec. has καὶ ἐγώ, but with the far better and preponderant authorities A. B. C. D. E. F. G. Cod. Sin. Lach. and Tisch. read κἀγώ [which, as Words. says, "gives less prominence to the I., and accords more with the Apostle's humility"].

[2] Ver. 1.—The Rec. has σαρκικοῖς according to ver. 3, where a preponderance of authorities declares for σαρκικοί, and only a few, governed by the original reading in ver. 1, have σάρκινοι. Here as in Rom. vii. 14; Heb. vii. 16 we must read according to best authorities σαρκίνοις. [So A. B. C. D. Cod. Sin.—followed by Gries., Lach., Tisch., Words., Alf., etc.].

[3] Ver. 2.—The καί, according to the best manuscripts [A. B. C. Cod. Sin.], is rejected by the great majority of translators and by the old church fathers.

[4] Ver. 2.—The Rec. οὔτε instead of οὐδέ is feebly supported and verbally incorrect.

[5] Ver. 3.—Καὶ διχοστασίαι is wanting in good authorities, A. B. [C. Cod. Sin.] and in the majority of versions and church fathers. Its omission is not to be explained. Probably inserted as a gloss from Gal. v. 20. [Wordsworth retains it].

[6] Ver. 4.—Rec. οὐχὶ σαρκικοὶ ἐστε. [Instead read οὐκ ἄνθρωποί ἐστε So A. B. C. Cod. Sin. Alf., Stanley, Lach., Tisch., etc.] οὐκ is better attested than οὐχὶ and ἄνθρωποι still better. The Rec. reading is probably taken from ver. 3.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 1. As in chap. ii. 1, so here Paul turns from his more general exposition to the consideration of his own ministry at Corinth. The points of connection are furnished in ii. 6, 14. The communication of wisdom on the part of the Apostles belonged only to the sphere of the perfect, of the spiritual; it could not be extended to those who were natural psychical (Seelische) and unreceptive of that which was of the Spirit. As every other person must have done therefore, I **also** was obliged to treat you as persons of the latter class.—**was not able to speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto** (merely) **fleshy** (persons), **as unto babes in Christ.**—Instead of ψυχικός, *natural*, lit. *psychical*, Ger. *seelisch*, he now uses σάρκινος and σαρκικός, *fleshy* and *fleshly* or *carnal*, the ordinary antithesis to πνευματικός, *spiritual*. The sense, however, is not changed by this, for the natural or psychical man is also at the same time a "fleshy" and "carnal" man (comp. ii. 14), and we can neither say, with Bengel, that these latter expressions are milder, nor with Rückert, that they denote simple weakness, while the former implies hostile opposition; nor with Theophy. that they are stronger epithets than "psychical," nor that the latter refers to the intelligence, while the former apply to the moral side of human nature, such as the desire and passions. Meyer 2d ed., "ψυχικός denotes the category to which σαρκινός and σαρκικός belong." 3d ed., "ψυχικός: one who stands outside of the influence of the Spirit, who either has not received Him at all, or has been again deserted by Him." Such a person is also σαρκικός. But not every σαρκικός as such is still a ψυχικός, because a σαρκικός may be also one who experienced the influences of the Spirit, but is not sufficiently actuated by his enlightening and sanctifying power to overcome the hostile power of the flesh; he still thinks, feels, judges, acts κατὰ σάρκα (according to the flesh). "He is here not speaking of Christians as distinguished from the world, but of one class of Christians as distinguished from another." Hodge.—Again it is a question how σάρκινος, *fleshy*, and σαρκικός, *fleshly*, stand related to each other. The former elsewhere is used to denote *made of the flesh, carneous*. [Barytones in ινος denote the material of which a thing is made, λίθινος of stone, ξύλινος of wood, etc.]. The LXX. employs it to signify partly the earthliness and weakness of man in contrast with God (2 Chron. xxxii. 8), and partly what is tender and easily impressed in contrast with what is hard and stony (Ez. xi. 19; xxxvi. 26. In like manner it occurs in 2 Cor. iii. 3). But σαρκικός is used in the New Testament, and afterwards by the church fathers, to designate the disposition and character as contrasted with πνευματικός. [Denominatives in κός express that which pertains to the noun from which they are derived, and are like our adjectives ending in *ly*]. Bleek in Heb. vii. 16 is of the opinion that in the first introduction of these terms they were used alike, and that it was not until later that the ordinary ethical signification was limited to the form σαρκικός which occurs but rarely in the classics. Meyer on the contrary sharply distinguishes. According to him σάρκινος designates the unspiritual state of nature which the Corinthians still had in their early Christian minority, inasmuch as the Holy Spirit had as yet changed their character so slightly that they appeared as if consisting of men flesh still. But σαρκικός expresses a later ascendancy of the hostile material nature over the divine principle of which they had been made partakers by progressive instruction. And it is the latter which, as he thinks, the Apostle makes the ground of his rebuke. In so far, however, as both epithets are of kindred signification, he could, notwithstanding the distinction between them, affirm, "for ye are yet carnal." So Meyer. The distinction between an intellectual weakness and narrow-mindedness in the first beginnings of Christianity (to which also the parallel expression νηπίοις, *babes*, refers), and a moral impurity and perverseness manifesting itself in the progress of Christian development, and involving also an intellectual incapacity for a true heavenly wisdom, is a distinction fully justifiable and consonant with the use of the terms σαρκικός and σάρκινος by the Apostle elsewhere. But that the term σαρκίνοις is to be here understood relatively, and as not denoting an entire lack of the πνεῦμα is clearly indicated by the phrase "as unto babes in Christ." The time here referred to is that when they had just begun to receive Christian instruction, and were but recently admitted into fellowship with Christ by faith and baptism, and so become the children of God. They were of course then wholly immature and spiritually dependent, so that their conduct did not indicate the full impress of the Spirit. Their conscious will, the I, was still fettered by carnal and selfish habits, and their ability to comprehend the deeper grounds and relations of Christian truth was yet undeveloped. In short the allusion is to that crudeness which is seen in children. [And does not the word "*fleshy*," seeing that the Apostle had in mind the image of babyhood, also clearly refer to the *appearance* of the babe also—a little lump seemingly of mere flesh, as yet evincing but little signs of mind or conscience, although containing these elements in the germ? One can hardly avoid discovering here one reason of the use of the word "*fleshy*" instead of *fleshly*, which is an opprobious epithet, applicable only to later years. That mere animalness, which is one of the beauties of the babe,

becomes deformity and a disgrace in an adult. Hence the change of terms when the Apostle comes to speak of their after condition. They were *σάρκινοι* at first, but not developing their spirituality they become *σαρκικοί*]. That fondness for showy eloquence which was natural at the first passed over into the vanity and corruption of an egotistical partisanship, and so instead of attaining progressively a confirmed Christian character, they become carnal. In like manner the Rabbins also speak of little ones and sucklings. Schoettgen in loco. Wetstein 1 Pet. ii. 2; Matth. x. 42. On *νηπίοις* comp. xiv. 20; Heb. v. 13; otherwise Matth. xi. 25.

VER. 2. The figure introduced in the previous verse is still further carried out.—**I gave you milk to drink.**—That is, he gave them nourishment suited to their age. To the beginners in the Divine life, He imparted such instruction as was easy to be understood, the rudiments of Christian knowledge (Heb. vi. 1), not strong meat such as adults only could digest, not the deeper truths of wisdom, which only those who had advanced in religious experience could properly receive, ii. 6 ff.—**not meat.**—This is connected to the foregoing in the way of a zeugma. [Winer, § lxvi. c.]. Instead of *ἐπότισα, have given to drink*, which can only be asserted of the "milk," and not of the "meat," some other verb, such as *ἔδωκα, have given*, is to be supplied. "The distinction between 'milk' and 'meat' can lie only in the formal treatment of the same fundamental truth." NEANDER. "To refer the distinction here to the subject-matter of the preaching, is required neither by the figure used, nor by the connection." BURGER. ["The same truth in one form is milk, in another form, strong meat." HODGE. "Christ is milk for babes, and strong meat for men." CALVIN]. The reason of the above precedence was,—**for ye were not as yet able to bear it.**—The time here referred to was the commencement of his ministry, and that of their first conversion, and the verb *ἐδύνασθε, able* is to be taken in an absolute sense, as it is used also in the classics, "ye were not strong or capable enough." MEYER.—**nay, nor yet now are ye able.**—The *ἀλλά* [which we render "nay"], is climacteric: not only *were* ye unable, but indeed ye are so still." It might appear inconsistent with this declaration that Paul proceeded in the xv. to expound to them the doctrine of the resurrection which certainly is strong meat rather than milk; but there was a special demand for such an exposition, which saved him from the charge of contradicting himself.

VER. 3. [Assigns the reason of the inability. —**For ye are yet carnal**—here we have *σαρκικοί*—not *σάρκινοι*, as the word of censure applicable only to their advanced stage, and showing that though they had been Christians for a long time, they had yet the fleshiness of children upon them, now become fleshliness. The proof of this]—**for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions** [?], **are ye not carnal, and walk according to man?**—Here he refers back to what was said in i. 10, ff. In Gal. v. 20 he also counts these same things as among the works of the flesh, comp. likewise Rom. xiii. 13. *Ζῆλος, envying;* in classic as well as in Hellenic usage, this word occurs in a good sense, *zeal, emulation*, and in a bad one, *jealousy, envy*. Here it signifies partisan rivalry. Out of this arose *ἔριες* strife, *i. e.* verbal disputation. If *διχοστασίαι, divisions* (see Crit. notes) were genuine, we should have in this a climax, indicating the schisms before referred to. *Ὅπου, whereas*, occurs in the classics, also in a causal sense, *because, in so far* as, *since*. Passow. According to de Wette, it is like *εἰ*, a conditional designation of the reason, "if there be," etc. According to Meyer it implies a local conception of the conditional relation: "where there is" (comp. Heb. ix. 16: x. 18).—*Κατὰ ἄνθρωπον* (also Rom. iii. 5)=*σαρκικῶς*. It is the opposite to "walking in the Spirit," Gal. v. 25. What he means to say is, 'your conduct conforms to the ways of men as they ordinarily are in their apostate and irreligious condition.'

VER. 4. A further confirmation.—"**For when one says, 'I am of Paul;' and another, 'I am of Apollos.'**—The allusion to the parties is not as full as in i. 12, inasmuch as he has in this paragraph only to do with that of Apollos, or rather with the opposition existing between this and that called after himself." MEYER. "These were at the same time the most important parties at Corinth." OSIANDER. Here likewise the distinction is not stated according to grammatical rules. The *ἐγὼ μέν*, however, brings out the contrast with emphasis: "I, on my part;" or, "I, at all events." (Comp. Passow *μέν*, A. I., II. 7; vol. II. I. p. 175 and 177),—**are ye not men.**—The same usage as in ver. 3: *κατ' ἄνθρωπον* · "after man's fashion." It was natural for the Jews to see in man (אָדָם), the earthly, an implication of what was defective, imperfect, indeed the exact antithesis to God, and whatever was godlike. Hence the expression in the Old Testament: "the children of men," and especially "the daughters of men" (Gen. v.). in opposition to "the sons of God." (This is, according to the only interpretation suited to the connection and the spirit of the Old Testament, which sets the sanctified portion of the race over against those who represent men, human nature severed from God). The expression as here used, is certainly unique, but entirely in accordance with the analogy of Scripture. "It means people who have not been lifted above human infirmity, and in whom the Divine element is utterly wanting." MEYER.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

Comp. on i. 12 ff.; ii. 6 ff.; ii. 1 ff.

1. [*Christian truth is of different grades, and suited to different capacities.* It has rudiments for the simplest child, and profundities which the angels desire to look into, and can never fully penetrate. It begins with the plainest facts of history, furnishing in these the foundation of a saving faith, but every one of these facts conduct us down into the deep things of God. Thus the Gospel is adapted to all classes of mankind. Its storehouse is furnished with all kinds of provisions, from the milk for babes to the strong meat for adults. In this we have one token of its Divine wisdom, and of its celestial origin and eternal destiny. Infinitude lies back of all its lowliest approaches to man in his fallen state,

and in all it presents to faith, it furnishes that on which mind and heart shall feed for evermore].

2. *The vanity of man apart from God.* Human nature, originally so exalted in its likeness to God, so glorious in knowledge and voluntary power, has sunk so low by reason of sin, that God's word, uttering ever the language of truth, associates with man (when regarded apart from the person of Jesus, and from what may be realized through Him) the conception of something small, weak, incapable, transient, vain, false; in short, of such imperfection and depravity as results from a rupture of our communion with God. Hence the inquiry, "who art thou, O man?" (Rom. ix. 20; comp. ii. 1, 3); and, "what is man?" Ps. viii. 4; cxliv. 3, ff.; and the saying, "all men are liars." Rom. iii. 4. Indeed, as used in common parlance, the term is often one of contempt. Luke xxii. 60: "Man, I know not what thou sayest." Matth. xxvi. 72: "I do not know the man." On the contrary, in Christ everything wins a different aspect. While in the Old Testament the term, "children of men," is a disparaging epithet, Christ on the other hand, as "the son of man," wears the honors of One, who, though He entered into all the weakness of human nature, and incurred its worst ills, yet rose again, and on this very account became the Mediator of a perfect communion with God, and the vehicle of all its consequent blessedness to the human race. By His righteousness He counterbalanced the sin of the old Adamic nature, and averts all its bitter results. He becomes also the sole Mediator between God and man, and appears as the One who from the lowest depths of humiliation, has been raised to utmost height of majesty. Comp. xx. 18; xxiv. 27, 30; xxv. 31; xxvi. 64, etc. All this was foreshadowed in the vision of Daniel, where the Son of man is seen to come in the clouds of heaven, and to whom is given eternal power and a kingdom without end (vii. 13), and where human nature thus honored by God, is contrasted with the brute nature, the beast, which develops itself in the kingdoms of this world. The oft-repeated title conferred on Ezekiel, בֶּן אָדָם: *thou Son of man*, may also be regarded as typical of this One who is preëminently *the* Son of man. It was bestowed on the prophet as the receiver of the Divine communications, and was as honorable as it was humiliating (comp. Gerlach on Ezek. ii. 1). Of the same sort was the epithet, "Man of God," which was conferred on the prophets and other messengers of God, and passed out from the Old Testament into the New Testament. In fine, it may be affirmed generally that wherever, and to the degree in which communion with God is in any way predicable, the designation "man" at once obtains a higher signification, and becomes one of honor, and is prophetic of exaltation. Elsewhere it carries the opposite import.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

HEUBNER:—1. The wisdom of the Christian teacher is shown in knowing how to adapt himself to different ages, and to regard the necessities of his congregation; and to build up beginners unto perfection (ver. 1). 2. To the carnal nature belong self-love, vanity, ambition; these traits are exhibited in strife and partizanship. There is a *zeal* which is nothing more than an eagerness to maintain our own opinion, cause, or party, simply because it is ours, and we expect to stand or fall with it, and not because conscience bids. From this comes *strife*, contention about points of difference. The issue is *division.* Since neither will yield, they separate. This accords with man's fashion. Just as if Christianity were an affair of schools and sects, or as if one could act in the Church just as he does in the political world where factions and jealousies abound (ver. 2).

RIEGER:—1. God's *method of instruction* requires that we do not *overload.* Novices are to be treated as children. We are to be considerate of their weaknesses, and not to crowd upon them those deeper doctrines which can be properly judged of only by such as are spiritual and strong. 2. In regard to "milk" and "strong meat" let us not err. "Milk" is a designation not of cheapness and meanness, but of what is most truthful and most nourishing to the spiritual life.—"Strong meat" signifies not every thing which our intellectual curiosity may lust after, but the deeper disclosures of the fundamental verities of God's kingdom, the knowledge of which promotes growth in grace. 3. The *carnal mind*, suspicious, opinionated, and thus divisive, not only begets oppositions in doctrine, but also diversities in practice, which end in schism.

STARKE:—1. CR: to become a believer is not the result of a fit of enthusiasm, as if the wind were to blow upon a person and he straightway became perfect; but we must hear, learn, pray, read, inquire until we are transformed from one degree of conviction unto another. 2. HED: God's children often have gross and unacknowledged faults which linger in them until they have waxed in faith and grown strong to overcome. 3. To discourse to young converts of the deeper mysteries of Christian doctrine were as irrational as to give strong meat to babes. And since with the majority growth is slow and difficult, we must often continue longer to deal out to them "the sincere milk of the Word."

GOSSNER:—Every one thinks his party has the kernel and others only the shell. Whereas they all are apt to let the kernel alone and dispute about the shell, as if that were the kernel (ver. 4). So is it with those who, having begun in spirit, go back to the flesh. Mistaking incidentals for essentials, they grow weak in the inward man and are soon puffed up (vv. 1, 21).

W. F. BESSER:—The mind of Christ tolerates no party-spirit, and no love of divisions. The conscience of many in this day is not sufficiently tender on this point. Indeed there are numbers who consider their Christianity so much the purer in proportion as they disregard the visible exhibition of Church unity, and are reckless in breaking the bond of peace which outwardly unites companions in one faith.

[R. W. ROBERTSON:—"Strong meat" does not mean high doctrine such as Election, Regeneration, Justification by faith, but "Perfection," strong demands on Self, a severe and noble Life

The danger of extreme demands made on hearts unprepared for such is seen in the case of Ananias.]

[N. Emmons. Ver. 2. *Doctrines of the Gospel food for Christians.* I. What doctrines the Apostle did preach to the Corinthians: *a.* Depravity; *b.* Regeneration; *c.* Love; *d.* Faith; *e.* Sanctification; *f.* Final Perseverance; *g.* Divine Sovereignty; *h.* Election. II. Why these are called milk:* *a.* Because they are easy to be understood; *b.* Because they are highly pleasing to the pious heart; *c.* Because they are nourishing. III. Why the Apostle preached these rather than others to the Corinthians: *a.* Their internal state required such preaching; *b.* Their external state required it. Improvement. 1. If these doctrines are milk, what is meat? *a.* The rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic Law; *b.* The types and predictions of the Old Testament; *c.* The predictions of the New Testament. 2. The doctrines which Paul preached to the Corinthians, as shown above, have been misrepresented. 3. We have a criterion to determine who are the plainest preachers. 4. No people are incapable of hearing the doctrines Paul preached to the Corinthians].

[* One would suppose the aforementioned doctrines to be the strongest kind of meat. The sermon is interesting as a specimen.]

V. THE ESTIMATE TO BE PUT ON TEACHERS AND THEIR WORK. THEIR VALUE TO BE PROVED IN THE DAY OF TRIAL.

Chapter III. 5–15.

5 Who then is Paul, who *is* Apollos,[1] but[2] ministers by whom ye believed, even as
6 the Lord gave to every man? I have [*om.* have] planted, Apollos watered; but God
7 gave [was giving] the increase. So then neither is he that planteth any thing, neither
8 he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase. Now he that planteth and he
that watereth are one: and every man [each one] shall receive his own reward accord-
9 ing to his own labour. For we are labourers together with God: ye are God's hus-
10 bandry, *ye are* God's building. According to the grace of God which is given unto
me, as a wise master builder, I have [*om.* have[3]] laid the foundation, and another
11 buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For
12 other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.[4] Now if
any man build upon this[5] foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble;
13 Every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it
shall be revealed by fire; and the fire [itself: *αὐτό*[6]] shall try every man's work of
14 what sort it is. If any man's work [shall] abide[7] which he hath built thereupon, he
15 shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but
he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.

[1] Ver. 5.—The Rec *τίς*, instead of which Lach. and Meyer read *τί* [following A. B. Cod. Sin. and others] is sustained by nearly the same preponderance of authorities as declare for the mention of Apollos first. The received text, which puts Paul first, is to be explained from vv. 4 and 6. The repetition of *ἐστίν* is also established by the better authorities.

[2] Ver. 5.—Before *διάκονοι* the Rec., which Tisch., 6th ed., follows, has *ἀλλ' ἤ*. This makes the question continue to *ἐπιστεύσατε*. But the best authorities are against this reading, and it is therefore rejected by Lach. Tisch. and others. [For the true rendering see the Exegetical comment.]

[3] Ver. 10.—The Rec. *τεθεικα* is retained by Tisch. ed. 6 [also Alf., Words.]. But Lach. following A. B. C. [Cod. Sin.] reads *ἔθηκα*.

[4] Ver. 11.—The Rec. *Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός* is feebly supported. Better *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*. Tisch., ed 6, *Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς*.

[5] Ver. 12.—*τουτόν* is rejected by Lach. according to A. B. C. [Cod. Sin.] but is retained by Tisch. in accordance with many weighty authorities [so too by Wordsworth, Alford].

[6] Ver. 13.—*αὐτο* is inserted after *πῦρ* by Lachmann, Meyer, Tisch. [Alford, Wordsworth, Stanley] according to the best authorities. [A. B. C. Cod. Sin. Origen, Chry. Eus., etc.]

[7] Ver. 14. *μενεῖ*, future, is better authenticated [Latin version]. Received *μένει* [see note].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

"From this point onward to ver. 23, Paul proceeds to explain in what light the Corinthians were to regard their spiritual teachers, and the work which these performed among them. And first, from vv. 5–9, he deals with the relation which the human instrumentalities sustain to the Lord who employs them; then, from vv. 10–15, with the responsibility which they have for their work and the decision to which it is liable; and, finally, from vv. 16–23, with the position which the Church holds and ought to pursue towards them."—Burger. Ver. 5.—**Who then is Apollos? and who is Paul?**—The reading *τί*: *what*, is at least as easily explainable on the ground that the answer given appears to point

rather to "what?" than to "who?" as the reading τίς is capable of being accounted for from the effort to assimilate the genders.—["οὖν: *then*, follows on the assumption of the truth of their divided state."—ALFORD.] The question here put is not to be regarded as coming from the readers (Rückert) *q. d.* "Who are Apollos and Paul, if we may not have them as our leaders?" This thought would have been expressed in quite a different manner—more his own.—(Comp. xv. 34; Rom. ix. 19 ff.). It is simpler to understand the connection thus: "You call yourselves after Apollos and Paul. Who are these persons, then? From the answer given, it is clearly implied that the partizanship of their followers does not accord with the spirit of the leaders they have chosen, and is condemned as a carnality.—**Ministers, through whom ye believed.**—Were ἀλλ' ἤ: *but*, to be taken as genuine (see under the text), then we should have here an emphatic implication that Apollos and Paul were nothing else than mere ministers. There is in these words a mixture of two constructions: οὐδὲν ἄλλο, ἀλλά: *nothing else but;* and οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἤ: *nothing else than.* So Meyer on 2 Cor. i. 13. Fritzsche, according to Hermann on Viger, construes it otherwise: "but either—or I know not what." The phrase is to be found in Luke xii. 15, where its correctness is undisputed. It was plainly, therefore, not rejected because of its objectionableness. διάκονοι: *deacons, ministers*, is here to be understood in its broadest sense, as contrasted with leaders. We may supplement "of your Church," comp. ver. 21, and Matth. xx. 28; or "of God," or "of Christ," comp. ver. 6 ff; 2 Cor. vi. 4, *etc.* The words following would favor the one as well as the other, or perhaps hint at a combination of the two="ministers of Christ in your behalf." (Col. i. 7.)—**through whom ye believed.**—Bengel says briefly and forcibly: "*Through* whom, not *in* whom" (Jas. i. 7). They are thereby designated as instruments in God's hand for the production of faith. And such they were in their function as preachers and teachers of truth. But this instrumentality was of different kinds; that of Paul, for the exercise of the faith, of Apollos, for its further development. This process is expressed in the aorist tense, as in Rom. xiii. 11; Gal. ii. 16.—**even as the Lord gave to each one.**—This statement is made to bring forward prominently the fact of the dependence of the ministers on the Lord, both for their gifts and their ministry, and so to dampen the disposition "to boast in men." καὶ ἑκάστῳ ὡς ὁ κύριος ἔδωκεν, not an instance of attraction, as if ἕκαστος sc. διάκονος ἐστιν, ὡς—ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ. But ἑκαστῳ stands first by way of emphasis, as in Rom. xii. 3, because having spoken of them in general, he wishes next to designate what is peculiar to each one. There is no need of taking "the Lord" to mean God, instead of Christ [so Hodge], contrary to the usage of Paul, nor are we compelled to this by vv. 6, 9, 10. The endowment of ministers with manifold gifts is also ascribed to Christ in Eph. iv. 7 ff. In what follows, when "God" is introduced, the Apostle is speaking of something else, *viz.* of the Divine blessing, and of the dependence on God for desired results.

VER. 6. **I planted, Apollos watered, but God was giving the increase.**—Under these figures Paul exhibits partly the diversity of operation between him and Apollos, and partly their equal dependence on Divine favor for success. Paul labored for the founding of the Church, for the planting of the spiritual crop; Apollos for the further development of the life of faith thus begun, for the edification of the Church; he watered and helped to mature the growing crop. But after all it was to God, as the efficient cause, that both owed the results obtained. It was His power, working in them and through them, that caused the faith to strike root, and spring up, and bring forth fruit. "Αὐξάνειν: *to increase*, a designation of the attainment of an object which had been furthered by the Divine powers at work in the instruments, and by divers other auxiliary operations of grace which accompanied or prepared the way for them. ["ηὔξανεν: *was giving.* Observe the force of the Imperfect, intimating a continued bestowal of Divine grace as distinguished from the transitory *acts* of His ministers whose operations are described by aorists."—WORDS.].

VER. 7. **So then** ["ὥστε: an illative particle of frequent occurrence" WORDS.] **neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth, but He that giveth the increase, even God.**—The inference here drawn goes to the discrediting of all human organs taken by themselves, and to the rebuking of all partisanship. ἔστι τι: *is any thing*, either *in numero est:* in account (comp. Acts ver. 36) or yet more strongly, is absolutely any thing. On the other hand, to the last clause we naturally supplement τὰ πάντα ἐστίν: is all (xv. 28; Col. iii. 11). Bengel: "is something, and, because He is alone, all things." What is here viewed separately for the purpose of counteracting the tendency to unduly exalt the instrument is elsewhere taken together; the agency of the instrument and the agency of God in their concrete unity (Rom. xi. 14; 1 Tim. iv. 16). ["In this passage ministers are brought into comparison with the Lord, and the reason of this comparison is, that mankind, while estimating grudgingly the grace of God, are too lavish in their commendation of ministers, and in this manner they snatch away what is God's, with a view of transferring it to themselves." CALVIN.].

VER. 8. **Now He that planteth and He that watereth are one.**—["ἕν: *one thing* neuter. God is ὁ εἷς, mas. He is the *one agent;* they are *an instrument* in His hands; and they are *one* as united together in Christ. But they are not what you would make them by your party factions to be, separate *persons* and rival *heads* and *leaders* of *opposing sects.*" WORDS.]. Paul does not here intend to deny the different merits of ministers or their separate worth, as though they all stood at par (Bengel, Billroth); he is referring only to their office and services. They are alike ministers. And in so saying he means to counteract all rivalry and all exaltation of one over another. The unity and mutual connection, which he asserts, do not, however, exclude diversities both in their labors and in the recognition of these labors, on the part of the Lord, in ways corresponding thereto.—**And**

each one shall receive his own reward according to his own labor.—The words "*his own*"—"*his own*" stand in contrast with "*are one.*" Bengel styles it "an appropriate repetition antithetic to the "*one.*" κόπος denotes not the *result*, but the labor, the *effort* put forth. This, however unsuccessful, involves a fidelity and devotion which can be estimated by God alone. κατά indicates also the qualitative, and not merely the quantitative relation—ἴδιον: *own*, that which especially belongs to each one, both in the labor expended and in the reward. The μισθός, as the context shows, signifies the Divine recompense. The full λήψεται (λήμψεται, Altic Ionic form) points to the reward which will be conferred at the coming of Christ. (Comp. iv. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 19; 2 Tim. iv. 8; Dan. xii. 3; Matth. xxv. 20 ff.; 1 Pet. v. 4). This reward is praise bestowed for the labor done. According to Bengel, "Something more than salvation." It is an addition to the blessedness common to all the subjects of grace, which, as Osiander observes, consists in the various degrees of glory (δόξα) conferred on them (comp. Luke xix. 17 ff.); moreover it is a reward of grace, since the whole thing rests upon the plan and promise and operation of grace. Yet it is apportioned in righteousness, "to each one his own." "Relatively to redemption nothing can be said of desert. But within the sphere of redemption, the question comes up, 'how faithfully has a person employed the grace received, and wrought with it. Here it can be asserted 'To him that hath shall be given.' This is what Paul means by *reward.*" NEANDER. That such a reward is to be expected appears from what follows:—

VER. 9. **For we are God's fellow-laborers, God's husbandry, God's building are ye.**—The emphatic word here is θεοῦ, *God's.* Since it is *God's* work to which we devote our labor, each in his own part, we are therefore to expect it from His truthfulness that He will not refuse to us the corresponding reward. This reference to what precedes (Meyer) has a decided advantage over that interpretation which regards these words as a comprehensive exposition of the calling of spiritual teachers, and their debt of service to the congregation (ver. 5 ff.), and especially of their oneness in it (ver. 8). In this case the γάρ, *for*, in relation to the first clause, would be explanatory and in reference to the second, causal (Osiander). "It is also preferable to that interpretation which, in order to make out here a rebuke of party spirit, takes the sense to be: Every thing is to be ascribed to God; therefore to God be all the glory." BURGER. Inasmuch as the idea of a reward recurs also in what follows, it perhaps would be more proper to regard these sentences only as confirmatory of what was said respecting the reward. [Stanley takes the "for" as giving the reason for the oneness among the teachers. "Their object is the same (though their modes of working are different), *for* it is *God* who is our fellow-laborer, *etc.*; therefore they cannot be set against each other." Hodge combines the two ideas]. Θεοῦ συνεργοί=God's helpers, who work with God,—not: "who do God's work associatedly" [as Olshausen], for this would be etymologically inadmissible. Even so συνεργὸν ἡμῶν, 1 Thess. iii. 2. Although God works all in all, yet He works through His servants, whom He recognizes as helpers in His work, and whom he suffers to work, each one in his own peculiar way. Calvin: *Eximium elogium ministerii, quod, quum per se agere possit Deus, nos homunciones tanquam adjutores adsiscat, per quos ita solus agit, ut tamen vicissim cum eo laborent* (cf. Osiander in loco). Here we have a hint of the dignity of the ministerial office, and of our obligation to keep in view God's objects in it. [Though, indeed, it must be said that the design of the argument is not to dignify the teachers, but to abate the excessive estimate put upon them]. Θεοῦ γεώργιον, a field belonging to God; so also θεοῦ οἰκοδομή, God's building. The Genitive of cause (=it is God who built you) [so Alford] is less fitting here, since Paul is speaking in the context concerning the performance and the reward of teachers, and in these statements he is establishing the expectation that God will grant to them their reward on the ground that that on which they are at work, belongs to Him. Γεώργιον (also in Prov. xxiv. 30; xxxi. 16)= *tilled land, a field, a garden, a vineyard*; οἰκοδομή, a word of the later Greek=οἰκοδομία, οἰκοδόμημα. Both indicate the kind of labor pursued by God's co-workers: the cultivation of a field, the rearing of a building. But in making God (θεοῦ) prominent, the subjects on both sides retire into the background in a corresponding degree. Hence neither "we" (ἡμεῖς) nor "you" (ὑμεῖς) is expressed. Taking the whole context in its broader scope, and considering the aim of the whole paragraph, we might suppose with Chrysostom, that in the repeated mention of God in the last clause there was an implied rebuke of the tendency in the Church to call themselves after men [so Words.] (ver. 4) (cf. Osiander). The figure in οἰκοδομη (building), analogous to that in the "temple of God" (ver. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 21) is carried out still further in what follows.

VER. 10. Paul here proceeds to state what he himself had done towards erecting God's building.—**According unto the grace of God, which was given unto me.**—By "grace" he means not the Apostolic office as such, but those peculiar endowments which qualified him for laying the foundation (comp. i. 3, 4). Lit. 'by virtue of the favor shown unto me.' And this favor was manifest both in the call to office and in the bestowment of those gifts which enabled him to become a co-worker with God. By this acknowledgment of his indebtedness in advance, he obviates all misconception with a wise humility, and avoids all appearance of arrogance. The same expression occurs in Rom. xv. 15; xii. 3; Gal. ii. 9; Eph. iii. 2.—**as a wise master master-builder I laid the foundation.**—This was done in that preaching of Christ crucified, which had first elicited their faith (ver. 11; ii. 2). ["θεμέλιον, *a foundation.* St. Paul uses the masculine form, ver. 11, and 2 Tim. ii. 19. St. Luke the neuter (Acts xvi. 26); which is Attic. The masculine is very appropriate here, because the foundation is Christ." Words. In saying that he laid this "as" a wise masterbuilder, "he does not vaunt himself, but propounds himself as an example." CHRYSOSTOM]. The

wisdom he claims, might be regarded as that betokened in the act of *laying a foundation*, since the attempt to build without such preliminary work would indicate a lack of sense. Yet ver. 11 seems to imply that he had reference to the *nature of the foundation*, in that it was the only one suited for a "building of God," and such a one as a wise builder would alone lay. [Why not both?]. Σοφός, *wise, skilful—thoroughly understanding his art.* The same usage occurs in the classics. The claim here made, tells against the partisan disparagement of his labors.—**and another buildeth thereon.**—ἄλλος *another*, not merely Apollos, but also every person who had engaged in the work of the ministry at Corinth, "more especially those successors of his who were still laboring in the Church." Osiander. (Comp. iv. 15). To such, he, as the Apostolic "masterbuilder," gives the caution.—**But let each one look how he buildeth thereon.**—"How," *i. e.* in what way, and with what material. He thus warns them of the greatness of their responsibility, and of the importance of making the edifice correspond with the foundation. On this point he explains himself further by showing what is the only proper foundation of a church.

Ver. 11. **For other foundation can no man lay besides that lying there.**—He here explains why he speaks simply of *building the superstructure*, and says nothing in regard to the *foundation*. This had been already laid, and was confessedly all right. There could possibly be no idea of changing or modifying that. ["In taking this for granted, he implies the strongest possible caution against attempting to lay any other." Alf.]. The emphasis here rests on "foundation," which is accordingly put first in the sentence. δύναται, not *may*, but *can*. Paul here wishes to express the absolute impossibility of change, without entirely destroying the character of the building. And hence there naturally follows the utter inadmissibleness of attempting to lay any other foundation. The thing is so contrary to the nature of the case, that no Christian teacher can be supposed willing to undertake it. παρά, *alongside of, and yet not touching;* hence, *besides, beyond, contrary to.* In regard to κείμενον, *lying there* it may be asked, whether the idea involved in τέθεικα, *I laid*, of ver. 10, is here resumed, so that it refers to what Paul had done ["in which case it would have been τεθέντα." Words.], or whether it implies what had been done by God in sending His Son to be our Redeemer, and laying him as the precious cornerstone of His Church [or whether it is with Words. to be taken in the middle sense as lying there "by His own free will and act."]. Adopting the second of the above interpretations, the verb "I laid," in ver. 10, would indicate Paul's accordance with the Divine procedure. He had laid in its place at Corinth that foundation which God had provided for the Church universal, by proclaiming Christ there as the only proper object of faith. This would accord better with the more general form κείμενον, and also establish the impossibility declared in the words, "can no man." 'If God has laid a foundation, then surely no Christian teacher will think of laying any other. Accordingly, I also have made this the basis of the Church at Corinth, and could do no otherwise.' ["This word, κεῖται, from which κείμενον comes, descriptive of Christ's character as the one foundation of His Church, is applied to Him in His first presentation in the material temple at Jerusalem. Luke ii. 34, οὗτος κεῖται εἰς πτῶσιν. It is observable also that the man of sin, who *places himself* as a foundation of the Church, in the room of Christ, is called ὁ ἀντικείμενος. 2 Thess. ii. 4." Words.]. What this foundation is, is expressed in the relative clause, —**which is Christ Jesus.**—By this he means Christ in His own *person*, not simply the *doctrine* of Christ as being a fundamental doctrine. ["The former interpretation which is adopted by many distinguished commentators (de Wette, Alf., Stanley), is more in accordance with the common representations of scripture, and perhaps also with the form of expression here used. The second, however, is certainly more consistent with the context. In saying that he had laid the foundation, Paul could only mean that he had in Corinth taught the doctrine concerning the person and work of Christ." Hodge. But surely it was not the doctrine as such that was the foundation. The doctrine availed only as it brought Christ directly and personally present to the mind of the Church, and induced them to build on Him. The distinction Kling maintains is a very important one. There is constant danger of persons mistaking the *doctrine* of Christ for the *person* of Christ. The former is the foundation of a *theology*, the latter of a *life*.]

Ver. 12. The nature of the foundation being settled, he now proceeds to consider the several ways in which superstructure might be carried up.—**But**—["The δέ implies that though there can be but *one* foundation, there *are many ways* of building upon it." Alf.]—**if any man build upon the foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble.**—He here illustrates the various kinds of material that might be employed in the edifice, either worthy and durable, that could stand the test of fire, or worthless and incapable of passing the ordeal. Both sorts are mentioned in lively succession, without any express exhibition of the diversities implied. According to the best and largest number of commentators, from Clem., Alex., down to Osiander and Meyer, Paul here intends to denote by this building material, not *persons*, but *doctrines*, such as when joined with faith in Christ may or may not suit the foundation; such as in worth and durability do or do not correspond with the precious indestructible corner-stone. That the wood, hay and stubble were designed in general to signify such teachings as mingled the weak and disfiguring products of human wisdom, art, philosophy and Jewish traditions with the truth of God, is very evident. But any attempts to particularize, either as to the dogmas referred to, or as to the parts of the building they were intended for, would be futile and out of taste. Moreover, we are to hold fast to the idea of but one building contemplated, into which all the different kinds of material specified are worked, and not to imagine [as Wetst., Billr., Stanley] that two sorts of building are had in view, such as a palace and a hut; or that a whole city was intended, "the city of God," for instance. We

might also very appropriately, but rather by way of accommodation, bring under consideration here the distinctive practical fruits produced under the different kinds of teaching and the different sorts of church members brought in and trained under the same. [So Theodoret adopted by Stanley, who deems the practical fruits the main thing referred to, and adds, "He is here preparing the way for the accusation of the incestuous person."]. To suppose, however, with Olsh., that there is any allusion to the private work of personal sanctification, would be untenable, inasmuch as the entire context treats solely of ministerial functions. Rückert's interpretation is too abstract and general. Proceeding on the ground that "work" (ἔργον) with Paul signifies the entire business of life, he takes the sense to be: "only he who builds upon the true foundation *in a right manner*, so that his work will abide the test, is entitled to a reward. He who builds on it unsuitably, can expect none. This only, however, can be said for his comfort, that he will not forfeit his salvation since it was his will at least to further the work of the Lord." On this whole subject, consult Osiander and Meyer. ["*Precious stones*" here means stones valuable for building, such as granite and marble. "*Gold and silver*," were extensively employed in adorning ancient temples, and are therefore appropriately used as symbols of pure doctrine. "*Wood, hay and stubble*" are the perishable materials out of which ordinary houses were built. Wood for the doors and posts, hay mixed with mud for the walls, and straw for the roof. These materials, unsuited for the temple of God, are the appropriate symbols of false doctrines." Hodge].

Ver. 13. **Every man's work will be made manifest.**—The worth or worthlessness, the durability or perishableness of what a man has wrought is not to remain concealed.—**For the day will declare it.**—*i. e.*, will make evident what is genuine or not genuine, what is truth and what mere show. This is a matter which often remains for a long time uncertain. But what are we to understand by this *day of revelation?* Not certainly the time of Jerusalem's overthrow [as Starke], for the Apostle is not speaking here of Jewish traditions, the vanity of which would then be exposed. Nor yet time in general, or any prolonged lapse of time, for the term "day" is never used in this sense by the New Testament writers, nor would it suit the following context. Ever since the period of the Reformation, Calvin's view has widely prevailed, that the allusion here is to the time when the pure knowledge of the Gospel should spread over the earth. So others also. But the apostolic usage and modes of thought warrant our understanding it only of the day of Christ's second coming (comp. iv. 5; Rom. ii. 16; 2 Cor. v. 10). This is the period of that searching, sifting trial which is to begin at the house of God (1 Pet. iv. 17), and which after manifold preludes will reach its consummation in the appearance of our Lord. In this sense the word "day" stands without any explanatory term in Heb. x. 25; 1 Thess. v. 4 ss.—**Because it is revealed in fire.**—What is revealed? The work of which he has just said "it shall be made manifest." To this it is objected that the sentence would in that case be tautological. But a repetition of this prominent thought will appear less strange in view of the fact that it is more distinctly defined by the additional words, "by fire," and that the following clause appears to be a fitting further development of them. It would indeed be most natural to regard "day" as the thing revealed. [So Alf., Stanley, Words., Hodge]. But nowhere is it said that the *day* of the Lord is revealed. Such a mode of speech would be unusual. It were better, with Bengel, to supply "the Lord" as the nominative, since indeed it is the day of *the Lord* that is referred to, and this construction would have its parallel in 2 Thess. i. 17: "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire." Here fire is represented as accompanying the manifestation of Jesus, (not, however, as a means of vengeance). But such a supplying of a word is warranted only in case no other suitable explanation can be found. If then "work" be the proper subject, "the fire" must be taken to denote that by which the work is tested. The relation of this clause to the foregoing then would be this: because fire is the agency by which the work is tried, therefore will the day of the Lord, who is to appear in flaming fire (2 Thess. i.), the day which is to burn as an oven (Matth. iv. 1), make this work manifest. ["To show the *certainty* and *perpetual imminence* of that fiery trial of the Last Day, Paul uses the present tense (ἀποκαλύπτεται) *is revealed*." Words.]—**And each one's work, what sort it is this fire itself shall prove.**—This clause stands independently of ὅτι, *because*, and sums up the whole truth, stating once more the ordeal contemplated and the peculiar means of its accomplishment. It is the fire that is to try the work, and demonstrate its quality—τὸ πῦρ αὐτό, *the fire itself*, by its own specific action. That this means neither the Holy Spirit nor yet persecutions of any sort is evident from the interpretation given to the word "day." Still less tenable is the Roman Catholic interpretation, which discovers herein an allusion to purgatory. (Council of Florence). ["The fire of which St. Paul speaks is the Fire of the Great Day; not a Fire of any intermediate state. And the Fire which he describes does not *cleanse*, as that intermediate fire is feigned to do, but *tries* and *destroys*. It is not a Purgatorial but a Probationary Fire." Words. Besides "Paul is here speaking of ministers and their doctrines, and not of believers in general." Hodge, 9, v. 1]. "We deny not that anticipations of the judicial fire of the Last Day may be traced in the fiery trials with which God will visit His own house (1 Pet. iv. 12–17); but the fire by which Christians will be refined and purged before the end comes will burn not on the other side but this side of death." W. F. Besser. Neander on the contrary says: "The fire is an image of the progressive purifying process which goes on along the course of the development of the Church. This process will allow only what is genuine and Divine to stand." It is, however, the outward and substantial manifestation of the judicial energy of the Lord, who will work as a purifying flame, so that everything in the labors of those who have been endeavor-

ing to build up the Church, that does not carry the Divine impress, but is the vain and perishable invention of man, will be brought to nought. Of this manifestation we have a prelude now in the continuous judgment of the Holy Ghost, and in the persecutions which the Church here suffers. The effect of it is exhibited antithetically in

VERS. 14, 15. **If any one's work shall abide which he built thereon, he shall receive a reward.**—This is the positive side. Μενεῖ, *shall abide* (the future corresponds with κατακαήσεται), shall stand the fire which is to consume all that is unworthy. "Reward," as in ver. 8. By this we may understand on the one hand, a presentation before Christ as a faithful and true workman, whose work is honorable to the Master (1 Thess. ii. 19 ff.; Phil. ii. 15 ff.); and on the other hand, an appointment to higher trusts in the kingdom of God (Dan. xii. 3; Matth. xix. 28; 2 Tim. iv. 8; Matth. xxv. 21–23). "The abiding of his edifice will be itself his great reward, just as Paul terms the fruit of his labor, and of his founding the Church his boasting and his crown in the day of the Lord (2 Cor. i. 14; Phil. ii. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 19). Still we do not in this completely gauge the reward of a true builder." W. F. BESSER.—Next comes the negative side.—**If any one's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss.**—The omission of the conjunction is owing to the rapid rush of the thought, and renders the style more vivid. The "loss" spoken of is not of "the work," but "the reward." True, the judicial fire, which consumes all impure and untenable doctrines, will also consume his whole performance; but the consequence will be that he will forfeit his reward, and so incur damage (comp. ζημιοῦσθαι, 2 Cor. vii. 7–9; Phil. iii. 8; Matth. xvi. 26). ["It is possible that this whole image, as addressed to the Corinthians, may have been suggested or at least illustrated by the conflagration of Corinth under Mummius; the stately temples (one of them remaining to this day) standing amidst the universal destruction of the meaner buildings." STANLEY].—**But he himself shall be saved;**—αὐτός δὲ, *he himself*, as contrasted with the reward [and also with the work]. Here it is presupposed that the individual has been building indeed upon the true foundation, Christ, but has failed only in respect to the manner of his building (from infirmity of the flesh or from ignorance, as Calvin suggests). Altogether superfluous and incorrect would it be to translate it 'he *can* be saved.' To supply the condition, 'if it be possible,' is wholly arbitrary; and still more so to assume that by 'work' is meant the scholars of a good teacher who perish without his fault. Many of the Fathers interpret σωθήσεται, *be saved*, in the sense of τηρηθήσεται, *should be preserved*, as if it meant: shall be not annihilated but kept alive in eternal torments and in fire. But this, apart from all other objections, is contrary to the usage of the word in the New Testament. It can only mean: he shall obtain salvation in Christ. "Here we have one clear evidence that salvation is not a *reward*, but is freely given to us through the merits of Christ." W. F. BESSER. — **Yet so as through fire.**—(διὰ πυρός). Herein is expressed the narrowness of the person's escape. [illegible]op with the snatched as a brand from the burn[illegible]d and stub-nothing but his bare life (comp. [illegible]little know-Amos iv. 11; Jude 23). The image [illegible]hrist, and of a man *living* in a house, but of one occupied with the building of it, and who just delivers himself with great effort from the conflagration that has caught his work, and sees in sadness and anxiety the loss of all he has done, to the marring of his blessedness. And such a person attains only to a lower stage of bliss (comp. Matth. xx. 16; Mark x. 31, last clause). So Meyer, rejecting however, the idea that words embody anything of the nature of a proverb, since Paul is here speaking literally of a consuming fire. But nevertheless the use of the word ὡς, *as*, constrains us to regard it as such. For although we should interpret "as" in the same manner as we do in Jno. i. 14, and render, 'just as one would expect in the case of a conflagration,' still it would amount to about the same thing. Only we might say it is not to be understood as a proverb *merely* (comp. Osiander, p. 174 f).

DOGMATICAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Ministers are co-workers with God.*—It is in this that the highest dignity of the Christian teacher consists. To wish to be nothing but an instrument for performing the Divine will, to aim at nothing but the fulfilment of God's designs, to desire to have and to exercise no power save what this line of action includes, to covet no reward, no honor, no enjoyment, excepting what comes from such labor, and helps to the more complete discharge of this calling, this is the characteristic of a servant of God, who follows Christ in self-denial and love, and purposes only to save souls for God and consecrates to this all his faculties, and is diligent to present to God a work pleasing to Him and honorable to His holy Son, and neither seeks nor strives after any glory for himself, but is content that God be exalted Supreme over all, and that His will alone should prevail. To such a person, nothing is too insignificant to be undertaken, provided it serves this end. No work will he be ashamed of or shun, even though it be among those who are low, or despised, or degraded, provided the gracious designs of God may be accomplished thereby. Such servants are, in truth, co-workers with God. He takes them into a fellowship of labor with Himself. He shares with them His exalted work of renewing, blessing, sanctifying and glorifying lost creatures. He shares with them also His authority, His power, His honor, His joy in this work. And this He is able to do because they have entered into a fellowship with Him in His thoughts and intentions by the operation of the Holy Ghost; because the spirit of Christ, God's perfect servant, animates them; because *His* mind is also *their* mind; and because the holy will of a self-denying, self-devoted love is alive and strong in their hearts. For this reason, they will have nothing to do with partizanship. It sickens them to see poor lost souls clinging to them and wishing to make them masters alongside of Christ, or in His place; to see people following *their* directions, and exalting *their* merely human and personal peculiarities into a standard of

might also y which to regulate their conduct. of accommedings they repel, and they strive here the er might instead to fasten souls upon under th their only master. The higher God differs them, the more intent are they on being tr.ining, and passing for nothing, in themselves. Then and thus the Church of God is built up in truth.

2. *This Church is God's field.*—This truth controverts all party action in the same way that the view just given, of teachers being God's servants and co-laborers, controverts it. The Church belongs to God; He it is who tills the field—*externally*, by the preaching of the Word—*internally*, by His Spirit. What teachers do is to plant and to water. But the word sown is His seed; all the ability employed in its first planting and after culture is His gift; on Him depends all success. Without His blessing, all planting and all watering, however skilful and careful, amount to nothing. What thus belongs to God is a sacred possession, which must be secured for Him. To wish to introduce another there as co-possessor is a wicked ignoring and contemning of God's right. Indeed, not to acknowledge this right in its *entireness*, is virtually to deny it *altogether* And such denial takes place when we adopt human teachers as our masters, and follow them, and call ourselves by their names. Then God is robbed of what is His (Rom. ii. 22).

3. *The Church is God's house.—Christ the foundation-stone, laid by Him.*—This is the ground and measure of all sound teaching. The foundation is of Divine worth and of lasting duration. To build anything on this, which is not according to the mind of Christ, which does not carry the impress of His Spirit, which does not spring from Him, but which originates in a foreign spirit, and is the product of human art, or science, or opinion—this is to introduce into God's building something, which, however highly it may be estimated by man, is in truth worthless. It cannot stand in the day of God's judicial purgation, however skillfully we may be able to vindicate it on human grounds. When Christ reveals Himself as the One to whom all judgment is given, when, by his majesty as Judge, he sifts out and destroys everything that is not His, then will this be found not proof. The fire of His judgement will annihilate it. Thus will the work of such a person come to naught. He can not be honored as one who has assisted in God's building. He cannot confront the Lord his judge with joy,—beholding in Him the Rewarder of his fidelity. On the contrary, he will shrink back in sorrow, pained at the thought of having wrought foolishly and to no purpose. Yet with all this, he will still have reason to congratulate himself that he may nevertheless snatch his soul from the flame which devours his unprofitable work. Thus it happens that the person himself may be saved, while all his doings prove worthless. From the common salvation, indeed, he may not be excluded, since he held fast to the foundation; but he forfeits the glory of being accounted a co-worker with God.

[4. *Every believer's work in life awaits a searching ordeal*, which is to prove its genuineness. The times of such ordeal are called in Scripture "days of the Lord." They occur for individuals and for communities all along the course of human history, and are the preludes to a final "day" when the Judge in person shall appear to purge His Church—the living temple—of all that is corrupt, and to set it up complete in the perfection of its beauty. Then will the value of each one's labor be fully manifest.

But what the specific means of this ordeal will be is a matter of question. Whether it will be by literal fire or by some other more spiritual instrumentality, of which fire is but a symbol, it were hard to determine. The latter seems the more probable in view of the declaration of the Baptist that Christ would "baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Such a baptism of purification is observable even in this age to some degree; yet it is not by material fire. We see the chaff of false doctrine and hypocritical performances, consuming and passing out of sight, as if perishing in consuming flames, while the golden truths of God, wrought out in the experiences and doings of the true believer, grow brighter, and live on to be a blessing to subsequent ages; and who can tell in what way the precious shall be taken from the vile at the last day? Sufficient to be assured that the ordeal will be applied in the most searching manner, and that it awaits every member of the Church. Judgment is to begin at the House of God.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

RIEGER: 1. *Mischievous zeal.* *a.* How kindled? By making too much of diversities of gifts in ministers. Here one is blamed if the Church be not edified, and there another is extolled, if by his preaching the light begins to burn more brightly, and people consider not that with the one as well as with the other, "the increase" depends on God, and that the inequality of results, so far as it lies with men, may be attributed not so much to the preacher as to the peculiarity of times and circumstances. *b.* How shall such evils be guarded against? Safety will be found just in proportion as the minister follows the simple word of God, and resolves to be nothing, and seek nothing for himself; just in proportion as he endeavors to improve impartially every thing that God sends, without attempting to determine prematurely to his own injury what the distinctive importance of it is in the sight of God.

2. *Co-workers with God.*—God has chosen laborers, *a.* not because he needs assistance, but *b.* out of his own good pleasure, inasmuch as he desires to work *on* men *through* men, so that each person's love for the truth, and readiness to obey may be more signally manifested.

3. *Caution in building.*—*a.* In building each one must take heed not only that he builds on the foundation, but that he uses good material and builds well. He must speak the truth in love, bring sound doctrines into their proper connection, employ suitable aids to discourse, and learn the art of seizing upon the hearts and consciences of men. *b.* The hearers, too, have need of care rightly to improve their advantages, since much of the preacher's success depends upon their fidelity in receiving and practising what they hear.

4. *Differences in the superstructure, though resting upon the right foundation*, are found according as a person *a.* either adheres to that which is closely akin to the foundation, selecting that which promotes the salvation and edification of souls, *b.* or prefers what is alien in character, resorting to what pleases men, or promotes his renown, or gratifies a vain curiosity, rather than to what is of solid worth and promotes vital godliness.

5. [*Preparation for the final ordeal.* If there is to be a day of visitation and trial, how important to be examining our own work in advance and subjecting it to the most rigid tests, lest we be overwhelmed at last with utter dismay at our loss, and have the mortification of discovering too late that we spent our strength for naught, and have only our souls for a prey. Ver. 13 ff.].

STARKE:—All good comes from God and must be ascribed to him. No boasting. No exaltation of one at the expense of another (10, 11). Not wrong to prefer listening to enlightened and regenerated preachers, rather than to such as are carnally minded. Wrong comes when amid diversified gifts in genuine ministers we cleave to one and contemn the rest. This is to sin not only against those contemned, but also against God. This is to evince a lack of just spiritual taste, and to bring to the sermon, the ear rather than the heart. The preachers office an effective instrumentality for saving souls. The gifts and labors of the ministry diversified yet inseparable. One plays into the hands of the other. Preaching must be followed up. Instrumentalities are needed in the spiritual as much as in the temporal husbandry. Their efficient power, however, comes from God. It lies in the word as it lies in the seed. God works through the word on the heart. (Ver. 6, 7). Be satisfied with planting and watering. Should no crop ripen accept it as God's will. Let not those more richly endowed and occupying more elevated positions exalt themselves above those holding a lower station. Nor let those below be troubled because they are there. All alike are servants of God (2 Cor. xii. 11) (ver. 8). Ministers labor with God, not as though associating their power with His, but as having His power working in them, (by the grace granted them of God, ch. xv. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 5 ff.); yet according to the degree of culture enjoyed by each one, and also according to the native talents possessed which the Lord sanctifies (Hedinger). He who wishes to have part in the heavenly paradise, must first consent to form a part of God's earthly farm, and suffer himself to be ploughed, and sowed, and reaped (Ver. 9). As a house is not built in a day, so neither is the Church. It rises gradually (Ver. 9). Christ is the foundation, 1. *in His Person*, as God (Col. i. 17), and man, (Acts. iv. 12), and in both his natures; the whole Church (Eph. ii. 20) and each believer is firm only when *resting* on Christ. Yea, since believers are "*lively* stones" (1 Pet. ii. 8) and Christ a *living* foundation, all the stones must be supposed to derive their life from Him. 2. *in doctrine*, by means of which we are brought to Him as the sole Life-giver (Jno. xiv. 6), and by faith are justified, sanctified and glorified. They who would build a church for Christ by insisting only upon a reputable conduct, erect a structure without a foundation. It must, therefore, fall of itself (Ver. 13). Better erect no superstructure and stop with the foundation, than to go on piling wood and stubble. Better simplicity in Christ with a little knowledge, than much learning without Christ, and a brain full of the fine spun cobwebs of worldly wisdom (Hedinger) (ver. 11). Fire tests and destroys. By the cross, by persecutions, by death through the judgment it will be shown what is wheat and what chaff, what is a pithy saying and what the dry lifeless conception of some subtle logician or wrangler of the schools (Hedinger) (ver. 13).

HEUBNER:—The Christian Church is a garden; ministers the gardeners. The analogy may be carried out to the full, both as to labor and dependence (ver. 6). God's Spirit has his times and seasons for operation (Ver. 7). Ministers, however various in character and office, have one problem to work out, and therefore should be harmonious. Hereafter all will enjoy the work of all (Ver. 8). What an honor to assist the Almighty! God's part in the work, however, is the chief thing. If He leaves the field—the human heart, waste, it lies eternally waste. But He does work on us. And how faithfully oftentimes on one single soul! Ministers come in as instruments. They work under Him upon the field, which has to be broken up by the ploughshare of the Law, sown with the seed of the Gospel, warmed by the influences of the Holy Spirit, and fructified by the dew and rain of divine grace (Ver. 9). An ordeal is coming. Anticipate it. Examine thyself in all that thou thinkest, teachest, preachest. Inquire whether thou art trusting to thyself for vindication at the bar of God (Ver. 13).

GOSSNER:—The love we show to ministers should be very different from that we show to Christ. They only *proclaim* grace; He *bestows* it. Hence while they are welcomed, He should be beloved. With them it is an honor if they may only preach, but He saves at the cost of His own blood (Ver. 5.) God is so gracious that although He is the source of all goodness, yet He rewards His servants as if they had done it all (Ver. 14).

[F. W. ROBERTSON:—The preaching of Christ means simply the preaching of *Christ*. Recollect what Paul's Christianity was—how he sums all up. "That I might know Him and the power of His resurrection," etc. Settle it in your hearts; Christianity is Christ; understand Him, breathe His Spirit, comprehend His mind. Christianity is a life—a Spirit (Ver. 11). There is a distinction between the *truth* of work and its *sincerity*. In that day nothing shall stand but what is *true*; but the sincere worker, even of untrue work, shall be saved. Sincerity shall save him in that day, but it cannot accredit his work (Ver. 15).

M. HENRY:—The ministry is a very useful and a very gracious institution; and faithful ministers are a great blessing to any people; yet the folly and weakness of people may do much mischief by what is in itself a blessing].

[VER. 5. If Paul and Apollos were nothing but servants, and refused the position of party leaders, how much more should this modesty appear in their successors. Who will arrogate the honors in a church which a Paul declines?]

[J. Saurin. 11–15:—*The different methods of preachers.* I. The occasion of these words, as shown in the Epistle. II. The design of the Apostle,—to rectify our judgments in regard to three different classes of preachers; *a.* such as preach the word of man not only different from, but directly opposite to the word of God (ver. 11); *b.* such as preach the pure word of God free from human admixtures (ver. 12); *c.* such as indeed make the word of God the ground of their preaching, but mix with it the explications and traditions of men (ver. 12[2]). III. Explain the metaphors. *a.* Christ, the foundation. *b.* Gold, silver, and precious stones—doctrines sublime, excellent, demonstrable. *c.* Wood, hay and stubble—doctrines less considerable, uncertain, unimportant. *d.* The revelation by fire—the examination and disclosures of the last judgment, not the destruction of Jerusalem, nor the fire of purgatory. IV. Application—in what manner we are to regard the three classes of ministers].

VI.—THE RUPTURE OF THE CHURCH BY PARTY SPIRIT PROVOKES HEAVY JUDGMENT. THE RENUNCIATION OF OUR OWN WISDOM THE CONDITION OF TRUE WISDOM. THE LOFTY TITLE OF CHRISTIANS TO ALL THE INSTRUMENTALITIES AND MEANS OF SALVATION.

Chapter III. 16–23.

16 Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, [God's temple[1]] and *that* the Spirit of
17 God dwelleth in you? If any man defile [destroy] the temple of God, him[2] shall God
18 destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which *temple* ye are [of which sort are ye]. Let
no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world [3] let him
19 become a fool, that he may be [become] wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness
20 with God: for it is written, He [that] taketh the wise in their own craftiness. And
21 again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain. Therefore let no
22 man glory in men: for all things are yours; Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or
the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are [*om.* are[4]]
23 yours; And ye are Christ's; and Christ *is* God's.

[1] Ver. 16.—["God's" should stand first as in the Gr. to mark the emphasis].
[2] Ver. 17.—Τοῦτον. Lach., Tisch., and others read αὐτόν according to many and in part weighty authorities [A. D. F. Syr.]. Meyer: "τοῦτον, because after εἴ τις in the protasis αὐτόν is most usually employed, and it was corrected to this as more usual." [So Alf., Words, and others following B. C. L. Cod. Sin.].
[3] Ver. 18.—[The proper order is, "If any one thinketh to be wise among you in this world." See exegesis].
[4] Ver. 17.—ἐστιν is to be omitted according to preponderant authorities [A. B. C. D. F. Cod. Sin.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

["He passes to another argument against the sin of ranging themselves in opposite factions under human leaders, particularly such as corrupt the essential purity and fundamental soundness of the spiritual fabric of the Church." Words.].

Ver. 16. **Know ye not that ye are God's temple?**—It will hardly do to connect these words directly with the preceding—if for no other reason than simply because the threat of destruction made in the following verse stands in direct contradiction to the promise of salvation there held forth, showing that Paul has a new case in mind. [Olshausen, however, regards the Apostle as simply intensifying and carrying out still further his previous figure. The edifice is now spoken of as God's temple, and the guilt of desecrating or injuring the building by introducing incoherent materials into its structure is enhanced in proportion. And still further, the taught as well as the teachers are also here brought into view. So substantially Hodge, Alf., Stanley; Calvin says more correctly: "Having admonished the teachers as to their duty, he now addresses himself to the pupils"]. Οὐκ οἴδατε: *know ye not?* This phrase is not to be confounded with ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε: *or know ye not?*—and it might very well serve to introduce a new turn of thought, indirectly suggested by what precedes. Thus far, Paul has contemplated the Church as a building belonging to God, and has exhibited the great responsibility attendant on the work of erecting it, after the only proper foundation has been laid. Now he describes its sacred character more fully by likening it to a temple inhabited by God's Spirit, the violation of which incurs condign punishment. By the question: Know ye not? he appeals directly to the consciousness of Christians and intimates to his readers that in that spirit of partisanship which they cherished and which was so destructive to the integrity of the Church, there was a strange and criminal obscuration of true Christian feeling, inasmuch as they were conducting themselves just as if they possessed it not, and knew not what belonged to their profession. In the objective clause the emphasis lies on

temple (ναός), marking an advance upon the more indefinite term, *building*, used before. ναός, according to its derivation, (ναίω) means indeed a building in general. But the Greeks used the word only to denote the dwellings of gods, and especially that room where the image stood. ["ναὸς is more holy than ἱερόν." WORDS.]. Here it denotes the spiritual sanctuary, the place where the true God reveals His presence, and bestows blessings, and is worshipped, forming one complete whole, and consisting of all such as carry in themselves the Spirit of God. This appears from the explanatory clause following—**and** (και explicative) **that the Spirit of God dwells in you.**—Hence Christians are called "a spiritual house" (1 Pet. ii. 5), also "a habitation of God through the Spirit" (Eph. ii. 22); comp. also 2 Cor. vi. 16 ff.; Rom. viii. 9, 11; 2 Tim. i. 14; Ez. xxxvii. 27, *etc.* οἰκεῖν, *to reside permanently* (comp. Jno. xiv. 23.) The words ἐν ὑμῖν, *in you* (not, 'among you'), refers, like the statement: 'ye are the temple,' to the Church, or to individual believers, not, however in their separate capacity, but in their organic connection. Here the law of all organization obtains that every organ is a complete whole in itself. As Christendom unitedly is a "temple of God," so is also every Christian congregation and every individual Christian. But as the whole is to be understood and apprehended only in its parts, so are the parts to be understood only as connected in the whole. The translation: '*the* temple of God' is by no means needed for the sake of setting aside the idea of a plurality of temples. We can employ the rendering: '*a* temple of God,' simply as signifying the kind of building implied. [Meyer on the contrary more justly says: "ναὸς θεοῦ is *the temple* of God, not *a* temple, for Paul does not conceive of the various churches as *various temples* of God, which would be inconsistent with the Jew's conception of God's temple; but of each Christian church as in a mystic sense *the temple of Jehovah.* So there are not many temples, but one only, and many churches, each one of which is ideally the same temple of God." So Stanley and Alford].

VER. 17. **If any one destroy the temple of God, him will God destroy.**—This is the first clause in an inference which rests upon the undoubted recognition of the inviolability of the temple of God, as maintained also in the Jewish Scriptures. All injuring, or desecrating, or even disturbing the sanctuary of God's manifested presence, was deemed a sacrilege, which incurred the Divine vengeance. This is strongly indicated by the immediate succession of the same word in the two forms, φθείρει and φθερεῖ. "If any the temple of God destroyeth, destroy him shall God." See a like case in Rev. xxii. 18. The punishment here implied as related to the old temple was that of temporal death. Used, however, in relation to the spiritual temple, the word, in the first instance, signifies the rupturing of the Church by violent partisanship, which must finally end in its entire dissolution; and in the second instance, as indicating the consequent punishment, it denotes exclusion from salvation (απώλεια). [Stanley says that "φθείρειν, in the LXX. and in the New Testament, seems to have lost the sense of '*defile*,' and merely to retain that of '*mar*' or '*destroy*.'" And so Hodge, who says "the passage may be rendered 'If any man injure the temple of God, him will God injure.'" Olshausen goes still further: "The connection shows that the word cannot be understood of absolute destruction. Probably the Apostle chose the strong word only on account of its having been used just before for the purpose of intimating that God would requite like with like." But such modification of its plain meaning is certainly contrary to the parallel which the Apostle introduces. The violater of the sanctuary of the ancient temple was unquestionably punished with death. And to preserve the analogy, we ought to maintain the word φθείρειν in its original signification].

Next follows the proof with the application of the penal principle just stated to the case in hand. —**For the temple of God is holy.**—It lies in the very idea of a temple that it is holy and inviolable, and that therefore all injury done to it is a crime.—**And of this sort are ye**—οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς ὅστις refers to the object *generally* as one of a class, and not definitely, thus serving to render a proposition general; here it means: of which sort, *viz.*, "holy." The antecedent here is not "temple," but the adjective "holy."* That they were the temple of God he had already asserted in ver. 16. "Recurring to ch. i. 1 he hereby awakens a feeling of reverence and a holy communion of Spirit in opposition to that unworthy servility engendered by a divisive regard for human authorities." OSIANDER. ["Meyer well remarks that this clause is the minor proposition of a syllogism: Whoever mars the temple of God, him will God destroy, because His temple is holy: but ye are are also holy as His spiritual temple: therefore whoever mars you shall be destroyed by God." ALFORD].

VER. 18. The Apostle now proceeds to point out the real source of the mischief he rebukes. The rupture of the unity of the Church by a party spirit, sprang from a pride of knowledge, and a vain conceit of that wisdom which belonged to this world, and not to God's kingdom. This was especially the case with the party of Apollos, which the Apostle seems chiefly to have in his eye, throughout this chapter. As it took pride in Apollos, because of his dialectic and rhetorical skill and learning, and clung to these qualities in him, so also did it seek to imitate his manner, and signalized itself for laying a great stress upon secular wisdom, and for no little conceit in that respect. This tendency Paul denounces as unfounded in truth, and unsuited to such as strive for the kingdom of God. In his view it involves a self-deception, more or less gross, against which he felt constrained to warn them.—**Let no one deceive himself.**—The deception here consisted in a person's imagining himself to possess a profound insight into the truth and ways of God, when in fact he was utterly devoid of it, yea, was involved in entire misapprehension and gross blindness in reference to it. Such delusion passes away only when all conceit of wisdom is

[* Hodge prefers the rendering of the E. V. which follows that of all the previous English versions, as well as the Syriac, Vulgate and Luther's. And this rendering is sustained by *Jelf. Gr. Gram.* § 816. 7, § 821. 3. The plural in οἵτινες is to be explained on the principle of attraction.]

given up, and a person is willing to be regarded a fool, or consents to renounce all secular wisdom in the exercise of that simple faith which he before had regarded as folly, and which passes for folly with the world. And this is what the Apostle requires when he says:—**If any one thinketh to be wise among you in this world, let him become a fool that he may be wise.**—Δοκεῖν may mean either: *to think*, or *to appear;* hence the clause may here be translated, "if any one passes for a wise man, either in his own estimation," or "in others' estimation." The former rendering is best sustained by what has been said before. Hence the exhoration, "let him become a fool," must be understood as relating to his own, and not to others' judgment, and in such a way that either the words παρ' ἑαυτῷ, *in his own esteem*, shall besupplied; or that the person be regarded as passing over to a standpoint, which had until then appeared to him and to others like-minded as folly. The latter sense best suits the word. [And here it must be borne in mind that this renunciation of our own wisdom, or of the world's wisdom, is required because all such wisdom is one only in appearance, and not in reality. It is its intrinsic worthlessness that renders it discreditable]. The phrase "in this world," lit. "in this age," is not to be united with the clause following, [as Origen, Chrysostom, Luther, Rosenmuller] as though it meant, "let him become a fool in this world;" the order of the words forbids this. But it belongs to 'wise,' as designating the sphere where this wisdom prevails; *q. d.* 'wise in this world' (comp. ver. 19). [Alf. following Meyer says: "it belongs not simply to 'wise,' but to the whole clause going before; to the whole assumption of wisdom made by the man, which as made in this *present world*, must be false; "for," adds Meyer, "those very persons who thought to become eminent among Christians through their wisdom in this premessianic period, when the knowledge of Divine things is yet in its infancy, and exceedingly limited, were not really wise, but were ensnared by their own self-decit." Such a limitation, however, of the meaning of the word αἰων, *age*, here is very questionable. It is plain from the following verse, that "this age" is to be interpreted not temporally, but qualitatively, as synonymous with "this world" (κόσμος)]. Ἐν ὑμῖν, *among you*, designates the sphere in which the person supposed hopes to shine by his wisdom.

Vers. 19, 20. Sustain the previous exhortation, and shows that in becoming a fool a person but coincides with God's judgment.—**For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God** —As such, therefore, it deserves to be cast aside. "Wisdom of this world" (κόσμος), comp. i. 21; ii. 6. "It is a wisdom ruled by the spirit of this world that oversteps its proper bounds, seeks to satisfy itself about divine and human things, is tainted with error, and therefore stands in direct opposition aliko to the highest reason, and to God, and to great objects for which the world and man were created (μωρία)." Osiander. [παρὰ τῷ θεῷ—παρά is used with the Dative "to express standing before a person as a judge, and submitting to his decision or sentence." Hence the expression 'before God' carries a deeper meaning than simply 'in his sight.' God has passed upon it and condemned it.]—The proof of this.—**For it is written, "He taking the wise in their own craftiness."**—This passage is cited from Job v. 13, and is a part of the speech of Eliphas. It accords with the original text, and agrees in sense with the Septuagint. [The phraseology of the latter, however, is changed for stronger terms. δρασσόμενος, *catching* for καταλαμβάνων, *taking* and πανουργία, *craftiness* for φρονήσει, *prudence*]. The sentence is incomplete, since Paul quotes only the words suited to his purpose, omitting those on which these grammatically depend. Hence they need no supplement. Human wisdom, art, cunning are here stated to be incapable of standing before the wisdom of God, since God catches those who rely on these aids, in their own craftiness, and the very excellencies on which they pride themselves, are turned into a snare through which they are entrapped. By thus causing them to be destroyed by their own devices, God shows them up to be nothing less than the veriest fools. This citation, the only one in the New Testament, taken from the book of Job, like much which Eliphas spoke, belongs to that wisdom which uttereth her voice in the streets, and is marked as here with the stamp of Divine truth.—**And again.—'The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise that they are vain.'**—This second passage, taken from Ps. xciv. 11, was originally directed against those proud contemners of God, who acted as if there were no God above, observing and noting down all their unrighteous deeds. In accordance with the object he has in view, Paul here employs the word "the wise," instead of "men," as it stands both in the original Heb. and in the Sept. But this is no arbitrary alteration, since the whole Psalm treats of those vain sophists, who pride themselves on their perverse and groundless notions respecting God. Διαλογισμοί in Hellenic speech, was used to denote all those capricious reasonings and reflections which either opposed Divine truth or tended to render it doubtful, comp. Rom. i. 21; Eph. iv. 17. Μάταιοι, *groundless, void of truth*, therefore, counter to wisdom, and belonging to folly. Whether this word in the original belongs to the wise themselves, or to their reasonings, is questionable. The essential meaning is the samo in either case. ["It appears from these two verses thus placed in juxtaposition, that St. Paul followed the LXX., but uses his own discretion in doing so, and sometimes substitutes for it a translation approaching more nearly the original." Words.].

Vers. 21–23. From all this a warning is derived.—**So then**—ὥστε.—["This word is used by St. Paul to introduce the summing up and conclusion of his argument here and elsewhere in this Epistle, iii. 7; iv. 5; viii. 38; xi. 33; xiv. 39; xv. 58."—Words.] It serves even in classical writers to introduce an imperative clause when this follows upon another which contains the reason why such command is given. (Comp. Passow, ii. 2.) [Also Winer, *N. T., Gr. Pt.* iii. 5, note 1; also *Jelf. Gr. Gram.*, § 867, 1].—**Let no one glory in men.**—That is, so far as they set up for themselves, and rely on their natural powers—not as possessed of

spiritual gifts and because of such. In the latter case the boasting would be in the Lord. The caution is addressed to those who are inclined to make much of men in consequence of their education or supposed wisdom, cleaving to them in partisan attachment, and disparaging other servants of Christ in comparison, to the overlooking of the unity of the Church. Such persons are guilty of putting the highest value on what is merely a natural advantage. And all such should be avoided by reflecting, that the wisdom of this world is folly with God. For this there was an additional reason:—**For all things are yours.**—Here he exhibits to us the dignity of Christians, [in contrast with the world and its folly], as persons who, by virtue of their union with Christ and, through Him, with God, are precluded from dependence on men, and have a direct claim on every thing which belongs to God and Christ, so that all things serve their advantage and promote their exalted destiny (Rom. viii. 28)—even as all things are compelled to serve Christ (Matth. xxi. 3; xxvii. 60; xi. 27). As Neander well says: "The sovereignty over the world was indeed conferred on man in his original estate. But this, being lost through sin, was restored again by redemption. The spirit which is bestowed on Christians, carries in itself a principle which every thing must eventually obey, and which will subjugate the world ever more and more, until at last the promise, that 'the meek shall inherit the earth,' is fulfilled, and the world has become the theatre of the Divine kingdom.' From the drift of the passage we may see the utter groundlessness of Billroth's view, who supposes the warning here to be addressed to teachers, cautioning them against boasting on account of their partisans. In such a case, we should be obliged to interpret 'yours' of the teachers, which would be impossible. It is to *the Church in general* that Paul is here speaking. Instead of glorying with a one-sided partiality, in the fact that this or that person belonged to them as their master, he would have them maintain a blessed consciousness of the privilege, that all things and persons belonged to them alike.

What in particular these things were, he goes on to specify, beginning with the teachers whom they had made the occasion of their strifes.—**Whether Paul, or Apollos or Cephas.**—(Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 5.) Each one of these they were all to turn to their own advantage, instead of adhering to any one exclusively. Here he could not add, "or Christ," for this would be to reduce Christ to the same footing with his servants. The Christ-party do not come into view here, and could not, "since their relation to the Apostles was only a negative one" (comp. on i. 12).—**or the world.**—"This leap from Peter to the whole world gives a sudden breadth to the discourse, as if he were borne on with a sort of impatience to set forth his theme in its fullest scope."—BENGEL. Comp. Rom. viii. 38. There is here neither a climax, as if he were proceeding upward from the lowest point, nor an argument from the less to the greater, [as Calvin, when he says: "If Christ has subjected to you also the world and life and death, how much more men, so that they should *serve* rather than *rule* you?"] Nor is the term 'world' to be understood as denoting: 'the university of the learned;' nor yet: 'the knowledge of all natural things' wherein the learned boast; nor: 'unbelieving teachers as contrasted with the aforementioned believing ones;' nor: 'all the rest of mankind.' But the word is to be taken in its most comprehensive sense; Christians, who are the destined "heirs of the world" (Rom. iv. 38), have even now a claim upon the world. It belongs to them. It must serve them. Yet in order not to make the term synonymous with the expression: "all things" (ver. 21) we shall have to limit it (with Osiander) to mean the visible world, with a special reference to mankind dwelling in it. ["The present order of things," says Hodge, "is maintained and directed to the promotion of the great work of redemption." And Barnes well expands the thought, 'the world is yours,' under four particulars: (1) The world was made by the common Father, and all His children have an interest in it as His work. (2) The frame of the universe is sustained and upheld for their sake. (3) The course of providential events is ordered for their welfare. (4) They have the promise of as much of this world as is needful for them (Matth. vi. 33; Mark x. 29, 30; 1 Tim. iv. 8)]. With this view the following members of the sentence best accord.—There we have indicated the most momentous states and changes belonging to this visible sphere.—**or life, or death.**—The former expresses the fullest exercise of all our vital energies in all its varied influence and bearings; the latter denotes the entire suppression of this activity. And both these must promote the advantage of believers and help onward their salvation. ["They are dispensed and administered so as best to fulfil the designs of God in reference to the Church. The greatest men of the world, kings, statesmen and heroes, ministers, individual believers and unbelievers, live and die just as best subserves the interest of Christ's kingdom."—HODGE. "'Life is yours': (1) Because believers *enjoy* it. It is a *real* life, not vain show. (2) Because its various events tend to promote their welfare and work together for their good." "'Death is yours': (1) Because believers have *peace* and support in their dying hour. (2) Because it is the avenue which leads to their rest. (3) Because they should triumph over it, in that it will be swallowed up in the glory of a higher life, releasing us from what is mortal to put on immortality."—BARNES.]—**Or things present or things to come.**—These terms alike refer to the present life, and include all its vicissitudes from the passing moment onward, whether joyful or sorrowful.—**All are yours.**—A summing up and emphatic reassertion of what he opened with. And from this he passes on to state the ground on which Christians possess such wealth. **But ye are Christ's.**—["Here the category changes; *Christ* is not *yours* in the sense in which 'all things' are—not made for and subserving you—but (δέ) you are His."—ALFORD]. It is this fact which gives to believers their royal power over all creaturely existences. By partaking in Christ's redemption, they once more attain unto a dignity which originally belonged

to man (Gen. i. 26; Ps. viii. 6) and which is promised God's people (Ex. xix. 6). And this is a dignity far transcending all that ever was surmised by Pagans or is expressed in their most famous sayings—such as: 'the wise alone are kings—are rich—are free. "The analogousness of such language to that of the New Testament indicates the remaining traces of the nobility of human nature; but without Gospel redemption the dignity of man thus set forth would be wholly unrealized. Antiquity planted itself upon self-exaltation, Christianity on self-humiliation."—NEANDER. (Comp. ii. 15; 1 Jno. v. 1; Rev. iii. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 9). By belonging to Christ, the Church and all its true members become partakers of his glory as the One to whom all things have been given by the Father. In their fellowship with Him—a fellowship involving entire dependence on their part—they are made independent of all else, and all else stands at their service. By the fact expressed in: "ye are Christ's," all partizanship is cut off, all generic differences are dissolved, and a proper relation to all teachers established. Meyer says finely that the *active* relation of *possession* mentioned in ver. 22 ('all things are yours') and the *passive* relation of *being possessed* here brought out ('ye are Christ's') are both alike opposed to the disorders arising from subservience to human authorities. We may, perhaps, detect here a slight intimation intended for the Christ party, that in their partisan appeal to Christ there was an ignoring of that connection which all alike sustained to Him, and a disparaging levelling of their Lord to an equality with human leaders.—**But Christ is God's.**—["And even being Christ's does not reach the highest possession: He possesses you not *for Himself, but* (δέ, again) the head of Christ is God," (xi. 3).—ALFORD.] Thus it is shown that by belonging to Christ we indirectly belong to God, and are planted upon an immovable basis of independence and power (comp. Jno. x. 28–30). And so, on the one hand, we see our union to God to be mediated by Christ, and, on the other, that Christ is subordinated to the Father, as shown in xi. 3. To consider this subordination however as belonging solely to His human nature, would not accord with a correct view of the whole subject. It is the *whole Christ* that is here spoken of, and that too not simply as in His state of humiliation, but also in His state of glory (comp. xv. 28; Phil. ii. 9). In His essential equality with God, He is at the same time *subordinated* to God (comp. Jno. v. 23–26; xiv. 28; xvii. 3). ["There is," says Alford, "a striking similarity in the argument in this last verse to that in our Lord's prohibition, Matth. xxiii. 8–10, 'But be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ; and call no man your father upon earth, for one is your Father, who is in heaven.'"]. "This last clause gives to the whole course of thought a most exalted close, and to the argument presented its strongest and noblest foundation, and rounds off the whole paragraph by a most fitting allusion to the idea of the one holy temple of God with which it opened (ver. 16, comp. ver. 9), in order to show Christians that by virtue of their union to God through Christ they are really taught of God."—OSIANDER.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The sacredness and inviolability of the Church.* It is God's temple. If so, then it is the place of His gracious presence—His sanctuary, to be treated with tender reverence and awe. To introduce strange fire (Lev. x. 1, 2) into it is a sacrilege which incurs the heaviest judgment, even an exclusion from the communion of saints. Of this crime they are guilty who bring into the Church some other authority than that of God's word, and pin their faith to something else than that which God has given, and prize another wisdom beside that which is in Christ. By such conduct the Church is desecrated, and robbed of its true character as the temple of God. In fact it is as such destroyed. And this occurs whenever party spirit prevails. In *such a case* man's word and wisdom usurp the place of God's word and wisdom. Then adhesion to some particular human leader is made a test of Christianity and a condition of brotherhood. Then Christ, "who of God is made unto us wisdom," *etc.*, (1 Cor. i. 30), is crowded out of His supremacy. In place of this one holy image of God, the only proper pattern for believers, there comes in the idol of some human personality to be copied as the true standard of character, and this not for the sake of any resemblance it may bear to Christ, but for the sake of some natural peculiarities it may happen to possess. Instead of the flame of a holy love kindled by the Spirit and warming toward all, there burns the fire of human partialities, which begets alienation and hostility towards all who do not cherish like preferences; and when such are the results of party spirit, it must be seen that he who engenders or furthers this spirit mars the work of God, and desecrates His sanctuary. And can such a person hope to escape condign punishment from Him who is thus insulted in His own temple?

2. *The Christian's regal glory in its nature and grounds.* "All things are yours and ye are Christ's, and Christ's is God's." Since God is love itself, He keeps nothing for Himself, but imparts to others all—yea, His *very Being* in the fulness of its perfections and blessedness. This He does in an original and eternal way within the sphere of the Godhead, to his only-begotten Son, who, by virtue of this communication, is, has, and can do every thing the same as the Father. He does it also in an indirect manner towards all creatures made in His image, according to their measure. Hence the appointment of man to lordship in his own province. [This lordship he indeed lost by reason of sin, and became the slave of the circumstances which he ought to have ruled. But in the work of redemption it has been restored to him through the interposition of this Son, who became the second Adam, and, in His assumed humanity, re-established this supremacy for all who should believe on Him. "Fear not," He says to His own, "for I have overcome the world." Hence it is] in Christ that we see this appointment to Lordship actually fulfilled; and how it was fulfilled may be seen, both during His life of humiliation, when He controlled all things by the word

of His power, and in His exaltation to universal power and authority at the right hand of God In this power believers are now invited to share by union with Him. Through Him the whole creation stands subject to their disposal. Every thing He has is made to subserve the purposes of His love in them and promote their sanctification and glory.

But since now, for a period, their life is, to a certain degree, hid with Christ in God, so also is their power. Nevertheless this power is to be experienced even here in striking ways, and ever more and more through the prevalence of their prayers. And the terms on which they receive it show the ground on which it rests, *viz.:* the fellowship had with Christ, and through Him with God. Prevailing prayers are such as are offered in the name of Christ or according to the will of God (Jno. xiv. 13 f.; xvii. 23; 1 Jno. ii. 14), or as are presented in faith (Matth. xvii. 20). In them there is an identifying of ourselves with God through Christ, so that all private preferences are given up, and we keep ourselves in exclusive dependence on Him. Besides, as in Christ Himself there was manifested this same demeanor towards the Father; as He, the Divinely equal Son, kept Himself in perfect dependence on God, and determined to be nothing else but the revealer and executor of the Father's will; as He, the first man, was obliged to qualify Himself for the exercise of Divine power in the way of obedience,—just so it is with believers. Their *voluntary and complete dependence on Christ and through Him on God is the condition and source* of their all embracing power. The fact that they belong to Him is the ground that all things belong to them.

[3. *All sound title and right to use the creatures of God, together with the ability to use them to advantage, are conditioned on faith in Christ.* He, having by His obedience recovered for man his lost sovereignty, makes those who believe on Him joint heirs with Him to this inheritance. And He also imparts to them that purity by which all things are pure to them. Hence to them every creature of God is good, when received with thanksgiving and sanctified with the word of God and prayer. And in the ordering of His providence all things are made to work together for their good. Not so is it with the wicked. A kind of natural right to possession and use they may indeed have in the present condition of things; but—it is under God's toleration and only for a time. If they continue unbelieving to the last, they are finally despoiled of all. While even in this life the good they seem to have is no real good, and "nothing is pure, since even their very mind and conscience is defiled." This is what Origen seems to teach. "All things belong to the saint. The whole world is the possession of faith. But the unbeliever has no claim to even an obolus; for the goods which he has he holds as a robber, since he knows neither how to use them nor yet the God that made them." (Taken in substance from Wordsworth)].

4. [*Christ is God's.* On the subordination of Christ to the Father, see on viii. 6 and xi. 3].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—To be "the temple of God," inhabited by the Holy Spirit, is the highest dignity of Christians. It ennobles the humblest to a greatness that far surpasses all secular honor and glory. The Spirit dwells in us: 1, through faith in Christ; 2, through peace with God; 3, through hope; 4, through love; 5, through special gifts and powers; 6, through comfort, cheer, patience, joy in the cross; 7, through true life in the soul, continuing even when it passes out of the body, which itself also partakes of this life, whether it be in this or in the future state, (Selnecker) ver. 16.—How fearful the woe which awaits those who mislead and destroy souls, either by false doctrines or by an ungodly life (ver. 17).—"Let him become a fool." What a paradox! A fool first—then wise! The world seeks to be wise and then becomes foolish. But what is this "becoming a fool?" Not the losing of our understanding and will, [but the confession of ignorance, the avowal of our knowing nothing, that we may be willing to be taught, so as truly to know every thing] (ver. 18). —God sometimes lets "the wise" run their course, accumulate their knowledge, construct their cunning systems, so as at last to be caught as in a snare by their own devices, and be the more thoroughly convinced of their folly. [Few are so profoundly sensible of the incompetency of the human intellect and the meagreness of human attainments as those who have most profoundly and honestly explored and discussed the great problems of nature, humanity and God] (ver. 19). The Church is not for the teachers, that *it* should be subject to *them* and called by *their* names; but *they* are for *it*, to serve *its* welfare and build *it* up. Hence no man or set of men has power over Christians to prescribe laws for them and bind their consciences. Let no one therefore choose a mere man for his guiding star unconditionally, or follow his lead blindly; much less should any one count himself blessed in having adopted this one rather than that as the controller of his life and conscience. Nor yet let him provoke dissensions and divide the Church by asserting his partialities to an undue extent (ver. 21).—"All things are yours"—[all true Christian teachers of every name, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or Calvin, or Wesley, or Leighton, or Fuller. Every faithful minister profits the whole Church; and every member of the Church may and ought to derive benefit from the teachings of all. It is thus the mind is expanded beyond party limits into a true Catholicity]. And "this world,"—sun, air, water, fire, earth, all stand at your service, and ye can use them and praise the Creator for them. Your natural "life," too, preserved by this world's goods, [is, while preserved, for your advantage, even though it may be passed amid pains, and privations, and disabilities, that seem worse than death]. Finally, "death" is yours, as it opens an entrance into eternal blessedness and glory (ver. 22).—'Ye are Christ's.' He has bought you with His blood, and is your proper Lord and Master. He is the Head—you, the members. Hence cleave to Him only. Be called after him only. "Christ

is God's," as the appointed Mediator and Ambassador of God to men. Likewise, as Head of the Church, He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, and acted ever in the Father's service and to His glory (ver. 23).

Heubner:—The indwelling of the Spirit is opposed to all party strife. Hence in moments of holy inspiration, [in times of religious awakening], sectarianism melts, [and the hearts of believers of every name flow together], ver. 16.—The conceit of our own unimpeachable wisdom is self-deceit or self-betrayal (ver. 18).—The wisdom which would know nothing of God and would discard a Saviour, will be finally exposed by God in all its nakedness, and all its aims baffled and punished (ver. 19).—To be proud of our own denomination or of our own leaders is nothing but a concealed self-love, which seeks to shine in the glory of another. And this is derogatory to the Christian name, for the believer is servant to no man (ver. 21).—Since all things are ours through Christ, all things should conduct the Christian to Christ. [Failing in this, their use and enjoyment become so far prejudicial and unlawful. They are then not properly "*ours*"]. (ver. 22).—"Ye are Christ's," then ye should serve Him, even as He, the image of God, served God in all things and conducted all to God (ver. 23.)

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 18. "Be not deceived." Self-deception is an injurious thing; it renders much labor useless, and despoils us of our reward. But worst of all is that self-betrayal which hardens the heart against brotherly admonition.—"Let him become a fool." Such is the power and wonder working of God's word, that it moves me to become an enemy to myself; and to empty myself of all that which best pleases my flesh; and to become a fool in this world, to give up the reputation of being a sagacious man, who moves on with the party of progress, and stands upon the apex of the civilization of the time; and so to pass into obscurity and contempt.—(Ver. 19). God weaves a snare for the wise out of their own craftiness, wherein he catches them while they think to slip from Him by their arts: *e. g.*, explaining away His miracles through their rationalism.—(Ver. 21). The building here does not belong to the builders but the builders to the building.—Ver. 22 as compared with i. 12. Christ does not stand in the second rank with His servants. He is the Lord of Glory. The declaration "all is yours" promises the world to Christians preëminently in this sense, that all secular art and service help to furnish mortar for building the temple of God. Christians are called not to curse the world, but to overcome and rule it for God. The world is nothing but a scaffolding that will be broken up when it has served its end in assisting to construct God's house. But this house, which is destined to be eternal, are we.—All this world's wisdom is folly with God, if it insists in playing the mistress in His house; but if it act the part of handmaid, it is in its place.—(Ver. 23). Though Christ may employ His servants for bringing all those who have been purchased by His blood to become His by faith; still the saints thus called hang upon Christ, independently of any man, just as needles are drawn and held by the power of the magnet, even though some other needle, which had been first attracted, should sustain them by virtue of the magnetic power streaming through it.

[Barnes:—Ver. 20. "Words of the wise, vain." This admonition especially applicable to ministers. They are in peculiar danger on this subject, and it has been by *their* yielding themselves so much to the power of speculative philosophy that parties have been formed in the Church, and that the Gospel has been so much corrupted].

[J. Barrow:—Ver. 16. *The Divinity of the Holy Ghost.* I. His nature and original—the Spirit *of God.* II. His personality—He *dwelleth* in us. III. His Divinity—Christians are called *the temple of God because* He dwelleth in them. IV. His sanctifying virtue—in that he constitutes us temples by His presence in us. Application. 1. We are obliged to render all adoration to the majesty of the Divine Spirit. 2. The consideration of His presence and work should awaken devoutest gratitude. 3. We should desire and pray for God's Spirit. 4. We should demean ourselves worthily toward the Spirit. 5. The doctrine full of comfort and encouragement.—J. Howe:—Ver. 16. *The Christian a living temple,* I. *built,* and II. *inhabited, by the Holy Ghost.*—See this whole subject largely discussed in *Howe's works, pp.* 77–113.—R. South:—ver. 19. *Worldly wisdom.* I. Principles: *a.* Dissimulation in concealment or false pretences; *b.* Self-interest as opposed to conscience or religion; *c.* Self, the chief end; *d.* All its beneficence and gratitude are practiced with an eye to advantage. II. The folly and absurdity of these principles: *a.* The end pitched upon not suited to man's condition, either as to duration or rational nature; *b.* The means pitched upon are unsuited to his end, inasmuch as they are insufficient and often contrary to it].

VII.—THE TRUE STANDARD FOR ESTIMATING MINISTERS. THEIR WORTH TO BE MADE KNOWN IN DUE TIME. OUR JUDGMENT TO BE SUSPENDED TILL THEN.

CHAPTER IV. 1–5.

LET a man so [So let a man] account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards
2 of the mysteries of God. Moreover [Here ὧδε[1]] it is required[2] in stewards, that a man be
3 found faithful. But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of [by]
4 you, or of [by] man's judgment [lit. day]: yea, I judge not mine own self. For I
know nothing by [against] myself; yet am I not hereby [not by this am I] justified:
5 but he that judgeth me is the Lord. Therefore judge nothing before the time, until
the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will
make manifest the counsels of the hearts: and then shall every man [each one] have
[from ἀπὸ] praise of [his ὁ] God.

[1] Ver. 2.—ὧδε is supported by a great preponderance of authorities [A. B. C. D. F. Cod. Sin.] and preferred by Lach. Meyer [Alf. Stanley], to the Rec. ὁ δέ. See under "Exegetical and Critical."

[2] Ver. 2.—ζητεῖται is sustained mainly by the old versions, and is decidedly preferable to ζητεῖτε [which is found in A. C. D. Cod. Sin. and others.] Stanley remarks that the confusion arises from the similarity of sound in Romaic between ε and αι. The Cod. Sin. inserts τί before ζητεῖτε, and would be rendered, "Moreover what do you here seek in stewards? That a man," etc.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 1. [Having thus exhibited the regal title of Christians to all things, to the benefits to be derived from all Christian ministers, and from all objects and events in this world, he now turns to present, as a corollary from this, the view which they ought to take of ministers, and the manner in which they are to treat them; and thus, as it were, to remind them of certain limitations in the prerogatives of those whom they were disposed unduly to honor].—**So let a man account of us.**—οὕτως, *so*. This does not serve to connect the following with what precedes, as Meyer (3d Ed., but not 2d Ed.) supposes, rendering it: *so then*, or, *accordingly*. [No such connection is here implied.*] Rather Paul here intends to hold up the proper mode of estimating teachers in contrast with that "boasting" in them reprobated in iii. 21; and the "so" here refers to what follows. — "So **as servants 'of Christ.'**—not as leaders taking His place.† Ἡμᾶς, *us*, primarily or chiefly, Paul and Apollos, as ver. 6 and iii. 4, show. Λογίζέσθαι, *to bring to account, to reckon, to estimate*, as in Rom. viii. 36 (חָשַׁב). "It implies the formation of a sound, well-weighed estimate, as contrasted with the partisan judgments which the Corinthians formed respecting their teachers." OSIANDER. Ἄνθρωπος, = not, *every man*, but, *man generally*, according to the Hellenic and Hebrew usage. Ὑπηρέτας as διάκονοι, iii. 5. The word properly denotes a servant of subordinate rank, an understrapper. In patristic parlance it was used of sub-deacons. The New Testament employs it for helpers and attendants. Luke iv. 20; Acts xiii. 5. The verb from which it comes, occurs in Acts xxvi. 16, to signify David's working for the fulfilment of God's purposes. In the text the word carries the idea of one laboring for the cause of Christ. To adopt its fundamental meaning, that of a *rower* [as Valck.: "Christ is Pilot of the vessel of the Church, we are rowers under His command." WORDS.], would be just as appropriate as to render it: *adjutants* or *orderlies*, according to the precedent in Xenophon. If not precisely equivalent to "*deacon*," yet it certainly is brought in here to indicate a very subordinate position under Christ, in contrast with the leadership ascribed by the Corinthian partisans. Nevertheless the idea of honor is not excluded, since this comes from being connected with Christ, whose work is performed. The dignity of the office is, however, more prominently exhibited in the second designation—**and stewards of the mysteries of God**—οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ. Rom. xvi. 23; 1 Pet. iv. 10. The article is not prefixed, because the word stands qualitively, to indicate that what has been entrusted to their charge is something very important and weighty. And by these "mysteries" we are not to understand *the sacraments*, thereby following patristic usage. [In which case Paul could hardly have been a steward, for he was sent not to baptize, but to

* [This is not so clear. Οὕτως does often have reference to what precedes. And here certainly Paul seems to be applying the principle, he had just been laying down in general, to himself and his associates in particular. The very position of οὕτως ἡμᾶς *so us, too*, seems to require this. As they were Christ's, so it was to be borne in mind that he and Apollos were also Christ's, and that, too, in their official capacity. They were Christ's servants—stewards of God's mysteries, and were to be respected accordingly. Οὕτως, *so*, therefore points back to what has been said, and also forwards to ὡς, *as*, which resumes and makes the implication more definite].

† [But in thus putting the emphasis on their *official capacity*, rather than on the fact of their *belonging to Christ*, the way does not seem to be prepared for what follows. There may, indeed, be an implication here of a subordinate position, which contradicted their partisan estimates; but this evidently retires before the rising thought just about to find expression].

preach the Gospel]. Rather they are "the mystery of God" in its manifold variety and fulness; or as Luke viii. 10: "the mysteries of the kingdom of God;" in other words, the revelations of God, as matters which could be known only by Divine communication. [Such is the meaning of the word "mystery" in the New Testament—not, as in common parlance: *something uncomprehensible;* but: something which, *being beyond the reach of man's intelligence, has been made known to him in some special Divine way*]. The "stewardship" consists in [preserving and administering the truth revealed through] preaching and teaching,—no less in properly didactic instruction than in prophecy. The "steward" belonged among the "servants," and his business was, not to manage one particular branch of the household economy, but to take the whole in charge. He was therefore put over the rest of the servants. The stress here, however, is not to be laid upon the preëminence enjoyed by the steward, but upon the responsibility accompanying the goods entrusted." NEANDER. To suppose that the Apostle used the term "stewards," with some vague idea of provisions floating before his mind, to which he would liken the truth,—as if the persons thus denominated were regarded by him in the light of family providers, would be rather far fetched, and Luke xii. 42 gives no countenance for such a thought in our passage. "Between the father of the household and the stewards, there stood the son, who had from the father a power of control, so that the stewards were in fact his servants likewise." MEYER.

VER. 2. **Here, moreover.**—We must first consider what the true reading is here. The Rec. has ὃ δὲ λοιπόν. But this is not by any means so well supported as ὧδε λοιπόν, which is the reading that prevails throughout the codices, versions, and church fathers in equal degree. If it be not the original reading, then it must have come in either by mistake, or by intentional correction, since the phrase ὃ δὲ λοιπόν nowhere else occurs. But neither case is probable, considering the numerous, and at least partially independent authorities which attest it. The Rec. text, apart from its unusualness, is evidently the easier reading, [and therefore may be the more readily accounted for as an intended emendation]. It would be rendered, *but finally;* lit. *as for what remains: i. e.* after setting aside all your unsuitable claims. But ὧδε, which occurs nowhere else in Paul, save in Col. iv. 9, though very common in other parts of the New Testament, means, *here; i. e., in this connection,* or *in this matter,* where we are treating of the administration of the mysteries of God, comp. Rev. xiii. 10, 18; xiv. 12; xvii. 9. [Alf. translates it locally: *here, on this earth,* "It is," he says, "emphatic, and points to what follows, that though in the case of stewards inquiry was necessarily made *here below,* yet he, God's steward, awaited no such inquiry, ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας: by man's judgment, but one at the coming of the Lord." Stanley follows Lachmann in connecting ὧδε with the previous words, "stewards of the mysteries of God here," and makes it mean, *in this matter* (as in the references above given). Wordsworth adheres to the Rec. He considers ὧδε as harsh, and accounts for it as arising from the confusion of o and ω, than which, he says, nothing is more common in the best Mss. Hodge, on the contrary, says it yields good sense]. Λοιπόν might serve for making the transition, like *ceterum, moreover,* and belong primarily to ὧδε. Or it may be joined to "is required," (which is favored by the order of the words), and so as to imply, that with this consideration the whole matter is wound up; or to express something further in relation to that mentioned in ver. 1, which was specially worthy of consideration.—**it is required that.**—ἵνα has a telic sense, and shows that the purport of the requirement is at the same time its purpose. The investigations in regard to such persons, aims at this, that **one be found faithful.**—This is why great trusts are reposed in a person, that he might conduct himself in the management of them according to the mind and will of God, who has committed them to Him, for the glory of His name and the welfare of His Church, and not for the legatee's own benefit (comp. Luke xii. 42). Εὑρεθῇ, *be found* by the result as shown at the time of trial OSIANDER. Τὶς, according to Meyer, *every one* ["Faithful," emphatic. "The great requisite for the office of a steward is *fidelity.* As a servant he must be *faithful* to his master. As a disciple, he must be *faithful* to those under his oversight. He must not neglect to dispense to them their food, nor adulterate it, nor substitute any thing in place of that given to be distributed. So in regard to ministers." HODGE].

VER. 3. Having stated the point of view from which alone a proper judgment could be formed in regard to him and his associates, Paul next proceeds to state his own feelings as to the judgment that might be formed of him by men. [Alford adds, "in contrast to the case of the stewards, into whose faithfulness enquiry is made 'here' on earth."] Very naturally the Corinthians would think that a good deal of weight attached to their judgment.—**But** [δέ indicates a transition to the application of what was said in general to his own particular case] **for me it amounts to the very least thing.**—εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν. The εἰς here, according to Greek usage, shows the result to which the thing comes—**that I be judged by you.**—ἵνα ἀνακριθῶ. The objective clause in telic form. It certainly is not equivalent to ὅταν ἀνακριθῶ: *when I am judged;* nor perhaps precisely the same as τὸ ἀνακριθῆναι, *to be judged.* ["Here and always ἵνα is more or less the conj. of *purpose.*" ALFORD*]. A weakness of its force in the later Greek is not to be denied; but *here* the idea of intention or tendency lies in this, that something is about to happen or impends: 'I am not at all disturbed that I shall be judged by you as to my merits.' [Stanley, on the other hand, says that "the substitution of ἵνα with the subjunctive for the indicative is in the modern Romaic," and seems to take it so here]—**or by man's judgment**—lit.: '*by human day.*' This

[* But Jelf in *Gr. Gram.* § 803, obs. 1, shows in full argument the gradual modification of meaning until it comes to have the force only of the accusatival infinitive. And this, he says, is frequent in the New Testament. There seems to be a great effort among some critics to avoid the admission of this, and to show the telic force of ἵνα in every instance].

is neither to be taken as a Cilicism nor as a Hebraism. It designates a day of judgment, analogously with the phrase *dicem dicere*, and here comes in correspondingly with the expression: "day of the Lord." We are not to understand by it a private decision ("by you") in contrast with a public one. But it is a generalization of the phrase: 'by you,' and by an obvious transition, the *day* of the act is put for the *act* itself, and the *judgment* as a whole for the *judges* themselves; or as Meyer: *the day* is personified, and hence ὑπό is used in accordance with ὑφ' ὑμῶν, *by you*. There is something of solemnity in this phraseology; nor is it without a slight touch of irony or rebuke at their presumption in being supposed to fix upon a day of trial, and to sit upon a judgment-seat in order to pronounce upon Paul's merits or demerits. All appearance of haughtiness in this disparagement of other's opinions is removed by what follows.—**Yea, I judge not of mine own self.** Lit.: 'But neither do I judge myself.' The ἀλλά here is like that in iii. 2. Before ἐμαυτον we would naturally look for an οὐτός. But this is not necessary. The judgment on himself, which he here disavows, is a final decision as to his own merits, such as he is willing to abide by. ["Paul is here speaking not of the actions of men whether good or bad, but of the *eminence* of each individual, which ought not to be estimated by men's humors." CALVIN].

VER. 4. Instead of the expected antithesis, there follows first a confirmation of what precedes, in the way of a parenthesis.—**For I know nothing with myself.**—This first clause is concessive, [the force of *for*, as Winer says, falling upon the subsequent clause]: *q. d.* 'For *although* I know," *etc.* So also Meyer, [who says, however, that the force of the proof does not lie in the second clause, so that the first would be only concessive, but *in the antithetic relation of both clauses*. He yet gives the sense thus]: "The clearness of my conscience as to my official duties is nevertheless (doch) not the ground on which my justification rests." [The phraseology here is peculiar, but thoroughly idiomatic, both in the Greek (*οὐδὲν ἐμαυτῳ σύνοιδα*) and in our E. V., which almost literally translates it:—"I know nothing by myself." So also the Latin—*nil conscire sibi*. All expressions alike mean: I am conscious of no wrong. (See Jelf, *Gr. Gram.*, § 682, 2). The English phrase is to be found in the early writers, and Stanley asserts: 'it is still a provincial form of speech for the same thought']. 'Know nothing,' *i. e.*, so far as my official conduct is concerned. ["Elsewhere he speaks of himself as the 'chief of sinners,' which is perfectly consistent with his saying, that his conscience acquitted himself of failure as a Christian minister." HODGE.]—**Yet not in this am I justified**—*i. e.*, before God. It is a question, however, whether this justification is to be understood in the *dogmatic* sense, [of imputed righteousness], as Meyer, and Billr., and others maintain, or in the *legal*, ethical sense [as the early fathers, Calvin, Hodge, Alford, and others assert]. If the former, then the meaning is: that since his justification did not depend on the verdict of his own conscience but upon Christ, therefore his conscience could not furnish the ground on which he was to judge himself. If the latter, then the sense would be: that his acquittal of all blame does not rest on the fact that his conscience charged him with no official derelictions; since conscience pronounced only in regard to particular actions and not to the whole moral character as it appears in God's sight, so that of course a clean conscience could afford no certain basis of estimating the real worth of any person. Of these interpretations the latter is to be preferred, since there is no allusion in the context to the Gospel doctrine of justification by faith.—**but he that judgeth me.**—[Observe, not: "that *justifieth* me," which language would have been the term employed, had Paul here had in mind the matter of his general Christian estate, but: "*judgeth*" (*ἀνακρίνων*), *i. e.*, holds an inquest and decides on the merits of the case which may be brought into issue.]—**is the Lord.**—*i. e.*, Christ, [who looked deeper than conscience; and of course deeper than all outside observers], and who alone could comprehend all the data by which his official conduct was to be estimated. ["This inward allegiance of the conscience is the highest form of worship. The Lord Jesus was to the Apostle the object of all those sentiments and feelings which terminate on God. And He must be so to us, or we are not Christians. What makes a man a Christian is to feel and act towards Christ as God." HODGE.].

VER. 5. Practical inference from the foregoing. **So then** (ὥστε), **judge nothing.**—μὴ τι κρίνετε. Τί is not the *object* of judgment but its *contents*. It is equivalent to κρίσιν τινά. Hence the meaning is: "do not judge any judgment." The logic may be presented thus: "Since my judgment belongs to the Lord, therefore refrain from all premature decisions respecting me." BILLROTH, with less simplicity, says: "Since I do not even judge myself, therefore follow my example, and do not yourselves judge." He alludes here not to the mutually disparaging censures cast upon each other by the several factions (Billr.), but to the judgment of the Corinthian brotherhood upon himself.—**before the time,** —which is more fully explained in,—**until the Lord shall come.**—The time of His advent to judgment—His "appearing," or "epiphany" (2 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Thess. i. 7). The ἕως ἂν is used with the subjunctive ἔλθῃ, because an end to be reached is fixed upon from the standpoint of the present, but the reaching of which (here in respect of time), is still undecided. Or, according to Meyer: "The coming is thereby designated as problematical, and dependent on circumstances; not indeed, as it is doubted; also not, as it is dependent upon subjective determination, but, as it is an object of expectant faith." [The uncertainty indicated by ἂν is not as to the *fact* of Christ's coming, but as to the *time* when He shall come: *q. d.*, "until the Lord shall come, whenever that may be." (See Jelf., *Gr. Gram.*, § 846, 2.)] (Comp. Matth. xvi. 28; Luke xiii. 35).—That a correct judgment will then, for the first time, be possible is shown from what follows.—**who also.**—The καί here is neither to be taken in connection with the καί in following clause, as if it were *et, et, both, and:* nor has it a mere strengthening force, *even;* but it serves to single out from among the functions of the Lord,

as He comes to judgment, that one with which he is here concerned: ["also,' *inter alia*, as part of the proceedings of that Day." ALFORD.]—**will bring to light.**—*φωτίζειν*, with the accusative, *to enlighten, illuminate*, as the sun does the world, and hence *to disclose, bring to light* (comp. 2 Tim. i. 10),—**the hidden things of darkness**:—*i. e.*, such as belong to darkness, or which darkness vails. (In Rom. ii. 16, we have simply: "the hidden things.") ["This includes acts now unknown, and those principles of action which lie concealed in the heart where no [human] eye can reach them. This is all that the context requires. In other connections, the secret things, or the works of darkness, means *wicked works*, works done in the dark to avoid detection. But the Apostle is here speaking of the reason why judgment should be deferred until the coming of Christ. The reason is that He alone can bring to light the secret acts and motives of men." HODGE.]—**and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts.**—Epexegetical of the former, or a specification under the general head just mentioned. One function of the Judge will be to lay open the inner determinations of the will—the motives and purposes by which men are governed, and which are withdrawn from human sight. It is on these that the decision respecting our merits and our fidelity must at last turn. All depends upon the simplicity of our temper—upon such a service of the Lord as excludes all by-ends, and is upright and sincere. "The thought here is this: In this life our inward character can only be inferred from our acts; at the judgment it will be directly laid open by the Lord." NEANDER.—**and then**,—as contrasted with the present, when so much is vailed, and when men are disposed to exercise a premature judgment—**shall each one have his praise**:—*ἑκάστῳ ὁ ἔπαινος*. Literally: "to each one the praise," *i. e.*, the praise which is his due, according to its various measures and degrees, corresponding to his worth. He here speaks of praise only, since he has in view primarily Apollos and himself, and not any Judaizing opposers. Hence there is no necessity of taking *ἔπαινος* as *vox media*, contrary to all usage, or even to regard it as an euphemism (with Theophylact). Paul's statement here, as CALVIN says, "arises from the assurance of a good conscience." He knew there was laid up for him a crown of righteousness (2 Tim. iv. 8).—**from God.**—This stands emphatically at the close. By this he gives us to understand that the judgment of the Lord, which would be pronounced upon his servants, was the judgment of God himself. Thus does he appeal from those partizan judgments, which exalt one at the expense of another, to the absolute and impartial judgment of God, who will give to each one his due. On the adjudication of Christ in its relations to God see Rom. ii. 16; Acts x. 42; xvii. 31. On "the praise from God" see Matth. xxv. 21. ["The command not to anticipate the judgment of the Lord is consistent with Paul's frequent recognition of the right and duty of the Church to sit in judgment on the qualifications of her own members. He is here speaking of the heart. The Church cannot judge the heart. Whether a man is sincere or insincere in his professions, whether his experience is genuine or spurious, God only can decide. The Church can only judge of what is outward. If any man profess to be holy, and yet is immoral the Church is bound to eject him, as Paul clearly teaches in the following chapter. Or if he profess to be a Christian, and yet rejects Christianity, or any of its essential doctrines, he cannot be received, Tit. iii. 10. But 'the counsels of the heart' only the Searcher of hearts can judge." HODGE.]

DOGMATICAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Christ's ministers stewards of the mysteries of God.*—In this we see the high significance and solemn responsibility of the ministerial office. In a preëminent sense, CHRIST is the servant of God. It is through His hand that the pleasure of the Lord prospers; and on Him has God poured His Spirit without measure, and to His control given all things, and on Him conferred power over all flesh that He should give eternal life to as many as God has given Him. Subordinate to Him in this work are Apostles, Evangelists, Pastors and Teachers, acting the part, so to speak, of handworkmen (*ὑπηρέται*). They labor under His direction, undertaking and executing all those various offices by which the redemption and the guidance of souls are accomplished. The more completely they put themselves under Him, preferring His will and His plans to their own, seeking no glory but His, asserting His authority as the only rule—the more exalted will they appear in God's sight, as persons who are worthy to coöperate with "His Servant" in this, the most important of all concerns, and to become the organs of his gracious purposes.

The lofty significance of their office appears enhanced by the fact, that in this service they are made "*stewards of the mysteries of God.*" To them has been committed the wondrous plan of salvation—a plan which from all eternity had been hid in God, and was concealed from the researches of the wisest in this world, and was at last revealed in Jesus Christ, and hence is well termed a mystery—even this plan, with all the means requisite for its execution, in reconciling sinners to God, and awaking the spiritually dead, and enlightening the benighted, and originating, preserving, confirming, and perfecting the life of faith in God's dear children. Their business it is, therefore, to employ this wealth of Divine instrumentalities for the extension of the kingdom of God on earth, and in behalf of each and all of God's people; and to discharge this trust publicly and privately, towards all classes and conditions in society without partiality:—to inquire out the ways through which God leads souls to the truth, and to construct such ways, by examining into the tendencies and characteristics and wants of individuals and communities, and by investigating their circumstances and inward conditions in life; and then to urge men to enter them:—to be unwearied in beseeching men in Christ's stead to become reconciled to God, warning, exhorting, rebuking, reproving, in the consciousness that God is acting in them and through them and in the exercise of something of His holy earnestness and pitying love. *This, this* is

to act the part of a *faithful steward; this* is to fulfil the obligation which rests upon the office-bearers of a Christian church. In order to be thus faithful they must be instructed by the Spirit, and follow in the footsteps of Him who, as the Son of God, was faithful in all His house, and who said of Himself that He could do nothing except what He saw the Father do. But if, instead of this, they go their own ways, employ methods to their own liking, conduct themselves so that the mind and counsel of God are not to be discerned in them—if they allow themselves to be carried away by carnal zeal and impatience, or yield to disgust and slothfulness, or suffer sensual gratifications, whether refined or gross, or a love of honors and authority and applause to slip in and betray them into unhallowed courses,—then are they chargeable with a faithlessness which incurs a fearful accountability.

2. *The Lord is Judge.*—This truth is, on the one hand, a source of comfort to all true servants of God, amid the various criticisms and censures passed upon them; and, on the other hand, it serves to abate the confidence of their own self-estimation. In the great day of account the Searcher of hearts will bring to light all that has been stirring within them, their longings and strivings, their secret motives and inward struggles, their inarticulate sighs as well as their uttered prayers; and in view of these things, all unknown to men, will He judge them. However others, who judge acoording to appearance, may find occasions for censure, or may misconstrue their doings and omissions, they can accept it all in peace and look away in calm assurance from these hasty decisions to the righteous sentence of an All-seeing Judge.—Yet, with all this, there is at the same time something very subduing in the anticipation of this only valid adjudication. However unconscious of blame they may be in the discharge of their duties, still this can afford them no certain ground for hoping to be acquitted before their Lord. His all-piercing eye detects faults that are hidden from their own consciences; and in His all-illuminating light much may appear unclean which to their clouded vision seems stainless. Hence it becometh them to be modest and leave to Him the final award.—Yet from him, who has been diligent in his endeavors to be faithful, the due praise will not be withheld,—however much men might criticize. From the mouth of his Lord he will receive the sentence: "Well done thou good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things. Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."—But even as when on earth every tribute of honor had the effect only to humble him the more, by bringing out in contrast a sense of his own unworthiness; so, too, will he receive this approval of his gracious Chief Shepherd in utmost lowliness. The crown of glory will ever be cast at his feet.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—*Christ's servants* should perform their service, not so as to please men, but as the Lord requires. As stewards of the Gospel treasures, they have the right to open these treasures, and to close them against the wicked (Matth. xvi. 19). The higher the Lord, the higher the servant; yet the latter is ever subordinate.—Ministers are *servants*, not *lords*, of men's faith. One is our Master, even Christ. Both pastors and flock are brethren (2 Cor. i. 24), (Hed.), ver. 1.—A minister must be faithful: 1, to God, in looking to Him with single eye, seeking His honor, acting according to His will and maintaining His rights; 2, to the Church, in withholding from it nothing essential to its welfare, and in declaring the whole counsel of God, so that no person shall suffer or perish through his fault or neglect; 3, to his own office in not acting the part of a lord, but of a servant who is ready to listen and labor. *Fidelity* in *office* grows out of fidelity to *one's self*. A true preacher preaches Christ not only with the mouth but from the heart. He speaks from experience and confirms his doctrine by his conduct, ver. 2.—A minister of God must be deaf, alike to the praise and the blame of men. His rule is the will of his Master, not the opinion of men. If he follows the latter he will never be faithful in his office, ver. 3.—It is one thing to have a good conscience before God for our consolation (1 Jno. iii. 21) and another thing to have it for our self-justification. The one requires a sincerity and diligence such as David could claim, the other a faultless perfection such as neither David nor Paul dare arrogate (Ps. xix. 13; Phil. iii. 12).—Blessed state, to be conscious of no wrong, and yet not to be disposed to justify oneself, ver. 4.—How unlike the judgment of God and the judgment of man. The former comes at the end of probation, is impartial, comprehensive in its data; the latter is ordinarily premature, rash, and grounded only on the outward appearance.—What must be the disclosures of the last day! God holds the key to the inmost thoughts of all men; and when they are all open to inspection, how fearful will then be the outcry! Take heed, O hypocrite; the Lord knows thee. Rejoice, thou sincere heart; the Lord will come and be thy witness (Job xxxiv. 21), ver. 5.

RIEGER:—*The office of the preacher* springs out *of Christ.*—As the Father sent Him, so He sends forth His ministers in order to proclaim the power which has been committed to Him in heaven and earth. This is their service and stewardship, ver. 1.—If distinctions are to be made among ministers, better look to their *fidelity* than to their *gifts* or *reputation;* and in judging of fidelity, that must often be taken into account which is least apt to strike the notice of men.

HEUBNER, A.:—*The worth of true evangelical ministers* consists: 1, in the purpose of their office; *a*, to serve Christ and be wholly dependent on His word; and hence, *b*, to promote the salvation of the congregation as stewards of God, ver. 1.—2, In their fidelity, which is seen; *a*, in the actual discharge of their duties; *b*, in a sincerity of spirit which ever stands as in God's sight and cares to be approved by Him alone, ver 2.—3, In the humility, which; *a*, refuses to justify self, ver. 3 ff., and, *b*, awaits in confidence the Divine award, vv. 4, 5.—B. *Ministers and congregations will one day together stand at the bar of God:*—1. They will so stand, for; *a*, Paul implies this; *b*, it is necessary to the revelation of the Divine righteousness. 2. The fact is a momentous one; *a*, for

ministers—it ought to shame them of their unfaithfulness, prompt them to walk conscientiously, and lift them above the opinions of the world; *b*, for the congregation—it should keep them from judging before the time, and cause them to take heed rather that the Word of God brings forth fruit among them; *c*, for both—they ought to conduct themselves as if already before the judgment seat.—Man is often unconscious of the deepest motives which actuate him; hence he can give himself no assurance that he has omitted nothing due, or done nothing sinful, ver. 4. —So act always that thou canst at any moment have thy heart exposed, ver. 5.

Gossner:—As a general thing, the natural man loves to hear what people think of him. It is harder to despise praise than blame.

[Hodge:—"Ver. 1 contains two important truths: ministers have no arbitrary or discretionary authority in the Church; neither have they any supernatural power such as is attributed to them in the Romish Church. Their authority is merely ministerial, and therefore to be judged by the standard of those commands which are known to the whole Church. And, secondly, they are not, like Aristotle or Plato, the originators of their own doctrines, or the teachers of the doctrines of other men, but simply the dispensers of the truths which God has revealed."]

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 2. It is a comfort that nothing but fidelity is required of stewards, not talents, nor inventive powers, nor manifold activity, nor success. The daintiness and fanciful taste of the vain and luxurious Corinthians, in whose sight fidelity seemed a small virtue, are no rarity in these times. But worse still is the rebellion shown by many congregations, who style themselves churches of Christ, against the fidelity of their pastors and teachers.

[G. C. A. Harless:—Ver. 2. What is here asserted of ministers holds good also of all Christians. Compare the parable of our Lord on "The talents," Matth. xxv. 14ff. The peculiar nature of the fidelity demanded is determined by the peculiar character of the blessing of salvation intrusted. It is not fidelity to a duty outwardly imposed, to a precept, rule, maxim or the like, but fidelity to an inwardly active vital principle—personal fidelity to a personal fellowship with God, wrought by the power of the Holy Ghost. It is the fidelity of a new-born child of God in whom the Spirit testifies to what the word promises].

[Calvin:—Ver. 4. Conscious of no wrong, and yet not justified. "Papists abuse this passage for the purpose of shaking the assurance of faith; and truly I confess that if their doctrine were admitted, we could do nothing but tremble in wretchedness during our whole life. For what tranquillity could our minds enjoy if it were to be determined from our works whether we are well-pleasing to God. I confess, therefore, that from the main foundation of Papists there follows nothing but continual disquietude for consciences; and accordingly we teach that we must have recourse to the free promise of mercy which is offered to us in Christ, that we may be fully assured that we are accounted righteous by God"].

[A. Tholuck:—Vers. 1–5. *The characteristics of a faithful steward.*—I. All he has he regards as belonging to his Lord. II. He is as faithful in small things as in great things. III. The source of his fidelity is his love for his Lord.—Th. Chalmers:—Vv. 3–4. *The judgment of men compared with the judgment of God.*—I. God has a right to prefer greater claims against us, than men can. II. God has a clearer and more elevated sense of moral worth and holiness than men have].

VIII.—APPLICATION OF THE FOREGOING CONTRAST BETWEEN THE SELF-SUFFICIENCY OF THE CORINTHIANS AND THE ACTUAL CONDITION AND DEPORTMENT OF THE APOSTLES.

Chapter IV. 6–13.

6 And these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and *to* Apollos
for your sakes; that ye might learn in us not to think *of men* [*om.* to think of men[1]]
above that which [the things which[2]] is [are] written, that no one of you be puffed
7 up for one against another. For who maketh thee to differ *from another?* and what
hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive *it,* why dost thou
8 glory, as if thou hadst not received *it?* Now ye are full, now ye are rich, ye have
reigned as kings without us: and I would to God [*om.* to God, *and insert* indeed, etc.]
9 ye did reign, that we also might reign with you. For I think that God hath set
forth us the apostles last, as it were appointed to death: for we are made a spectacle
10 unto the world, and to angels, and to men. We *are* fools for Christ's sake, but ye
are wise in Christ; we *are* weak, but ye *are* strong; ye *are* honorable, but we *are*

11 despised. Even unto this present hour we both hunger, and thirst, and are naked,[3]
12 and are buffeted, and have no certain dwellingplace; and labor, working with our
13 own hands: being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it: Being defamed, we entreat: we are made as the filth of the world, *and are* the offscouring of all things unto this day.

[1] Ver 6.—The φρονεῖν of the received text is an old supplement, which is not to be found in good authorities [A. B. D.* E.* F. G. Cod. Sin., nor in the Vulgate, and is omitted by Lach., Tisch, Mey., Alf., Words. and Stanley].

[2] Ver. 6.—The Rec. has ὃ [according to D. F. L.]. The better authorities [A. B. C. Cod. Sin.] have ἃ, which reading is adopted by Lach., Tisch. [Words. Alf.]. Mey. thinks that ἃ is a correction to suit the ταῦτα preceding.

[3] Ver. 11.—[The Rec. has γυμνητεύομεν, with B.[2] but A[2]. C. D. F. Cod. Sin. all have γυμνιτεύομεν. And this is the reading of all good editions now. See note].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 6. [Having laid down certain principles in regard to the Church and its relations to its teachers, and illustrated them in the case of Apollos and himself, Paul now proceeds to show their more general scope and bearing].—**And.**—δέ, [in the sense of *now*], indicates that he is approaching the close of what he has to say on party strifes.—**these things.**—ταῦτα, refers back to iii. 5.—It is from that point that he has spoken of himself and Apollos. [So Hodge, de Wette, Meyer and others. But Alford says: "There is surely no reason for limiting its reference within that point." He accordingly extends the reference back to ch. i. 12, and infers that all the names mentioned there were only used "as samples," behind which the real persons intended were hid].—**brethren,**—addressed to the Church as a whole, but primarily (de Wette) to the party leaders and their followers. "By this title he lays hearty hold upon the Corinthians, who had been showing themselves very unbrotherly." Besser.—**I have transferred in a figure,**—μετεσχημάτισα. There is some difficulty in determining the sense of this word. It elsewhere appears with the meaning: *to transform, to change*, Phil. iii. 21. The simple σχηματίζειν is used to denote that form of speech, where a person, instead of saying directly what he means, hints it in ways for his hearers to reflect upon and puzzle out the meaning of—allegorizes. It is used also of transformations, false movements, feint attacks, disguises (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 13). Neander explains it: "to transfer something to any one by a figure of speech. The μετεσχηματισμός here consists in this, that Paul develops in reference to himself and Apollos what holds good also of all the Corinthian teachers." Hence arose the old interpretation, that Paul had only *by supposition* represented in himself and Apollos what really belonged to others who were the actual party leaders, putting his own name and that of his friend for theirs. But this is a groundless assumption, irreconcilable with i. 12.—Still less admissible is the idea that the word refers to the figures of "planting" and "watering," under which he had exhibited the nature of his work (iii. 6); for these were used only for vividly illustrating his point, and had nothing to do with the main object in hand.—Undoubtedly he means "a transfer" of such a sort,—that, what was true of teachers in general, and so was calculated to bring down the pride of the party leaders at Corinth, he had applied especially to Apollos and himself. It was in fact *a transforming* of the general into the specific, the relation of which to the parties concerned is expressed by εἰς.—**unto myself and Apollos, for your sakes.**—Why he did this is at once explained,—**in order that in us ye may learn.**—By exhibiting himself and Apollos of so small account (suitably no doubt to the feelings of the latter also), he would by example teach them that modesty which does not seek to exalt itself.—**not above what is written.**—τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται. Were φρονεῖν genuine [see under the text], then it would read: "not to think of yourselves above," *etc.* But, as it is, the brief clause, converted into a substantive by the article τό, is very forcible, and is to be rendered imperatively: "not beyond what is written;" *i. e.*, exceed not this measure, hold to the Scripture rule both in your inward judgments and in your pretensions. Thus this short expression, so abruptly brought in, conveys more than the gloss, "to think." ["The ellipsis of the verb is significant as giving greater largeness and general comprehensiveness to the proverb, which would be limited by the insertion of a particular verb with a special idea. Compare a similar ellipse in Terence, *ut nequid nimis*, and in Milton: 'Observe the rule of, not too much, by Temperance taught.'" Words.]. — But what does he mean by ἃ γέγραπται: "what things are or have been written?" Does he allude here to his own previous declarations? [as Luther and Calov. assert, and Calvin allows]. Hardly; for then it would have been προέγραψα, *I have before written* (comp. Eph. iii. 3). According to Paul's usage, the formula: "it is written," refers to the Holy Scriptures, especially to the Old Testament: since we find no allusion to any New Testament, or to any life of Christ in any of Paul's writings, ["though indeed, as Chrysostom supposes, St. Matthew's Gospel had been written at this time, and there the Corinthians would find cautions from Christ himself against the sin of calling and being called, Rabbi." Words.]. Undoubtedly Paul here has in mind, not individual expressions of Holy Writ, but its collective tenor, which all points to this truth: that all honor belongs to God; and that all self-boasting, all cleaving to men, and priding oneself in men, must be given up. This doctrine we find summed up in apophthegms like Jer. ix. 23, to which reference has already been made. The sense, therefore, cannot be doubtful. This is exhibited more clearly in what follows:—**that ye be not puffed up one for one against another.**—The Ind. φυσιοῦσθε after ἵνα occasions no little difficulty. The Ind. after ἵνα first appears in the later Greek, nowhere else in the New Testament. [Winer, however,

adopts the view that it is the Ind. and is to be regarded as an impropriety of the later Greek. § xli. 1. b.; and so does Jelf, *Gr. Gram.*, § 806, ver. 2.] Some (Bengel, Osiander) assume here a peculiar or mistaken form of contraction for φυσιῶσθε (as in ζηλοῦτε, Gal. iv. 17); others (Fritzsche [Origen and Theod.] change ἵνα into ἐνα; others give to ἵνα a local signification: *where, whereby, under which circumstances*, and render the clause: "in which case, *i. e.*, while acting according to Scripture rule, ye are not puffed up," (present for the future). So Meyer. Since the correction, which was designed to restore the supposed original text, is untenable,—for the reason that the change of ἐνα into ἵνα would have drawn the subjective after it (but which nowhere appears, save in one MS. of Chrysostom); and since the use of ἵνα, in the sense proposed by Meyer, does not reach back to the prose of this period, we must in consequence decide for Bengel's view, and all the more, for the reason, that ἵνα stands just before in its telic sense. The second clause with ἵνα stands either coördinate with the first, or subordinate to it. The latter can be understood as denoting, equally with the former, the purpose of the Apostle, yet so as to be included in it—defining the point more exactly. [To avoid the appearance of solecism, Wordsworth suggests that φυσιοῦσθε be taken as imperative, thus involving a change from the indirect to the direct style. Examples of this sudden transition he finds in Acts i. 4; xxii. 3; xxiii. 32; Luke v. 14; Mark vi. 9; also in this very Epistle, i. 31.—Accordingly he would translate: "in order that—(you may practice this precept)—be not ye puffed up." This is ingenious, but harsh, especially as we have ἵνα with the subj. in the clause immediately preceding, and we would naturally look for the same construction here. Instead of "liveliness," we should have "*raggedness*," of style as the result.] The meaning, however, is plain. We have here a striking exhibition of the partisan spirit. "It is the definition of a sect, where individuals admire individuals." BENGEL. The adherents of one party are here represented as seeking mutually to exalt each other to the prejudice of those of another party (comp. ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων, 1 Thess. v. 11). ὑπέρ: *to the advantage of, in favor of* (not [as Winer] "*above* the one," both on account of the Gen. and of the contrast in κατά, *against*). Τοῦ ἑνός, *the one*, denotes a person belonging to the same party; τοῦ ἑτέρου, *the other*, a person belonging to another party. Interpreting, however, in the light of facts, we must suppose that the leaders and not private members are particularly intended. Ὑπέρ then would stand as in 2 Cor. vii. 4. It implies that party pride which would prompt a person to puff his own chief and look down with contempt upon the chief of another party. De Wette, without sufficient grounds, insists on referring this to the Christ-party, who also had exalted their leaders above the others.

VER. 7. **For.**—Paul goes on to give the reason for his protest against their emulation, in the most energetic style, addressing a series of questions to those who were "puffed up." The first,—**Who maketh thee to differ?**—"This has been commonly taken to imply distinction of some sort; either *actual* distinction, by office and the like, in which case the answer would be: 'not thyself, but the Lord;' or *assumed* distinction by a claim to preëminence, in which case he would imply: 'no one does this, but thyself; it is an arbitrary self-promotion;' or at least: 'there is no judge qualified for doing this.' But thus interpreted, the Apostle would be regarded as addressing properly the party *leaders* [so Words.], while it is clear that he was just before addressing the partisan *followers*. Besides, in the construction, first suggested above, the second question would be already anticipated. Finally, these interpretations would transcend the demonstrable use of διακρίνειν, whether in the New Testament or elsewhere. The rendering best suited to usage and to the connection is: 'Who separates you?' This, then, would refer to the party position which the person spoken to assumed, and in which he proudly stood aloof from other parties and their leaders. What the Apostle means to ask is: 'What is the reason you say'—or 'Who justifies you in saying: "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos," and in priding yourself in such partisanship? This party separation, in which you boast, is altogether arbitrary and unwarrantable.' [Bengel, Words., Alf., Calv. give the meaning: 'Who distinguisheth thee,' as if by reason of some excellence which is supposed to exist. And for this use of διακρίνω Words. refers to Acts xv. 9. The propriety of this, also, Hodge concedes. And it was the construction on which Augustine proceeded in his argument with Pelagius, and in his maintenance of the doctrine of sovereign grace. It seems better, therefore, to abide by the ordinary interpretation given in the text].—In the second question,—**What hast thou which thou didst not receive?**—he alludes to the advantages which a person might possess, and which stood connected in some way with the quickening and informing influence of this or that teacher. [But is not this limiting the scope of the question too much? which plainly bears upon the leaders also]. 'These advantages,' he implies, 'could only be the ground of pride in case they had been self-attained. But thou hast only what thou didst receive. All thine insight, thy gifts for speaking, *etc.*, are a bestowment from God, even though imparted through human instrumentalities.'—To this question the next directly joins, since it presupposes that something has been received; and this not problematically, but as actually existing,—and yet it designates the boasting as something contradictory to this supposition, and therefore wholly unsuitable. Its import is,—**if**—as I grant—**thou really didst receive**—something—**why dost thou boast, as if thou hadst not received it?**—but all were due to thine own exertions or to thy connection with this or that teacher?' The καί here belongs, as usual (*Passow* II. p. 1540), not to the entire hypothetical clause, but to ἔλαβες, and may be translated, *actually, indeed, really*.—But may we not obtain a fuller meaning, and one more comporting with the words and aim of the Apostle, if we suppose the Apostle to imply in the second question that nothing had been received, by punctuating it, either so that τί δὲ ἔχεις shall be taken alone: 'and what hast thou?'—or so

that τί δὲ shall stand separately: 'how now?' or: 'what then? hast thou that which thou didst not receive?' He would thus be pointing to their vain conceit, their empty boasting, their pride in the gifts of their teachers, in which they had no part themselves. The third question would then first treat of a case wherein they were supposed to have received something, and which as such excluded boasting. So Bengel: "There are many things, which thou has not received, and therefore thou hast not these things, and canst not boast of them; either thou hast received, or hast not received; if thou hast not received, thou possessest not; if thou hast received, thou possessest it not, except as received, and so without cause for glorying. The latter sense renders the meaning of καί, *even*, which immediately follows, more expressive, and shows the antanaclasis (repetition in a modified form) in the clauses: 'thou hast not received' and 'hadst not received.'"

VER. 8. **Already ye are full, already ye are rich; ye have reigned as kings without us.**—[Having before *rebuked*, he here proceeds to *deride*, as Calvin says,] their false contentment, vain self-sufficiency and lofty bearing, as if they had already reached the goal of all Christian hope and effort. Especially has he in mind certain persons who always aspired to pitch the tune, and the parasites, who were ever ready to strike in. The clauses here are not questions, but declarations charged with keenest irony. Only when so understood do the words carry their proper emphasis. To deny him the right to use such irony, and to impute lordly desires to Paul in consequeuce, is one of Rückert's false assumptions. And to this Meyer fairly replies, that the Apostle must have been the best judge as to the mode in which it was necessary to discipline the Corinthians, and that it was precisely because of his very purity of conscience that he was able to yield to his justly roused feelings without rendering himself liable to suspicion. Neander says: "The conceit of a narrow-minded bigotry can best be attacked with irony and sarcasm;" and Besser: "The servant of Christ need not be ashamed of any outburst of indignation that springs from a hearty love, and the biting salt of derision, which spices his language, does not detract from his amiability;" [and Hodge: "The prophets especially employ these weapons freely in their endeavors to convince the people of the folly of idols"]. In what precedes, Paul has just exhorted them to modesty in accordance with the pattern set by himself and Apollos, and reminded them of their dependence on God for all their endowments—a dependence which excluded boasting. Now he reminds them, not only that they were unmindful of this dependence, but that they were also cradling themselves in the vain conceit of their own perfection—they, the very persons whom he had just before convicted of great imperfection and moral perversity.—Ἤδη, *already*, *i. e.*, so long before the proper time for it. It points to a goal remote, and hints that all true satisfaction, and true riches, and true kingship, belonged not to the present period of the world; and hence it implies that they were vainly anticipating the glory which was to come hereafter. The word is put first for the sake of the emphasis.

The three verbs following form a climax: "ye have enough;" "ye enjoy a superfluity;" "you have attained to lordship." κεκορεσμένοι ἐστέ=ἐπλουτήσατε (comp. Rev. iii. 17); the former implies the full possession and enjoyment of salvation; the latter, that they had this in superabundance. We have here a picture of that self-conceit, that sense of sufficiency and fulness which the sectarian spirit generally engenders, and by which all disposition to receive spiritual good from any quarter outside of the party circle, is entirely destroyed. The sectarian always feels himself perfectly supplied in all respects, and in no time or way needful of any thing further.—It must be acknowledged, indeed, that the Corinthians were enriched by God's grace, "in all knowledge and in all spiritual gifts" (i. 5–7), yet the consciousness of this fact was disfigured by their pride; and that sense of their poverty in themselves, and of their manifold defects, which ought to have kept them humble, was in like manner suppressed.—In the verbs ἐπλουτήσατε and ἐβασιλεύσατε, the Aorist form leads us out of the idea of simple *being* into that of *becoming* (having become) comp. 2 Cor. viii. 9. By the word "reign" we are not to understand either the enjoyment of any high degree of knowledge, authority, safety and happiness [as Calvin and Barnes]; nor yet the supremacy attained by party leaders [as Billroth]; nor yet the preëminence of one party over another. Paul here refers to that regal state which Christians were to enjoy under the future reign of the Messiah, and which is alluded to in 2 Tim. ii. 12; Rom. viii. 17; Jno. xvii. 24; Rev. v. 10; xx. 4;—a state in which they should be delivered from all the restraints of this life, and introduced into the full possession of all the gifts and powers of the heavenly kingdom. This it is which he says the Corinthians had begun to assume *already*, so prematurely. [So Alf., Stanley, Words., Hodge]. "That which afterwards developed itself in the Papacy on the one side, and in the fanatical sects, like that of the Anabaptists, on the other, had already begun to prevail in the Corinthian Church. When both the bottomless depths of sin and the glory of divine grace are alike uncomprehended, then people dream themselves into a supremacy, whose kingdom, with all its show of spirituality, is of this world, and where the holy Apostles enter not." BESSER.

There remains to be considered the cutting expression—**without us**—*i. e.* without our presence or coöperation. He does not here mean to charge them with having given him any personal affront; but he only states with emphasis the fact as it was, viz., that in all their boasting, and in all their supposed attainment of their goal, himself and associates, ["who had been looking forward to present them on that day as their glory and joy" ALF.], had no part, and were not needed.

From this point he turns to speak in another tone ["and with solemnity" ALF.].—**I would**—ὄφελον, according to later usage, a particle with the Indicative. [The addition "to God" found in our version, is not authorized, or at

least not demanded by the original. The Scriptures do not authorize such appeals to God as seem to be in common, when our version was made" Hodge].—**indeed**;—γε strengthens the wish—**that ye did reign.**—The irony can hardly be supposed to continue here, as if he insinuated as the object of his wish: "that you might give us some share in your kingdom, [and that we might be of some account among you." So Lightfoot, who interprets this as a "bitter taunt"]. This would have been indeed too bitter. Rather we must take it as the expression of a glorious and sincere wish, that they had already reached the goal; so that the Apostles, their teachers, might enjoy their glory with them, inasmuch as both parties were inseparable in their final fruition of glory when this was actually obtained. "When you shall be perfected, then we shall have ease, and the end of Apostolic trouble." Bengel. This is implied in the clause—**that we might reign with you.**—In thus speaking of them as the original possessors of glory, and of the Apostles as only partners with them, he adopts a humble phraseology, which at the same time conveys an indirect rebuke at their pride (comp. Osiander in loco).

Ver. 9. **For.**—He here proceeds to state what reason he had for the wish just expressed, and how closely it lay on his heart. This reason might be seen in the miserable condition which he and his fellow Apostles were in. The connection may be stated thus: 'for we, the Apostles, ("founders of churches, which these high-swelling pseudo-apostles are not," Osi.), are so persecuted and afflicted, that this fellowship in the kingdom cannot but be greatly desired by us.' This is a more simple interpretation than to insert a parenthesis here, implying: 'but this cannot happen until the kingdom of God is revealed; for I think,' *etc.* Ruckert is mistaken in supposing that the irony is still continued, as if it meant: 'very probably God has appointed us last; you naturally go in first, then, after all the rest, we follow suit.' This interpretation (which supposes that what immediately precedes is ironical likewise) presents the Apostle in a too ignoble aspect for even the utmost candor to admit. There is no implication of this sort in the opening word:—**I think**—δοκῶ—**God has exhibited.**—ἀπέδειξεν, as in 2 Thess. ii. 4, comp. θέατρον—**us.**—To interpret this of Paul alone [as Calvin, Beza] is forbidden by the article before ἀποστόλους—**the Apostles.**—And in case any would wish to translate: 'God has appointed us, the *last Apostles*, unto death [as Calvin, Chrys.], an objection arises to this, apart from all other reasons, in the fact, that then the article would have been put before ἐσχάτους:—**last.**—In this word [which is here a predicate, attached to the verb defining its operation] there is expressed in a general manner what is afterwards stated more definitely—*last*, not in point of time, but in grade of society (*homines infirmæ sortis*).—**as appointed unto death.**—ὡς ἐπιθανατίους, Chrys.: καταδίκους; Suid.: προσδοκίμους τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν, comp. 2 Cor. xi. 23–27. No allusion is here made to *bestiarii*, or to gladiators [as Stanley after Tertullian, Chrys., Calvin and others]. That they, as malefactors condemned to death, were also exposed to public contempt, is still further set forth in a causal sentence—**for we are become a spectacle.**—θέατρον, which is elsewhere called θέαμα. So θεατρίζεσθαι, Heb. x. 33—**to the world.**—["not to a single city, but to the whole world" Chrys.],—corresponding to the range of the Apostles' labors, which embraced all nations and lands (see Col. i. 6, 23; Rom. x. 18).—But this general term is so specialized as to include also the dwellers in heaven, the angels; and so he seems here to pass, in thought, beyond the direct sphere of his personal activity.—**As well to angels as to men.**—By "angels" does he mean good or evil angels? Undoubtedly the former, since no epithet is applied; and, according to New Testament usage (with but one exception—vi. 3), the term denotes good angels, never the bad only, nor yet the two classes together. Only in case we take the word "spectacle" in a bad sense, indicating an object for mocking and malicious enjoyment, can we suppose bad angels to be intended. We should then be compelled to take the term "world" as a designation of the entire realm of beings hostile to the Gospel. This, however, would be an arbitrary interpretation (see Meyer). While then by "men" we understand all on earth, of every sort, who observe the Apostles' wants and suffering, the "angels" can only mean those who from above look down in loving sympathy and wonder at the Apostles' steadfastness. Such are the cloud of witnesses in the midst of which Paul feels that he and his associates are exhibited for a spectacle. Comp. Osi., and passages like Luke xxii. 43; Matth. iv. 11; Heb. xii. 22; 1 Pet. i. 12. On the contrary, Luther, Neander, Bisping, Besser, interpret the word, of angels and men, both good and evil. Besser says: "So the world, both angels and men, are divided in respect to the Apostles and their ministry. It is a spiritual battle, to which the Gospel trumpet summons the hosts in heaven and on earth, in the atmosphere and the whole visible circuit. The scene presented to the eyes of men, is but an image of that which goes on behind the curtain."

Ver. 10. ["Again the bitterest irony: 'how different our lot from yours! How are you to be envied—we to be pitied!' Alford]. He begins with a contrast lying nearest his thought. —**We, fools for Christ's sake.**—"Are" is understood. He means: 'we *pass* for fools, because we preach Christ crucified, and propose to know nothing else.' Osiander's explanation transcends the simple meaning of the words: 'I am content out of love for Christ and his cause to pass for a fool.'—**but ye, wise in Christ,**—*i.e.*, they, in their union with Christ (not, "in the Church," nor, "in the doctrine" of Christ), are very knowing, full of insight. This is ironical. They *fancy* themselves such, and seek to pass for such, in their efforts to combine Christianity and secular wisdom.—**we, weak,**—ἀσθενεῖς signifies a lack of energy, which any superficial observer might suppose to characterize the Apostle, by reason of his modest reserve on the one hand, and of his suffering condition on the other. (Comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 4; x. 10). "The word expresses the prevailing tone of the Apos-

tle's mind—a consciousness of weakness, by virtue of which he was the better able to receive strength from God." NEANDER. (See ii. 3).—**but ye, strong.**—Ἰσχυροί suggests the idea of a bold, energetic forth-putting, which carried the appearance of assumption, and "a proud parade of abilities that were derived from the Lord." With this, there is closely connected the condition, which, by reversing the order of the contrast, is presented first.—**ye, glorious,**—Ἔνδοξοι *i. e.*, in honor and authority, by reason of your wisdom and power.—**but we, despised.**—Ἄτιμοι, *i. e.*, void of esteem, in disgrace, as seen in the shameful treatment received. To supply the words: "on account of Christ," and: "in Christ," in the second and third antithesis, is unnecessary, although it would yield fitting sense.

VERS. 11–13.—He here leaves the antithesis, and goes on to enlarge upon the destitution and ignominy endured by the Apostles. [His irony, too, gives way to deep, earnest feeling, awakened in view of all he had encountered for Christ and for the Church; and his spirit mellows to the kindlier mood which speaks in ver. 14].—**unto this present hour.**—The designation stands in contrast with the "already" of ver. 8. [While they seemed to have got through trials into triumphs, he was still in the midst of trouble].—**we both hunger and thirst and are in want of clothing.**—Γυμνιτεύειν, 2 Cor. xi. 27; Matth. xxv. 36; Jas. ii. 15; Is. lviii. 7. [On the form of this verb see Winer, § xvi. "From γυμνός one would expect γυμνίτης and accordingly the best codd. have in this place, γυμνίτευομεν, which we must not, with Fr. and Meyer, take for an orthographical error."].—**and are buffeted.**—Κολαφίζεσθαι, *to be beaten with fists* (comp. Matth. xxvi. 67; 1 Pet. ii. 20.—**and have no certain dwelling place.**—ἀστατοῦμεν. The word occurs only here,—lit., *are without fixed abode*—and points to flights amid persecutions [such as Paul often was obliged to make; and why not also to his perpetual journeyings, having given up home to be the continual missionary that he was?]—**and we labor,**—From pains he turns to toils. (Comp. ix. 6; 2 Cor. xi. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 9; Acts xviii. 3).—**working,**—*i. e.*, as a hired person,—**with our own hands.**—According to Greek notions, this involved a sort of disgrace (ἀτιμία).—**Being reviled we bless.**—He here goes on to exhibit his self-denial in still other forms, as shown in his deportment under ill usage. 'In requital for wicked words of execration (λοιδορεῖν), we give good words of benediction (εὐλογεῖν).'—**Being persecuted we suffer it.**—*i. e.*, under a persistent and active hostility (διωκειν) we exhibit a patience, which refrains from retaliation or resistence, and lets all pass (ἀνεχέσθαι).—**being defamed, we entreat.**—For slanderous speeches (δυσφημεῖν) we return dissuasions (παρακαλεῖν), entreaties that such things may not happen, not intercessions before God [as Calvin; but Stanley says: (1) 'we offer consolation,' or (2) as in ver. 16, 'we entreat men to follow our example,' comp. 2 Cor. i. 3]. The reading βλασφημούμενοι, is indeed well supported [see under the text], and it means essentially the same thing.—Whether godless cursings are also therein implied, is at least doubtful, since this idea comes in only when God is the object of the blasphemy. [But why should not this idea enter here as well, when Paul carried on himself the name of Christ which was blasphemed in him? This was the sorest spot on which a true Apostle could be attacked. Hence in this word his statements reach a climax]. In these declarations Paul gives us to understand, not (as Meyer) that the Apostles were so very destitute of honor among men, that they did not care to vindicate themselves against their villifiers (as persons do who have honor to maintain), but that they sought honor itself by thus requiting and overcoming evil with good. (Comp. Matth. v. 44; Luke xxiii. 34; Acts vii. 60; Rom. vii. 14, 17; 1 Pet. iii. 9).

Finally, he returns to the simple exhibition of the dishonor into which they were cast, and sets it forth in deepest colors and at the extremest point.—**as the refuse of the world have we become.**—Mey.: 'It is as if we were the scum, the vilest dregs of mankind.' This idea, however, would not be lost if, with Luther and others, we were to translate the word περικαθάρματα: *sin offerings*, in allusion to an ancient custom (the continuance of which, however, to the time of the Apostle cannot be confidently asserted, or that it was so far held in popular remembrance that the expression would be readily understood in this sense), *viz.*, that of devoting to death the vilest men, such as slaves and malefactors, in seasons of public calamity, for the purpose of conducting off from the rest the wrath of the Deity. These *homines piaculares* were indeed designated by the simpler word κάθαρμα; but in Prov. xxi. 18, the LXX. gives περικάθαρμα for the Hebrew כֹּפֶר; *sin offering*. It denotes *purification*, remotely, *expiation;* but also, that which is purged away, *filth, refuse, offal;* in Arrian, *a reprobate man, an outcast.* [Calvin says that "Paul, in adding the preposition περί, seems to have had an eye to the expiatory rite itself, inasmuch as those unhappy men, who were devoted to execrations, were led *around* through the streets, that they might carry away with them whatever there was of evil in any corner, that the cleansing might be more complete." Hodge thinks any such allusion improbable, in consequence of the uncommonness of the custom. "Paul," he says, "certainly did not consider himself or his sufferings as a propitiation for other men. The point of comparison, if there be any allusion to the custom in question, is to the vileness of the victims which were always chosen from the worthless and the despised."] Luther's interpretation, given above, accords well with what follows.—**and of all things the offscouring unto this day.**—περίψημα, *that which is wiped off* (περιψᾶν) in cleansing, *scrapings* and *filings.* This word also occurs in the formula with which the human victims, who were put under the curse, were ordinarily consecrated: περίψημα ἡμῶν γίνου—ἤτοι σωτηρία καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις: be thou our expiation, that which by us is set apart for the purification of the rest (Suidas). Meyer's objection that in this case the plural, περιψήματα, would be required, because each individual would be regarded as a separate sin-

offering, hardly suffices to set aside this objection, since all the Apostles may be taken collectively as composing one such offering. The Genitives, *κόσμου*,—*πάντων*: *the world's*,—*of all* (which stand first as emphatic) by this explanation, denote those whose curse lights on them, and in behalf of whom they are sacrificed. [In the second edition, which is posthumous, the editor adds], nevertheless without the *περι*, in *περικάθαρμα*, having anything to do with this (analogously with the phrase *περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας*), or without any support being given to the assumption of any expiatory virtue in the Apostle's sufferings. But although the idea of expiation and deliverance through another's sufferings, especially of the guilty party, comes elsewhere prominently forward, and this is the strongest designation of fellowship in the sufferings of Christ, who was reckoned among the transgressors; and although the Apostle speaks of his official sufferings in images drawn from the sacrificial phraseology, in order to express the greatness and sanctity of the end they furthered, *viz.*, blessing for the Church and the world: yet this thought is foreign to our context, and, all things considered, the explanation given in the translation deserves the preference.—Here we have a description of the deepest disgrace. [Wordsworth ingeniously argues for the sacrificial idea].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

[1. *The promised glory of believers not to be realized here on earth*, as the Corinthians seemed to imply by their conduct]. The true view of Christ and of Christianity combines an Idealism and a Realism. On the one hand, in Christ old things have passed away and all things become new. (2 Cor. v. 17). He who believes in Christ has eternal life (Jno. iii. 36); God has quickened us in Christ, and has raised us up together, and made us to sit together in heavenly places in Christ (Eph. ii. 5 ff.). But on the other hand, it doth not yet appear what we shall be (1 Jno. iii. 2); our life is hid with Christ in God (Col. iii. 3); we here walk by faith, not by sight (2 Cor. v. 7); we are indeed saved, but it is in hope (Rom. viii. 24).—This latter side of Christianity, which is betokened in the very cross-bearing character of Christ's kingdom, is utterly misapprehended by a false idealism, which would anticipate in this life the glory of Christ's kingdom, shrinks from all manner of sufferings and trials, loves to luxuriate in self-satisfaction and in the enjoyment of the riches and the glory which are in Christ, and seeks to make an impression abroad with the show of higher learning and science, so that Christianity shall attain to honor and authority and influence in the world, in accordance with the truth that Christ is the Lord to whom all power in heaven and upon earth belongs—a truth, which it is claimed, must manifest itself more and more in the outward condition of those who are his. This idealism is the fruitful source of various forms of fanaticism, from the anticipation of the regal glory of Christ by the Romish hierarchy, and from the grossest Chiliasm which aims to set up a sort of secularized kingdom of God (as seen in the Anabaptists of the 16th century), down to the most refined theories of a progressive spiritual transformation, according to which Christianity is gradually to pervade the whole human race in all spheres of life, and to overcome all opposition, until at last it get possession of, and assimilate to itself, all governments and social customs, and art and science, and thus appear in full glory. In all this we see a Pelagianizing ignoring of the sharp contrast, which exists between the present condition of the world, rooted as it is the life of nature, and the spirit of Christ; also, a vain self-sufficiency, which hopes to find in the attainment of certain results, in the relative improvement of our earthly conditions, in the glow which the sun of truth and righteousness may cast over human affairs, in the reformation effected by the Gospel in all departments of human society,—in short, in the modification of the natural by the spiritual, a form of life springing out of, and developing itself from the spiritual unto the natural, and so dreams of a progressive realization of the kingdom of God on earth. Of an apostasy, of a fearful catastrophe, of antichrist and his overthrow, of a new heavens and a new earth following upon the destruction of the old, it evinces no knowledge. All this it quietly ignores. Hence all that glory which the promises of God's Word exhibit to our hope, and reserve for a future age altogether different from the present, it assumes to have already in this, by a gradual, ceaseless, progressive development. The beginnings of such notions were already discernible in the Corinthian Church during the life of Paul, and with great soberness he encounters it by an exhibition of the actual state of things with the Apostles themselves—a state of things which was of a far different sort. According to the mind and precedent of Christ, he shows them that the passage to glory lies through sufferings. (Luke xiv. 27; Acts xiv. 22; Jno. xii. 24). But this the worldly-minded would fain overleap, passing round the vale of humiliation, trouble, persecution and self-denial, to enter at once into the full possession of glory. They shrink from the cross. Hence when it comes to hard conflicts and severe tests, they are readily shaken, and are scandalized, and seduced into error, and exposed to apostasy.

2. *A spectacle to angels.* An encouraging thought, rooted in the idea of a one all-embracing kingdom of God. As in Christ and through Him and to Him all things were created, which are in heaven and on earth (Col. i. 16 ff.), so has it pleased God to gather together in Him all things, which are in heaven and upon earth (Eph. i. 10),—in Him, through whom the angelic as well as the human world shall be restored to their original harmony with God (comp. Meyer on Col. i. 20),—and through whose church unto principalities and powers in heaven shall be made known the manifold wisdom of God (Eph. iii. 8; comp. 1 Pet. i. 12). Hence these heavenly spirits are full of liveliest interest in God's redemptive work on earth. Those very beings, who have by God's grace, been set in such close relations with earth's little ones as to be called "their angels," who have been sent "to minister for them who should be heirs of salvation," and who "rejoice over the sinner that repenteth," are also sympa-

thizing witnesses of the conflicts and sufferings of God's co-laborers in the work of redemption. And while human observers are differently impressed with these same scenes, yet in this heavenly host there is felt nothing but astonishment and joy in view of the steadfastness and patience exhibited. Moreover, as an angel from heaven was seen to strengthen our Lord in the hour of His agony, so in the darkest hour of the conflict will angels be near to quicken and strengthen the soldiers of the cross. The encouragement and confirmation accruing to these oppressed sufferers and fighters of the good fight, from the consciousness of sympathy from such witnesses, corresponds to that which is said in Heb. xii. 1, in reference to the great cloud of witnesses, composed of the ancient heroes of the faith, and of the believers looking to Jesus the author and finisher of our faith.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[1. *Spiritual pride, self-sufficiency, vain-glorying, assumption of superiority*, are so unbecoming and absurd as to be the *fit objects not only of severe rebuke*, but *also of ridicule:* for: 1. they are contrary to a Christian's dependence on God for what he is and has (ver. 7); 2. they proceed upon the false assumption, that the glory and the crown belong to the present age, whereas they are only to be enjoyed after Christ comes, and the whole church can possess them together (ver. 8); 3. they are contrary to apostolic example. The Apostles were cross-bearers all their lives through, and looked for the crown hereafter. (ver. 9–13)].

[2. *Indignant reproof, irony, sarcasm, satire*, are legitimate means for correction and discipline. But like the instruments of a surgeon, they are as dangerous as they are keen and useful, and can be safely employed only by skilful hands and loving hearts. When badly managed they kill rather than cure. Let none attempt to handle them, unless like Paul they are conscious only of the sincerest paternal affection towards those on whom they are used. Malice in the heart is sure to poison their edge, while love conveys healing balm through the wounds they make].

STARKE:—VER. 7. Whose is the fine plumage? Hast thou borrowed it? How then, supposing the wind should carry it away? Where is thy boasting then? Give then to God his own, and do not serve either thyself or the devil with thy gifts. (Hed.).—Ver. 8. Desire not here in time what is only to be had yonder in Eternity. Here is strife; there alone is perfect rest and glory.—Ver. 9. They who are adorned with greatest gifts, have the greatest trials for their humiliation.—Ver. 10. External influence, happiness, glory, are no signs of a true Church. Who are the best Christians? The wise, the strong, the lordly? No. They are the weak, the despised, those who for Christ's sake are willing to be as fools.—Ver. 11. Thou complainest of persecution in thy office? Consider, has it come to hunger, thirst, nakedness, blows? Hast thou "resisted unto blood?" The crown is given to the soldier who has 'endured hardness.'—Ver. 12. A person is not *required* to preach without pay. Yet be content. Do not desert thy office because of a small salary. To do good and to suffer evil are the peculiar tokens of a true servant of Christ. The Christian's proper weapons in persecution are patience and prayer.—Ver. 13. The true children of God understand well the greatness of their spiritual nobility, and that this, so far from being sullied by the base treatment of the world, is only made more illustrious thereby.

RIEGER:—Instead of courting admiration for Christianity, and admiring in turn those who admire us and our cause, it becomes us to root ourselves more deeply in a self-denying spirit. One chief characteristic of godlessness is lowliness of mind, which gives to God all the praise, and counts men for nothing.—When we are willing to rend the bond of peace for the sake of aught we prize, we act not as if we had received it from the Lord whose gifts are to be appropriated in love, but as if we were at liberty to turn it all to our own selfish uses and advantage.—Where danger is greatest, there oftentimes presumption and self-confidence are at the height. The faithful performance of duty in the midst of shame, and detraction, and persecution, is a spectacle which angels cannot but admire, and men regard with honor. How many are disposed to leave cross-bearing to the Apostles and early Christians, and to maintain a Christianity in which the world will find nothing to hate.

HEUBNER:—VER. 7. True humility springs from a sense of our absolute dependence on God. This guards from pride. With this there belongs also a clear recognition of God's greatness and glory; we must feel that God is every thing, and we nothing. Only an exalted nature can be truly humble. How foolish our pride over advantages that we did not procure. The more gifts received from God, the greater the cause to be humble. Pride is not mere *folly;* it is *wickedness* also, because it robs God of His glory.—Ver. 8. Judging from their outward condition, God appears often to treat believers, not as if they were His children, but as if they were the vilest of the race. But the more He puts on us, the more we are observed. The holy angels, unseen, rejoice when they see us victorious. Devils look on, hoping that we may succumb.—Ver. 10. Christians, when most deserving, are often the most derided. The dishonor put upon the primitive believers is a mortifying rebuke to our pride. What a contrast between the cross-bearing Apostles and the later clergy, with their costly tables, splendid array, their pomp, and retinues, and palaces!—Ver. 12. Paul an example of noble independence. He earned his own bread.

GOSSNER:—VER. 6. We were made to be humble, and should be kept short. Too much honor should not be shown us in this life. If you see a person exalting himself above others, look for no further evidence of his folly.—Ver. 8. Even in our time, there are among the awakened some, who feel already perfect, and satisfied, and rich, from mere knowledge, while their fellowship with the Saviour and love for Him has grown cold.—Ver. 11. The disciple of Jesus moves through this world always a stranger, nowhere tolerated, nowhere at home; and even should he settle any where, it is uncertain how long the world and his foes would allow him to remain. In such a

case comfort comes from Christ.—Ver. 13. It is better to be the offscouring, than the honored of the world; better a castaway, than the bosom-child of a wicked race. The Saviour chose shame, the Apostles also, and we should arm ourselves with the same mind.

W. T Besser:—Ver. 7. Nothing is mine but my sin; nothing, not saving knowledge and sanctifying wisdom, not repentance, not faith, nor love; in short, nothing Christian, have I from myself. It is all grace received—a gift from God (Jas. i. 17). To have received and then to boast is a hateful inconsistency. Gratitude and praise alone are becoming to recipients—accordant praise from all recipients of the manifold grace of God. In scorning thy brother less gifted, take heed that thou findest not fault with God.—Ver. 8. What, already satisfied! This is self-deception. Satisfaction, without hungering and thirsting, comes only when we behold God's face in righteousness and awake in His likeness (Ps. xvii. 15).—Ver. 11. Christian fasting is of two kinds—one when a person fasts voluntarily for the sake of serving the Lord with lighter spirit; the other when one is compelled to it as a Christian for Christ's sake (2 Cor. xi. 27).—Ver. 12. If we cannot stop the mouths of our defamers with soft words of entreaty, we have still one resort: we can pray that God will 'not lay the sin to their charge.' The prosperity which the Corinthians sought upon earth was then, and is now, to be had only at the cost of separating from the Apostles and from the true Gospel.—While all the Corinthian glory is but as stubble, the crown of honor will rest ever fresh and green upon the heads of the despised Apostles, both in Heaven and upon earth.

IX.—PATERNAL ADDRESSES AND WARNINGS.

A. The grounds, spirit and intent of his severity. As their spiritual father, he would have them imitate him.*

Chapter IV. 14–17.

14 I write not these things to shame you, but as my beloved sons I warn[1] [ad-
15 monish] *you*. For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet *have ye* not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten [begot] you through the
16 gospel. Wherefore I beseech you, be [become] ye followers [imitators] of me.
17 For this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my[2] beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ[3], as I teach every where in every church.

[1] Ver. 14.—The variation νουθετῶν [found in A. Cod. Sin.] is a supposed improvement, made for the purpose of uniformity with ἐντρέπων.

[2] Ver. 17.—Instead of the Rec. τέκνον μου. Tischendorf [Alf., Stanley] read μου τέκνον according to A. B. C. [Cod. Sin.] and others. ["The Rec. is a correction to the more usual order." Alf.].

[3] Ver. 17.—Lach. reads Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [after C. D². Cod. Sin. Vulg. etc.]. Others, κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ [after D¹. F.]. But the Rec. Χριστῷ is best supported [being found in A. B. D³. L. and in most citations of the Fathers].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Ver. 14. Sinking now into a milder tone, 'not from motives of prudence, but in accordance with his own natural disposition,' (Neander), and in order to observe his own precept, 'not to provoke children to wrath,' (Besser), he here goes on to explain the ground and intent of the severity he had used. He had rebuked them, as a father would his children, out of paternal love, and as he had a right to do.—**Not shaming you,**—ἐντρέπων. The participle here does not necessarily involve the idea of intention or design, as if it meant: 'not for the purpose of shaming you;' although the present part. *may* denote a purpose which one is already on the point of realizing. Meyer: 'I do not shame you by that which I now write,' (*i. e.*, from vv. 8–13). Ruckert's idea, that Paul alludes here to his charges for not being properly supported (vv. 11 and 12) is too restricted, and unsustained by the context. Alike needless, also, is his explanation of ἐντρέπειν, *to cast down, to shatter*, as it occurs in Aelian. And at all events, the word cannot mean, as elsewhere in Greek, *to restore to a right mind, to cause a person to come to himself.* The Apostle commonly uses it in the sense in which it usually occurs in the LXX., for חָפַר, *to shame*, in connection with αἰσχύνεσθαι (see Frommii Concord.) (comp. 2 Thess. iii. 14; Tit. ii. 8; also the subst. ἐντροπή 1 Cor. vi. 5; xv. 34).—**do I write these things**—ταῦτα, *i. e.*, the things written from the eighth to the thirteenth verse,—**but as my beloved children.**—A tender and winning word, designed to re-

[* This section has been divided on account of the manifest difference between the two parts].

mind them that, with all his severity toward their pride and false security, he yet regarded them with paternal affection, and was only seeking their restoration to a right mind.—**I admonish you.**—*Νουθετεῖν, to bring to mind, to warn.*—It may imply severe rebuke or friendly admonition. Here it is evidently the latter. [See more fully on this word Trench *Syn. N. T.*' *sub voce*, and Wm. Webster, *Syntax and Synonymns of the Gr. T.*].

VER. 15. He justifies his right to admonish on the ground of the paternal relation he sustains to them. This he exhibits in contrast with the mere preceptorship held by their other teachers. To the latter they were indebted only for discipline, but to him they owed their spiritual existence.—**For even though.**—By virtue of the relation of the two clauses indicated by *ἀλλ', ἐάν* carries the significance of *κἄν, even though*—**ye have ten thousand.**—*Μυρίους* implies only an indefinitely large number, as in xiv. 19. Bisp.: 'never so many,'—a hint, perhaps, that there were too many teachers there,—**instructors**—*παιδαγωγούς*. This word among the Greeks designated those who were employed to look after, and train little children; and these were commonly slaves. Paul here applies it to the teachers who succeeded him (iii. 10 ff.), but without any bad implication [such as Calvin, Beza and de Wette suppose], since this would not befit Apollos and others like him. Nor can we well conceive the term to imply that those whom it designated were holding the Corinthians back in rudimental knowledge [Calvin] (Gal. iv. 2), or were acting upon a stand-point that sought to unite legal and evangelical elements. All he means is that his right over them was higher, his relation to them more intimate than that of any other could be; and that these allowed him the privilege of supervising their education in their new Christian life.—**in Christ.**—This adjunct shows the sphere in which these instructors were supposed to labor, that of the Christian life. [Hodge says, that "the words in the original show that they belong to the verb, 'Though ye may have in Christ, *i. e.* in reference to Christ, or as Christians, many instructors yet have ye not many fathers.'"]—**yet not many fathers, for in Christ Jesus.**—Here again, as before, the words "in Christ Jesus," denote the element in which Paul labored.—**I begot you.**—*i. e.* as Christians. On *γεννᾷν* comp. Phil. 10; Gal. iv. 19. Others connect the words 'in Christ Jesus' with 'I,' and make it mean: 'I in Christ,' *i. e.* as 'an Apostle in Christ.' But as this designation in the foregoing clause does not belong to 'instructors' in any such way as to mean, that they instructed by virtue of their fellowship with Christ, so here it is not to be similarly connected with Paul, although it was in itself true, that those labors of his, which begot in them the new life, and developed it afterwards, could have proved successful only so far as they had been wrought in Christ—**through the Gospel.**—Here we have the instrumentality employed. It was the proclamation of those good tidings which are briefly summed up in Jno. iii. 16; 1 Tim. i. 15, and elsewhere. The Gospel is 'the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth' (Rom. i. 16); 'the word of the cross;' 'the word of truth,' by which God begets us (Jas. i. 18); 'the living,' the undestructible seed of the new birth (1 Pet. i. 23). And the essential substance of this Gospel, that which gives it its quickening and nourishing power, is Christ Himself [the Word in the word.] The claim to paternity here put forth, is in no way prejudicial to the fatherhood of God, or the Lordship of Christ, since Paul is here speaking of the relation which the Church sustained to the different teachers in respect to the origin and growth of their spiritual life. The higher absolute relation to God is here presupposed, and even intimated by the phrases "in Christ" and "through the Gospel." The simple instrumentality, alluded to in the whole case, is evident of itself; just as in 1 Tim. iv. 16.

VER. 17. **Therefore:**—*i. e.* because I am to you as a father, and it accords with the analogy of nature, that children should resemble their parents.—**I beseech you.**—An affectionate entreaty to heed one brief request.—**be ye imitators of me.**—But how far? Not in general; but in those particulars which he has just been enumerating, wherein he stood in such striking contrast with them, *viz.*, in humility and self-resignation; "in the renouncement of all ambition and conceit" MEYER; we might also add with Osiander, 'in that self-devoted heroism with which he sealed his faith.' ["Nor these only," says Alf., "but also, as in ver. 17, in his manner of life and teaching"].

VER. 18. **For this cause.**—This is to be referred back either to ver. 15, as expressing the *motive* of his sending Timothy: 'because I am your father, and feel towards you like one' [as Chrys., Theoph. and others]; or to ver. 16, as indicating the purpose of his sending him: to promote your imitation of me. The latter reference is to be preferred, otherwise ver. 16 must be taken parenthetically. Osiander combines both, and justly, in so far as what is said in ver. 16, rests upon the paternal relationship asserted in ver. 15. The meaning is: 'since I, as a father, must insist on your imitating my example, I have sent unto you my dear Timothy, who will aid you in this respect.'—**I have sent to you Timothy**—not as though Timothy was to be the bearer of the Epistle (comp. Acts xvi. 10), since he came later, being obliged to go through Macedonia on his way to Corinth (Acts xix. 22).—**who is my son.**—Timothy is here represented as one who, equally with the Corinthians, was converted by Paul, and had derived through him his spiritual life, and so held the same relations to Paul that they did. And the Apostle testifies to his tender care over them in the fact, that he sends to them this their brother, who was especially dear to him, and enjoyed his fullest confidence; one, therefore, whom they had peculiar reason to welcome cordially, as a person able to exhibit to them the mind of their common father in a most reliable manner. [It must be remembered also that Timothy was with Paul during his first visit to Corinth, and must therefore have been personally known to a large portion of the Church]. To explain the epithet 'my son,' on the ground that Timothy had been *educated to his office* by Paul, after the manner that the Rabbis called their scholars 'sons,' is not sufficiently sustained by the consideration

that we have no further information of his conversion by Paul. Rather the intimacy of the relation between the two expressions in Tim. i. 2, 18; 2 Tim. i. 2, and also the application to him of the same title, 'beloved son,' which had just been applied to the Corinthians, would seem to confirm the opinion that Paul had also 'begotten him through the Gospel.'—**beloved and faithful in the Lord.**—The phrase 'in the Lord' belongs not merely to 'faithful,' (*i. e.* devoted to me, true to his calling, and therefore reliable) but also to all that is said of Timothy. The praise bestowed on Timothy appears also to have the incidental purpose of impressing upon the Corinthians, in a tender manner, the kind of conduct which they owed to their spiritual fathers.

Timothy's errand is expressed in the words:—**who shall remind you of my ways in the Lord.**—The ἀναμιμνήσκειν: *to remind*, presupposes the existence of a knowledge which has been repressed by adverse influences, so that it needs to be called up again and refreshed. "There is a slight implication here" (Osiander), and Chrysostom remarks that 'the word is finely chosen to quiet the pride of the Corinthians which might be aroused at the idea of being taught by a youth.' What he means by 'his ways in Christ' he goes on to explain.—**as I teach every where in every church.**—It was his mode of conduct as a Christian teacher; and this, as it regarded, not so much the subject of his teaching, or its manner, as his demeanor while doing it,—the humility and self-denial with which he discharged his calling. This is implied by the connection. The use of καθώς here, as employed to introduce a defining clause, in the sense of: *how*, is somewhat remarkable. See Acts xv. 14; 3 John, 3 [where the word is clearly used in this sense, and where Alford somewhat arbitrarily asserts that it is alone thus used]. Hence Billr. joins it to the verb '*remind*,' as if Paul meant: 'he will remind you, etc., just as I myself teach.' But from this 1, no good sense can be obtained, and 2, 'myself' is arbitrary. Osiander's explanation, though suitable in sense, is yet somewhat forced: 'who will remind you of my walk (my course of life), agreeably to which I teach everywhere.' The first explanation has the most in its favor, in spite of its grammatical difficulties. The 'reminding' could however refer to his activity *in other churches* also, since they undoubtedly had knowledge of this, from information which had been given by brethren on their travels. The reference to this uniformity of his conduct generally, strengthened the motive for their imitating him.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Spiritual paternity.*—The awakening of the spiritual life in man is a Divine act. It *originates* in God's purpose of salvation, formed in reference to the individual (Jas. i. 18; Eph. i. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 13). Its *ground* is Christ, in His complex divine-human life as carried out in the work of redemption, which was effected through His death and resurrection and final glorification (Jno. vii. 39). Its immediate *cause* is the Holy Spirit, who imparts to the redeemed the new life of Christ, proceeding from his death; or, in other words, reproduces in us individually the new man of righteousness, born in Christ through a judicial process of death passed upon the old man or the flesh. The *organ* of this Spirit is the Word, *viz.*, the testimony of Christ, and concerning Christ, which proceeds from Him; and the object and substantial contents of which He Himself is. By bringing this living Word forcibly to bear upon the heart, the Spirit opens the heart. Testifying to sinners of the love of God cherished towards them individually in Christ, he regains their lost confidence; and starts the fountains of all godly life, of all holy conduct towards God,—in obedience and patience; and puts an end to the old distrust, that was the source of all rebellion and sin. And he does this in a way to magnify God and belittle man, and to convert the sinner's pride to humility.

But inasmuch as in this process of renewal God employs human instrumentalities, he confers on these also the dignity of a spiritual fatherhood, and so takes them into a sort of fellowship with Himself. This holds good, however, not of those who have become, so to speak, the accidental instruments in this work, *i. e.*, who have in some way brought about the conversion of souls either by speaking or writing saving truths, the force of which they have not practically felt, but only of those who have the life of Christ in them as an energizing power, and who can, out of their own personal experiences, testify of Him, and of His enlightening and regenerating grace, and who are therefore in a condition to beget a kindred life in others. Standing in Christ as the ground of their life, and moving ever in Him, such persons are enabled to introduce others into the same communion, by presenting to them, in quickening power through the Gospel, Jesus Christ in the fulness of His holy love and in His redeeming work, and by thus inducing them to come out from themselves and give themselves up to Him who has given and will yet give Himself for them. In this way they become spiritual fathers; for it is by virtue of the living power of Christ dwelling in them that they are capable of engendering life in others, just as in the sphere of the physical life, the natural creative power, resident in the individual as a personal property, involves in its generative exercise the character and dignity of the paternal relation.

But the more clearly and simply this spiritual paternity is recognized and maintained upon its Divine ground, the more decisively will all further educational efforts on the part of the earthly parent result in bringing these spiritual children out from their first dependence on him (a dependence which often involves an unworthy attachment to his personal idiosyncracies), and fastening them more exclusively upon Him, who is the eternal and absolute ground of this relation, even God in Christ. The children are thus liberated from all that is limited and imperfect in the human parent, to enter upon a freer and more independent development in Christ, and thus to make purer advances in knowledge and holiness.

But this spiritual paternity carries with it a high authority, a holy right to discipline, to re-

buke, to exhort, to purify, with severity or mildness, or both commingled, as circumstances may demand. And this right is exercised as one of love, and under love's strong impulses, and with that ingenuous wisdom which is peculiar to love, and with which it devises all sorts of methods for alluring, urging, restraining, arousing, and softening children, restoring their disturbed confidence and reëstablishing over them a weakened authority.

["A father never is afraid
Of speaking angrily to any child
Since love he knows is justified of love."]

All this is illustrated for us in the Apostle Paul.

2. [*Apostolic piety is the standard for the whole Church, even to the end of time.* The Romish theory, which distinguishes between the clergy and laity, and imposes on the former a degree of sanctity and a mode of life not exacted of the latter, is here plainly condemned in advance. Paul puts all believers on the same footing with himself. He lays claim to no special grace, and recognizes no obligation to self-denial and sacrifice which does not equally rest on the whole Church. In his office as an Apostle, he became indeed a spiritual father; but in point of that Christian character, which underlay his Apostleship, he would have his children resemble him. Here we learn that the Spirit of Christ aims to pervade His entire body, and seeks to mould all, pastors and people alike, to a common type. And this spirit is a cross-bearing spirit. It is a spirit, which it devolves on every minister to exemplify and enforce, and on every Church to imbibe and cultivate. There will be no abatement of this requisition until Christ shall come].

3. [*Christian example is an important means for instructing and edifying the Church.* Its uses are: 1. For *illustration.* It is the living Epistle, accompanying the written Epistle, in the way of comment and explanation. The truth stated in doctrine, example embodies in solid substantial forms, that are more fraught with meaning, and more vivid in expression than words can be. The duty enforced in the precept, it exhibits in the operations of a holy life, that teach the true method of its performance. Thus the understanding is helped to right conceptions of the Word; and the life of God in the Church proves the light of the world. 2. *For persuasion.* "Words teach, but examples draw." So says the proverb, and the reason is, that that inward conviction and force of will, which are the secret of personal influence, express themselves most significantly in the conduct. It is through this, therefore, that man acts most powerfully on man. 3. *For encouragement.* The lives of eminent believers show the possibility of high attainment, and a certainty of the divine promises; and by the shout of "victory at last" animate the spirits of observers to enter the fight of faith, and to do and endure in like manner, with the full assurance of like results. 4. *For rebuke.* The zeal, energy, courage, patience, self-denial and sufferings of every devoted believer, presents a disparaging and mortifying contrast with the conduct of those who, while professing a like devotion, evince only an easy idle, self-indulgent, self-satisfied spirit, or aspire only after honors and applause.

To set a worthy example is the duty not only of Apostles and ministers, but of all Christians alike. As Paul called upon the early converts to 'imitate him,' so were they instructed to live so as to extend the same call to others coming after them. The guiding word which ought to be continually heard passing down the ever lengthening ranks of the Church, as it moves onward through darkness and through light, treading in the footsteps of its great leader, should be: 'Follow me, even as I also follow Christ'].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

1. [Church founders and all who have been instrumental in converting souls should: 1. love the subjects of their labors with a paternal affection, even as they stand towards them in the peculiar relation of spiritual fathers (ver. 15); 2. aim in their reproof, however sharp, *a.* not to mortify and disgrace their spiritual offspring, but, *b.* to admonish and so restore them to duty (ver. 14); 3. set an example of the Christian life which they shall be able to call on their children to imitate (ver. 16); 4. take pains to show them how they live in all their ways, so that there shall be no excuse for ignorance or mistake, (ver. 17)].

Starke: Nothing is sharper and more penetrating than the rebukes of love, (ver. 14).—Hedinger: Ver. 15.—It is the duty and the characteristic of a true minister to beget children through the Gospel, or to lead those, who have been thus begotten, to a further knowledge of Christ. No less is it the token of a right-minded hearer to suffer himself to be thus begotten through the Word, and be trained to maturity in Christ. (1 Thess. iv. 1, 10; 1 Pet. ii. 2). A preacher must build not only with words but also with his life, and so as it were with both hands, that he may be an example to believers both in word and conversation. It is a shame for children to run in strange paths and thus degenerate, (ver. 16). The visitation of churches by suitable persons is a useful and highly necessary practice (ver. 17).

Berl. Bib.:—It is no small thing to be a spiritual father and teacher. Only those who are mature in Christ are suited for such an office; for only according to the measure of our attainments in the divine life shall we be able to beget and fashion other souls. It is, therefore, a presumption in those, who are as yet but children, to wish to become fathers and teachers, before they themselves have rightly learned (ver. 15). Who would wish to exhibit himself as a pattern for others, before he has himself patterned after Christ? (ver. 16).

Heubner:—Fathers, who carry their children on their hearts, mourn over the transgressions of their children, long for their reformation, and strive to make them blessed. Yea, they would be willing to pluck out their own hearts for their sake, if so be they might in this way do them any good (ver. 15). What joyousness of spirit is required to warrant a person in holding himself up as a pattern for others (ver. 16).

[CALVIN:—The first token of return to a right state of mind is the shame which the son begins to feel on being reproached for his fault. Yet he who admonishes in a friendly spirit will make it his particular care that whatever there is of shame, may remain with the individual admonished, and may in this manner be buried. In reproofs use moderation, mixing honey and oil with the vinegar. Let it be understood that nothing is sought but the welfare of those reproved (ver. 14).—How few there are that love the Churches with a *fatherly* affection and lay themselves out to promote their welfare. Meanwhile there are many *pedagogues* who hire out their services as it were to discharge a mere temporary office, and hold the people in subjection and admiration. When I say *pedagogues*, I do not refer to Popish priests, for I would not do them the honor of reckoning them in that number (ver. 15).—Uniformity and steadfastness of conduct "in every place," most important for a minister, so that no objection can be brought against him, as though he conducted himself differently in different places. (Ad sensum) (ver. 17)].

B. Anticipation of misconception as to his motives in sending Timothy and of consequent arrogance on the part of some. Such to be tested in point of power. The kingdom of God a thing of power.

CHAPTER IV. 18–21.

18 Now some are [have been] puffed up, as though I would not come [were not coming]
19 to you. But I will come to you shortly, if the Lord will, and will know, not the
20 speech of them which are puffed up, but the power. For the kingdom of God *is* not
21 in word, but in power. What will ye? shall I come unto you with [ἐν] a rod, or in love, and *in* the spirit of meekness?[1]

[1] Ver. 21.—The Rec. has πραΰτητος [with D. F. L. Cod. Sin.]; but Tisch. [according to A. B. C., ℵ 2] reads πραὐτητος [so Words., Alf., Stanley].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 18. He here obviates an inference which might be drawn [and, it would seem from the Apostle's language, had actually been drawn], from his sending Timothy to Corinth. It was, that he was not coming there himself. And some were elated, in consequence, with the idea, that it was because he *dared* not come.—**Some have been puffed up.**—By ἐφυσιώθησαν, *puffed up*, we are not to understand that conceit of wisdom, spoken of before, which lifted certain of them high in their own esteem, above the simplicity of the Apostle. He alludes rather to that arrogant manner, that overweening insolence, which is a common feature of party spirit. Whether any declarations of theirs, respecting his not coming to Corinth, had been communicated to Paul; or whether he only inferred from their conduct that they must be indulging in such expectations; or whether he only intended to say that they were puffed up, as though he were not to be present among them again, may be left undecided. Bengel's idea, 'that a Divine inspiration discovered to him the thoughts which would arise in their minds on reading his letter,' is ingenious, but hardly suitable.—**as though I also were not coming.**—ὡς μὴ ἐρχομένου μου δέ.—The δέ relates to the sending of Timothy, and puts μου in conjunction with him. ["ὡς expresses the assumption in their minds: the present participle ἐρχομένου refers to their saying—οὐκ ἔρχεται: 'he *is* not coming.' And, inasmuch as ὡς—ἐρχ. forms *one* idea, the δέ is placed after it all. See HART. *Partikellehre* 1, p. 190." ALF.].

VER. 19. Counter-statements.—**But I will come to you shortly.**—Paul's courage here speaks out resolutely in an emphatic, '*I will come*' (ἐλεύσομαι), which is put first. The 'shortly' (comp. xvi. 6), [but why not also the entire fact of his coming also?], he makes dependent on the will of the Lord (xvi. 7), whose servant he is, and who might appoint him tasks, the discharge of which would prevent him from executing his purpose.—**if the Lord will.**—Thus courage and assurance are coupled with a humble consciousness of dependence, and with submission to the control of a higher power. ["So constantly did Paul live in communion with Christ as his God, submitting to Him and trusting to Him at all times." HODGE].—**and I will know,** γνώσομαι.—This denotes, not a judicial finding upon a previous trial, nor yet a simple taking knowledge of by observation (Meyer), but a consciousness attained by experience, and by tests applied. It implies that *Apostolic discernment*, which penetrates through all outward shows into the very essence of things, which does not suffer itself to be deceived by lofty phrase, or high sounding threats (i. 17; iii. 4), but which accurately detects the presence or absence of a true capacity for energetic and successful labors in the kingdom of God (comp. ver. 20).—**not the speech of them that are**

puffed up, but the power.—There is the same contrast between λόγος and δύναμις here, that we have 1 Thess. i. 5; comp. 2 Tim. iii. 5, where instead of "speech" we have "the form of godliness" contrasted with "power." "Δύναμις is the essential power, or true nature and efficacy of a thing in opposition to mere external show." NEANDER. To explain it of the power to work miracles [Chrys., Grotius], or of moral virtue [Theod., Pelagius], or of the influences of doctrine upon life [Calvin], would not suit the context. ["It is power to work for the furtherance of God's kingdom—a power conditioned on the possession of true inward spiritual energy (which de Wette makes it to mean). Examples of this are seen in Paul himself, in Luther and in others." MEYER. It was such power as the Apostles were commanded to wait for at Jerusalem, ere they went forth to be witnesses for their Lord, and which was exhibited so wonderfully at the day of Pentecost; such power as Paul speaks of, when to the Thessalonians he said: 'Our Gospel came not unto you, in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost' (where we see that the antithesis in the text is not to be taken absolutely but relatively); such power as is mentioned in Rom. xv. 18, "the Gentiles being made obedient by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Holy Ghost." It was an essential attribute of the Church, and especially of the ministry of the Church, as energized for the conquest of the world by the indwelling spirit of God, and so made mighty to the pulling down of strongholds. The lack of power, therefore, indicated an absence of the spirit,—the want of a Divine commission and of a heavenly unction].

VER. 20. Reason for the foregoing. The eye of an Apostle must be directed to the kingdom of God, and to whatever promotes its advancement. And this kingdom is not built up by beautiful and high-sounding speeches, but by that spiritual energy which awakens and develops the inward life of the spirit.—**For the kingdom of God.**—By this is meant the Divine kingdom of the Messiah as a life in communion with God, or as a social state pervaded and regulated by the Divine will. It must, therefore, bear upon itself the signature of righteousness, holiness and blessedness. Or, as the Old Testament describes it (*e. g.* Ps. 72), it is a 'kingdom of righteousness and peace; in which character it is spoken of again in Rom. xiv. 17. This is also the ruling idea in historical Christianity, whose primitive form is the Church. Its full realization, however, where the living law penetrates and pervades all that is phenomenal, or, in other words, where the archetypal idea and the fact wholly correspond, belongs to the future age. To exclude the ethical element from the conception, is just as incorrect as to hold by it altogether. In the New Testament both are united, prominence being given, sometimes to one, and sometimes to the other, in different passages. But that only the truly pious and believing can properly be members of this kingdom (Col. iii. 3; Phil. iv. 21; Eph. v. 5), is seen in the fact, that it is a fellowship in holiness. [For a good exposition of this important term, see FAIRBAIRN'S *Herm. Man. p.* 56. OLSH. *Com. Matt. iii.* 21].—**is,** ἐστίν—is to be understood and associated with ἐν, *in*, and is to be taken as in ii. 5, to mean, *consists in, stands in.*—**not in word, but in power.**—From this it is evident that the ethical element of God's kingdom is mainly considered. But whether the Apostle is here speaking of the *ground* or *condition* upon which a person participates in this kingdom, or of its *direct active advancement*, may be questioned. In the former case the sense would be: that, whereon participation in God's kingdom is conditioned, *viz.*, faith and love, is not brought about through word, but through the power that is at work in its behalf, *i. e.* of the minister or teacher (Meyer); in the latter case it would mean: he only is able truly to advance God's kingdom, in whom this power exists. The latter interpretation, which includes also the idea, that such a person alone can be regarded as rightly belonging to God's kingdom, is simpler and more suited to the context. "It must be said, however, that the distinction here made between word and power, is not for the purpose of separating the latter from the former, and attributing to it an operation that manifests itself apart from and independent of the word, as fanatics teach; but in order to contrast with the empty declamation of false teachers that true preaching which is filled with the spirit,—to oppose to their mere artificial rhetoric the power of God which resides in the simplicity of the Gospel." BURGER.

VER. 21. Having expressed his determination to go to Corinth, he here leaves it for them to decide in what form his authority shall be exercised (2 Cor. x. 6; xiii. 2 ff.). This verse some commentators [Calvin, Beza, Lachmann, Stanley Words.,] connect with the following chapter as opening a new topic for rebuke. But, as no allusion is there made to his coming to Corinth, and there is no particle to connect it with what follows, it is better to take it as concluding this chapter. [So Meyer, Alf., Hodge].—**What—** τί=πότερον, but is more forcible, inasmuch as the alternative presented does not appear at once. **—will ye?**—["As Chrys. strikingly says, 'The whole thing lies with you.'" MEYER].—**Shall I come.**—The verb ἔλθω is not dependent on θέλετε—**to you with a rod,** ἐν ῥάβδῳ—[The use of ἐν to express the relation of accompaniment or instrumentality, is not a Hebraism, but a genuine Greek idiom. So Meyer. But Winer, § xlviii. d. says, it is also used like the Hebrew ב in cases where Greek authors employ the Dative alone. Its significance in the text is well given by ALF. "not only *with* a rod, but *in such purpose* as to use it. The preposition here gives the idea of the element *in which*, much as ἐν δόξῃ"]. Here also he presents to view his paternal relation. The rod is the symbol of fatherly severity. [It means the rod of His mouth. For the word of God, spoken by such as Paul, was sharp and powerful. There is an intimation here of Paul's consciousness of power]. In contrast with this, and as the alternative before them, *love* is mentioned—**or in love.**—This indeed is not excluded from severity; but it forms an antithesis to it, inasmuch as in severity the natural expression of love is kept in abeyance, and it is compelled to manifest itself in ways alien

to itself. This idea is more fully brought out in the associated clause—**and (in) the spirit of meekness.**—LUTHER says: "with tenderness of spirit," so that πνεῦμα would then mean the subjective disposition. But Meyer, following the analogy of such passages as John xv. 26; Rom. viii. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 13; Eph. i. 17; Rom. i. 4; [where, as here, πνεῦμα is followed by the abstract genitive and evidently denotes the Holy Spirit, whose specific working is expressed by the noun in connection], interprets the word here in like manner. [But, as Alf. shows, Meyer is mistaken when he affirms, that this meaning attaches to πνεῦμα in all kindred passages of the New Testament. There is plainly no fixed usage compelling this interpretation here. It were better, therefore, with Calvin, de Wette, Stanley and others, to understand by the phrase: a meek, gentle spirit. See Winer § xxxiv. 3 b]. Πραΰτης denotes sparing, forgiving mildness. In this winning way he gives them to understand that he would much rather be spared the necessity of discipline. ["It is plain from this, as from numerous other passages, that the Apostles exercised the right of discipline over all the churches. They could receive into the communion of the Church, or excommunicate from it at discretion. This prerogative was unseparable from their infallibility as the messengers of Christ, sent to establish and administer his kingdom." HODGE. "For nerve and vigor, for dignity and composed confidence, this passage cannot be easily paralleled even in Demosthenes himself." BLOOMFIELD].

DOGMATICAL AND ETHICAL.

The kingdom of God, a thing of power. This kingdom, formerly typified in shadowy outlines (σκιά) through the promise and the law, and through a series of special providences, and prepared through miracles and signs, and through the gracious, wise and holy guidance and training of a chosen people, was first exhibited in its original principles, and perfectly realized as the kingdom of heaven upon earth, in the person of the Son of man, come from Heaven (comp. Luke ii. 14; Matth. xii. 28). He was the first to fulfil all righteousness, always doing that which was well pleasing to the Father (Jno. viii. 29; Matth. iii. 15). In the plenitude of the Spirit's might, which rested on Him, (Jno. i. 32), He exercised a constraining and subduing power over the hearts of men, and in word and deed evinced a Divine puissance of love, that overcame the hostile spirits of darkness, proved invincible to Satanic assaults, loosed all manner of bonds, and removed evil of every kind. Though externally weak and depressed, we find Him emerging victorious out of that judgment and death, to which He had freely subjected Himself, and, as the one to whom all power in Heaven and upon earth had been given, rising far above all creaturely limitations into the right hand of the Majesty on High.

Having thus in His own person and history laid the foundations of the Kingdom of God, and illustrated its character and career and triumphs, we behold Him gathering a Church, through the dispensation of the Spirit, out of that apostate race, (whose nature He had assumed and had, essentially as well as morally, united to God), and exhibiting in it, as in a germ, the kingdom of righteousness and peace, in the exercise of a lofty power over the hearts of men and in the manifestation of ability to redeem and save. This Church, which, from its unseen beginnings, has, after a lapse of ages, spread out into a mighty tree, continues to exist now, precisely as it originated, only through the might of the Divine Spirit, who works in its members—especially in those who are active in its cause—for the continued illumination and sanctification of mankind. And only by the same Divine agency is the kingdom of God, which is enclosed in the Church, advanced, and that period hastened, when it shall be made manifest in all its glorious reality, and when the Lord shall reign King over all the nations. (Zach. xiv. 9). The powers which rule in the Church are, in fact, the powers of 'the world to come,' the *αἰὼν μέλλων* (Heb. vi. 5); and while these powers display their Divine energy, in cleansing the heart more and more from the filthiness of the flesh and the spirit, in promoting knowledge and sanctification, and in strengthening the will to endure under all assaults of temptation and persecution, the Church is ripening towards that glorious epoch when, in the union of all the holy in Heaven and upon earth, it will appear supreme in Christ, over all things, as the true Kingdom of God, wherein God shall be all in all (1 Cor. xv. 28).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[1. The *carnal-minded* in the Church, 1, are apt to gather presumption, and take courage for self-display, during the absence of their Divinely appointed guides, ver. 18; 2, need to be thoroughly tested as to their really spiritual qualities, and exposed, ver. 19; 3, are deserving of rebuke and discipline, ver. 21.

2. Since the Kingdom of God is not in word, but in power, its *ministers* must be, 1, full of courage and fearless of opposition, ver. 19; 2, dependent on the Lord, from whom their power comes, for direction in all their movements, ver. 19; 3, capable of testing human pretensions, ver. 19; 4, prepared for severe or lenient dealing, as circumstances may require, yet disposed in spirit to the latter, rather than the former, ver. 21.

3. In the truth, that the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power—the power of the Holy Ghost, we have, 1, *A lesson of instruction.* It shows us to what source ministers and all Christian laborers are indebted for the success of their words and efforts; 2, *A criterion for judgment.* We can ascertain whether the kingdom of God is present in any person, or church, which claims to possess it, by the ability shown to achieve those results for which the Divine power is given; 3, *A ground of encouragement.* Weak as believers are in themselves, and great as is the work to be accomplished, the kingdom of God in them can strengthen them to do all things; 4, *A lesson of duty.* If we would do great things for God, we must trust, *a.* not to our own skill in persuasion, but *b.* in the power which the Holy Ghost imparts; 5, *A rebuke.* Lack of

achievement for the kingdom of God cannot be charged upon a *lack of power in it*, but upon a *lack of faith in Christians* to use the power given].

LUTHER:—Ver. 20. Faith is a living, essential thing; it makes a man entirely new, changes his disposition, and turns him completely about. Wilt thou continue to remain in thy pride and immodesty, in avarice and anger, and wilt thou boast and prate much of faith? then comes Paul to thee and says, 'Listen, good friend; the kingdom of God does not consist in words, but in power and in deeds.'

STARKE:—The point to be looked at is not *how* a person *talks* about religion, but whether the *essentials of Christianity*—truth, experience, action—are in him (ver. 19). O, precious declaration! It is power—*power*—not prating and show that makes the Christian.—HED. Where the kingdom of God is, there Christ is, and the Holy Spirit also, who regenerates men (ver. 20).—If soft words won't serve, then the minister must rebuke sharply.—Love remains the same when it is severe, as when it is mild, provided it only leads to God. Its various arts of regulation must first be thoroughly learned and then practised when needful.—Righteousness, holiness and love exist in God combined; and as both Law and Gospel have alike issued therefrom, so should every evangelical minister rightly employ both. 2 Tim. ii. 15 (ver. 21).

BERL. BIBLE:—The whole kingdom of our God is pervaded with Divine and heavenly powers. And although indeed He utters words from thence, yet these words are spirit and life, yea, the words of eternal life (Jno. vi. 63, 68). Hence words, fraught with the spirit and quickening in their influence, are also a fruit of the kingdom of God, which consists in power. In short, every thing which God speaks, works and does, in and through his Son, carries in itself a kind of power, and manifests this power wherever it is not hindered (ii. 5; Rom. i. 16), (ver. 20). People say sometimes: 'Where is love? More is accomplished by love than by severity.' True, provided we are not compelled to use severity. Then severity itself is also an effect of love (ver. 21).

HEUBNER:—The "puffed up" are mighty in words, but weak in deeds. Inward spiritual power lies in humility. The Church of Christ does not need braggarts, but true workers (ver. 19).—The unction of the true preacher is detected in the power he exerts upon the hearts of men (ver. 20).—Man determines for himself the treatment he shall receive, whether it shall be severity or mildness. Well for him, who is still enjoying the gracious period of discipline. He is better than one altogether reprobate. God has a two fold staff, the staff of *mildness* and the staff of *woe* (Zach. xi. 7–14) (ver. 2).

X.—A SECOND INSTANCE OF DEFECTIVE CHRISTIAN SENTIMENT.—TOLERATION OF IMPURITY.—NEED OF CHURCH IN PURIFICATION.

[*A case of incest stated.—Call for Excommunication.—Its form and intent*].

CHAPTER V. 1–5.

It is reported commonly *that there is* fornication among you, and such fornication as
is not so much as named [is not even[1]] among the Gentiles, that one should have his
2 father's wife. And ye are puffed up, [?] and have not [did not] rather mourned,
[mourn], that he that hath done[2] this deed might be taken away [*om.* away[3]] from among
3 you [?]. For I verily, as[4] absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already,
as though I were present, *concerning* [*om.* concerning] him that hath so done[3] this deed,
4 In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ [*om.* Christ[5]], when ye are gathered together,
5 and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, [*om.* Christ[5]]. To deliver
such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in
the day of the Lord Jesus[6].

[1] Ver. 1.—The addition of ὀνομάζεται in the Rec. has the best authorities [A. B. C. D. F. Cod. Sin.] against it, and is perhaps a supplement according to Eph. v. 3.

[2] Ver. 2.—It is doubtful whether we ought to read ποήσας with Griesbach, Meyer [Alford, Words.], or πράξας with Rückert, Tischendorf. Both are equally suited to the sense, and are about equally supported.

[3] Ver. 2.—The Rec. ἐξαρθῇ is still less authorized than ὀνομάζεται ver. 1, and no doubt originated out of ver. 13.

[4] Ver. 3.—The Rec. ὡς, *as*, before ἀπών, *absent*, has indeed the oldest MSS. [A. B. C. D.[1] Cod. Sin.] against it, and hence is rejected by Lachmann, Meyer [Alf. Words.]. But there are also many and good authorities in its favor. [D.[2] F. L. Syr. and many of the Greek Fathers]. And it might as easily have been omitted for the sake of avoiding the repetition (παρών), or, as not suited to ἀπών, as almarginated, and then afterwards inserted according to the analogy of ὡς παρών. We retain it with Tischendorf. [We, on the contrary, omit it as badly supported and wholly needless, and wait for Tischendorf's last Ed. See comments below.]

[5] Ver. 4.—The χριστοῦ of the Rec. was probably added later, because of the solemnity of the title. [It is found in D[3]. F. L. Cod. Sin. omitted in A. B. D[1].]

[6] Ver. 5.—This reading (Rec.) is the most probable. Both the omission of Ἰησοῦ (Tisch.) as well as the addition ἡμῶν after κυρίου and of χριστοῦ after Ἰησοῦ are not sufficiently accredited.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Paul here turns to a second topic for animadversion, and what follows might well serve to take down still further the self-conceit of the Corinthians. ["This, practically speaking, forms the crisis of the whole Epistle. It is, as it were, the burst of the storm, the mutterings of which, as Chrysostom observes, had already been heard in the earlier chapters, and of which the echoes are still discernible, not only in this Epistle, but also in the second Epistle, the first half of which is nothing less than an endeavor to allay the excitement and confusion created by this severe remonstrance." STANLEY]. The passage is introduced abruptly without any conjunctive particle.

VER. 1. States the specific ground of complaint. —**Commonly** ὅλως: not *indeed*, nor, *at all*, as it can mean only in negative clauses; [nor "*absolutely*, as simply adding force to the assertion." STANLEY; nor, *in short* (Clericus), which Ols. says is the only second meaning that can be justified]; but, as in chap. vi. 7; xv. 29: Matth. v. 34, *in general*. It belongs not to πορνεία, *fornication*, but as an adverb to ἀκούεται, *is heard*, and so to the whole clause. ["It implies, however, the general prevalence of the practice spoken of." OLSHAUSEN. So Meyer, de Wette; and Hodge allows it. "The signification, *certainly*, implying that the matter was no doubtful rumor, but an evident fact (as Calvin, Beza and others), is contrary to the meaning of the word." MEYER]—**there is heard among you**, ἀκούεται ἐν ὑμῖν.—By this it is not simply meant, that there was some talk of the subject mentioned in their circles generally, but that the thing, of which the talk was, prevailed there; although this is only to be inferred from the context, and is not directly expressed. (It would then mean: ἐν ὑμῖν οὖσα, or εἶναι; the former, in case it was a correct report; the latter, if it were only a vague rumor). [The names of the informants are not specified, as in the former instance. It was a case of public rumor, and the sin so notorious as to need no vouchers. See Words.].—**fornication**, πορνεία.—["The word is used in a comprehensive sense, including all violations of the seventh commandment." HODGE]. Of these one in particular was singled out, of the grossest and most astounding sort, *viz.*, of incest. This is introduced by καί, which points to something special under a general head, and brings it in as a climax,—**and indeed**, or **yea even**,—with the repetition of the general term for the sake of emphasis,—**such fornication, as not even among the Gentiles**.—The ellipsis might be filled up most readily by: 'is heard,' or simply by: 'is.' [The Rec. text has 'is named,' which Alf. calls "a clumsy gloss taken from Eph. v. 3."] Paul here sets forth the unparalleled nature of the crime he was about to speak of, and the greatness of the disgrace which thereby fell upon the Christian Church—'a holy people.'—**That one has his father's wife**, *i. e.*, his step-mother (μητρυιά)—comp. Levit. xviii. 7, 8—and this either as wife, or concubine. The word ἔχειν, *to have*, is used of both relations, as is seen by such passages as vii. 2, 29; Matth. xiv. 4: xxii. 28; Jno. iv. 18. In this case it most probably stands for an illegitimate concubinal relation (comp. Osiander), which was also a 'having,' inasmuch as it was a habitual thing, as well as an act consummated (πράξας: having done, ver. 2; and κατεργασάμενος: having perpetrated, ver. 3).* By the expression—'his father's wife,' the wicked violation of the relation sustained to the father, is brought out more conspiculously than if he said simply 'step-mother.' The father, moreover, is to be considered as still living, (against Besser), and as a Christian. See 2 Cor. vii. 12, where the father is spoken of as one 'that had suffered wrong' (ἀδικηθείς), and where Paul says 'he did not write *on his account*.' The son, at all events, must have been a member of the church; the woman, however, not, since he, and not she, is made the subject of censure. Further questions, *e. g.*, as to whether the man was a proselyte, and had proceeded on the Jewish maxim, that a person who had become "a new creature," had severed himself from all former connections, and was at liberty to enter into new relations otherwise forbidden? may be suffered to rest. In speaking of the crime here mentioned as something not existing among the Gentiles, Paul does not mean to say that it never occurred in their history. Cases of this sort are indeed recorded, and tragedies have been founded upon them; but they are always spoken of as rare exceptions, that excited the utmost public horror. Cicero pro Cluentio: "*Scelus incredibile, et præter hahc unam in omni vita inauditum.*" (comp. Wetstein and others on this passage).

VER. 2. Expressions of astonishment at their conduct in view of the above fact.—**And ye are puffed up?**—[This and the following clause should be read as questions. So Calvin, Meyer, Alf., Words., et al.]. The ὑμεῖς, *ye* is emphatic, and points back to ἐν ὑμῖν, *among you*, *q. d.* 'such a thing has occurred among you, and *you* are, *etc.* Questions of this sort are often introduced by καί, *and*, which here does not take the emphasis as though equivalent to: 'and yet,' but throws it forward on the word following. The assertion that they were puffed up, refers, not to iv. 18, where this is affirmed only of some, but to iv. 8, where he describes the whole Church as filled with the conceit of their spiritual perfection. A great mistake it would be to suppose (with Chrys., Theod., Grot.) that the incestuous person himself was the subject of their pride, on the ground that he was some distinguished teacher among them; or that Paul here alludes to the boasting of other parties over that to which the incestuous belonged.—The proper state of feeling which they ought to have manifested, is expressed in the negative question.—**And did not**—when ye first knew of the crime—**rather mourn**—*i.e.* mourn, that a member of their

*["It is not credible that the Corinthian congregation would have endured that one of their body should live with a *harlot*, especially his mother-in-law. But because this illicit connection had been palliated by the name of matrimony, therefore they might *connive* at it, especially if there were any who were the man's zealous friends, and endeavored to soften the baseness of the thing." CRELLIUS. And this is the view of Meyer, whose arguments Kling does not seem to have thought it worth while to refute, and which undoubtedly ought to be admitted].

body had sunk so low, and the Church of the Lord, which ought to have been kept holy, had been thus defiled and dishonored. (The Aorist *ἐπενθήσατε* indicates the act, expressed by the present, as past and finished, as in *ἐπιστεύσατε* iii. 5). This mourning, which has its source in a lively sense of the common interest which all have in what affects all, implied also a combined and energetic movement for the removal of the evil deplored,—**in order that he who had done this deed might be removed from among you?** *ἵνα ἀρθῇ*.—The *ἵνα* here is not ecbatic, but retains its proper telic force, "*unto the end* that he," *etc.* The removal pointed to, must not be regarded as implying any Divine visitation, a cutting off by death for example, or the like; since it is clear from ver. 13, that he only contemplated the excommunication of the guilty party by an act of the Church itself—an act to which their sorrow should have prompted them. BENGEL says: "Ye had no sorrow to stir you up for the removal," *etc.* The manner in which the party under censure is designated, carries force: "*he that hath done this deed*"—*ἐργον, facinus, this wicked deed.*

VERS. 3–5. That such sorrow, leading to such results, should have prevailed in the Church, he confirms by stating the decision, which he, on his part, had reached in the case. ["There is something in the involved structure of this sentence, which gives a strong impression of the emotion, anguish, and indignation with which it was written, and which vented itself in broken and disturbed periods, as it were *per singultus*."—WORDS].—**For I, for my part,** *ἐγὼ μὲν*.—The *μὲν* puts Paul in strong contrast with the Corinthians, who were so indifferent and remiss in the case. If we are to retain *ὡς*, *as*, it must be regarded as embracing in its force the two following participles, and belonging especially to the latter, 'though absent in body, yet as present in spirit.' This then reappears in the next clause without any qualifying term, and as carrying the emphasis: *κέκρικα ὡς παρών*. The same contrast occurs in Col. ii. 5: "For though I am absent from you in the flesh, yet in spirit I am present with you." [Meyer, Words., Alf. omit the *ὡς*, as unauthorized. The sense is clearer without it—'for I being absent in body, yet present in *spirit*.' The participles state the facts in the case, and require no *as* implying similitude. This appears only in the next clause, where it properly belongs].—**Absent in body, yet present in the spirit.**—By 'in the spirit' we are not to understand the *Holy Ghost* (as Chrys. and others), but *his own spirit*, as contrasted with *his body*. Yet the spirit of the Apostle must not be thought of apart from the Divine illumination and energy which he enjoyed, and by means of which, even in his absence, he looked into and influenced the state of the Corinthian Church; although the *τὸ πνεῦμα, the spirit* designates even his spiritual nature in contrast with his physical. A similar case occurs in 2 Kings v. 26, where Elisha says to Gehazi: "Went not my spirit with thee?"—**have already judged,** *ἤδη κέκρικα*.—(comp. on ii. 2). "*Already*,"—this energetic and prompt conduct on the part of an absent person forms a contrast all the more striking with the slackness of those among whom the shameful scandal had occurred, —**as present,**—[Not, in spirit, for he was there already in spirit, but in body; 'as though he were visibly among them to control and direct in the matter.' So Meyer, Alf., Hodge].

[As the words which follow are brought under discussion as to their grammatical construction, it seems best, for the sake of perspicuity, to give them in full and translate them as they stand:—*τὸν ὕυτω τοῦτο κατεργασάμενον ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ*. lit,—**him so having perpetrated this thing, in the name of our Lord Jesus being gathered together, you and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus, to give such a one to Satan.**—The first question is as to the proper connection of the first clause here: "him having perpetrated this thing." In the E. V. this is taken as governed by some preposition understood, *e. g.*, *κατα, concerning*—so Words. Others (Stanley) construe it as the direct object of the verb *κέκρικα, judge*]. In this case the sentence would read: 'I have judged or passed sentence on him who has,' *etc.* The best way, however, would be to regard it as the object of *παραδοῦναι* in ver. 5, so that the *τὸν τοιοῦτον, such a one*, would then be merely the resumption of the same object under another form. [We should then translate, putting a colon after *κέκρικα*, 'I have judged, that the person who has perpetrated this thing, ye in the name of the Lord Jesus, *etc.*, do deliver such a one,' *etc.*]. The reason for putting this objective clause first is to give it the emphasis, as bringing the guilty party more prominently in front. And the word 'so' is inserted for the sake of intensifying the enormity of the guilt incurred; and it points to certain aggravating circumstances well known to his readers,—"So shamefully, while called a brother."—BENGEL. We might also (with Osiander) here take in view both, the man's shamlessness in perpetrating his crime and his utter disregard of his Christian obligations. The next question is about the proper connection of the subordinate clauses. These may be combined in four different ways. Either they may all be united with the principal verb *παραδοῦναι, to deliver* [Mosheim, Schrader and others], to which Bengel and others also join *ὡς παρών, as present;* or with the participial clause *συναχθέντων, being assembled* [Chrys., Theoph, Calvin]; or they may be connected partly with this and partly with the other, so that either *ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ, in the name, etc.*, shall be joined to *συναχθέντων, being assembled*, and *σὺν τῇ δυνάμει, with* the *power*, to *παραδοῦναι, to deliver* [so Beza, Calov., Billr., Olsh.]; or precisely the reverse [Luther, Bengel, de Wette, Meyer, Alf., Hodge]. The last method seems the most suitable, *viz:* to unite the clause, "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (which stands first by way of emphasis, and which otherwise the analogy of Matth. xviii. 20 would lead us to join with the participle, 'being assembled') with the main verb, as expressing the ground of the chief transaction, so that the act spoken of shall appear to rest on Jesus, the acknowledged Head of the Church, and upon His authority, and so pass for His act. (Com. 2 Thess. iii. 6; Acts iii. 6–16; and

respecting the word 'name,' chap. i. 2). As for the clause, "with the power of the Lord Jesus," the very position of it makes it probable that this is to be connected with the participle, 'being assembled' and its adjuncts, since otherwise this participle would, in a most remarkable manner, be made to separate the more strictly qualifying terms of the main sentence. Besides it must be said that the phrase, "in the name of our Lord Jesus," better serves to qualify the act of 'delivering over to Satan,' and includes also the force of the other phrase, "with the power of our Lord," letting alone the fact, that in this way we avoid the accumulation of qualifying terms for the main verb (as well as for the participial clause, if both should be joined to this). Nevertheless, it is not to be overlooked that the phrase, "with the power of our Lord," also serves to qualify the act of "delivering over;" yet not directly, but only as a component part of the clause where it occurs. The entire parenthesis will then mean, that the whole case should be decided in an assembly of the Church,* where he would also be present in spirit;† and that in this gathering they would, moreover, be accompanied by the power of the Lord Jesus for their assistance, (Σύν, *with*, designates association, where, however, the co-worker is not a simple instrumentality in the hand of the other; and δύναμις, *power*, denotes not merely: '*disposing influence*,' as Meyer supposes, but: *force, might, capability*).‡

But what are we to understand by 'the delivering of such a one to Satan?' That by this phrase excommunication is intended, is evident from ver. 2 ("that he might be taken away from among you.") and from ver. 13 ("Wherefore put away, *etc.*). But that this is all the expression involves, is improbable from the fact that it is not elsewhere used in this sense. We meet it again only in 1 Tim. i. 20, where it appears, as here, to imply something more. Rather it would seem to convey the additional thought that those, who were ejected from the Church of God—a realm which, as such, is exempt from the dominion of Satan,—were given over again into Satan's power, and unto his destructive influences; and that hence a certain control over these persons is granted him, *viz.*, in so far as it may please the Lord, who ordains this lot for them through His Church and through the Apostolic office (Meyer). [But the question is, whether this was a *miraculous* subjection to the power of Satan, such as involved special evils and could be effected only by Apostolic authority, and so was peculiar to that age alone; or, whether it had regard to Satan only as the common source of the manifold miseries by which men are scourged, and as the unwilling instrument of a Divine discipline over God's children universally, and hence was something possible for all time, and takes place whenever a man is given over to suffer the bitter consequences of his vices, uncheered by the grace of God's kingdom? The former is the view which has prevailed in the Romish Church from the earliest times, and it was much used to enhance the terrors of priestly excommunication and justify the deliverance of ecclesiastical offenders into the hands of secular authorities for punishment. It is still advocated by many Protestant commentators, among whom are Meyer, Alford, Barnes, Hodge. The latter thus sums up the reasons in its support: 1. "It is clearly revealed in Scripture that bodily evils are often inflicted by the agency of Satan. 2. The Apostles were invested with the power of miraculously inflicting such evils, Acts v. 1–11; xiii. 9–11; 2 Cor. x. 8; xiii. 10. 3. In 1 Tim. i. 20 the same formula occurs probably in the same sense. 4. There is no evidence that the Jews of that age ever expressed excommunication by this phrase, and therefore it would not, in all probability, be understood by Paul's readers in that sense. 5. Excommunication would not have the effect of destroying the flesh, in the sense in which that expression is used in the following clause." The consequence of this view is to exhibit the act under consideration as one done solely by Apostolic authority and power, and therefore as an exceptional case of discipline,

[* "The feeling of absolute control in the matter, which finds expression in ver. 3, the Apostle softens first by the use of 'in the name of our Lord Jesus,' and then by associating with himself, in the republican spirit of primitive Christianity, the whole Church, where he presides in spirit."—DE WETTE.]

[† "The Apostle translates himself in spirit to the Church in Corinth, and expresses his decision as if in midst of them."—BERGER.]

[‡ Meyer, de Wette and Alford agree in taking the words, "with the power of our Lord Jesus," not as a third element in the proposed assembly, nor yet as something resident in the whole Church, but as belonging exclusively to Paul, and so connect it directly to "my spirit." But this seems arbitrary. If the act of 'delivering over' was to be the act of the whole Church and not one of independent apostolic authority, we must suppose that it, too, was fully empowered for the purpose by the Lord who had promised to be in it, when assembled in His name, to the end of time, giving force to its decisions. The grammatical question here will be apt to be determined very much in accordance with the preconceived theories of church government entertained by the interpreter. Hodge (*e. g.*) regards the Church as convened not for the purpose of voting and acting in the premises, but "as mere spectators," to impart "solemnity to the judicial proceeding." So he takes the words in question as connected directly either with "my spirit," or with 'to deliver'—the sense in either case being substantially the same. Wordsworth goes still farther, and regards the excommunication as not only "promulgated in the presence of the Church," but also as having "been done without taking council with them," and "probably against their inclination." And so the Rheims version:—"Though the act was done in the face of the Church, yet the judgment and authority of giving sentence was in himself and not in the whole multitude, as the Protestant and popular sectaries affirm." Owen, on the other hand, analyses the matter thus:—1. The *supreme efficient cause* of the excision is the power and authority of Jesus Christ. 2. The *declarative cause* of the equity of this sentence, the spirit of the Apostle. 3. The *instrumental, ministerial cause*, the Church. They were to "do it in the name of the Lord," and thereby "purge out the old leaven;" whence the punishment is said in 2 Cor. ii. 6 to be "inflicted by many." (See a full discussion of this in OWEN'S *Works*, vol. xvi. p. 169). And NEANDER forcibly observes: "The Epistles of Paul, which treat of various controverted ecclesiastical matters, are addressed to whole churches, and he *assumes that the decision belonged to the whole body.* Had it been otherwise he would have addressed his instructions principally at least to the overseers. When a licentious member of the Church at Corinth was to be excommunicated the Apostle considered it a measure that ought to proceed from the whole society, and placed himself therefore in spirit among them, to unite with them in passing judgment." Furthermore it might be asked, If the Church had no power to act in the premises, where was the ground for Paul to complain of their conduct, in not securing the expulsion of the guilty parties? Plainly his purpose here, in decreeing as he did, was to supplement their lack of duty: and we are not to construe his procedure as *pro formâ*, but as extraordinary, and based upon that plenitude of power which he had as an Apostle.]

which can afford no precedent for after times. The opposite view is the one maintained by Calvin, Beza, Turretin, Owen, Poole, and many others. They regard the formula, 'to deliver a person to Satan,' only as a more solemn mode of stating the fact of excommunication as expressed by our Lord in Matth. xviii. 17,—one designed to exhibit more vividly the sad condition of him who has been cast out from the kingdom of God and so consigned into the hands of his great enemy, uncheered by the light and comforts of the Saviour. This seems the more rational interpretation, only that it does not take sufficient account of the malign agency ascribed to Satan in the Scriptures. For, 1, it accords precisely with the view of the Apostle, that outside the kingdom of God, Satan reigned as "the prince of the power of the air"—as the one that "had the power of death"—as the one who was the source of bodily inflictions, and had sent 'a messenger to buffet him,'—even as he had "bound the woman who had the spirit of infirmity," whom our Lord cured—and so was ever working in various ways to afflict mankind. And surely there is nothing in Scripture to warrant our believing that his agency in this respect has been restrained as yet. His power to tempt to sin implies a power also to inflict the evils which sin engenders. 2. The power of Satan, we are also taught, is subordinate to the power of God. He may be suffered to work an utter destruction, or be used as the unwilling instrument of a Divine discipline. Job and Paul are illustrations of the latter case. And we have every reason to believe, that Satan is still employed in God's hands for this very work of discipline or destruction. Now if this be true, there is nothing miraculous or extraordinary in the case under review, even though we may suppose that physical evils are understood. The instances of Annanias and Sapphira, and of Elymas the sorcerer are not parallel with it. It is no objection that this formula of excommunication has never been found to have been used by the Jews, for it is in keeping with the whole tenor of Paul's doctrine. Moreover, the results anticipated would be directly conducive to the end proposed, if, as was hoped for, the culprit was no reprobate, but one who promised recovery under this most humbling and chastening discipline].—The end to be subserved by this 'deliverance unto Satan' was, **—for the destruction of the flesh**—*εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός*.—That by this no mere moral effect is indicated, such as the mortification of the selfish and sensuous propensities of our nature, is evident both from the connection with what precedes, which points to an operation of Satan, and from the use of the word *ὄλεθρος*, which nowhere occurs in the above sense (for which rather the terms *θανατοῦν*., *νεκροῦν*, *σταυροῦν*, and the like, are used), and from the antithesis made here between "flesh" and "spirit." *Σάρξ* here denotes the physical life in its depraved state, as an organism where sin is seated, and which serves sin. Now this, which had been used in so shameless a manner by the incestuous person as the instrument of sin, Paul wishes to have given over as a prey to Satan, that he might execute upon it a corresponding disorder, and so fulfil the Divine judgment. [And it must be added that there is no vice so fearfully avenged in that which is its seat and source, as this very one under consideration. Its legitimate consequences, so terrible as to carry in them the aspect of Satanic malignity, are, in fact, a 'destruction of the flesh'].—But the ruin, thus to be wrought in the outer man, was not to be an utter and final one. There was in it a merciful design,—**that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.**—The idea is, that through the penalties inflicted upon his body the offender might be brought to repentance, so that although the former might perish, yet his spirit—the centre of his personality—being still receptive of Divine impressions, might be snatched from destruction, and be found at last within the circle of the ransomed at the day of final separation and decision. That the Apostle here contemplated something more than a bare possibility, is apparent from the whole tenor of this passage; and he might express such hope without presupposing any irresistible operation of Divine grace.* [On the general subject of Satan—the nature and extent of his agency, and his relation to the kingdom of God, see the able articles in KITTO's *Enc.*, 2d ed.; SMITH's *Bib. Dict.*, under the word "*Satan*," and the one in HERTZOG's *Re. Ency. Teufel;* also an article by MOSES STUART in the *Bib. Sac.* for 1843, p. 117].

DOGMATICAL AND ETHICAL.

[*Excommunication: its right, occasions, grounds, form, intent and results.* 1. The right to excommunicate is both a natural and a delegated right. The right of any community to exist, involves also the right to eject from itself all elements that are inconsistent with its character and integrity and well being. This belongs, therefore, to the Church. But above and beyond this, the injunction of Christ (Matth. xviii. 17), and the example of the Apostles make it an imperative duty, for the preservation of the Church as a holy body, bearing witness for God and truth and righteousness. 2. The occasion which calls for the act must be some flagrant and habitual offence. Spiritual perfection is not to be looked for in the Church. The tares, which in outward appearance resemble the wheat, must be allowed to remain to the end. Hence many faults in doctrine and practice in the Church at Corinth, Paul was content with rebuking. But the incestuous person was to be cast out. In this forbearance of his towards the one, and severity towards the other, an example is set for all time. To distinguish when the one should end and the other should begin, belongs to the gift of wise government. 3. Its grounds]. The soul of a true evangelical discipline is Christ, His name and power—Christ dwelling in the hearts of believers by faith, and especially present with those whom he has made shepherds in it, with His living, powerful, all-enlightening, penetrating, sifting and dividing word, and hence with the energy of His Spirit operating therein. It is in the light of this word, that sin must be recognized as a

[* Kling's refutation of Rückert's charge of "hasty and indiscreet zeal" on the part of Paul we venture to omit as unnecessary. No one in this country would think of entertaining it for a moment].

reproach and a desecration of His name, and therefore as something which evokes a reaction against it from this Name—a reaction which is nothing else than a manifestation of the might of a holy, divine love.—[4. Its form]. The constraining power of this reaction must be felt and exhibited in the Church, which is Christ's body, and especially in those who are the stewards of the Divine mysteries, and ambassadors speaking in His name, urging them as by an irresistible impulse, and arousing them to a strong determination to make it effective upon the offender. And the Church in assembling for this purpose when occasion calls, should come together solemnly, attended by the presence and power of the Lord. Thus and thus only, in a manner truly valid, and with unfailing results, can he, who has desecrated the name of Christ, and has proved unworthy of fellowship in His body, be cast out from the sphere of life in Christ, and from a participation in His protecting grace, and given over into the power of Satan to suffer the merited penalties of his sins. [5. The intent of this act is not punitive, but remedial, in consistency with the design of the whole Gospel dispensation, which was "to save and not to destroy;" and with the object of the power intrusted to the Apostle, and so to their successors, "which was for edification and not for destruction." And this intent must be displayed in the manner in which the act is performed, and in the hopes and prayers with which it is accompanied. For though the act of excommunication is in one sense a cutting off from the means of grace, in another it may itself be made a means of grace through the blessing of God which may follow the offender in his exclusion and turn the very severity of his sufferings into a glorious benefit. And where this result is not hindered by the obduracy of the guilty party, and he has not sinned past forbearance, we may expect 6. as the result, repentance and restoration. Nor is this surprising]. In bringing about such issues Satan, the arch enemy of Christ, is employed as his servant, even while he, on his part, seeks only to gratify his own love of corrupting, plaguing and destroying men. Our sinful nature, the organ of sin and the seat of its impure impulses, is given over into his power to be wasted and destroyed. And while in doing this, his intention is utterly to ruin, Christ aims at the ultimate deliverance of the spirit, which, having been enthralled by the flesh, is to be liberated through its weakening and destruction. He who inflicts the judgment, prescribes the limits beyond which the Evil One may not pass; yea, compels him to subserve the purposes of his holy love. This is one truth taught us in the Book of Job, although the author there is speaking not of punishment but of proof and trial. The results of such discipline will be brought to light on that day when all things shall be revealed. And they will be brought to light in such a way that Satan will be put to shame, while God will be glorified in the midst of His own, even among those who have deeply fallen, as One who is wonderful in counsel and glorious in execution.

[On this subject it will be profitable to consult Owen. *Works*. xvi. p. 151–183. Edwards *Serm. on Excom.* Hooker *Ec. Pol. Book* VI].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[As before we had the picture of a Church *imperfectly united*—still divided by the prevalence of ambition and conflicting opinions, so here we have a picture of one *imperfectly purified*, still carrying in itself the corruptions and spots of an earlier depravity. And here we see: 1. How sin may convert the very grace of God into a warrant for a lasciviousness even grosser than any which may be practised without, ver. 1.—How it shows more flagrant and abominable when seen in a body professing holiness, than elsewhere, ver. 1–3. The melancholy aspect of a Church unconscious of its defilements, and flaunting in the conceit of its own perfection and beauty; and 4. in contrast with this, the proper attitude of humiliation and sorrow that it ought to assume, ver. 2–5. The duty of observant and faithful ministers in the premises—to reprove remissness, and exhort the Church to self-purgation, ver. 3—6. The duty of the Church made alive to its disgrace—to cast out the evil it cannot cure, and consign the obdurate offender to the master he serves, *a.* with united action; *b.* in the name of the Lord; *c.* evincing a holy abhorence of sin; *d.* yet a love for the offender that shows itself in the desires and prayers for his recovery, ver. 5].

Starke:—Since the scandal of crimes committed in the Church is greater than that of those committed in the world, we should avoid them the more carefully, lament over them the more deeply, and punish them the more scrupulously. The Church must tolerate the public rebuke of open offences, ver. 1.—Christians should mourn over the sins of their brethren as if these were personal afflictions (Ps. cxix. 136; Ez. ix. 4) ver. 2.—It is possible for us to promote the welfare of a Church even when absent, by prayer and by power [?] by writing and giving counsel, ver. 3.—Heb.: 'How glorious the uses of excommunication!' By it many an offender, who would otherwise continue in sin, and have part with the devil, is saved; by it the Church evinces its abhorence of evil, and shuns disgrace; by it she keeps from participating in others' sins, which, through connivance, would involve a whole people in guilt and punishment; and finally, by it she prevents the spread of iniquity, ver. 5.

Berlen. Bib.:—Merely formal assemblies profit nothing: the spirits must be present, and they must first be united by the power of Christ, ver. 4.—A true church-censure flows from love. Its aim is the preservation of the spirit. It has ever been God's method to destroy a part, and that the least part, rather than to lose the whole. So the Gospel still keeps the preponderance. And though the act wears a legal aspect, it is evangelical in intent, aiming to save what belongs to Christ.—We shall obtain salvation at the appearing of our Lord, provided we first awake from sleep, arise from the dead, and let Christ give us light, ver. 5. The toleration of even small things, which originate from impure sources, endangers the whole obedience of faith, ver. 6.

Rieger:—Conceit and self-satisfaction, whether in individuals or communities, open the way for carnal license.—A person must have dug deep in

poverty of spirit, if he takes not occasion from others' trespasses to enhance his own reputation—He who spares the rod hates his child. The omission of a lesser discipline only exposes the guilty one to greater judgments.

HEUBNER:—The abominableness of incest, from which even the heathen shrank with horror, must have a deep foundation in the nature of things, even in God, and not be sought for in the consequences alone, ver. 1. Public offences, when tolerated, involve the whole Church in guilt, even the better portion, partly because all are members of one body; and partly, because their toleration is a token of a want in the Church of zeal and watchfulness and care, for its order and welfare, ver. 2.—This power of censure *i. e.* of delivering over to Satan, which is now conceded to no one [?], is still invisibly exercised by Christ and His Apostles, over every Church, so that in their sight all unworthy persons are already excommunicated. Oh that we could ever bear in mind this scrutiny and judgment that is exercised over us from above!—The Christian Church is holy. It is a city set upon a hill, whose light shines far. Through offences and crimes its crown is trampled under foot. They are violations of the majesty of Christ.—The stringency of primitive Church discipline is no longer maintained. In congregations so mixed as ours, the consciousness of Christian communion has vanished, and public censure would be deemed a libel, and would fail of its end. Hence it only remains for the better members to withdraw their fellowship from every person who dishonors the Church, and refuses to reform, and so make manifest their displeasure at his conduct (Matth. xviii. 17). This would be a voluntary discipline wholly within the power of Christians, of which even the guilty party cannot complain, ver. 5.*

NEANDER:—It is well for the soul if it can be saved, even at the cost of bodily sufferings, ver. 5.

[* These remarks apply only to churches united with the state; and they bring to view one great evil of the state-church system, and afford evidence of its utter inconsistency with the whole idea of Christianity, and of its incompatibility with the Gospel requirements].

[W. F. BESSER:—It is not indeed granted the Church to know, or to determine what sort of evil Satan will inflict on one given over into His power. That he will not, however, slip the man on from one sin to another (Ps. lxix. 28; Rom. i. 24), but will, on the contrary, sensibly touch him with this or that external evil or misfortune, this the Church knows, because it recognizes Satan as the personal power of evil, and it purposes in Christ that the strokes of the destroyer shall smite the flesh of the condemned party, whether it be to the destruction of his bodily life, or to the loss of his earthly prosperity, in order that the spirit of the returning penitent (and so his body too at last) shall be saved in the day of the Lord].

[F. W. ROBERTSON:—The Church excommunicates in a representative capacity. Man is the image of God, and man is the medium through which God's absolution and God's punishment are given and inflicted. Man is the mediator, because he represents God. His acts in this sense are, however, necessarily imperfect. There is but One in whom humanity was completely restored to the Divine Image, whose forgiveness and condemnation are exactly commensurate with God's. Nevertheless, the Church here is the representation of that ideal man which Christ realized, and hence in a representative capacity condemns and forgives.—The indignation of society is properly representative of the indignation of God. God is angry at sin, and when our hearts are sound and healthy, and our view of moral evil not morbid and sentimental, we feel it too. And in expressing this we represent and make credible God's wrath. When the offender hears the voice of condemnation and feels himself every where shunned, then conscience, which before had slumbered, begins to do its dreadful work, and the anger incurred becomes a type of coming doom. Thus is there lodged in Humanity a power to bind; and only so far as man is Christ-like can he exercise this power in an entirely true and perfect manner. (Abbreviated*)].

[* See his striking views on this subject more fully exhibited in his *Serm.* on Absolution in the 3d Vol. of his series.]

X.—[*B. The duty of Church purification in general. Its motives, grounds, and limitations. Rectification of misconceptions as to his meaning in an earlier Epistle*].

CHAPTER V. 6–13.

6 Your glorying [That in which you glory] *is* not good. Know ye not that a little
7 leaven leaveneth the whole lump?[1] Purge out therefore [*omit* therefore[2]] the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our pass-
8 over is sacrificed for us [*omit* for us[3]]: Therefore let us keep[4] the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened
9 *bread* of sincerity and truth. I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with for-
10 nicators: Yet [*omit* Yet[2]] not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with

the covetous, or [and[2]] extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs[6] go out
11 of the world. But now[7] I have written [I wrote] unto you not to keep company, if
any man that is called a brother be[8] a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a
12 railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such a one no not to eat. For what
have I to do to judge them also[9] that are without? do not ye judge them that are
13 within? But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore [*omit* therefore[2]] put
away[10] from among yourselves that wicked person [τὸν πονηρὸν, the wicked one].

[1] Ver. 6.—The variations δολοῖ and φθείρει are glosses.

[2] Ver. 7.—The οὖν of the Rec., as well as the καί before οὐ, ver. 10, and the καί before ἐξάρατε, ver. 13, are connective particles that are feebly supported. [They are not found in A. B D. F. Cod. Sin.]

[3] Ver. 7.—ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν after ἡμῶν is a dogmatic gloss, which has all the most important authorities against it. [This sentence ought to be rendered: '*For our passover has been sacrificed, even Christ.*']

[4] Ver. 8.—["ἑορτάζομεν, A. D., but ἑορτάζωμεν, B. C. F L. Cod. Sin." ALF.]

[5] Ver. 10.—The Rec. ἤ is feebly supported and is an alteration to conform to the general context. [A. B. C. D[1]. F. Cod. Sin. all have καί.]

[6] Ver. 10.—[The Rec. has ὀφείλετε with B[3]., which Alf. calls "a correction from misunderstanding." Wordsworth and Meyer retain it. A. D[1]. C. D. F. L. Cod. Sin. have ὠφείλετε. It would then read: 'Ye ought to have gone.' "The necessity would long ago have occurred and the act passed. And this Lachmann, Tisch., Rückert, approve.]

[7] Ver. 11.—[The Rec. has νυνὶ with C. D. Cod. Sin[1].; and so Meyer, Words. But A. B. F. L. Cod. Sin[3]. have all νῦν, which Alf. adopts.]

[8] Ver. 11.—The Rec. ἤ is accented according to the analogy of what follows. But ἦ is best authorized [being supported by nearly all the ancient versions.]

[9] Ver. 12.—The καί has indeed many important authorities against it. [A. B. C. F. Cod. Sin.] But it might very easily have been omitted as dispensable, and ought to be retained with Meyer and Tischendorf. [Alf. omits it.]

[10] Ver. 13.—The Rec. καὶ ἐξαρεῖτε also from Deut. xxiv. 7. 'Εξάρατε is decidedly better supported. A. B. C. D[1]. F. Cod. Sin.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

[In this section the specific duty of excommunicating an incestuous church member is expanded into the broader one of individual and social purification in general. And this is exhibited under a familiar metaphor, and enforced by reasons drawn from it. In entering upon it Paul starts with alluding to that state of mind which presented so strange a contrast to their actual condition.]

VER. 6. **That in which you boast is not good.**—In view of the word here rendered, 'boasting' (*καύχημα*), the question arises, whether it is the *act*, or the *ground* of boasting that is intended. The latter meaning is certainly the one which prevails in the New Testament, even 2 Cor. ix. 3, [and this is in accordance with the passive form of the noun]. Then we should render it: 'that of which you boast;' and while with the other signification *οὐ καλόν* would mean: 'it does not become you,' *etc.*, it would in the other case be rendered: 'is not seemly or beautiful,' implying that it is, rather, hateful. It is not, however, the incestuous person that is meant [as Hammond and Whitby singularly suggest, supposing him to have been a man of some reputation for wisdom and eloquence], but the whole condition of the Church, the complete corruption of which he proceeds to illustrate by a familiar comparison.—**Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?**—In like manner, he implies, that the whole Church was infected by one crime, tolerated in the midst of it. The "little leaven" here refers not so much to the person in question, as to the vice of fornication, which had broken out upon him in its worst form. "It denotes some impurity of the former state, not yet purged out,—a little remnant of which, if allowed, was sufficient to corrupt again the salvation already obtained, and render it ineffective." BURGER. [It is not, however, says Alford, the "*danger of corruption hereafter*" by the future spread of the tolerated evil, that he here speaks of, but "the character already tainted" by its presence among them in this one instance." But are not the consequences merely anticipated in their certainty, and the future and present all included under one view? The leaven and its working must here be taken together]. The same comparison, used to illustrate a corrupting influence, occurs in Gal. v. 9, and Matth. xvi. 6, and the parallel passages. On the other hand, it appears in Matth. xiii. 33, and in the parallel passages, to illustrate the penetrating and pervading power of Divine grace.

In consequence of the contagious effects of tolerated evil, Paul gives the following exhortation:—**Purge out.**—'Εκκαθαίρειν sometimes is followed by the Accus. of the thing cleansed, and sometimes, as here, with that of the thing removed. [Stanley calls it "a strong expression," and remarks that the duty it enjoins was "carried out in later times with such extreme punctiliousness, that on the fourteenth day they searched with candles into the darkest holes and corners to see whether any leaven remained."]—**The old leaven.**—This, in accordance with what has been said, does not indicate the incestuous person, so that the command would only be a repetition of that in ver. 2 and 13, but the moral evil which was defiling the Church. This he calls 'old,' because it was the remains of their former unregenerate state which, like leaven, was still at work vitiating their character.—**That ye may be a fresh lump,** *νέον φύραμα*,—wherein there is no leaven, hence a complete whole, morally renewed by purification—a Church holy and free from sin, evincing its early love and zeal. (Starke). (*Νέος, fresh* differs from *καινός*, which means *new, entirely different from what it was before*).—What follows clearly shows that the Apostle had in mind the practice of the Israelites removing leaven from their houses before the Passover began.—**As ye are unleavened.**—Thus he designates the Church ideally considered, and as it can become only through the power of Divine grace, and shows the divinely postulated character of its member-

ship; and hence it presents an argument for removing the existing evil, as he enjoins them to do. They are to come up to their true ideal. [Conybeare and Howson, however, interpret this clause literally, as alluding to the condition in which the Jewish portion of the Church were at that moment, it being the time of Passover: "Even as ye, at this Paschal season, are without the taint of leaven." This view Alf. combats at length. His strongest argument, and one which must be deemed conclusive, is that it is "*wholly alien from the habit and spirit of the Apostle.* "The ordinances of the Old Law," he says, "are to Paul *not points, on whose actual observance to ground spiritual lessons*, but things passed away in their literal acceptance, and *become spiritual verities* in Christ." Kling's view is the one generally adopted, and in refutation of the one above suggested, he adds further]. It would evidently transcend the meaning of the term, ἄζυμοι to make it mean those who *eat* no leaven, or observe the festival of unleavened bread, *i. e.*, the Jews, nor would such a meaning be applicable to the case of a Church composed mainly of heathen converts. But it may be fitly used of all professing Christians, inasmuch as they are themselves supposed to be free from those sinful corruptions which prevail without in the world, and which are here denoted by the leaven. And such an interpretation accords with the previous phrase "a fresh lump." The translation of ἐστε by: 'ye ought to be,' instead of by: 'ye are' [as Chrysostom, Theoph., and after them Billroth, Flatt and Pott, and many others suggest], though in itself incorrect, would point to the ideal view of Christians expressed in the word 'unleavened.' [But the strongest argument for the interpretation given above of the clause before us, is in what follows, where we see that the Apostle's mind was moving not in the sphere of Jewish carnal ordinances, but among the higher verities which they typified].—**For our Passover also has been sacrificed even Christ.**—[Such can only be rendering of the words, καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός. The main subject is evidently τὸ πάσχα; and the intent of the Apostle is to show the propriety of speaking of Christians as unleavened, since they, too, had a paschal offering, which was Christ. Kling, however, goes on to raise the question]. Does this declaration furnish the ground of what immediately precedes? or is it a further argument for the whole exhortation? In the former case, the sense would be: ye are free from that corruption by virtue of that redemption achieved by Christ. But such connection would suit, provided only, that we took the term "unleavened" in the sense rejected above. [But why so? Why not consider it as justifying the application of the term to Christians also, on the ground that they likewise had a passover which obliged them to be free from the corruption which the leaven symbolized?] We, therefore, refer the clause to the whole exhortation, as furnishing an argument for that. [And such, no doubt, is the more extended bearing of it.] As among the Israelites from the first day of the feast to the slaying of the Paschal lamb, it was the rule to put away all leaven and all unleavened bread from their houses, so likewise were Christians under obligation to put away all former sinful practices—the leaven of wickedness—inasmuch as their Paschal lamb, even Christ, had been slain. And here we have an evidence that the ancient Paschal lamb was a type of Christ. And to this also Jno. xix. 36, plainly conducts us. The point of comparison is, primarily, the redeeming power of the blood of the victim. It was with this that at the time of their departure from Egypt, the lintels and doorposts of the Israelites were sprinkled, and by reason of this that those within were preserved from the destroying sword, while the Egyptians fell under its stroke. In like manner under the new dispensation, which fulfils the old, it is said the hearts of believers are sprinkled by the blood of Christ (Heb. x. 22; xii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 12), and thus saved from destruction. The slaying of the Paschal lamb accordingly obtains the character of a sacrifice (θύειν), and indeed of an expiatory, covenant kind, forming a distinction between the members of the covenant, whose sins are covered with its blood, and the others who are left to their doom. Worthy of consideration, though somewhat problematical, is Lücke's and Meyer's observation, that this designation of Christ accords with John's account of the crucifixion which places it on the day of the slaying of the Paschal lamb* (contrary to the account of the Synoptists), and can only be explained on this ground. But, however this may be, a powerful motive is found in this fact for moral purification. (comp. 1 Pet. ii. 24).—This is further carried out in

VER. 8. **Let us therefore keep the feast.** —The previous command in a milder form—that of an exhortation to a social solemnity, for which the expression, "our Passover," forms a fit transition. The whole context alludes to the Easter festival; and it is highly probable that the Apostle wrote the Epistle at or near the approach of Easter (comp. xvi. 8), and, being full of the idea, gave to his exhortation a corresponding form. That the Christian festival of Easter, commemorating the resurrection of our Lord, had already been established, can hardly be affirmed. But that Gentile converts united with the Jewish, to celebrate the Passover in commemoration of its fulfilment through Christ, is too probable to be denied. In any case, it is safe to assert with Osiander, that it was solemnized in spirit. As for the rest, the language is figurative. The duty indicated is not the outward, but the inward spiritual observance, namely, the united offering of praise to God for His redeeming grace, through the maintenance of a Christian conversation (comp. Osiander). [Hodge, Alf., Stanley, agree in the opinion that there is no reference here to the keeping of the Passover festival, nor yet to the observance of the Lord's Supper (though Wordsworth regards "the text as specially applicable to a consideration of the privileges and duties" connected with this), but, as Kling, to that "continued Passover feast," that "sacred festival" of a consecrated life, which should follow upon our union to Christ in

[* See this disproved, and the whole chronology of our Lord's last acts fully discussed in ANDREW'S "*Life of our Lord*," pp. 423–460; also LANGE on *Matth.* pp. 456 and 463].

His death, even as a feast, professedly of holy joy and gladness, protracted through seven days always followed upon the observance of the Passover among the Jews].

How the feast was to be kept is explained still further; first, negatively.—**not with old leaven,**—which he had just told them to purge out (ver. 7), and which he goes on further to describe in words which are to be understood, not as introducing a new thought, but as explanatory of the former.—**neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness.**—What, in point of fact is one, is here formally distinguished; or we may say with Meyer, that of the kind in general one particular is selected and made prominent. The preposition *ἐν with*, indicates that with which the feast was accompanied, or in which its character was violated. [The Genitives are those of apposition, 'the leaven which is,' &c. See Winer, § 59, 8, a]. *Κακία* denotes the opposite of that love which seeks the welfare of another—a desire and effort to injure a neighbor (Eph. iv. 31); *πονηρία* ["is a still stronger word" Hodge], and denotes wickedness, villany ["the performance of evil with persistency and delight. Hence Satan is called *ὁ πονηρός*"—Hodge]. In contrast with these we have the true method expressed.—**but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.**—*Εἰλικρίνεια* is purity—the quality of having been proved in the sunlight (*εἵλη*) and found (*κρίνεται*) genuine; *ἀλήθεια*, the harmony of man with himself, and with Divine truth, which is made known in the uprightness of conduct. To distinguish these terms as indicating, the one the *substance*, the other the *manifestation* of goodness, and thus as expressing the opposite to *κακία*, the *substance*, and *πονηρία*, the *manifestation* of evil would be too abstract. Bengel's distinction: "*κακία* is *vice*, as contrary to virtue, and that virtue unalloyed, or *insincerity*, and *πονηρία*, *wickedness*, as in those who strenuously defend and retain *κακίαν*, and is opposed to the truth"—is very uncertain. We can better accept the distinction he makes between *εἰλικρίνεια* and *ἀλήθεια*—"the former takes care not to admit evil with the good, the latter not to admit evil instead of good." For other attempts to discriminate between these words, see Starke in loco. [Also Trench "*Syn. of the New Testament.*" § xi., and W. Webster "*Syntax and Syn. of the New Testament*," pp. 194, 195].

Ver. 9-13.[1] We here have an episode to the proper subject of this paragraph, which is resumed again in ver. 12[2]. The exhortation given above suggests the correction of a misunderstanding in regard to the meaning of a certain passage in a previous letter, which he had written to them about holding intercourse with fornicators.—**I wrote to you in the Epistle.**—The stringency of theological dogmatism, which refuses to admit the loss of any Apostolic writing, insists that the reference here is to a previous passage in this Epistle, *viz.*, ver. 2 and 6. But such reference neither suits the expression "in *the* Epistle," nor yet the contents of the verses cited. The allusion must therefore be to some earlier letter now lost. [This is the conclusion of Calvin, Beza, Bengel, de Wette, Meyer, Wordsworth, Alford, Hodge, Barnes, and most other modern commentators, and as Words. argues, "is perfectly consistent with the position, 'that no Canonical Book of Holy Scripture has been lost.'" Stanley, however, ingeniously argues for the other view, advocated mainly by the Greek Fathers, also by Hammond and Whitby, and asks whether there are not indications that the whole passage from v. 9 to vi. 8 is, in some sense, a distinct note, a postscript not merely to v. 6-8, but also to vi. 9-20? This he says has been already conjectured by two Englishmen, J. Edwards and Dr. Thos. Arnold, and he alludes in the way of comparison to a remarkable passage in Livy. iv. 20, called by Niebuhr, the only instance of a *note* in any ancient author. Similar digressions he thinks he finds elsewhere, also in Paul's Epistles. To say the least, he makes a very plausible case, and his arguments, if not convincing, are very interesting].—**not to keep company with fornicators.**—*Συναναμίγνεσθαι, to mingle oneself up with*, as in 2 Thess. iii. 14; the Inf. after verbs of counselling, or commanding. The warning thus conveyed they had interpreted to mean, that they should hold no intercourse at all with persons of the sort mentioned; and they did this perhaps from a secret disinclination to follow Paul's instruction, and in their letter had pointed out the utter impracticability of the thing. He therefore goes on now to explain himself more exactly upon the subject.

Ver. 10. **Not altogether with the fornicators of this world.**—The ellipsis here is certainly to be supplied from the foregoing—'I wrote not to mingle with.' But the question is, whether these words are to be inserted after 'not,' so as to separate it from 'altogether' (*πάντως*), or whether these two words are to be taken together; and then, in the latter case, whether the two are to be joined with 'I wrote,' or with the nouns following. In our opinion, the separation of 'not altogether' (*οὐ πάντως*), ought, if possible, to be avoided. But if we connect the words unitedly, to 'I wrote,' and render the clause: 'I did by no means write to you not to associate with the wicked,' then it has the appearance of promoting directly such intercourse. ["And this, although perhaps the more common explanation, does not give so good sense." Hodge]. They had better therefore be joined with what follows, in the way of limitation; 'not entirely and under all circumstances' with the fornicators of this world. By the epithet, 'of this world,' the persons alluded to are distinguished from those of the same class found in the Church.—Since he is treating, in this paragraph, of moral purification in general, he adds yet other sorts of persons who presented a decided contrast to the Christian character, and with whom it was unbecoming in them to associate—persons whom he had already spoken of in his previous letter.—**or with the converts and extortioners.**—These two classes go together, as may be seen by the *καὶ and*, which connect them—a reading better supported than *ἤ, or* of the Rec. The *πλεονέκτης* is one who means to have more than his neighbors, or, more than belongs to him, and who therefore indulges in frauds, and overreaching, and oppression. This trait is more prominently brought out in the

second term, *ἅρπαξ*, which denotes one who manifests his greed of gain in robbery and plunder. [Conybeare renders the former of these words: 'lascivious person,' and says that "*πλεονεξία* in St. Paul almost invariably means *impurity*." And Stanley advocates this interpretation as being more in accordance with the drift of discourse. And there is not a little to justify the view taken. Sensuality and rapine most frequently go together as branches from the same root of covetousness, and stand in close connection with idolatry. The same view is also maintained by Hammond, who explains the *πλεονέκταις* to mean 'men of inordinate lusts;' and in consistency with this, supported by no small show of classic authorities, translates *ἅρπαγες*, *ravishers*. But there is no special reason why "the extraordinary sense" should be adopted here; and the conjunction 'and' seems to affiliate the words in meaning with the other to which it is thus connected. See TRENCH, *N. T. Syn.* § 24].—**or with idolaters.**—To those who violate the rights of neighbors, he joins such as violate the highest right—that of God. And in this religious aberration is found the source of all moral aberration. ["This is said to be the earliest known instance of the use of the word *εἰδωλολάτρης*; it is never used in the LXX., although *εἰδωλον* is constantly employed in that version to denote '*false gods*.'" HODGE]. That the prohibition which he had formerly given could not have been meant in the broad sense supposed by his readers, he now shows apagogically by exhibiting the absurdity of the thing.—**Since, indeed, ye must then have gone out of the world.**—The *ἀρα*, *in that case*, following upon *ἐπεὶ*, *since*, shows yet more definitely the consequence which would ensue upon the interpretation put on his language. Properly a protasis is here to be supplied. 'If it were so as you say, why then in that case,' *etc.* [For the force of *ἀρα*, see WINER § LIII. *a*]. *Κόσμος*, *world*, in this last clause, is to be taken in its physical, not, as in the first clause, in its ethical sense. The world is full of bad people, with whom we are compelled to deal, in some form, in business or traffic, by the very exigencies of our earthly lot; and if we would avoid them altogether, we can only do it by quitting the world altogether.

VER. 11. **But now I wrote to you.**—He cannot here be repeating what was in the former Epistle, for had the words which follow been there, the misunderstanding could not have arisen. *Νῦν δὲ ἐγραψα* must accordingly imply: 'but now my meaning was,' *νῦν* being taken in its logical sense, as referring back to the previous statement (comp. xv. 20; xii. 18; xix. 6). In like manner *λέγω* and *ἔλεγον* often stand for: 'this is what I mean, or meant, by what I say, or said.' So i. 12 and elsewhere. This interpretation is better suited to the context. We have here the positive explanation of a former declaration, following upon the negative one in ver. 10,—and not a new declaration made 'now' (*νῦν*), differing from that made "in the Epistle," ver. 10; in which case the aorist *ἐγραψα*: *I wrote*, must be taken after the old epistolary style as referring to what was said in process of writing (see Meyer in *loco*). ["Thus by the right rendering, we escape the awkward inference deducible from the ordinary interpretation, that the Apostle had previously given a command and now retracted it." ALF.].—**not to keep company, if any one called a brother be a fornicator.**—The participle *ὀνομαζόμενος*, *called*, forms an antithesis to *ᾖ*, *is*, as contrasting profession with reality. To connect the partieiple with the following noun [as Augustine, Ambrose, Estius, and others], so as to read: 'be a reputed, or notorious fornicator,' would be alike opposed to the drift of the passage, and to the usage of language. *Ὀνομάζεσθαι* can mean only: *to be called, or, to be honorably mentioned*. Besides in this case the text would have been: *ἀ δελφός τις*,—**or a covetous, or an idolater.**—The term idolater, as applied to one called a brother, must denote, [not an open worshipper of idols, for such a person would hardly have been found among the brethren], but one who ate of the heathen sacrifices, and participated in the heathenish customs connected therewith—a practice alluded to in x. 14. Then enlarging his catalogue beyond that of ver. 10, he adds,—**or a railer, or a drunkard,**—*μέθυσος*, a term which in old Greek was used of women only,—**or an extortioner; with such a one neither to eat.**—This does not refer to communion at love-feasts, or at the Lord's Supper; but to association at ordinary meals, a practice which would indicate intimate companionship. The characters described, they were not to entertain as guests, nor visit as hosts, nor unite with them at a party in the house of a common acquaintance; but they were to cut them off from their society and give it to be understood that they would have nothing in common with them. "Here we learn what sins justify excommunication. We must also suppose that among the converts at Corinth, here and there, a reaction towards their former state had already taken place." NEANDER.

VERS. 12, 13. A further reason why he could have designed his exhortation only in a limited sense. The contrary would have been an assumption of authority over those not Christians, an application of discipline to them which was not allowed him.—**For what have I to do,** —*τί γάρ μοι*.—The expression is pure Greek. It means, 'what concern is it of mine? It does not belong to my office.'—**to judge also those without.**—*Οἱ ἔξω*, was a designation applied by the Jews to the heathen, and by Christians to unbelievers. The latter are without, because they are outside the pale of God's Church—not to be found among His people. In like manner Col. iv. 5, 1 Thess. iv. 12. His refusal to judge such he sustains by a reference to their own procedure.—**do not ye judge them that are within?**—The *τοὺς ἔσω*, holding the emphatic place, forms the antithesis to *τοὺς ἔξω*, and *ὑμεῖς* to *μοι*. Then the argument is: 'since you yourselves confine your jurisdiction to those within the Church, you had no reason to ascribe to me advice which went beyond this limit.' It would be clearly wrong to separate, as some [Theoph. Hammond, Michaelis, Rosenmuller] do, *οὐχί* from what follows, and then take the verb in the Imper. *q. d.*, 'No, judge ye,' *etc.* It would then have read, *οὐδέν*, *nothing*, as the reply to the

previous question; and ἀλλά, *but*, would have appeared after it. In saying 'ye,' Paul does not mean to exclude himself. This would be contrary to what he had just enjoined in vv. 3–5.—**—But those without God will judge**, or **judgeth.**—This clause is best taken by itself, affirmatively, and not as continuing the previous question: 'The right to judge unbelievers belongs solely to God, not to you or me.' Whether the verb here is to be taken in the present or future is doubtful, for the accentuation is uncertain —whether κρίνει or κρινεῖ. If the latter—the future, the reference is to the last judgment. But this is not what Paul has exclusively in mind. Taken in the present, it corresponds best with the previous clauses. ["These remarks about judging form a transition point to the subject of the next chapter. But having now furnished his explanation of the prohibition formerly given, and with this subject of the fornicator among them, he gives, before passing on, a plain command in terms for the excommunication (but no more) of the offender. And this he does in the very words of Deut. xxiv. 7, from which the reading καὶ ἐξαρεῖτε has come." ALF. and this he does without any connecting word, the abruptness being characteristic].—**Put away the wicked one from among your own selves.**—In this he but resumes the chief topic of this section, which had not been altogether abandoned. Even during the seeming digression, Paul clinches it. There is no sign of that momentary passionate outburst which Rückert detects. The reference in τὸν πονηρόν: that wicked one, is to fornicator, not to the devil, as Calvin supposes, whose power was to be averted by the removal of what was evil and impure. Such a reference is disproved by the plain citation here from Deuteronomy.* Ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν is emphatic: 'from out of the midst of yourselves.'

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

[1. *Christ the antitype of the Paschal Lamb.* Thus the Old Testament pours light upon the New, and reveals to us the meaning of Christ's mission. As the Paschal Lamb saved the Israelites from destruction through the sprinkling of its blood upon their habitations, so Christ saves His people, not by instruction, not by example, not by the converting grace of His Spirit, though these means are included in His work—but primarily, by giving His blood for their ransom. He is our Redeemer in virtue of His having made Himself a *sacrifice* for us. This truth is involved in the very word employed to designate the nature of His death, ἐτύθη—a word appropriated to denote the slaying of victims at an altar. And should it be objected that the Paschal Lamb was not, properly speaking, a sacrifice, it not having been offered at an altar, nor through a priest, nor in a consecrated place, thus answering to the requisitions of a sacrifice, it is enough to reply that it is so called in Scripture in various places (Ex. xii. 27; xxiii. 18; xxxiv. 25; Deut. xvi. 2, 4, 5, 6), and had all the effect of an expiatory offering. Indeed, it seems to have been the root out of which the whole sacrificial system grew. And as its offering was the very condition on which the Israelites escaped the doom of Egypt which set them free, and as its observance was the condition of continued membership in the ransomed nation, so is the death of Christ the ground of the sinner's exemption from the condemnation and curse resting upon the world, and the continued commemoration of that death is a duty imposed on all that would be numbered among His saints].

[2. *Both the sanctification of the individual believer, and the purification of the Church as a body, necessarily follow from the fact of our redemption through the sacrifice of Christ.* As the Israelites were redeemed to be a "kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Ex. xxx. 6), so is the Church redeemed to be "a royal priesthood and a holy nation" (1 Pet. ii. 9). And this purpose is realized under the inspiring motive of grateful joy for the deliverance vouchsafed. Hence the whole of every truly Christian life becomes a holy festival, an offering of praise to God for the glorious works He hath done for us through Christ. His redemption was nothing less than the achievement of a Divine love that condescended to take upon itself the doom of the sinner, and expiate his guilt by the sacrifice of a life assumed in his nature. Now where this fact is known and felt, there the sin thus atoned for can no longer be tolerated in its selfishness and lovelessness. He who truly believes that Christ died for him in love, himself becomes "dead unto sin" (Rom. vi. 11). In him the body of sin with all its affections and lusts is nailed upon the cross of his Lord, and the life he henceforth leads, is maintained in fellowship with that Saviour who loved him and gave Himself for him. Thus it is that malice and wickedness are purged away, and instead thereof we see a life of simplicity and truth manifesting itself in word and deed; and this, not under the constraints of legal obligation and fear, but under the actuating power of devout gratitude and joyful devotion. Such is the ideal of a Christian life. And so far as this ideal is realized, both the Church as a whole, and every individual in the Church becomes a temple of God where He is perpetually worshipped and where a true and lasting festival goes on].

3. It follows from the above that wherever the Christian life is in full and vigorous exercise, there the Church will, as far as possible, maintain a *discipline*, which shall separate between the holy and the profane, and preserve its own consistency and integrity; there Christians will withhold the title of 'brother' from every professor that walketh disorderly, and will take heed how they countenance by their friendly

[* And yet Calvin's interpretation is more in accordance with the enlarged course of thought pursued in the latter part of the chapter, and carries with it greater force. It also explains the abruptness with which the injunction is introduced. The grand finale of the whole matter is: 'Put the wicked one away from the midst of you—the wicked one and all that belongs to him.' This seems more natural than to suppose a recurrence to a matter already settled].

[* See Archb. Magee's conclusive argument on this subject in his "Atonement and Sacrifice," Note xxxv. KURTZ *Sacrificial Worship*, § 180, and articles on "*Passover*" in KITTO *Bib. Ency.*, and SMITH'S *Bible Dict.* Also BAHR *Symbolik*, Vol. II., p. 627 ff., LANGE *Life of Christ, Edinburgh. Trans.* IV., p. 149, and LANGE *Matth.* xxvi. 1–5].

society those who openly dishonor the name after which they are called; there the vices which stain the Christian character will be regarded with greater abhorrence and put under severer censure than those which are openly practised by the world. And this discipline will be the natural operation of that holy love which the death of Christ enkindles, manifesting itself both in the ordinary intercourse of life, and through official acts. Without this vital power, Church discipline, however exercised, may indeed succeed in maintaining a creditable external order, and in carrying on a creditable conflict with public immoralities, but it never can accomplish an inward renovation, or bring to pass deep and lasting results.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[1. The Church of God, as a body redeemed from condemnation by the death of Christ, is thereby put under obligations to purge itself from all sin and immoralities, and to preserve a saintly character and appearance. The inflation of vanity is one evidence of the working of the leaven of wickedness, and should excite suspicion of its presence ver. 6.—No immoralities should be tolerated under the pretext that they are small, because—1, the toleration of them indicates a general laxity of principle; and 2, endangers the purity of the whole body by a vicious infection ver. 6; and 3, is contrary to the ideal character of the Church ver. 7. The sins of our former state are especially to be guarded against, and the remains of them to be searched for and cast out. They both desecrate the purity and mar the joy of what should be the Christian's life-long feast ver. 7.—The Church, though separate from the world, is yet to exist in the world; and one of the problems it must solve is so to mingle with the ungodly and profane as not to compromise its character or countenance iniquity, and yet so as to maintain peace with all men and win the worst to Christ. The principles which should regulate its intercourse with the world are thus given by Barnes: '*a.* The Church is not to be compared to the world in any of its peculiar and distinguishing features; *b.* It must treat all men justly and righteously; *c.* Its members must discharge all obligations and duties belonging to the social relations; *d.* They must do good to all men; *e.* They must so associate with sinners as to be able to work for their salvation' (vv. 9, 10).—Those that are justly liable to church censure, and must be excommunicated, are the openly immoral and profane. But while these characters in the Church are to be judged by the Church, the world without is to be left to the judgment of God. And this judgment is to be exercised in the Church in order that those who are judged by it may, if possible, escape the condemnation awaiting the world (ver. 12).]

STARKE:—If evil be allowed free course, the result will be a settled wantonness of character, leading the person to commit iniquity without reserve—yea, even with pleasure and determination; and then to ignore guilt, or so to varnish it over that the villain beneath shall not be suspected under the fair outside. Sin has its lurking holes, and must be hunted out through them all. Alas, for the few genuine Easter days which Christians enjoy, ver. 8.—Of what profit is it to leave the world and skulk away in the mountains and clefts of the wilderness? The old Adam will skulk with thee even there. Drive him out, and then will thy heart itself be a blessed solitude, where Christ will come and converse with thee. So associate with open sinners as to teach, not learn—warn, not confirm—help to life, not hasten to death (ver. 9–10).—Look out for home; God will take care of things abroad.—In order to effective Church discipline, the majority of the Church must themselves be sound ver. 13.

BERLEN. BIBEL:—If thy wrong is made public and judged, count it not as an injury; for a genuine purification requires that we do not withdraw our iniquity from condemnation and destruction. Now that Christ has died for our justification, and sent us His Spirit for our sanctification, this personal purification may be justly required. We *ought* to do it, because now we can do it—not, however, in our own strength, but in that of our risen Saviour (ver. 7).—The true Passover festival of Christians is followed by a constant succession of Sabbaths, wherein they daily rise with Christ to newness of life. He who has learned this, keeps Easter all the time. Christ's life is his life; and this life is peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. His festival will terminate only when Christ ceases to be ver. 8.—If we must be surrounded by the world, let us take care to abide with ourselves through a constant inward intercourse with God. In such a case the world will not harm us.

HEUBNER:—The Pericope on Easter. To the worthy celebration of Easter there belongs—1, repentance vv. 6, 7; 2, faith and joy, because of redemption ver. 7; 3, new resolves for greater sanctification (ver. 8).—The life of a Christian is a continuous Easter—1, in ceaseless repentance and sorrow for man's fall; 2, in constant looking to Christ, the risen, reigning Lord. —Easter as the festival of a spiritual resurrection—1. Its necessity as a memorial of the Apostacy, since from one sin the whole race has been corrupted vv. 6, 7. 2. It shows the possibility of redemption. Only One, Christ, can raise us from our fall ver. 7. 3. It is a general demand to walk in newness of life, in order to become fit for eternal life through sanctification (ver. 8). HEUBNER.

F. W. BESSER:—We, too, have a Paschal Lamb. It was a gift from God. What has God from us in return? We have the *true* Paschal Lamb. God requires of us the true Easter-cake. What vile ingratitude, if we are disobedient! (ver. 7). Daily would we celebrate Easter in spirit, provided we daily acknowledge, enjoy and praise our Paschal Lamb, 'who was slain for us once for all' (Heb. x. 10). "The time of the N. T. is a perpetual festal period," says Augustine. God's word exhorts you to purge out the old leaven, and if you refuse, you make your natural sourness altogether sourer through the vinegar and the gall of your opposition; weakness turns to stiff-neckedness and malice, and indolence, to spite and wickedness. But if, on the contrary, our old leaven is sweetened—if we admit the purifying influence of the Spirit, then

instead of wicked resistance we show honest repentance; instead of cherishing malice, we accept the truth in love. In the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth we celebrate our Easter by allowing ourselves to be reproved by the light (Eph. v. 13), and by giving honor to the truth.

[F. W. ROBERTSON:—'Ye are unleavened.' Here is the true conception of the Church: regenerated humanity—new life without the leaven of old evil. The Church visible and invisible, however, to be distinguished; the former composed of the men who in this age or that profess Christ, the latter such as every Church is only potentially and conceivably, according to its idea. For want of keeping these distinct, two grand errors arise: 1. Undue severity towards the lapsed. 2. Wrong purism in the matter of association with the world, its people, its business, its amusements. Under, 1. The attempt to make the Church entirely pure must ever fail. Only as a Church *visible* she must separate from her all *visible* evil; she must sever from herself all such foreign elements as bear unmistakable marks of their alien birth. Her purity must be visible purity, not ideal; representative, not perfect. Under, 2. We are not to go out of the world, but only to take care, in associating with sinners, not to recognize them as *brothers*, or as fulfilling in any degree the Christian idea].

[J. EDWARDS:—Ver. 11. *The Nature and End of Excommunication.* I. The nature of excommunication: 1. Wherein it consists: *a.* It is privative of the charity of the Church, of brotherly society with its members, of its fellowship, and of its internal privileges; *b.* Positively it is a deliverance unto the calamities to which those are subject who belong to the visible kingdom of the devil, and into the special power of Satan, who may be employed by God for the infliction of such chastisement as their apostacy deserves. 2. By whom inflicted: *a.* Primarily, by Christ; *b.* Ministerially, by the Church. II. The proper subjects for excommunication. 1. Those visibly wicked by gross sin. 2. The obdurately impenitent. III. The ends of excommunication. 1. That the Church may be kept pure, and its ordinances undefiled. 2. That others may be deterred from wickedness. 3. That the guilty parties may be reclaimed. IV. Motives to the duty. 1. The honor of Jesus, and of His religion, and His Church. 2. Our own good. 3. The good of those who are without. 4. Benevolence towards offending brethren. 5. The absolute authority of Christ.]

XI.—A LACK OF PROPER CHURCH SPIRIT IN THE MANAGEMENT OF THE CIVIL RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH-MEMBERS AMONG THEMSELVES. LITIGATION BEFORE HEATHEN TRIBUNALS.

CHAPTER VI. 1–11.

Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to the law before the unjust,
2 and not before the saints? Do [Or[1] do] ye not know that the saints shall judge the
world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the
3 smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more [to say
4 nothing of] things that pertain to this life? If then ye have judgments of things
5 pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church. I
speak[2] to your shame. Is[3] it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not
6 one[4] that shall be able to judge between his brethren? But brother goeth to law with
7 brother, and that before the unbelievers. Now therefore there is utterly a fault
among you, [a loss to you[5]] because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not
8 rather take wrong? Why do ye not rather *suffer yourselves to* be defrauded? Nay,
9 [On the contrary, ἀλλά] ye do wrong, and defraud, and that[6] *your* brethren. [Or ἤ]
Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God?[7] Be not
deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor
10 abusers of themselves with mankind. Nor thieves, nor covetous,[8] nor [not, οὐ[9]]
11 drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall[10] inherit the kingdom of God. And
such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified
in the name of the Lord Jesus,[11] and by the Spirit of our God.

[1] Ver. 2.—The omission of ἤ in the Rec. is feebly sustained. [A. B. C. D. F. Cod. Sin. and several versions insert it.]
[2] Ver. 5.—Lachmann reads λαλῶ instead of λέγω after B.
[3] Ver. 5.—Ἐστι [according to B. C. L. Cod. Sin.]. The Rec. has ἔστιν which is less authorized [being found only in D F. though more commonly substituted].

[4] Ver. 5.—Οὐδὲ εἷς probably genuine. [It is found in D.[3] L. Syr. Vulg. and maintained by Wordsworth. The omission of it [in B. C. Cod. Sin.] is to be attributed to oversight, the transcriber passing directly from σοφός to ὃς. The οὐδείς or οὐδὲ εἷς before σοφός are critical attempts to restore the text.] [The former is found in B. C. L. Cod. Sin. and the latter in F.]

[5] Ver. 7.—The Rec. has ἐν ὑμῖν. The ἐν was probably inserted to accord with the meaning: *fault*, given to ἥττημα [A. B. C. D. L. Cod. Sin. all omit it and it is rejected by Meyer, Alf., Words. Stanley, however, retains it.]

[6] Ver. 8.—The Rec. has ταῦτα, which is not by any means so well authorized as τοῦτο [which is found in A. B. C. D. Cod. Sin.] It was changed for the plural probably to conform to the two verbs preceding.

[7] Ver. 8.—The Rec. has the more common order βασιλείαν before θεοῦ, as in ver. 10. [The reverse order is found in A. B. C. D. Cod. Sin.]

[8] Ver. 10.—[The order of these two is reversed in D. L., a large number of the cursive MSS. and in the Greek fathers. πλεονέκται οὔτε κλέπται].

[9] Ver. 10.—The Rec. with Lach. has οὔτε [according to B. D.[3] L. But οὐ is found in A. C. Cod. Sin.] But the authorities for οὔτε have the same also before the following words. A. C. Cod. Sin. and the best critical edition, however, read οὐ there likewise.]

[10] Ver. 10.—The Rec. has οὐ before κληρον. which was, perhaps, inserted in accordance with the same in ver. 9.

[11] Ver. 11.—The variations of ἡμῶν after κυρ. and of χριστοῦ after Ἰησοῦ are undoubtedly insertions.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

["The connection of this paragraph with the preceding, seems to be, 'As we have nothing to do with judging the heathen, so we ought not to go to law before them, or suffer them to judge us.' This question was not new. It was held unlawful among the Jews for any Jew to bring a lawsuit against his countrymen before a Gentile judge, on the ground that in Ex. xxi. 1, it is commanded: 'These are the judgments which thou shalt set before'—not the Gentiles, but 'them—the Jews.' 'If any one brings the judgments of Israel before the Gentiles, he profanes the name of God, and honors the name of an idol. They who so do give occasion to the strangers to say, 'See how harmonious they are who worship one God.' This right of settling their own disputes, was conceded to them by the Romans; and hence the speech of Gallio to the Jews who attacked St. Paul. In the first beginning of Christianity, the same rule would be naturally held to apply. The existence of separate courts for the disputes of Christians among themselves, is implied [?] in this passage. The Apostolic Constitutions (II. 4, 5, 46, 47) and the Clementines, in language evidently founded upon this text, imply the existence of such courts at the time when those works were compiled, *i. e.*, apparently about A. D. 150. When one of the parties was a heathen, then it was thought lawful to prosecute before a heathen tribunal.

Under these circumstances, it was natural that the same controversy, which in a mixed society of Jewish and Gentile Christians ran through so many other departments of human life, should be felt here also; and that the Gentile Christians should still wish to carry on their litigations in the same courts to which they had been previously accustomed, and to indulge the same litigious spirit which had characterized the Greek nation from the time of Aristophanes downward. But in whatever way this tendency originated, the Apostle [here] treats it altogether irrespectively of any Jewish or Gentile custom, and condemns it solely on the ground of the low views which it implied of the greatness of a Christian's privileges, and the closeness of the bond of Christian brotherhood." STANLEY.]

VERS. 1. Here also, as in chap. v., there is indicated a lack of true Christian spirit in the failure to maintain the honor of the Church. In the former case it arose from a want of moral earnestness, here from an earthly temper, and from stubbornness of opinion. The tone of address is sharp.—**Dare any of you.**—This is not ironical, as Schrader imagines; but it is the direct outburst of indignation at the unworthy conduct manifested [and also at the risk run]. "The injured majesty of Christians," says Bengel, "is here noted by a grand word." Τολμᾷν, *sustinere, to have the heart to do* that from which a just sense of the Christian dignity should have restrained them. Here the culpable party must be regarded as consisting mainly of Gentile converts, since it was already a custom among the Jews to choose their own umpires—**having a matter.**—Πρᾶγμα ἔχειν is a phrase denoting civil suits, especially in matters of money and possessions.—**against another**—of course, a fellow church-member—**go to law,**—κρίνεσθαι, *to separate oneself, to part from*, then *to contend, to strive*, also *to debate*, and that before a tribunal. "This love of litigation—a remnant of the old leaven which abounded among the traffickers of Corinth—must have derived abundant nourishment from the divisions existing in the Church." BESSER.—**before**—ἐπί, as in Acts xxiii. 30—**the unjust**—τῶν ἀδίκων. These are the heathen. So in Matth. xxvi. 45, they are called ἁμαρτωλοί, *sinners;* while the Israelites, on the contrary, are termed δίκαιοι, *just;* Wisd. xviii. 20; xvi. 17; xi. 15. The designation 'unjust' is employed to bring out more prominently the absurdity [and the peril] of seeking for *justice* in such a quarter. It exhibits those to whom it is applied as devoid of that true righteousness which is found alone in God's kingdom, as withholding from God His due, and therefore as unqualified to administer justice among His people. On ἁγίων (=οἱ ἔσω chap. v. 12) comp. i. 2.—["Paul does not here condemn those who from necessity have a cause before unbelieving judges, as when a person is summoned to court; but those who *of their own accord* bring their brethren into this situation, and harass them, as it were, through means of unbelievers, while it is in their power to employ another remedy." CALVIN. "And besides the scandal of such a proceeding, as exposing their internal differences to the eyes of the heathen, there were certain formularies to be gone through in the heathen Law Courts, such as adjuration by heathen Deities, which would involve them in idolatrous practices." WORDS.]

VER. 2. He here goes on to show still further what an entire disregard of the true dignity of the Christian state was evinced in their conduct. —**Or do ye not know.**—The 'or' presents an alternative, suggesting some other cause for their conduct, *viz.*, that of ignorance; and the

interrogative form used intimates that it was a culpable ignorance of an indubitable and plain truth. ["This question," says WORDS., "occurs no less than *ten* times in this Epistle, and only *twice* in all the rest. It was a very fit mode of remonstrance with those who vaunted themselves most on their knowledge."]—**that the saints shall judge the world?**—"This is the only clear, direct enunciation we have of the truth here expressed, though it is in perfect harmony with conclusions elsewhere furnished." BURGER. The words imply more than an indirect participation in the judgment of the world, such as is brought to view in Matth. xii. 41, where it is said: "The men of Nineveh shall rise up in judgment against this generation," *etc., viz.*, that in contrast with the conduct, or faith exhibited by them, the guilt of the world will be set forth in clearer light, [so Chrys. and most of the Greek fathers, Erasmus, Words.]. Nor is it meant that the saints will simply unite in assenting to the sentence pronounced by Christ as assessors on his judgment seat [Barnes, *et al.*]; nor that they in some general way will be glorified with Him, [Schleus., Heyden., Barnes.]. Still less do they refer to any future judicial functions, which saints are to possess in this world as its princes and rulers, [Lightfoot, Whitby]; nor to any peculiar ability to estimate the value of the world's opinions and doings, [Mosh. Rosen.] (ii. 15, comp. ver. 3). And least of all are they to be interpreters of the church as the perpetual judge of the world, in so far as it carries the light which ever separates the darkness of the world from itself. (Cath.). But they refer to that reigning with Christ which is elsewhere promised to the faithful, (Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 12), and serve to define more exactly the import of the expression: 'glorified with Him.' What was said especially of the Apostles, that they should "sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matth. xix. 28), is here extended, in general, to all the true followers of Christ—His royal people, in relation to that portion of the race which shall persist in its opposition to the Gospel, *viz.*, the world. In short, Paul here asserts the active participation by the saints in the judicial work of Christ, such as is ascribed to them in Dan. vii. 22: "Until the ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom." [The same prediction reappears again in the *Apocryphal Book*, Wisdom III. 8: "They (the righteous) shall judge the nations, and have dominion over the people, and their Lord shall reign forever"]; also Rev. ii. 26, 27; xx. 4–6. That this is the element in their glory which the Apostle alludes to, the context clearly shows. [Such is the interpretation also of Calvin, Beza, Alf., Stanley, and others. And it is plainly the only tenable one. The others are either too far fetched, or imply a more general acquaintance with the New Testament, in its present form, than could have been possible for the Corinthians; and we cannot suppose that the Apostle would be likely to consider their ignorance of the matters suggested a fit ground for rebuke. But the prophecy of Daniel was in their hands; and the anticipations of the final triumph and glory of the righteous during the reign of the Messiah, were current among believers; and the ignoring or over-looking of these matters might well have been reproved. In fact the final and complete supremacy of Christ's kingdom was already assured in the very character of its head, and the former could not be disavowed without offence done to the latter. As to the *character* of the functions which the saints were to fulfil, opinions will vary according to the views adopted in respect to the nature of the millennial glory, and of the relation which the church will sustain to the world at that time. But whatever these functions may be, the language which describes them plainly implies the exercise of an active supremacy in the affairs of the world. That which saints are expected to do then, must, in some way, be analogous to the duties which the Apostle urges upon the church-members to discharge for themselves in the present age. For this reason the view of Hodge and Barnes and others, who suppose a reference in the text "to the future and final judgment" (with a somewhat uncertain allusion to Dan. vii. 22, as though the event pointed to here were the same as the other), must be set aside. On that occasion the saints appear only as the *retinue* of the Judge, and are nowhere represented as taking an active part in the trial. The idea of Barnes that the saints are to judge the world by simply 'encompassing the throne,' and 'assenting to Christ's judgment,' and occupying "a post of honor AS IF they were associated with him in judgment," hardly suits the style of the Apostle's reasoning]. The natural conclusion from all this, *viz.*, that persons destined to so lofty an office, ought also to be deemed worthy of passing judgment on the trifling matters of this life, is put in the form of a question, expressive of astonishment. This, as is often the case, is introduced with an 'and.' The question, however, is not thereby made dependent on the previous one, 'Know ye not?' but it stands by itself.—**And if among you the world is to be judged.**—The judges are here conceived of as constituting one vast assembly, in the midst of which the adjudication proceeds. The ἐν ὑμῖν is not precisely equivalent to: 'through you,' as in Acts xvii. 31; nor to: ὑφ' ὑμῶν, *by you*, though the sense is about the same; nor: 'in you,' *i. e.*, by your example; but properly: *in the midst of you*, and so; *before you:* (*coram*). [WINER § XL. VIII., *etc.* "Hence," says MEYER, "it is evident that the saints themselves are to be the judges sitting in judgment. And ἐν is employed in view of the following κριτηρίων, since the Christians judging therein, are conceived of as one judicial concourse, for the sake of representing the idea more vividly"]. The εἰ, *if*, in εἰ κρίνεται, as the context shows, is not meant to exhibit the judgment as at all problematical, but only states it as indubitably presupposed in what follows. The notion of futurity here retires into the background.—**Are ye unworthy of the smallest judgments?**—Κριτήρια is a word used to denote both places or courts of trials, and also the trials themselves which are there held. Here it means the latter, and the whole clause is to be taken in an active sense, *q. d.*, are ye unworthy of holding trial in the smallest matters? [Many, like

de Wette, Olsh., Hodge, Words., understand by *κριτήρια*, the matters in trial, as better suited to the context, ver. 4, 7, but Meyer says that this is contrary to all usage]. The adjective here (*ἐλαχίστων*) refers to the matters brought to trial, and which are here designated as of the most trifling sort, having to do simply with the earthly 'mine and thine,' Luke xvi. 10.

VER. 3. **Know ye not that we shall judge angels? to say nothing of things that pertain to this life?**—[A still wider contrast.] But are there here two questions, or only one? or are we to take the second clause as a corollary? Since *μήτιγε* in the first instance means, *not at all* (*Passow* III. p. 230. [ROB. *Gr. Lex.*]), and then: *yet much less*, it would seem to indicate that there is also a second question here. The sense then would be: 'Our judicial power, as ye ought to know, extends even beyond, even unto celestial beings; should it not then be now first applied to terrestrial matters'? *i. e.*, how much more now ought it to be applied to these?—In respect to the fact first alluded to, 'the judging of angels', we must at the outset put aside every explanation, which makes the phrase expressive of something inferior to the work of judging the world, instead of something which is an advance upon it—whether this be done by taking 'angels' to mean church officers, or priests, or teachers distinguished for devilish cunning; and by supposing the judgment spoken of to be of a spiritual kind, as relating to the errors of these parties, or to be even a mere ability to judge, (Gal. i. 8). The only point in doubt is, whether angels in general are referred to, or merely good angels, or merely bad ones. BESSER says: 'both classes; to the damnation of the bad, but on the good, to pronounce a judgment of blessing, since they will be united with us under one Head in Christ'. (Eph. i. 10). Since, however, the idea that good angels are meant, finds support only in that relation which they sustain to believers, hinted at in Heb. i. 14, and in the hypothetical expression found in Gal. i. 8, and inasmuch as good angels are represented as furnishing a part of Christ's retinue in judgment, and as acting the part of organs and witnesses of His judicial work, (Matt. xiii. 39, xvi. 27, xxiv. 31, xxv. 31, 2 Thess. i. 7, Rev. xx. 1 ff.), we are constrained to adopt the explanation, which supposes evil angels to be referred to, as the only correct one. [So Chrys. and most of the Greek fathers, and Calvin and Beza, and Bengel, Poole, and most of commentators. Whitby, with the same reference understands the judgment to denote that expulsion of the devils from their dominion over the world by the power of the Gospel, of which our Saviour speaks in John xii. 31, and xvi. 11. On the contrary, Meyer, Alf. and Hodge, following the usage of the N. T., where the word *ἄγγελοι*, without any qualifying epithet always means good angels, interpret it so here. But they do not profess to explain *how* these are to be judged, or they give to the word, 'judge', a very comprehensive meaning, implying only superiority of a general sort. Billr., de Wette, Stanley, leave the matter undecided. See Pool and Whitby.] At the same time it must be said that the unqualified term 'angels' indicates the superhuman nature of the beings contemplated, and puts them in contrast with the world; [and 'the argument will be not less conclusive in this way.' CALVIN;] while the position they are in, so analogous to that of the world, marks them as standing in an abnormal relation to God, and implies that the judgment spoken of will be one of condemnation, the same as in ver. 2, and not one that merely decides upon honors and rewards.—*Βιωτικά* = things serviceable for this life (Luke viii. 43), which belong to bodily sustenance, and are therefore of an earthly, temporal sort, as is every thing which forms a ground for suits respecting property, debts or inheritance. ["The Latin translation of this word by *sæcularia*, is probably one of the first instances of the use of that word, in its modern sense of 'worldly' as opposed to spiritual, instead of its ancient sense, 'belonging to a cycle of a hundred years'; and from this has sprung the signification of the word 'secular' in modern European languages". STANLEY].

VER. 4. **Secular trials indeed then would ye have.**—[*Βιωτικά* is repeated with emphasis, and so stands first, and] *κριτήρια* is to be construed as in ver. 2, not as equivalent to *πράγματα, matters to be judged*, for this rendering is void of support. *Ἔχειν* might denote in this connection: *to have on hand;* or, *to have a just comprehension of;* consequently: *to be in a condition to manage* (as in the phrases, *ἐχειν ἐπιστήμην, τέχνας, τὴν ἰατρικήν, etc.*), and this would fit well with what precedes. The *μέν*, introducing a clause correlative to the one following, might remain untranslated, and *οὖν* be rendered by, *then, accordingly*, or by some word of transition, which would indicate that the point mentioned has been established, and that the clause where it occurs also stands in inward connection with some previous expression. Properly: 'Have ye then indeed such trials? but ye by no means proceed in a manner suitable to this fact!' This thought would then be expressed by a protasis and apodosis, of which the latter is to be regarded as a question of astonishment at such procedure. An interrogation similar to this we have in Jno. x. 36 (comp. ver. 35), "how happens it that ye do this?" But such an explanation would necessitate our taking *ἐάν* as equivalent to *εἰ*, which could only be justified on the score of the laxity of the later Greek in this respect, and provided another interpretation were inadmissible. But we may interpret the *ἐὰν κριτήρια ἔχητε*, of the actual existence of such trials among them; in which case *ἐάν* would mean, *if, in case that*, and we should interpret the clause thus: 'if now it should happen that trials, involving secular matters, are held among you,—**those despised in the church these do ye set up**?—*i. e.* as judges. By 'the despised,' he means the unjust or the unbelievers, before spoken of, who, as such, pass for nothing in the Church, and enjoy no confidence or authority there. ["This translation," Hodge says, "is generally preferred as best in keeping with the context," and Wordsworth adopts it also. See, however, the note below]. But if any do not choose to construe it as a question of astonishment, it may be taken as a simple affirmation, stating once more what was actually occurring among them. ["So in the main, Luther, Calvin, Rückert, Olsh., de Wette, Neander,

and others]. The *οὖν* would then be an ecbatic particle. Yet the form of the question would in any case, be the more emphatic. The use of *καθίζετε* is also a remarkable way of expressing an appeal to heathen judges on the part of Christians, for it implies that such judges were formally set up in office by the Christians themselves, when they could have had no hand in their appointment, and only seemed to do so by appealing to them for decision in cases over which they ought to have no adjudication.—Τούτους, *these*, an emphatic repetition of the persons alluded to [involving also contempt]. Others, objecting partly to the use of *καθίζειν* in relation to heathen authorities, who are supposed to be already existing, and partly to the application of *τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους* to the heathen as unsuitable [and inconsistent with the respect which Paul inculcates toward heathen magistrates], understand the latter to denote *church members*, and construe the whole in the Imp. as an injunction [of rather an ironical sort]: 'If you must have trials, those least esteemed in the Church, these set up rather as judges.' But in such a case the text ought to read: *τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐξουθεν.*, and the word 'rather,' would be an arbitrary insertion. This insertion would, however, be necessary, if we understood the Apostle to mean such persons as might be suitable for the office in question, but who, for some reason, were of little repute. But, however this may be, still our first interpretation is favored by what follows.*

Vers. 5, 6.—**To your shame I speak.**—Comp. on iv. 14. The expression applies, as in xv. 34, to what precedes; and what follows, in part, explains more fully how far that spoken of in ver. 4 is disgraceful to them, and, in part, repeats emphatically the case as it stood.—**So is there not among you not even one wise man.**—The *οὕτως* is either climacteric, meaning: 'so completely are ye wanting in wise men,' which rendering does not well suit a strong negation [but is adopted by Chrys., Luther, Billr., Calvin, Alf., Olsh., Rückert]; or it is: 'in this way,' 'under these circumstances,' referring back to ver. 4: 'seeing that ye set up those persons despised in the Church for judges.' [So Meyer. The rendering here must be determined by the view taken of the import of ver. 4. If that last advocated be the correct one, it would be more natural to understand *οὕτως* in the former sense. King James' translation places the stress of the interrogation here, deviating in this respect from the previous versions which translate it, "utterly," "at all," and supposes an ellipsis: "Is it so that there is not?"]. *Ἐνι* is for *ἔνεστι*, an adverbial use of the *ἐν* without the copula='is there,' 'does there exist.'—*Οὐ δὲ—εἷς*, a strong expression, like *non ullus, nemo unus*, 'not even one.' Considering how wise they were in their own conceit, the question here is a very cutting one. At the same time it suggests a strong reason for their altering their conduct. By it he would urge them to the practical exercise of their vaunted wisdom—a matter in which they sadly failed. *Σοφός, skilful, expert in resources, experienced, discreet.*—**who shall be able**—*i. e.*, when a cause comes up—**to decide.** *διακρῖναι—to arbitrate* in a formal manner—**between his brother,** *ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ*,—a wise expression, where a person understanding himself to be meant, supplies in thought: 'and a brother.' Meyer regards the party distinctly mentioned as the complainant (the defendant he understood as a matter of course, who is specified by way of distinction, as the party in fault). Had the plural been used, the two litigants would then have been equally brought to view. In the use of the term 'brother,' a rebuke is intended which is still further enlarged upon—**but brother goeth to law with brother.**—This is not a question, whether considered independently, or as continuing the previous one; but it is an affirmation full of severe reproof. ["'Αλλά, after a question, passes rapidly on to the other alternative, the particle, which negatives the question being supressed, *q. d.*, 'nay; but.'" Alf.]. *Κρίνεται, goeth to law*, stands opposed to *διακρίνειν, to arbitrate.* Then, by way of contrast with the "wise man among you," before whom they ought to have settled their difficulties, we have the sad opposite:—**and that before unbelievers.**—["and that," a form of expression used when particular stress is to be laid on the circumstance indicated." Hodge].

Vers. 7, 8. Looking away now from the point last mentioned, *i. e.*, going to law before unbelievers, he here passes to rebuke the entire practice of litigation among Christians as in itself wrong.—**indeed therefore**—*ἤδη μὲν οὖν.* The *μέν* gives a peculiar prominence to the point to be mentioned as being the worst of all; *οὖν* is simply transitional and conjunctive; but *ἤδη* (see *Passow* II. 1326 ff.) is a determinative particle, which serves, in part, to strengthen the whole clause, and, in part, to call particular attention to certain thoughts about to be presented. —**it is in any case a loss for you.**—Ὅλως. presents the aspect of the case generally, without reference to any peculiar, aggravating circumstances, such as going to law "before unbelievers." [Stanley renders it: "certainly"] Ἥττημα. lit.: *a falling short;* it is used, partly, of failings and imperfections (hence the var. *ἐν ὑμῖν*), and, partly, of injuries, or damage, whe-

[* Yet the interpretation which Kling sets aside appears in all the six earlier English versions. Wickliff: "Ordeyne ye the contemptible men that ben in the chirche to deme." Tyndale: "Take them which are despised in the congregacion, and make them judges." Cranmer, the same. Geneva: "Them which are least esteemed in the Churche, them I say set in judgment." Rheims: "The contemptible in the Church set them to judge." In like manner the Rec version. Conant adopts it also. So, too, Syr. Vulg., most of the Greek Fathers, Calvin, Beza, Bengel, Hammond, Stanley, Alford. And certainly this interpretation is one which most readily suggests itself, being most in accordance with the tone of the Apostle's expostulation, full of lofty irony, and with the order of the words with the designations used, and with the use of *ἐὰν* with the subj. (see Kühner, § 339, 2 il. *b.*), and with the natural sense of *καθίζετε*: *set up.* What Paul means to say is: that if they would have trials over such trivial matters (a thing which he supposes they would have, even though they ought not), they ought to set up judges accordingly, not those of highest character, whose destiny was hereafter to judge angels, but persons who were comparatively of no account. This would be dealing with their litigious spirit as it deserved. And if we consider the complaints of Augustine, which Calvin alludes to, in consequence of the necessity he was under of devoting so large a portion of his precious time to secular affairs, we should see what reason the Apostle had for advising that the Corinthians should choose those "least esteemed" for this business].

ther it be in an ethical sense, as caused by the outbreak of sin and the violence of passion (comp. *ἡττᾶσθαι*, 2 Pet. ii. 20; *νικᾶσθαι*, Rom. xii. 21), or as some evil consequence upon these outbreaks, such as hinderance to our salvation, and to our participation in God's kingdom. It is here undoubtedly the latter, and points to what is more fully stated in ver. 9. This is undoubtedly the more correct interpretation, and it forms an implied contrast to any supposed temporal advantage they might gain by any legal process. [So Meyer, de Wette, Words., Alf., Hodge. But Calvin, Beng., Billr., Stanley, Rückert, Olsh., all prefer the meaning: 'fault,' 'imperfection,' 'weakness.' And there is strong ground for their interpretation]. Neander: "A backsliding of the Church, and sinking down from the high standard of pure Christian feeling." *ὑμῖν*, Dative of interest—**that ye have lawsuits with yourselves.** — *Κρίμα* elsewhere means, *judicial decision, sentence,* also *judgment.* With this rendering the sense would be: 'that it comes to this, that ye have legal decisions,' *etc.* The same sense substantially is obtained if we adopt the meaning which attaches to *κρίνεσθαι*, and which does not elsewhere appear, *viz.:* lawsuits. [So Rob. *Lex. sub. voce;* but Alf. says: 'matters of dispute']. *Μεθ' ἑαυτῶν*: 'with yourselves;' more expressive than *ἀλλήλων*: one another. [It suggests the unity of the Christian body, so in contrast with the segregated condition of the world].—How Christians ought to conduct themselves in cases affecting the 'mine and thine,' he states in the more striking form of a question.—**Why do ye not rather take injustice? Why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?**—The verbs *ἀδικεῖσθε—ἀποστερεῖσθε* are both middle and to be rendered as above. They imply the suffering of a 'loss.' It is one, however, only in appearance, being a victory in fact (Osi.). Comp. Matth. v. 39 ff. What follows may be taken as a strong assertion, or as a question, which either stands independently, or is depending still on 'why,' since the question 'or do you not know,' of ver. 9, has also its logical relations in the 'why' (so Meyer, ed. 2). But the former construction, which makes the sentence direct and independent, would be more expressive, and it is supported by *καὶ τοῦτο ἀδελφούς.* The *ἀλλά* then will have its proper force.—**But ye** (*ὑμεῖς.*, emphatic, ye Christians) **do injustice and defraud**—[the same verbs as in the previous clause, but active (transitive)] **and that brethren.**—["This passage is remarkable as being founded on the spirit of Matth. v. 40." Stanley]. [On the nature of ecclesiastical jurisdiction maintained by the early Church in secular affairs, its relation to that of the State, and the evils resulting from it, see Neander's *Church History,* Vol. II., p. 139 ff., Torrey's Translation].

Vers. 9, 10. **Or know ye not.**—The question presupposes a self-evident answer respecting the conduct spoken of. 'Such proceedings should not have been allowed by *you,* a people whose hope takes hold on God's kingdom, and who profess to be the children, and so the heirs of the Most High. "Or," *etc., i. e.,* your conduct can only be explained on the supposition of such ignorance.'—**that the unjust God's kingdom shall not inherit?**—Here (*ἄδικοι*) the idea involved in *ἀδικεῖν, to do injustice,* must be kept in view, yet looking away from the point wherein they as members of the Church were especially guilty. The 'unjust' ("a term used of the heathen in ver. 1, and here designedly brought in for the purpose of putting all who were unjust on a par with the heathen" Neander) are properly those among whom the practice of injustice has become habitual, who persist in wrong without repenting.—But here the word denotes the immoral generally, those who offend God and man by iniquities of every kind, such as are specified in the following context.—In reference to 'God's kingdom,' see on iv. 20. Considered in its perfection, as the object of Christian hope, the kingdom of God is the blessed state, wherein the will of a holy, loving, all-restoring, beatific God is fully realized; or, in other words, a condition wherein men and angels are unitedly and perfectly controlled by the Divine will, lead a life of righteousness and peace, and together with this, possess the highest good which it is desirable for men to participate in. And this participation is expressed by the word 'inherit' (*κληρονομεῖν*). It is something that properly belongs to the believer as a child of God (Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iv. 7), and involves a gracious right and an enduring possession. The expression, meaning literally, *to obtain by lot,* and then, *to receive as an inheritance,* belongs to the language of the Theocracy, and is used in the Old Testament to denote the entrance into the promised land, and into the society of those who are governed by the will of God. And this was but the type or shadow (*σκία*) of the kingdom of God that was to be set up on a renovated earth (2 Pet. iii. 13; Matth. v. 5). (That the verb takes after it the Accusative instead of the Genitive, belongs to the later Hellenic usage). The 'not inheriting,' implying an exclusion from the possession of the highest good, explains what is meant by *κατακρίνεσθαι* and *ἀπόλλυσθαι.*—That all conduct, which contravenes the justice of God, or the ordering of holy love, should cause a forfeiture of this inheritance, lies in the very nature of the case. In the Corinthian Church, however, there appear to have been some light-minded people who sought to persuade themselves and others that God did not mean exactly what he said, that this inheritance could never be withheld from any who had joined the Church. ["Such a divorce of morality from religion has been manifested in all ages, and under all forms of religion. The pagan, the Jew, the Mohammedan, the nominal Christian, have all been exact in the performance of religious services, while unrestrained in the indulgence of every evil passion. This arises from looking on religion as an outward service, and God as a being to be feared and propitiated, not loved and served." Hodge]. Against all such false conceptions and vain words (Eph. v. 6), Paul here warns the Church with his oft-recurring—**Be not deceived** (xv. 33; Gal. vi. 7, *etc.*)—To this he appends a full catalogue of such immoralities as exclude from God's kingdom:—**neither fornicators.**—This indicates the vice prevalent in Corinth, and points back to chap. v. To this he annexes, that wherewith fornication

was closely connected in Heathendom, and which when practised by God's people, was termed both 'fornication' and 'adultery:'—**nor idolaters.**—Then comes that inordinate indulgence of the sexual passion which violated alike the Divine ordinance of marriage, and the rights of the married parties:—**nor adulterers.**—The series of this class ends with the mention of that unnatural gratification of lust indicated in the words:—**nor effeminate, nor Sodomites.**—These express correlative ideas. The former denotes those who allowed themselves to be used as women (*qui muliebria patiuntur*); the latter, such as used the former in this unnatural way—a wide-spread vice in that period (comp. Wetstein on this passage, and on Rom. i. 27). Next follow classes of the 'unjust,' in the more restricted sense, such as violently seized upon others' possessions, or more indirectly sought for them:—**nor thieves, nor covetous,**—(comp. on v. 10 ff.).—In like manner in regard to the following—**nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners.**—The enumeration is not strictly logical, since those last mentioned would naturally come in after the 'covetous.' But drunkards and revilers naturally go together, since the vice of the latter commonly results from that of the former. After asserting solemnly that such **—shall not inherit the kingdom of God,**—he goes on to remind the Corinthians that for them these trials belonged to the past, and that indulgence in such vices was for them a backsliding into their old heathenish state, which utterly contradicted their high Christian experience.

Ver. 11. **And these things some** (of you) **were.**—The neuter *ταῦτα* carries a contemptuous implication, *q. d.*, 'such a set,' 'such stuff' (Meyer). *Τινὲς*: *some*, not all. What otherwise would be a too sweeping and severe imputation is thus limited in its application and softened in tone. [Calvin and Hodge regard the *τινὲς* as redundant or as distributive, *q. d.*, some were one thing and some another]. The simple *ἦτε*, or *ὑμεῖς ἦτε*, would imply too much, since all the Corinthian converts, without exception, had not been addicted to either one or all the immoralities specified; yet, on the other hand, *τινὲς ὑμῶν ἦτε* would have implied too little. "It would bring the whole body prominently to notice, and intimate that only a part would agree with the description." Osiander. The change which, however, had passed over them, is indicated by three expressions introduced with the emphatic repetition of 'but,' designed to set forth the contrast more strongly.—**But ye were washed clean.**—*ἀπελούσασθε.*—[*ἀπό*; *off, all off, clean*, intensive. This refers to their joining the Church in baptism. Comp. Titus iii. 5. In like manner Acts xxii. 16, where the verb is aor. mid., and signifies, *baptize thyself*, or, *cause thyself to be baptized*, not, 'be baptized,' as though it were passive. And so the verb here is middle, and must be taken in a reflexive sense, though it is difficult to translate it thus in English]. The term 'wash,' points to the defilement incurred by the sins before spoken of, and to the purification effected through the forgiveness obtained in baptism, or the removal of guilt then pledged (Acts xxii. 16). It is analogous to *καθαρισας* (Eph. v. 26). The moral purification, by the doing away of all that is sinful (Rückert), we cannot therefore take to be here meant: although repentance and faith are presupposed in baptism. In this washing of baptism, however, the cleansing through the blood of Christ (Rev. i. 5; 1 Jno. i. 7) must be considered as included.—**Ye sanctified yourselves,** *ἡγιάσθητε.*—This, too, is middle. It cannot therefore be supposed to denote the inward, progressive sanctification accomplished by the Spirit; but, as in i. 2, the act of personal consecration to God, of separation from the world and translation into fellowship with God; yet this, not putatively, nor externally merely, but as involving also some operation of the Divine Spirit on the heart (comp. Titus iii. 5; 1 Pet. i. 2).—**Ye were justified,** *ἐδικαιώθητε.*—This, in accordance with the usage of Paul and of the Bible generally, is to be construed, not after Augustine and the Council of Trent, as if it meant: 'made righteous' inwardly. This is contradicted by the aorist tense of the verb. But it implies an introduction into the state of the 'just,' admission to a participation in the salvation of God—to a place in His kingdom and a share in His blessings. This exhibits the positive side of God's salvation (the removal of guilt being the negative side), and is the result of consecration to God. Hence it fitly concludes the series. All three taken together denote an entrance into the state of grace ["and refer to the first conversion." Stanley. The view given by Kling is substantially that of Calvin, Hodge, Alf., Words. But the words also carry a further implication in the way of contrast. 'Having become thus, ye are not to defile and pollute yourselves afresh and incur renewed condemnation']—**in the name of the Lord Jesus and in the Spirit of our God.**—These qualifying phrases are by some referred to all three of the foregoing verbs, and by others to the last alone. Others still make a division, referring the words, 'in the name' to 'justified,' or to this and 'washed;' but the words, 'in the Spirit' to 'sanctified.' These attempts are a failure; although it is indeed true that the 'washing' and the 'justification' are grounded upon the name of Christ. Even as, on the other hand, sanctification comes through the Spirit. Again the reference of these phrases to all three of the verbs *appears* to be opposed by the separation of the verbs effected by 'but,' as well as by the unsuitableness of connecting the fact of the washing with the Spirit, since according to the rule (to which Acts iv. 7 is no exception) the reception of the Spirit is consequent on baptism (Meyer). But the first reason given cannot be decisive; and so far as the second goes, we find that in Titus iii. 5, the 'renewal of the spirit' is connected directly with baptism, as epexegetical of *παλιγγενεσίας*. And as the phrase 'in the name of Christ,' indicates the objective ground on which the washing rests, so does the phrase, 'in the Spirit,' indicate the subjective ground of the same, that is, the principle which inwardly imparts and applies the absolution implied in the washing. On the name of Christ comp. on i. 2. The entire personality of Jesus, so far as it is made known to us in the work of redemption and indicated in the name, is the *objective ground*

both of the pardon granted in baptism and of our justification and sanctification, according to the sense of the terms above given. But the Spirit of God *applies* to each individual what is offered to us in that name. He brings it directly to our consciousness, insures and imparts it to us, and enables us to realize it all within our own hearts. ["By the ἡμῶν: *our*, added to 'God,' he binds the Corinthians and himself together in the glorious blessings of the Gospel state, and mingles the oil of joy with the mourning which by his reproof he is reluctantly creating." Alford].

[Obs. This whole passage vi. 1–9, is memorable as laying the foundation for that ecclesiastical jurisdiction in civil affairs which in the lapse of centuries grew to such mighty proportions as to overshadow for a time the temporal sovereignty, and even threaten to subjugate it altogether. There are traces of the existence of church-courts for civil causes among Christians as early as the middle of the second century, and in the *Apost. Const.*, II., 47, the rule for the regulation of their proceedings is laid down. Ordinarily, however, the bishop became the referee in such disputes, and his office as umpire contributed largely to the increase of his importance and authority, and also greatly endangered his spirituality. When the State became Christian, this jurisdiction was conferred by law, and made binding on all parties that appealed to it. The custom once established, gradually extended itself with the increase of ecclesiastical pretensions, and the decay of secular power, until the Church assumed the form of a political association, with a well defined system of ecclesiastical polity that divided the control with the State both over the laity and the clergy, even in temporal matters, and aimed steadily at exempting the latter in particular from all amenability to the State. The history of this wonderful and yet perverse development of authority from the positions laid down in the text, furnishes a most instructive commentary on its meaning, and shows us the necessity of correctly interpreting it.

The limitations by which the precept is beset are as follows: 1. The litigants must be both church-members. Redress from wrongs inflicted from without may be sought at civil tribunals when public justice seems to require it—Paul, *e. g.*, appealed to Cæsar. 2. The causes, comparatively trivial, the minor matters of property, for example, in relation to which it were better that covetousness be mortified by quietly enduring the wrong, than indulged by the enforcement of rights. 3. The tribunals, heathen, or of a heathenish kind. The case may be altered when the judges are Christians. Yet even under such circumstances litigation between "brethren" ought, if possible, to be avoided. 4. The nature of the adjudication, informal—that of umpires chosen for the purpose by the contestants, and not of regular church courts. Paul's aim was to preserve the peace and spirituality of the Church by the *avoidance* of litigation, not to convert the Church into an arena for conflicts, and thus to secularize it. The Church was never constituted to be "a ruler and a divider" among men. 5. The evil condemned is not the practice of going to law, as though this were wrong in itself, for the magistrate, too, is a "member of God for good," but the litigious spirit so contrary to the Christian temper. There are instances when it would be a manifest sin not to seek justice. But in doing so, a Christian should take care to show that he was actuated, not by feelings of revenge, but by a supreme regard to law and order, and by a desire that even the wrong-doer may be reconciled to Him.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. [*The judicial function of the Saints in the age to come*]. Those are mighty words, "the saints shall judge the world," "we shall judge angels." Through them we catch a glimpse into the mysteries of the Heavenly kingdom, especially into the fundamental mystery of the creating and judging Word, and into the vital fellowship which believers have with their Lord, likewise also into the mystery of the future, when the inward life of the saints, which is now hid with Christ in glory, will be made manifest as a life of Divine power and holiness. Those of whom Christ said, "I in them and they in me," of whom it is grandly sung,

> "Devoid of strength they are guardians for all;
> Poor, yet they win, let the worst befall,"—

who here on earth have shared with their Redeemer in His sufferings and shame, these very ones will share with Him hereafter in the manifestations of His glory. "When Christ, who is their life, shall appear, exhibiting Himself as He really is, then will they also appear with Him as gods of earth, to the astonishment of the world. They will reign and flourish eternally, shining as stars in the firmament of God."

But by virtue of this union with Christ in glory, they become partners also in His *judicial authority*. Having been exempted from judgment through faith in their Lord, they will join with Him in executing judgment over all, whether men or angels, who amid the exhibitions of Divine love and wisdom and power and righteousness have continued hostile to God's truth, disregardful of His grace, contemptuous toward His salvation, and opposed to all the ways of His kingdom—hardening themselves evermore in their enmity, until past hope. And this judgment will be an act both of deepest insight,—piercing through to the very centre of the heart, and detecting there the inexcusableness of sin, and of highest moral power—exhibiting a righteousness full of decision and vigor—allowing of no further protests—exposing the fallacy of excuses, and annihilating them all as false and untenable through the might of an all-enlightening truth.

And this power to discern and judge at that period, is a living principle imparted to Christians now, through the indwelling life of Christ, and it unfolds itself onward unto perfection with the growth of their spiritual life, until it reaches its highest state of exercise in the future kingdom of glory. There is always implied in it a demonstration of the mind of Christ, as well in that pitying love which goes out after the lost, tracks them in their wanderings, and wisely and patiently applies the means of their restoration, as in that holiness which should keep them

from all fellowship with sin, consecrate them entirely to God, and maintain them in the obedience of faith amid manifold temptations from within and from without, in joy and sorrow, in honor and dishonor, in abundance and want, in health and sickness, even unto death; so that, as the instruments of Christ's truth and love, they shall have done what they could towards awakening, convincing and converting those who still walk in darkness—thus proving themselves fit and warranted to act the part of judges with their Lord at the last.

But as their authority is also to be exercised over the *world of spirits*, these too must in some way be regarded as coming under this saving influence. For is not the blood of Christ's cross said to be God's means for reconciling all things unto Himself, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven? (Col. i. 20). And is not the manifold wisdom of God to be proclaimed by means of the Church, even unto principalities and powers in heavenly places? (Eph. iii. 10). Shall we then mistake if we imagine that even in the extra mundane sphere there are also fallen beings, yet capable of salvation; and that into this sphere, whence came temptation and ruin unto our race, there shall in return go forth blessed agencies of deliverance from this very race, according to the wonderful council of God, and by virtue of the advent of His Son, through whom every thing above and beneath has been created? This is indeed an operation which, like that of the operation of this spirit-world upon us, comes not within the direct consciousness of believers; yet this fact does not militate against its reality, and like much that is now concealed, it will be made known to believers, as they enter upon their heavenly state. And if it be true, this circumstance will the more qualify believers for sitting in judgment over those bad spirits who obstinately close themselves against all such gracious influences, and scorn the salvation offered in Christ. These are conjectures indeed, and they might be carried out still further into the consideration of the particular duties in which the departed saints might engage in the other world. But it will not do to reject them as idle dreams, since they are in accordance with the analogy of Scripture, and are supported by the essential connection which exists between the judgment, and prevenient efforts directed to the recovery of the fallen.

Since the judicial work of the saints is not simply a corroboration of the sentence pronounced by Christ, but also an active participation in the judgment carried on by Him, as the organs of His office, a *training preparatory* to this high function will naturally be required of them. To this there belongs—1, a learning to speak what is true and right, not only in public, but also in private stations, so that a readiness may be acquired in distinguishing between right and wrong, and there shall be no danger of being misled, either through the purblindness of the foolish, or by the corrupt sophistries and wretched infatuation of the self-opinionated and dogmatic (analogous with Luke xvi. 10 ff.; xix. 17 ff.); 2, a calm, self-denying willingness to accept justice as set forth in the sentence rendered, whether it come from a judge or an umpire; for here the rule holds good, that obedience to authority is the best qualification for exercising authority; 3, the still loftier self-denial shown in a readiness to suffer wrong rather than to gain aught by going to law at the expense of love and unity. On the other hand, the habit of over-reaching and defrauding, originating in a spirit of selfish greed, as it disqualifies for admission into God's kingdom, so does it in an especial manner unfit a person to exercise judgment. And this is true also of every act which violates the rights either of God or man; for all such acts virtually disown and entirely neutralize that state of grace into which a person has been brought through the name of Christ and by the Spirit of God. The persons who practise them have washed and consecrated themselves, and been justified (in baptism) to no purpose.

[2. *The natural condition of man, depraved and lost* (vv. 9–11). When unchecked, the original sin of our constitution breaks out into the most flagrant vices and crimes, which reveal the inherent corruption. The most refined Pagan civilization has no power to restrain and cure it. Rather it serves to intensify the evil. The most demoralized society in the old world was to be found in the most refined of its cities. And the character, thus vitiated, forever excludes from a state of glory. *It shall not inherit the kingdom of God.* The strong negation here precludes all hope for such as possess it, and together with this puts the stamp of falsehood upon the figment of a universal salvation. No statement could be more explicit and conclusive].

[3. The change which fits the sinner for heaven is a radical one, wrought in Christ and through the Spirit, yet not independently of human volition. "Ye have washed yourselves clean, ye have sanctified yourselves, ye are justified." The filth of sin is voluntarily removed. From being his own, the person consecrates himself to God, and becomes forgiven and reconciled to God through faith in the work of Christ, and by the influence of the Spirit. Thus old things pass away, and all things become new, under the operation of Divine grace, and through the consent of the individual. There is, therefore, in renewal a voluntary assumption of the weightiest obligation to keep one's self unspotted from the world].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[*Litigation on the part of Christians*—1, involves great risk, and betokens a corresponding 'daring,' for it is a seeking for justice before the avowedly unjust, ver. 1[a]; 2 is a repudiation of their proper society, and of the advantages its saintly character holds out, ver. 1[b]; 3, is derogatory to the dignity of the litigants themselves, who are, by their profession, destined to be hereafter judges of the world and of angels, ver. 2, 3; 4, is an imputation upon the ability of their brethren to decide in the matters of lesser moment here, vv. 2, 5; 5, should be superseded by the selection of umpires in the Church, and the small matters it involves treated as they deserve, ver. 4; 6, is a disgrace to the Church and a cause of scandal, as it opens the faults of Christians to the observation and sneers of the world; 7, is

contrary to the spirit of Christ, "who, when He was reviled, reviled not again, and when He suffered, threatened not, but committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously," ver. 7; 8, implies wrong doing on the part of Christians, provoking litigation by their conduct towards each other, ver. 8; 9, those who by their offences provoke litigation are in danger of losing their inheritance in God's kingdom and becoming outcasts with the vicious of every class, vv. 9, 10; 10, the offences which cause it, and the spirit in which it is often done, are contrary to the change which believers profess to have passed through, ver. 11].

STARKE:—VER. 1. It is not in itself wrong to seek justice before earthly tribunals, since government, too, is a Divine ordinance, designed for protection and order; and Paul himself appealed to unbelieving magistrates against the persecution of the Jews (Acts xxii. 25; xxv. 10). But in all law-suits let every one take care wherefore, and before whom, and how he litigates. Otherwise his action may prove both a disgrace and a sin.—Ver. 2. In the coming judgment of the saints there is great comfort for those who have lost a righteous cause. Let corrupt judges mark well. Against whatsoever righteous ones they have declared unrighteous judgment, by these will they be righteously judged at the last day.—Ver. 3. To be associated with Christ in judgment is one of the loftiest honors promised to believers, 1 Pet. ii. 9; Rev. i. 5, 6; iii. 21. The dignity thus conferred should be displayed even in this life by the control which they maintain not only over themselves and the world, but also over the Devil, and so in their conquest over all their spiritual enemies. It should be shown also in the way they judge and condemn the world in and through their life and doctrine.—Ver. 4. Those who know and enjoy God ought to be held in higher esteem, and deemed more worthy of confidence, than those in whom such knowledge is wanting.—Ver. 6. Earthly goods are the means of separating the most united, heavenly goods can unite the most hostile.—Ver. 7. Christians ought to hold temporal possessions of such small account that the prime question with them should not be whether they have, or have not; and they should be so affectionate toward each other, that in case of dissension about "the mine and thine" the temporal good should seem so small and the brother so important, that ere they would disquiet their spirits by litigation, and unfit themselves for religious duties, and cause offence to their neighbors, they would let the whole thing go and suffer the loss.—Ver. 8. (Hed.). If an intelligent person is guilty of the wrong, then he commits the greater sin in putting the innocent person to so much cost and trouble with his lies; if the wrong-doer is ignorant, then it is not right, 1, to pursue the most stringent course with him and practise no forbearance; 2, to go to law in envious, avaricious, or ugly temper; 3, besides, the thing does not pay.—Vv. 9, 10. Those who needlessly go to law are classed with thieves and licentious persons, *etc.*, and incur a like condemnation. The world evidently judges very different from the Holy Spirit. Nothing is more common than to excuse sin because of its commonness. If all on this catalogue are lost, you can count the saved, almost all. Ye unrighteous litigants, fornicators, small and great thieves, sly and open thieves, be alarmed!—Ver. 11. (HED.): "Such *were* some," *etc.*, sweet word 'were.' To *be* and to *be willing* to remain such—that were the pity. Those who have escaped from the snares of the Devil should bear the past in mind continually, as a motive to avoid sin and foster gratitude.

BERLEN. BIB.:—Ver. 1. The reason why the righteous are often passed by, and the unrighteous are chosen as judges, is because people hope to make something out of the latter.—Ver. 2. Judicial honors hereafter await those only who have acted justly here, and allowed themselves to be judged.—Ver. 7. So completely does the Holy Spirit drive nature from her supposed rights, and subject it to patient suffering, yea, to death, that we are not at liberty to maintain our rights arbitrarily, but are bound, everywhere and at all times, to have regard to the jewel of our peace, and see that it be neither injured nor destroyed.—Vv. 9-11. The unrighteous are all the unregenerate, 1 Jno. iii. 7; Jno. iii. 3. There are many kinds of sins. Hence, if thou seest another sin, point not thy finger at him. Perhaps thou art implicated in another sin more deeply than he is in this. Remembrance of the past ought to cause perpetual humiliation. To this end we ought to think of our old sins, but for other reasons we ought to forget them. "But,"—"but,"—"but." O the importance and the preciousness of the change. Gracious acts all go together, though they are distinguishable. If we pray, 'God be merciful to me a sinner,' that implies, 'create within me a clean heart.' What God hath joined let no man put asunder. Salvation comprises forgiveness, sanctification, redemption, and we can get it in no other way than through the name of Jesus and the power of the Holy Ghost.

REIGER:—VERS. 2, 3.—We must improve the glimpses here allowed into the grander future, in such a way, that even here, amid our small engagements, we may as far as possible be lifted into higher moods. Through selfishness, impatience, anger, greed, the complainant often incurs as much guilt afterwards as the man has who injured him.

HEUBNER:—VER. 1. Every true Christian ought to be a sort of a justice of the peace.—Ver. 3. It is very natural that the betrayed should judge the betrayer. From a presentiment of this springs the hatred of evil angels against Christians.—Ver. 5. The lack of wise men in a church is great disgrace.—Ver. 6. That justice should be enforced by the secular power between those who profess to be governed by law is also a disgrace.

BESSER:—If we kept in mind what glory awaits us in the Church, it would prove a sad thing for us to strive with our brethren about mine and thine, and if we were drawn into strife then would the judges find in us peaceable people who respected the decision of the saints.—Vv. 7, 8. Paul says "*ye*." Mark then, a little leaven leavens the whole lump! The flagrant immoralities of some did not constrain the Church to mourning, did not move them to the exercise of discipline. A Christian Church, however, is

not a mere aggregate of names, but it is the body of one Spirit, composed of many members. Hence the declaration of the Apostle, "ye do wrong," struck at the whole Church, and stuck in it like an arrow until it acknowledged its own disgrace in bitter repentance.—Ver. 11. Whatever has been done for us and is to be found in the name of Jesus, that is appropriated to us through the Spirit of *our* God—that God, who is our God and highest Good in Jesus Christ our Lord.

[F. W. ROBERTSON:—Let us guard against a natural misconception of the Apostle's meaning. You might think that he meant to say, that the Corinthians should have ecclesiastical instead of civil courts; and for this reason, that churchmen and clergy will decide rightly by a special promise of guidance, and heathen and laymen wrongly. But this has not to do with the case. It is not a question here between ecclesiastical and civil courts, but between law and equity, between litigation and arbitration. The remedy [for offences] is, not more elaborate law, nor cheaper law, nor greater facility for law, but more Christianity, less loud cries about "Rights," more earnest anxiety on both and all sides to do no wrong].

XII.—AN EXHORTATION TO CHRISTIAN CONTINENCE, AND A PROHIBITION OF ALL HEATHENISH LICENTIOUSNESS. THE RELATION WHICH THE BODY SUSTAINS TO CHRIST; ITS CHARACTER AS THE DWELLING-PLACE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, AND THE GREAT PRICE PAID FOR ITS RANSOM, DO NOT ALLOW OF OUR REGARDING SUCH A GRATIFICATION OF CARNAL APPETITE MORALLY INDIFFERENT, LIKE THE ENJOYMENT OF FOOD.

12 All things are lawful unto me, [are in my power], but all things are not expedient;
all things are lawful for me [are in my power], but I will not be brought under the
13 power of any. Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats: but God shall destroy
both it and them. Now [But] the body *is* not for fornication, but for the Lord; and
14 the Lord for the body. And God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise[1]
15 up us[2] by his own power. Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?
shall I then take [away (ἄρας)] the members of Christ, and make *them* the members
16 of a harlot? God forbid. What! [*omit* what, *and read*, Or[3]] know ye not that he which is
17 joined to a harlot is one body? for, two, saith he, shall be one flesh. But he that is joined
18 unto the Lord is one spirit. Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body.
19 What! [*omit* what, *and read*, Or] know ye not that your body[4] is the temple of the
20 Holy Ghost *which is* in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For
ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, [*omit all that follows*[5]], and in your spirit, which are God's.

[1] [Ver. 14.—The verb ἐξεγείρειν appears in different codices under three forms—present, future and aorist. Tischendorf prefers the future, after C. D.[3] L. Cod. Sin. Syr. Copt. Meyer prefers the aorist, which is the most feebly supported, found in B. G[2]. (See Exegetical and Critical). Lachmann reads ἐξεγείρει from A. D[1]. It is best to take it as future.]

[2] Ver. 14.—The Rec. has ὑμᾶς, which is feebly attested, and Meyer thinks an error from Rom. viii. 11.

[3] Ver. 16.—The Rec. and Lachmann [with all the critical editions] read ἢ οὐκ according to A. B. C. F. Cod. Sin.]

[4] Ver. 19.—The Rec. and Lach. following good authorities [nearly all: A. B. C. D. F. K. Cod. Sin.] read τὸ σῶμα [and so also Alf., Stanley, Hodge.] But this is perhaps a correction occasioned by the singular predicate ναός.

[5] The clause καὶ ἐν τῷ, *etc.*, is an addition apparently with a view to make the exhortation complete. The most important MSS. and other old and good authorities omit it [and so do Alf., Stanley, Words.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 12. ['After speaking of the sin of covetousness, which had produced litigiousness,—and having reminded the Corinthians of what privileges they had received, and what sins renounced,—he now proceeds to examine and confute an argument raised by some of the Gentile Christians at Corinth, who in the presumptuous spirit of Greek Philosophy, pleaded, in behalf of fornication and of eating meats offered in sacrifice to idols, that *man is the measure of all things* (*πάντων μέτρον ἀνθρωπος*),—a principle in which both the greatest schools of Greek Philosophy, with which St. Paul had disputed at Athens, agreed, though they applied it in different ways: and that all the *creatures were his*, and that all things were *lawful* to him—a tenet which they imagined had received some countenance from

the Gospel itself, which promised to them universal liberty, and even universal dominion in Christ,—a doctrine which, when properly stated, and understood, with due conditions, is productive of that genuine independence which is the best security for self-control, and had therefore been placed in its proper light by St. Paul in the earlier part of his Epistle (iii. 21-23). This principle he here adopts with true oratorical skill, and proceeds to examine it, showing at once its truth and the falseness of its application by them.' After WORDS.].

All things are in my power.—Paul here has in view that easy, tolerant view of fornication which was so common among the heathen, and to which he has already repeatedly alluded (v. 1; vi. 9) This view was still further vindicated on the grounds of that Christian liberty which was supposed to countenance this gratification of a natural appetite as no less proper in itself than the eating of food was to satiate hunger. But the words with which the discussion begins are not to be regarded as the objection of an opposer, here cited for the purpose of refutation [Calvin and Barnes]. Had this been so, the fact would have been indicated by some formula like *ἀλλ' ἐρεῖς*: *but you say*. They are rather the statement of a fundamental principle of Christianity, resting upon its own grounds, yet with a suitable limitation of its application to the actual life of a Christian (*μοι*, *i. e.*, for me, as a Christian).* Accordingly we are not to interpret these, vv. 12, 13, as giving us a sort of dialogue maintained between some imaginary opponent and the Apostle (Pott). The context indeed shows that the fundamental principle here laid down was actually adduced in support of fornication; but there is no ground for supposing that the Corinthian converts generally advocated this practice on such a basis, or that they so argued in their letter to him. It were better to assume this only of a few individuals, and that the Apostle had been privily informed of the fact, as intimated in the case mentioned in chap. v. 1. Some suppose the maxim here to have a close reference to what just precedes in ver. 11, *q. d.*, 'I being now in a state of grace, and free from all Jewish restrictions, and all outward ordinances, and being no longer in bondage to an accusing conscience and to fear of sin, have right to the largest liberty.' But such a connection is by no means probable, since the verbs introduced by 'but' are chiefly designed to warn his readers against relapsing into their earlier immoralities. It were better to connect with ver. 9, and to suppose that out of the catalogue of sins there mentioned, he selected the first, and referred to the efforts made for justifying it. Besser regards the phrase as one of Paul's proverbs, [and Bengel says: "Paul often uses the first person to express those thoughts which have the force of maxims, especially in this Epistle, ver. 15; vii. 7; viii. 13; x. 23, 29, 30; xiv. 11"]. The term "all things" must of course be limited to such as were indifferent (*ἀδιάφορα*), *i. e.*, to such acts as were not in themselves wrong, but only under certain circumstances and connections seemed to conflict with Christian morality. "All things are lawful for me which may be lawful." BENGEL. [So also Hodge; but Words., well styles this explanation weak and tautological, and hardly justified by the original, and prefers Theodoret's view: "all things are in my power, by reason of my free will; but it is not expedient in all things to use this freedom, for in doing that which is sinful thou losest thy freedom." But is it not plain, after all, that Paul here has in view not actions, but external objects, the things in the world which were all given for man's use, and over which he held dominion, and which, under the Christian dispensation, were all restored to him unrestricted by carnal ordinances? (The Syriac version evidently so takes it; Tyndale, on the contrary, renders "I maye do all thinges: but I will be brought under no man's power." So Cranmer and the Geneva Bible). In this sense it may be said with the broadest scope "all things are in my power" (Ps. viii. 6; Heb. ii. 6–11). And to this the antinomian would add 'and I have the right to use them as I please, according to the cravings of my nature, and according as they contribute to my enjoyment.' And it is upon this lawless inference that the Apostle proceeds to put limitations]. "The abrupt commencement of ver. 12 is perhaps to be accounted for on the supposition that it alludes to a passage in their Epistle to him, and the words before us might have been used there even in reference to things indifferent; but without the proper limitations which the Apostle here supplies." NEANDER.

The first of these is—**but all things are not expedient.**—By this he means as in x. 23, not materially advantageous, but morally fitting and useful, especially, perhaps, in its bearing upon others. [It were better, however, to take the verb *συμφέρει* in its broadest acceptation and bearings—*conduce to profit*, whether to the person who uses them, or to others with whom he is connected, and whose welfare he is bound to consult. Every finite good has a special end, and must be wisely used with reference to that end, and not being absolute, is dependent on times and circumstances for the benefit it is to confer]. The second limitation is—**but not will I be brought under bondage by any thing.**—*Ἐξουσιασθήσομαι* and *ἐξεστι* are kindred words (the former being formed from *ἐξουσία*, which is derived from *ἐξεστι*), and they involve a paranomasia, which serves to bring out the contradiction, caused by the misuse of liberty, in a more forcible light. [We give the play on the words in English thus: 'All things are in my power, but I will not come under power to any thing']. "Not I" is emphatic. It exhibits the moral self of the individual (not simply that of Paul, but of Christians generally), in sharp contrast with everything, which, if yielded to passionately, or enjoyed with an accusing conscience, or fondly clung to as indispensable, acquires a despotic control over us. [The lord must preserve his lordship, and take heed that he become not the slave of any thing which is properly

[* It can hardly be supposed that Paul meant to lay any such stress on the word 'me,' as though he meant to assert a distinction between believers and unbelievers in this respect, claiming a liberty for the former which did not belong to the latter. This would lead to some pretty dangerous inferences.]

subject to him. Freedom must not commit suicide. The body was designed to be the organ of the Spirit for ruling over nature, not the organ of nature for ruling over the Spirit]. Ἐξουσιάζειν, *to be master of*, and it is here put in the future to express the firm inward resolve not to be mastered by any thing. Τινός is neuter corresponding to πάντα.

Vers. 13, 14. **Meats for the belly and the belly for meats,** *etc.*—Here we have a contrast drawn between what is in itself indifferent, and the view which cannot be brought under this category.* From the fact that a mutual relation has been established between meats and the belly by an ordinance of the Creator, the former being made to be received and digested by the latter, and the latter being formed to receive the former, and from the fact that both are alike transient, being designed only for this present life, it followed, as a matter of course, that eating was a thing morally indifferent, and was allowable, in so far as it neither proved inconvenient, or brought a person under bondage. Very different, however, was it with the act of fornication, since the body, standing as it did in direct relations with the Lord, and having been received by Him into the fellowship of an immortal life, does not in such practices fulfil any Divine destination, [but is rather alienated from its proper functions, and degraded by them]. After the nominatives, ἐστίν is to be supplied. It is altogether needless to suppose that the meats here spoken of had any special connection with the altar-feasts that were so closely associated with licentious practices.† By such a supposition the force of the argument is rather hindered than helped.—**And God shall destroy both it and them.**—Paul refers here to that great change which is to take place in the condition of mankind at the coming of Christ—a transformation which will preclude all need of physical nourishment, and dispense with the organs for its reception. Comp. xv. 44, 51; and Matth. xxii. 30. In the words, "and them," we have the hint of a time that reaches far beyond the death of the individual—a time when the world and all things therein shall be burned up. [Comp. 2 Peter iii. 11.]

In contrast with the foregoing, there is presented to us, first, that truth in a negative form, the analogy of which to the eating of food it is the aim of the Apostle to dispute.—**But the body is not for fornication.**—That is, fornication is not the natural function of a perishable organ, but it is the perversion to illegitimate uses of the entire body—that body which belongs to the Lord, and is with him, destined to an imperishable life. And in this also there are two elements involved; 1, a connection with the Lord;—**but for the Lord.**—And this relation is a mutual one, since the body is destined for the Lord, to be one of His members, and His exclusive possession; and on the other hand—**the Lord is for the body,**—to rule it, and to use it; yea, to appropriate and assimilate it to Himself; and, as others add, to nourish it with his life. (Comp. Jno. vi. 33, 53, and also ver. 15, μέλη). 2. The destination of the body to an immortal life, grounded on its connection with the Lord—a destination that stands in striking contrast with the destruction above alluded to, which awaits the purely material world.—**And God both raised up the Lord, and will raise up us also by His strength.**—This resurrection is an introduction into a life that is no more subject to death. Comp. Rom. vi. 9 ff. The καί—καί, *both—and*, binds the two clauses together. In the second clause, however, the reading is contested, and Meyer (ed. 2d) considers ἐξήγειρε, *has raised*, as the only right reading, although not so well attested. Paul, he says, never asserts the ἐγείρειν and ἐξεγείρειν, that is, a restoration to life after death, of himself and of his cotemporaries (2 Cor. iv. 14 is to be understood spiritually); rather, in anticipation of the speedy advent of Christ, he was looking to be changed without dying (xv. 51 f.; 1 Thess. iv. 16 f.); so that if he had been speaking of the future, he would have been more likely to have used the word ζωοποιήσει, *shall make alive*, than ἐξεγερεῖ, *shall raise up*. (Comp. xv. 22; Rom. viii. 11). He interprets the word, however, not of the spiritual resurrection, that is, the new birth, but as in Eph. ii. 6; Col. ii. 12 f., where Christ's resurrection is spoken of as the fact in which that of the believer is already involved, although the connection first becomes realized at the second advent, through the actual resurrection of the dead, and the transformation of the living. But if, according to this interpretation, both these ideas can be considered as included in the verb in its past tense (ἐξήγειρε), why not assume the same in its future form? In so doing, we should abide by the reading best attested—a reading which puts the verb in the same tense with καταργήσει, *shall destroy*—and would construe the verb ἐξεγειρει in its more comprehensive signification, as denoting the change which is to take place in the living, as well as in the dead. 2 Cor. iv. 14 might also be interpreted in the same manner. The distinctive changes awaiting the quick and the dead, although elsewhere made prominent, did not require to be alluded to here. (With this Meyer

[* But have we not here the evidence that in the "all things" Paul had reference not to *actions*, but to external objects? Out of these he selects one class, and shows what they were designed for, and how far they are good or expedient. But the like adaptation and utility and propriety he denies to exist in the indiscriminate use of woman, since the body of both was destined for higher uses, in the sexual relation, than mere enjoyment; and the purposes of God in reference to it, were violated by that use. The logic of the Apostle is obscured, if we consider him as having the *action* primarily in view. It proceeds wholly upon the rule of adaptation of things to ends].

[† This is Neander's view. He supposes that Paul "at first meant to speak only of partaking of meats offered to idols," and "then was prompted to leave the topic and speak against those excesses at Corinth of which he had not thought at first." The topic thus left, he supposes to be resumed again at the beginning of chap viii., but approached from a different point; and after several digressions and expositions of it, to be taken up in the same form as here in chap. x. 23. This view, though at first seeming to involve the course of thought in needless intricacy, grows more plausible the more we meditate upon the logic of the whole section; and it is not surprising that Neander says that neither Billroth's arguments, nor de Wette's have sufficed to convince him of its erroneousness. The case had better be left without arguing to each person's reflection—taking into account all the while the fact that here among the Corinthians there was probably the same connection between the eating of things offered to idols, and the sin of fornication that we find afterwards spoken of in the heresy of the Nicolaitans, Rev. ii. 14, 15, and that consequently the two stood very closely associated in the Apostle's mind.]

in his 3d ed. also agrees). It is hardly allowable to distinguish here between *ἐγείρειν* and *ἐξεγείρειν* (Bengel and Osiander), as though the former referred to the first fruits of the resurrection in Christ, and the latter to the work consummated at the end. The reason why he uses the word "*us*," instead of '*our bodies*,' is that he had used the personal form just before, 'in the Lord.' The context, in this case, allows of no misapprehension. "The body," says Osiander, "is the vessel of our personality." The clause, 'by his power,' it were better to connect with the latter verb, if by 'his' we understand, not Christ's, but God's, which is to be preferred, as God is the subject of 'shall raise.' Comp. xv. 38; Matth. xxii. 29; Eph. i. 19. *Διά* here expresses the internal instrumentality.

Vers. 15–17. **Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?**—Here he amplifies what is said in ver. 13, and "upon the ground there adduced of the immorality of fornication, he brings to their distinct consciousness the abominable character of the vice in question." So Meyer rebuts Baur's assertion, that Paul here makes a *petitio principii*. Elsewhere Christians *themselves* are called members of Christ's body—the Church in its totality, the head of which is Christ. (Comp. xii. 27; Eph. v. 30). But here their *bodies* are spoken of as essential parts (the vehicles) of his personality. And this, not so much on account of his incarnation, and of His so sharing with us our nature, as on account of the indwelling of His Spirit (ver. 19). Whether the Apostle had in mind the figure of the marital relationship (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 2; Eph. v. 26 f.; Rom. vii. 4) is less certain. The incongruity of making Christ the antithesis to a harlot (Meyer), would not stand in the way of our supposing this, since it makes no difference whether the other party be male or female, for Paul is here speaking of the essential contradiction which exists between a person's belonging to Christ, and so holding vital fellowship with the Holy and Pure One, and his having intercourse with an individual who was addicted to impurity, such as a common prostitute—an intercourse which involved the surrender of the entire person to her. It was only the impure conscience of a heathen that could be blind to the immorality of such fornication. But to the Christian's conscience this should be evident at once, and we should denounce it as a crime perpetrated against Christ—as an abominable violation of his sacred rights. Hence the Apostle directly proceeds to ask—**Shall I then take away the members of Christ, and make them the members of a harlot?**—*Αἴρειν* means not simply, *to take*, but, *to take away, to alienate from the proper owner*. *Οὖν, then*, or, *therefore*, introduces the inference: "since this is so, I will not so far forget myself, as to,' *etc.* *Ποιήσω* may be either, Aorist subj., as in xi. 22, meaning, *should I;* or, *have I any right to make;* or it may be future, *shall I make?* The sense will be about the same. [Jelf says that "the second and third persons of the Future often express necessity or propriety, *shall, must*." *Gr. Gram.* § 406 3]. This query he answers with an emphatic negative—*μὴ γένοιτο*, **let it never be**,—an expression by which in Rom. vi. 2, and elsewhere, he repels all unhallowed inferences and suggestions and declarations.

In order to prove that fornication involves all he has stated, he next goes on to show the nature of the connection it effects between the parties concerned, and sets over against this, the nature of the union believers have with Christ, so that the utter incompatibility of the two may be the more clearly felt—**Or know ye not**;—*q. d.*, 'or if this at least, appear doubtful to you, then it must be because of your ignorance' (Meyer). **that he who is joined to the harlot is one body?**—Κολλᾶσθαι, *to be most intimately joined with*. In this connection it denotes the sexual union, which involves the most intimate conjunction of the physical powers of life. The consequence of such a union is stated in a citation from Gen. ii. 24, found also in Matth. xix. 51, and this he introduces as a Divine declaration.—**For he saith**—'He,' *i. e.* God, since Scripture is the oracle of God, even though communicated through human organs (comp. xv. 27; Eph. v. 8; Heb. viii. 5). To suppose God to be the subject is better than to supply either the words 'Scripture' or 'Spirit,' though the meaning would still be the same. But most unsuitable of all would it be to construe it as impersonal: it is said.—**they two shall be into one flesh.**—This, which was originally affirmed of the marriage union, is here applied to illicit intercourse, it being the same thing, physically considered. *Secundum speciem naturæ non differunt* (Thom. *a. q.*). And by this application of the statement he shows that the act in question is not a mere momentary enjoyment with which the whole affair is concluded, but that it involves a real union of the natural powers of life in one complex personality. The term "flesh" here denotes simply man's physical nature, without the accessory idea of corruption. The words "they two" are not found in the Hebrew text. They occur in the LXX., and in all the quotations of this passage, even in those of the Rabbis. (Is this in the interest of monogamy?). "Into," *εἰς*, Hebr. ל, even in classic Greek, implies a transition into a particular state [Jelf, *Gr. Gram.*, § 625, Obs. 4].—**But he who is joined to the Lord is one Spirit.**—Here we have the contrast: *κολλᾶσθαι τῷ κυρίῳ*, a phrase which occurs also in Deut. x. 20; 2 Kings xviii. 6. As the result we have, not 'one body,' but 'one spirit,' denoting the element wherein this union takes place. But this unity is not a merely ideal one. It is one in essential reality, the indwelling of Christ in the believer, so that His Spirit and our spirit become one. Comp. xiv. 23. This clause stands independently.

Vers. 18–20. The warning implied in what precedes is now expressly given, and, although clearly an inference, is introduced abruptly without any connecting particle—**Flee fornication.**—*Φεύγετε, flee*—a striking expression. Anselm says, *Alia vitia pugnando libido fugiendo vincitur*. "Other vices are conquered by fighting, lust by flying." What follows substantiates this warning, by showing the characteristic peculiarity of that sin, which distinguishes it from every other. And this is exhibited antitheti-

cally.—**Every sin which a man might commit**—[ὁ ἐὰν ποιήσῃ ἄνθρωπος. The ἄν here belongs to the relative and not to the verb, and gives an indefiniteness to it, annexing the notion, 'whatsoever it may be.' Jelf, *Gr. Gram.* § 829, 1].—**is without the body.**—But how can he say this, when drunkenness and such like vices also involve an injury to the body, and indeed cannot be practised at all outside of the bodily sphere? There have been several modes of answering this question. We may either suppose that the word "every" (πᾶν) is to be taken in a popular sense for 'nearly all,' which is arbitrary; or we may consider the whole clause hypothetical, *q. d.*, 'Although all other sins were without the body, yet this,' *etc.* (Flatt) —which is inadmissible; others [Jerome, Origen, Aug., Bengel, Words.] take it to mean that fornication pollutes the *whole* body as no other vice does,—but this is not stated in the words; and others still, that no vices sever the body of the Christian from that of Christ as this does (Fritzsche), a thought neither expressed in the text, nor consistent with the view of Paul in chap. ix. f.; Rom. viii. 9); others again take the idea to be, that no sin imparts to the flesh such tyranny over the spirit as fornication, an idea plainly foisted into the language of Paul; others suppose that drunkenness and gluttony are here included in with fornication [Macknight]—a supposition not sufficiently established by the fact that these vices are frequently associated together. We would rather say, that all other sins affect and injure only the transient, perishable organs of the body, or that they require for their commission some means that are derived from without, and are foreign to the body.["Drunkenness and gluttony, *e. g.*, are sins done *in* and *by* the body, and are sins *by abuse of* the body; but they are still introduced from *without*, sinful not in their *act*, but in their *effect*, which effect it is each man's duty to foresee and avoid. But fornication is *alienating that body which is the Lord's, and making it a harlot's body*—it is a sin against a man's own body from its very nature, against the verity and nature of his body; not *an effect on* the body from participation of things without, but a *contradiction of the truth of the body* wrought *within itself.*" Alford].—**but he that committeth fornication sins against his own body.**—The scope of the argument is this: On the one hand the Apostle brings to view the fact that the fornicator by his sin surrenders his body to the harlot, and commingles his life with hers in such a manner that he loses the power to dispose of his body as he will, as it were yielding to another's nature the right he has to himself, and so coming in bondage to that (analogously to chap. vii. 4); and on the other hand, he considers how the body of the Christian (who is the only one here contemplated) is desecrated by fornication as it can be desecrated by no other sin. In both these respects this vice is a sin against one's own body in a preëminent sense. The truth, that the sin of *πορνεύων εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα*, fornicating against one's own body, is chargeable upon Christians, the only persons with whom he has to do, he exhibits still more clearly by referring them to the well-known dignity which the body of the believer, as such, possessed.—**Or know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?**—As in ver. 15 he ascribed to the *bodies* of believers what he elsewhere has predicated of *believers themselves*, so he does the same thing here in respect of their character as "the temple of God." This designation, before applied to the Church as a whole (iii. 16; also 2 Cor. vi. 16), he here applies to the bodies of Christians. Primarily, the Holy Spirit dwells in the "inward man," in the *πνεῦμα*, or spirit; but the body is its vehicle, or tabernacle, and inseparable organ. If we adopt the reading *τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν*, then it would mean: *the body of each one of you.* The same sense is yielded by the other reading, *σώματα, bodies.* To this thought, but especially to the clause—**which ye have from God.**—(*ἀπό*, the same as in Jno. xv. 26), showing how dependent they were on him, he adds this further truth—**and ye are not your own.**—From this it followed that they had no power over themselves, or over their own bodies, and therefore could not properly dispose of them to another, or use them for the gratification of unhallowed lusts, but were bound to employ them only in executing the holy will of God. And how they came not to be their own, he proves by referring to their redemption—**for ye were bought.**—*viz:* for God, to be His peculiar possession (comp. Acts v. 9, and *περιποιεῖσθαι* Acts xx. 28). The figure involved is that of a slave or body servant, over whom his master holds exclusive control. The purchase was from the servitude of sin, and from the curse of the law, and from the power of Satan (comp. Rom. vi. 17 ff.; Gal. iii. 13; Col. i. 13; Acts xxvi. 18). And this purchase was—**with a price**—and this price was nothing less than Christ Himself, His "soul," His "blood" (see Matt. xx. 28; 1 Pet. i. 18). Passing beyond the mere significance of the word, yet observing its import, we come to the important thought that it was a high price, and the purchase, dear. [To this Winer objects, LXIV. 5]. This expression occurs in viii. 23, but where, as in Acts xx. 28; Titus ii. 14, Christ is represented as the possessor. The practical inference from all this is—**Now then glorify God in your body.**—*Δοξάζειν* here denotes the exhibition of the Divine holiness (or of God's sacred presence, as in a temple) through a chaste, modest deportment. The praise is to be celebrated through deeds, as: 'do all to the glory of God,' x. 31; comp. also Jno. xxi. 19; xii. 28; xiii. 31. Ἐν, *in*, to suit the figure of the temple, or, *on*, specifying that whereon the conduct which is to glorify God should exhibit itself. *Δή* serves to make the exhortation more pressing. 'Act rightly, so that it shall be apparent to all that ye do it.' See Passow I. p. 612. [Ons.: "It is very remarkable how these verses contain the germ of three weighty sections of the Epistle about to follow, and doubtless in the Apostle's mind when he wrote them: 1, the relation between the sexes; 2, the question of meats offered to idols; 3, the doctrine of the resurrection of the body." Alford].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. [*Christian liberty, its nature and limitations.* 1. Its nature. Through the redemption effected by Christ, the believer is restored to that supremacy over the world, which Adam had forfeited, and has a free right and title to use it and all things in it according to his ability and pleasure. No longer is he fettered by the restrictions which the elder economy imposed. To him now "every creature of God is good," and he is at liberty to make all things in their way tributary to his interests. In the person of his Lord they are all "put under his feet," and with his emancipation from the bondage of sin, and the restoration of his inward freedom, his lordship over himself, he is at the same time restored to his proper sovereignty over the external world, and qualified to maintain it. But 2.] This liberty has its limitations, [first, by the law of expediency; secondly, by the law of self-preservation; and thirdly, by the law of duty. All things, *e. g.*, though in our power, do not prove in their use alike, and at all times equally, beneficial, either to ourselves or to others. Again, the use of some things in certain ways and degrees, may destroy the liberty which claims the right to use them. And, finally, we must yield to God and man what properly belongs to each, robbing neither of their rights. The liberty of the Christian is therefore not an absolute, but a restricted liberty.] Fundamentally, however, this restriction is a self-imposed restraint, an act of perfect freedom, nothing but the fulfilling of our appointed course *in love*. Though the Christian is made free through faith, free from all which the law imposed from without, and enforced by penalties, yet it does not follow from this that he is at liberty to assert his own sinful self-will in opposition to the revealed will of God. Rather this very freedom becomes the means of entirely cutting off all arbitrariness of conduct. For that faith, through which the believer has been liberated, is in fact an entrance into the very life of Christ. It implies such an apprehension of Christ, that the believer can say: 'It is no more I that live, but Christ that liveth in me.' But in taking Christ he takes into himself all that holy love of God which embraces both him and all his fellow-believers in one blessed union. Possessing this love, then, he comes to hate and shun everything which conflicts with the Divine will, everything which either tends to interrupt his fellowship with his Lord, or acts prejudicially upon his neighbors and associates in the churches; everything, also, which is calculated to weaken his power over the world, the flesh, and the devil, and bring him again under bondage. That alone he allows himself to use, in suitable modes and measures, which operates beneficially on himself and others, and advances the Gospel of Christ and promotes spiritual life, that alone which leaves his liberty perfect, and his mastery over self and the world undamaged. Thus does the truth and reality of our freedom rest in Christ, and prove to be nothing less than love freely and intelligently seeking its own proper ends.

[See this whole subject of man's freedom and dominion discussed in WUTTKE's *Handbuch der Christlichen Sittenlehre*, I., p. 349, 403 f., 431 f.: "Man may and can perfect his rule over nature only when he has fully subjected himself to be ruled by the holy author and Lord of nature."]

2. The power to purify the soul and keep one's self from all manner of fornication and uncleanness, is to be found in Christ alone. The simple sense of shame or of self-respect, or the mere dread of weakening or deranging our physical nature, is not sufficient of itself to counteract the strong temptation to this sin, and quell the might of this the strongest of our carnal passions. The enjoyment is instant and sensitive, the injury is remote, and perchance may never be felt; and so the weak will give way.—But in our fellowship with Christ, in the clear living consciousness of His presence, we have the power to overcome the very strongest of our carnal impulses, and to resist the most seductive enticements. While He dwells in us with His holy love, He becomes the quickening power which animates and controls our whole constitution. Through this love, which consented to suffer the bitterest of deaths for our sins, sinful lust is essentially slain, and the Christian resolves that he, with his body and its members, shall belong to none other than his Lord. His body he henceforth regards as a member of Christ, an organ of His holy life. No more can he prostitute it to the control of another, or become bound in vital union to a harlot. The remembrance of Christ's presence within him causes him to shrink with horror from everything which might defile that which has become a sanctuary consecrated to His glory. Mindful of his being purchased to God at the cost of the precious blood of His Son, he feels the weight of the mighty obligation, and is neither able nor willing to use that body, which is now God's property, for any other purpose than for his service and glory. Being now joined to Christ in one spirit, he resolves never more to hold carnal intercourse with any, apart from the Divine ordinance of marriage (which is to be consummated in the Lord, and for the Lord), or to be guilty of aught whereby the body, which is destined to partake of the imperishable life of Christ, shall be unfitted for the heavenly communion.

[3. *The true position and dignity of the body.* In its doctrine concerning the body, Christianity avoids two opposite extremes. It neither disparages it as worthless and contemptible, after the fashion of some ancient philosophers, and the Manicheans; nor does it idolize it into an object of supreme regard and care, as the Epicureans, ancient and modern, do. Regarding it as essential to the perfection of our humanity, and as a needful organ of the Spirit, Christianity gives the body likewise a share in Christ's redemption, and unites it to Him for sanctification here and for glorification hereafter. It thus makes it a member of Christ's mystical body, to be controlled and regulated by His Spirit. At the same time it imparts to it the character of a Divine temple, and requires that we keep it from all defilement, and preserve it in a condition suited for the service and worship of God. So far, therefore, from being at liberty to despise or abuse the body, or to set up its welfare and claims in antagonism with those of the Spirit, or

to make our care for it a distinct, though even a subordinate interest, our obligations to Christ demand that we unite it with the soul in one general system of spiritual edification and culture, yield its members as instruments of righteousness, and glorify God in it no less than in the spirit].

[4. *The Church is God's purchased possession.* He has redeemed it unto Himself by giving His own Son as a *ransom* for it, thereby delivering it from the tyranny of Satan and from the merited penalties of the law, to be His in love and devotion for evermore. Not that His hold upon the persons thus ransomed had ever been lost by their sin. God's property in man is absolute and inalienable, and His title to dispose of him according to His own pleasure and unto His glory remains unaffected, let man do what he may. But, if we may so speak, His right to love and favor them, and to treat them as His children, had been destroyed by the forfeit of sin, and instead thereof there rested on God the obligation to wrath and punishment. And this was the right which had been recovered by the purchase effected by the blood of Christ. Thus a new ground of dominion and rule has been laid, superadded to the former one, and with this a new mode of government devised, and new obligations imposed on the parties redeemed. God as Father holds the Church not only by the right of creation, but also by the right of redemption. He enforces His claims to obedience by pointing to the blood of His Son, which was shed for us: and the strongest incentive to devotion and praise on the part of the believer, both here and in eternity, is—"For Thou hast redeemed us unto God by Thy blood"].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[1. In the exercise of his *power and liberty* a Christian is bound to consult not simply the scope of his own rights and privileges, but also,), the bearing of his conduct upon, *a.* his own best interests, and *b.* the interests of others, ver. 12; 2, its effect upon his own spiritual freedom, ver. 12; 3, the intrinsic fitness of things for their special ends, ver. 13; 4, the worth of objects as determined by their durability, ver. 13; 5, the rights and claims of others, both God and man, ver. 13; 6, the particular honor which God hath put upon the objects under our control, being careful not to desecrate what he hath taken into fellowship with Himself, vv. 14–17].

[2. *The sin of fornication* consists, 1, in its being a violation of the Divine interest of the body, ver. 13; 2, in that it is an alienation from Christ of what belongs to Him, and an appropriation of it to another, vv. 15-17; 3, in that it is an abridgement of our own liberty, ver. 17; 4, in that it brings a person into intimate connection and union with the vilest of characters; 5, in that it is preëminently a sin against the body, being committed in and through it, in the perverted use of the highest functions of physical life, which were designed for the purpose of raising up a holy seed that should serve God; 6, in that it is sacrilege, vv. 19, 20].

LUTHER:—Ver. 19. A Christian may be compared with the tripartite temple of Solomon. His spirit is the Holy of holies, God's dwelling amid the darkness of faith (he believes what he neither sees, nor feels, nor grasps); his soul is the Holy place, where are the seven lights of the golden candlesticks; his body is the forecourt, exposed to the general view, where every one can observe how he lives, and what he does. Deep within the heart is the consecration made which unites him to the Church; in the secret recesses within does the Holy Ghost affiance itself to the believing soul; but the nuptial song rings throughout the entire man, and he becomes a spiritual temple of the Lord; and in the forecourt stands the altar of burnt offerings, whereon we are to lay our bodies as living sacrifices unto God (Rom. xii. 1).

STARKE:—Ver. 14. Our resurrection is founded upon the resurrection of Christ; and the thought of it should restrain us from all impurity; for although the impure also will rise again at the resurrection, yet it will not be to the glorification of their bodies.—Ver. 17. Christ and believers are united together in one mystical person; but from such union lawful marriage does not hinder believers, [for if he marries aright, he marries "in the Lord"]. Marriage is, in fact, a type of the heavenly wedlock (Hosea ii. 19; Eccl. iv. 9; Eph. v. 30).—Ver. 18. HEDINGER:—Fornication is the only sin which involves the whole body in disgrace, and so defiles it more than all other sins. Drunkenness and gluttony do not affect all the members of the body; neither are the meats and drinks, wherewith a person offends, members of the body. Other sins are committed against a neighbor's body (murder), his goods (stealing), his honor (bearing false witness), but fornication is a sin against ourselves, with our own bodies. Ver. 19. The inward glory of believers consists in this, that God Himself dwells in them and walks in them (Ps. cxxxii. 14). Ver. 20. The precious and imperishable ransom paid by Christ for the human race, deserves entire consecration of body and soul to His holy service.

BERLINBURGER BIBLE:—VER. 12. People are apt to inquire only whether a thing is allowable, but not whether it is fitting or obligatory. Christians are allowed greater privileges than many think, but they always take *themselves* into consideration. Christians are not blind; they see, indeed, that in Christ they are exalted above all things, but they bear in mind also *how* they are to use all things, and in their dove-like simplicity are as cunning as serpents. Freedom is a Divine endowment, but it cannot be preserved without Divine art. We have power over creatures only in God, and Christians are the only kings. If thou art in bondage to nothing, then hast thou all power. Freedom is a Divine jewel, but it must remain freedom, and keep clear of all snares and entanglements. Man boasts, saying: "I am lord of the creation." Yes, but let it only be so in fact, and become not a slave over it. We may, indeed, assert of any thing that it is good; but how art *thou?* May *it* not be holding *thee* in bondage?—Ver. 18. In this statement, 'The Lord is for the body,' we have a noble proof that Christ has verily given Himself to us. He, therefore, who now rightly honors his own body, is joined by the Lord unto

Himself. He who sunders the bonds of the Divine order, abuses his own body. Originally the body was not intended for impurity, but now, and as it is now, it beguiles. It does not, however, follow that I, like an ox, must yield to that which impels me.—Ver. 14. Can he who expects in faith this glorification of his body at the resurrection, endanger his hope by impure lusts? —Ver. 15. Believers themselves are Christ's members; therefore every thing which is theirs also belongs to Him. Universally is it true that if a Christian surrenders himself to the world and to the creature, he withdraws himself from his Lord Jesus. He who sins takes that power which God has given him and offers it up to another.—Ver. 17. *One Spirit.* To will what God wills, this is to be a partaker of the Divine Nature. With God, being and willing are one and the same thing (St. Bernard). This union to Christ is learned and attained in the inmost depths of the soul alone. If we delight to be with Christ, let us then cleave to the Lord and not to a harlot. Let us walk with God and follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. Let us abide in God, so that heart, disposition, sense, and all our powers, shall enter into God and come out of their selfish isolation and false freedom, and be God's possession. In this way doth God recover the man who has forsaken Him, and dwells in him as in His own temple—Ver. 18. This passage instructs us also how we may deliver ourselves. It is by avoiding opportunities; by not running into danger, and thinking ourselves strong; tearing ourselves loose and fleeing as Joseph did.—Ver. 19. A believer is not his own, but is the servant of God, who looks at and executes his Lord's behests. Where can a greater happiness be enjoyed in this life, than in the feeling that we are entirely and altogether God's? God, as it were, is under obligation to care for, and to protect those who belong to Him and are no more their own. Be then in no respect your own, in order that God may be entirely yours. —Ver. 20. Christ has purchased the whole man. Through His spotless offering we are enabled to sanctify the body. Originally man was the dwelling-place and peculiar possession of the Godhead, and after his fall he was purchased anew for the same purpose by the redemption of Christ so precious; therefore ought men to consecrate themselves to God; and to this end should we purify ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit. 2 Cor. vii. 1.

Rieger:—Ver. 12. By our misuse of freedom we are, for the most part, brought into bondage. Freedom is a condition wherein I am able both to use and also to misuse objects with ease.—Ver. 13. He who with every morsel he eats takes into himself something of that condemnation of death under which all things lie, will deem the pleasure to be enjoyed in eating as the least possible, and will be as little inclined to boast therein as a criminal would boast over his parting meal. Through the sense of shame imprinted by the finger of God upon the human heart, and by our longing after our primeval innocence, we are powerfully admonished to employ the power furnished by Christ's grace, for the proper preservation of the body and its members, and to bring them by means of it to the service of righteousness and fruits of sanctification; and for this reason also to rejoice that the Lord also belongs to the body, that the protection, love, and grace of God in Jesus Christ extends also over this, and works out its sanctification through His Spirit; yea, also its glorification at the resurrection.—Ver. 14. The liberty of giving one's body to fornication, and the hope of resurrection to life eternal, cannot co-exist in the heart. Those thorns choke this seed, and by the gross abuse of the body do we forfeit the enjoyment of the hidden manna, which is intended also for the nourishment of the bodies of the saints in eternal life.—Vv. 15, 16. Our bodies are Christ's members, since from Christ, the Head, there flows down upon them also both life and pleasure, and power to serve God and His righteousness, and also the control of His Spirit, together with the hope and desire of making manifest the mind of Christ also in our daily walk and conversation. But when a person withdraws his members from their proper Lord and Head, and in this way interrupts that enjoyment which flows from such communion, and destroys his peace and joy in the Holy Ghost; and besides this becomes joined to a harlot or a debauchee; then does such conduct bring with it such servitude of the whole man as compels a participation of all the other members likewise, or at least infects them with its own impurities, as if these were their own. What ought to happen according to God's ordinance only in lawful marriage, this happens also through commerce with a harlot; but it happens in such a way as to leave traces in the body and its members, which shall follow the guilty one even unto the resurrection of damnation.—Ver. 17. By idolizing the creature and by the pleasure sought therein, man becomes carnal; by cleaving to the Creator he becomes spiritual.—Ver. 18. The deeper the fire of lust lies in any individual, and the more the example of others and the hope that it will remain concealed and unpunished and the excuses furnished for it by man's wit, blow upon it to inflame it, the more need have we of the faithful watchman's alarm: "Flee fornication."—Ver. 19. A temple is consecrated to God and to His service; it is also decorated by God with many tokens of His grace. What a comfort then is it believingly to regard our body as built and furnished by God's hand, bought by Christ's blood, and consecrated in baptism to be a possession of God in Christ! Assaulted, indeed, and alas! too often overcome through the jealousy of the Devil, by all manner of alien powers, yet rescued again by the might of grace, and made meet to be the dwelling-place of God's Spirit! Ah, what a glorious thing it will be to carry a celestial body in which evil lusts no more dwell!

Heubner:—Ver. 12. The doctrine of Christian freedom cannot be more basely perverted than when employed to the gratification of fleshly lusts. The rule of its use is a consistent regard for self and for neighbor. The Christian should allow himself to be fettered by nothing. True freedom is to be bound by no lusts.—Ver. 13. God has given us the body for holy purposes, its members and powers are, as it were, an image of the Divine Creative Power. Everything in us should be consecrated to the service of God.

The Lord has become also the Saviour of the body, in that He has freed it from eternal death, and has earned for it its resurrection.—Ver. 14. The resurrection of the body should awaken in us a certain respect for our body, constraining us to use it in a worthy manner.—Ver. 15. Every Christian is a member of Christ. This holy union strengthens the sense of shame at all impurity.—Ver. 16. Fornication is union with a harlot, with something impure, therefore separation from Christ. The man becomes that wherewith he unites, by assimilation.—Ver. 18. Fornication is a direct sin against ourselves, for we desecrate our personality by it.—Ver. 19. The body inhabited by the Spirit of God should be used in a holy manner. Christianity sanctifies even our physical life.—Ver. 20. God has given His own Son as a ransom for us. Meditation upon the greatness of His sufferings should fill us with gratitude. Earnestness in the work of sanctification flows from a living faith in the work of redemption, alike in its precious foundation and in its importance to us.

BESSER:—Ver. 12. There is something great in the power of a Christian freeman, which Paul has so celebrated in word and deed; but no where does the devil build his little chapels more cunningly than right by the side of the temple of Christian liberty.

Because Christians are in some respects yet carnal, and are in danger of being biased by the flesh (iii. 3), they always need the rule of the Holy Spirit to enable them to distinguish between what is spiritual and what is carnal.

Paul himself is an illustrious example of a noble independence of all external things. He knows how to abound and to suffer need, being careful for nothing and in everything giving thanks.

VER. 20. He who depends on the Lord knows the meaning of that declaration (Ps. lxxxiv. 2), My flesh and my heart crieth out for the living God.

XIII.—INSTRUCTIONS IN REGARD TO MARRIAGE.

A.—The propriety of marriage, and the duties involved.*

CHAPTER VII. 1–11.

Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me:[1] *It is* good for a man not
2 to touch a woman. Nevertheless, *to avoid* fornication [But on account of the fornications], let every man have his own [ἑαυτοῦ] wife, and let every woman have her own
3 [ἴδιον] husband. Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence [her due[2]]:
4 and likewise also the wife unto the husband. The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own
5 body, but the wife. Defraud ye not one the other; except *it be* with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and [*om.* fasting and[3]] prayer; and come [be[4]] together again, that Satan tempt you not for [through, διά] your incontinency.
6 But I speak this by [as a, κατά] permission, *and* not of [as a. κατά] commandment.
7 For [But, δέ[5]] I would that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his
8 proper gift of God, one[6] after this manner, and another[6] after that. I say therefore
9 to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I. But if
10 they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn. And unto the married I command, *yet* not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart[7] from
11 *her* husband: But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to *her* husband: and let not the husband put away *his* wife.

[1] Ver. 1.—Μοι is stricken out by Tischendorf [Alf.] according to B. C. Cod. Sin., [but is retained by nearly all the critical editions according to A. D. F. K. L. Syn.].

[2] Ver. 2.—Ὀφειλήν according to by far the most weighty authorities [A. B. C. D. F. Cod. Sin.]. The Rec. has ὀφειλομένην εὔνοιαν, an old gloss [found in L. and the Syriac and certain fathers], and an incorrect one arising from a mistaken interpretation of the nature of the due spoken of; [or perhaps it was a Euphemism].

[* I have taken the liberty of altering Dr. Kling's arrangement. He has treated this whole chapter connectedly, and divided the text into four subjects—vv. 1-7, 8-16, 17-24, 25-40—with captions accordingly. The divisions I have adopted seem more natural, and I have treated them separately for convenience' sake.—TR.].

[3] Ver. 5.—Τῇ νηστεία καὶ is an ascetic appendage, [not found in A. B. C. D. F. Cod. Sin.[1] It appears in K. L. Cod. Sin.[2] in the Syriac vers. and in some of the fathers].

[4] Ver. 5.—The Rec. has συνέρχεσθε or συνέρχησθε—a gloss. [The true reading is ἦτε, as found in A. B. C. D. F. Cod. Sin.].

[5] Ver. 7. The Rec. has γάρ. This suits the sense, but is feebly supported. [It is found in B. D.[2] K. L. Cod. Sin.[3] Syr.; while δὲ is found in A. C. D. F. Cod. Sin.[1]].

[6] Ver. 7.—The Rec. ὃς μὲν—ὃς δέ, which belongs to the later Greek, ὁ—ὁ is better supported.

[7] Ver. 10.—χωρισθῆναι [so A. B. C. K. L. Cod. Sin.]. Lachmann [whom Stanley generally follows] reads χωρίζεσθαι [found in A. D. F.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Here we enter upon the second portion of this Epistle. Having first treated of those evils in the Church which he had learned by report, he, from chap. vii. and onwards, proceeds to give his opinion on those topics in regard to which the Corinthians had questioned him in their letter. This letter being lost, we can only infer what these questions were from the nature of the answers given. One was in relation to the propriety of marriage, and the performance of the duties it involved. This topic he treats of first, since it was closely connected with his earnest warning against fornication (vi. 12 ff.); for not only did it embrace the subject of the sexual relations; but that very depreciation of marriage also, which had begun to prevail in the Church, under the supposition that it was a sinful connection, which ought to be avoided, and, if possible, broken up when formed, was to be regarded as a reaction against the abounding licentiousness of the place.

This undervaluation of marriage, however, is by no means to be attributed (as by Grotius) [Whitby, A. Clark, Barnes] to the philosophic views current at that period;* since these affected not so much the morality of the thing, as the cares and dangers which belonged to the marriage institution. It were better to infer here an inference—though only a subordinate one—of that aversion to marriage which was just then springing up (so Osiander). But whether, and how far this difference of sentiment was connected with the party divisions in the Church, is a matter of doubt. Yet, if there were such a connection, still we are neither to suppose, (with Goldhorn and others,) that it was with the Christian party in particular, whose alleged theosophic, ascetic character is altogether problematical; nor yet (with Schwegler) that it was with the Essenic Ebionite Christians, whose presence at Corinth cannot be certainly ascertained; nor yet with the Petrine party, who, rather in view of the example of their leader (ix. 5; Matth. xiii. 14), and of the Jewish, Old Testament standpoint on the subject, must have held marriage in special honor. These questions must rather have originated with the Paulinists, who, through the precedent of their assumed leader, and by reason of such expressions of his as appear here, and were misunderstood by them, might have been led into an inordinate admiration of celibacy and disparagement of marriage, in opposition both to heathen immoralities, and to Jewish sensualism in this respect. With what modesty and wisdom Paul handles his subject will appear as we proceed.

["The whole is written," says Alford, "under the strong impression of the near approach of the end of the present state of things (vv. 29–31), and as advising the Corinthians under circumstances in which persecution, and family division for the Gospel's sake might at any time break up the relations of life. The precepts and recommendations of this chapter are therefore to be weighed as those in viii. *al., with reference to change of circumstances;* and the meaning of God's Spirit in them with respect to the subsequent ages of the Church, to be sought by *careful comparison and inference* not rashly assumed and misapplied. I may also premise that in hardly any portion of the Epistles has the hand of correctors and interpolators been busier than here. The absence of all ascetic tendency from the Apostle's advice, on the point where asceticism was busiest and most mischievous, was too strong a testimony to be left in its original clearness."

VERS. 1, 2, **Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote to me.**—["Each of his replies is introduced by the preposition περί, as here." WORDS.].—**it is good.**—There is here a Brachylogy, as in xi. 16; Rom. xi. 18. We might insert: 'I say,' or: 'it is my opinion.' [Some suppose that the Apostle is here taking up the language of the Epistle addressed to him and affirming it: 'It is good, as you say, or inquire.' And this is very possible, and may account for the use of the strong word καλόν here. It is adopted concessively.] The question is, however, whether by it the Apostle means to express the idea of suitableness, or allowableness, in consideration of the superior advantage of celibacy by reason of the religious opportunities it gave (comp. ver. 26); or whether he here has in view the moral beauty of continence. If we understand it relatively, then it cannot be inferred, as by Jerome, that the opposite is wrong, "*malum est tangere;*" and so the value and dignity of marriage as set forth in the context, will remain unaffected. "This agrees with the feeling in the previous chapter. Comp. below vv. 7, 8, 26, 34 (mid.), 35 (end), 40. 'Good,' *i. e.*, becoming, suitable for liberty and exemption from the marriage due, ver. 3, and for entire power over oneself, ver. 4; [good, not in view of marriage as originally designed; for in that case it was not good for a man to be alone; but good in view of the evils which sin had engendered, and by which it had marred that which was designed to be one of man's chief blessings]; though, on the other hand, the act of 'touching,' mentioned in ver. 1, is always ac-

[* MENANDER: "If a man consider marriage in a proper point of view, it is an evil; but then it is a necessary evil." METELLUS NUMIDICUS: "If we could live unmarried, we should be saved from a great deal of trouble; but seeing that nature has so ordered it, that we cannot live very comfortably with wives, and without them cannot live at all, marriage should be adopted not for the sake of the short-lived pleasure it has, but rather for the perpetual safety." But this was not the general opinion. From A. Clark].

companied with modesty among the chaste. ["Much ingenuity," says Stanley, "has been employed by the advocates of celibacy in making this word (*καλόν*) mean 'lofty' or 'noble,' and by the advocates of marriage in depreciating it to mean 'convenient for existing circumstances.' The obvious meaning is the true one. It is used as in Aristotle and the Greek moral writers generally) for 'good,' like 'pulchrum' in Latin, opposed to '*turpe*,'=*αἰσχρόν*, '*bad*;' and the only limitation to be put upon it is that supplied by the context." It means, *beautiful, praiseworthy*, yet only under certain circumstances, and in view of the traits thus exhibited. And so all must admit it to be, as *e. g.*, when practised by Paul. But not universally, for certainly he cannot be supposed to contradict intentionally what he says elsewhere of marriage, as "honorable in all;" or as a type of the union of the Church with Christ (Eph. v. 23–32); or as a thing, which to forbid was one of the signs of the great apostacy].—**for a man**;—*Ἀνθρώπῳ* does not stand precisely for *ἀνδρί*, although, of course, as the context shows, the man is here meant; ["and that, as Meyer remarks, not merely in his sexual, but in his human capacity. Thus in its deeper reference it would include the other sex also." Alf.] —**Not to touch a woman.**—This phrase the author formerly understood, with Rückert, to denote continence in the marriage state. In which case, then, the words in ver. 2: '*to have* his own wife,' would mean sexual intercourse in the marriage state; and vv. 3–5 would only be a carrying out of the same idea; and, *καλόν* would be equivalent to 'morally beautiful,' in correspondence with the tender feeling implied. But, apart from all other grounds, both the whole context as well as the usage of language (*ἔχειν*), leads me to abide by the common interpretation, which takes the words to mean sexual connection in general (as in Gen. xx. 6; Prov. vi. 29) of which that occurring in marriage is one species. And this first comes to view prominently in ver. 2. [So Alf., Meyer, de Wette. And undoubtedly they are correct. But Hammond, Whitby, Henry, Hodge, Barnes and others, take the phrase as meaning marriage, directly and primarily, finding support in this from certain supposed classical analogies. But this is certainly a perplexing and needless limitation. Paul here evidently starts with a broad, and surely very credible proposition. 'There is, he would say, 'nothing wrong, as the Jews argued, but rather something very proper, nay, very honorable, in having nothing at all to do with women carnally,' as there certainly was in Paul's case, and in that of many others who for wise reasons have given themselves up to a life of chaste celibacy.]

In ver. 2 he presents to us in contrast with the ideal *καλόν* the real practical need.—**But on account of** ["*διά* with the Acc. indicates the *ground* (ratio), not the aim (not even here), and it is only by implication that the notion of design can be brought in. Fornications are the reason for which the injunction is given, in order thus to prevent them." Winer, § XLIX. c.] **fornications.**—The plural points to the manifold and irregular sexual vices which prevailed in Corinth (Bengel: *vagas libidines*), in consequence of the multitude of courtezans to be found there. Now to ward off the temptations thus offered to the unmarried, by the enjoyment of legitimate intercourse in the marriage state he says,—**let every one have his own** (*ἑαυτοῦ*) **wife, and let every woman have her own** (*ἴδιον*) **husband.**—The *ἑαυτοῦ* and *ἴδιον* point to the established relation of the monogamy. [The contrast between *τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα* and *τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα* is a difference of idiom which runs all through the New Testament. Ἴδιος is never used for *γυνή*, nor *ἑαυτοῦ* for *ἀνήρ*, in speaking of husband and wife; perhaps from the seeming inappropriateness of using *ἑαυτοῦ*, except in the relation when the one party is, as it were, the property of another; perhaps from the importance of pointing out that the husband is the natural adviser of the wife." Stanley. See Winer, § XXII.]

[The Imp. *ἐχέτω*, *let have*, is not to be construed as permissive only, but it carries the force of a command [Jelf, *Gr. Gram.* § 420, Obs. 1: "The Imperative is used when something of decision or authority is wanted, so that the more civil form of the Optative would be out of place"], as is evident from the analogy of the subsequent imperatives, and from the reason by which it is sustained. But, if a command, then of course we must limit the 'each one,' both of man and woman, to such as have not the gift of continence (comp. vv. 3, 7, 36, 37). Here then we have a view of marriage in its lower aspects and bearings, as a safeguard against incontinence. But this pedagogical or practical view of marriage, as meeting a contemplated necessity, by no means excludes the ideal view given in Eph. v. 29 ff. For, as Neander says, "we must not overlook the fact that Paul is here not treating of marriage in general, but only in its relation to the condition of things at Corinth, where he feared the effect of moral prejudices concerning celibacy." [Besides, it must be remembered that marital intercourse is not the same in kind with the illegitimate connection, but is refined and elevated by the pure love which binds the parties in life-long and absolute union for the very noblest ends, and of which it is the bodily expression. Hence the Apostle is here prescribing a veritable cure for the evil passion, and not simply allowing it indulgence within a certain sphere].

Vers. 3-5. In order that the direction given in ver. 2 may attain its purpose, he goes on to insist upon the full consummation of the marital relationship, being prompted to this perhaps by the representations made in the letter of the Church, of a tendency towards a false asceticism in this respect, or of the actual practice of it among them.—**Let the husband render unto the wife her due, and likewise also the wife to her husband.**—Ὀφειλήν cannot therefore mean simply *ὀφειλομένη εὔνοια*, *due benevolence*, as the Rec. Text has it [which was either substituted as an expository gloss on the supposition that 'the due' was one of affection merely, or as an euphemism], but it refers to the due of marriage, *debitum tori*. That marital intercourse should here be set forth as a matter of duty, belongs to the higher ethical aspects of the case. [See Harless, *Christ. Ethik.* § 52, A. a., Wuttke

Sittenlehre, § 15, 3]. This he proceeds to establish more fully in the next sentence, omitting to connect it with any causal particle (for).—**The wife hath not power over her own body, but the husband; and likewise also the husband hath not power over his own body, but the wife.**—Here he shows that it is implied in the very nature of marriage, that the granting or withholding be not at the caprice of either party, but that each possesses a legitimate claim upon the body of the other, and has a right to its enjoyment. This is a reciprocity whereby alone marriage receives and maintains its monogamous character. The ellipsis at the close of each of these clauses is evident, and the nominatives must have their verbs supplied from what precedes. In the expression: the wife hath not *power* over *her own*, and: the husband hath not *power* over *his own*, Bengel detects an "elegant paradox." ["The ground of this being *another's*, while they *are their own*, is to be found in the oneness of body in which the marriage state places them." ALF.]. It is to this 'power' that the next injunction refers: **Defraud not one another.** At any rate, it amounts to the same thing, whether we say, 'of this power,' or, 'of your body,' or, 'of the due.' What he forbids is the arbitrary refusal of intercourse when the other party desires it. **Except it be,** *εἰ μή τι ἀν.* [The *ἀν* belongs to *τι*. On the attachment of this particle to other than verbs, see Jelf, § 430, Obs. *a.*]. There is here a limitation upon the above prohibition [which is elliptical in form; and, though it would naturally be supposed from the preceding verb, plainly implies a modification in meaning. It is not 'defrauding' that he allows, but 'abstaining,' as is evident from the appended condition], that both parties are agreed upon it, so that the rights of both parties are preserved: **from mutual agreement,** *ἐκ συμφώνου.* But even then the arrangement must only be **for a time,** *πρὸς καιρόν.* This might indeed denote some particular, *suitable* occasion that might occur, calling for such abstinence. But, according to later usage, it must be understood of some fixed definite period [Jelf, § 38, 2, *b*]. And this meaning is sustained by the purpose expressed, in its whole extent. First, he mentions religious exercises, for which they might wish to have time and rest.—**that ye may give yourselves to prayer,** — undisturbed by the excitements of this mighty passion. Such extraordinary and protracted devotional exercises were, in later times, enjoined for particular festival seasons, connected with fastings (hence the addition in the Rec. Text. of *τῇ νηστείᾳ καὶ*)*. And it is possible that the beginnings of this custom are to be found in this period, though such seasons were evidently of a purely voluntary character. That indulgence in sexual intercourse did not comport with holy solemnities, was a point assumed alike in the Old Testament (Ex. xix. 15) and among pagan nations. [Yet, as Harless well says, *Christliche Ethik*, § 44, *c.*, "we are not to suppose that the Apostle meant to say that such abstinence was a necessary condition to a spirit of prayer in general, but only that it was a suitable and necessary result of these peculiar circumstances in which the soul felt moved to special devotion toward God. To the Apostle who regarded the Christian's entire life as one continuous and perpetual prayer, it was impossible that such abstinence should appear as an absolute requisite to prayer, from the simple fact that he allowed of no enjoyment whatever which was not accompanied with prayer and thanksgiving," 1 Tim iv. 4].—**And be together again.**—This indicates euphemistically the resumption of marital intercourse. *Ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ*, a *constructio pregnans*='come together and remain together.' The dependence of *ἦτε* upon *ἵνα* is somewhat remarkable; hence the reading *συνέρχεσθε* (Imp.). It nevertheless rests on good grounds.

The limitation of their abstinence to a definite period, includes two objects, that they might have leisure for prayer, and might be united again. The reason for this is—**that Satan may not tempt you through your incontinency.**—By this he means a betrayal into that against which marriage was designed to be a safeguard, *viz.*, those fornications which were caused by incontinence. That such incontinence existed among them was to be inferred, not only from their peculiar circumstances, but also from the fact of their being married, which showed that they had not the gift of continence (comp. ver. 7). The betrayal through incontinence the Apostle ascribes to Satan. This is no mere form of speech, grounded on the supposition that all evil is to be attributed to Satan. Neither does it refer simply to seductions practised on them by the heathen, as though Satan were but another name for 'heathen,' the enemies of the Gospel. But it strictly accords with the whole doctrine of Scripture, and especially with Paul's teachings, that there is such a hostile evil spirit existing, whose business it is to seduce the people of God, and who, on this account, is styled preëminently "the tempter" (*ὁ πειράζων*) (Matth. iv. 3; 1 Thess. iii. 5). But the act of temptation (*πειράζειν*), in so far as it proceeds from this spirit of evil, is virtually a putting to the proof, since it presupposes some impurity or moral weakness in the parties operated on; or implies the hope of some pernicious result to them, on the ground of some suspected vitiosity of temper. In any case, it aims to demonstrate their impurity and impiety, and to effect their fall, and so to bring shame upon God and Christ, and to cause scandal in the Church, and involve it in disgrace, and hinder its spread, and weaken it in inward power and extent (comp. Job i. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 11, *etc.*).—*Πειράζειν* means, *to entice, to sin*, and that, too, with the intention of betraying (comp. Jas. i. 13ff.; Gal. vi. 1; Rev. ii. 10; iii. 10). But to derive *ἀκρασία* from *κεράννυμι*, as though it meant *not mingling, i. e.*, in sexual intercourse, is a philological fiction of Rückert's [one, also, which Words. adopts], which is untenable, if for no other reason than this, that *κεράννυμι* never appears as=*μίγνυμι* in this signification. The subst. *ἀκρασία* from *κεράννυμι* denotes bad mixture, such as that of insalubrious air. But the *ἀκρασία* of the text is that which comes from *ἀκρατής* and is=*ἀκράτεια*, the oppo-

[* "On these words was afterwards founded the practice of married persons living apart through the season of Lent." STANLEY.]

site of ἐγκράτεια. [So Alford and Meyer. The latter takes the 'your' (ὑμῶν) as an emphatic allusion to the prevailing fault of the Corinthians. This Alford questions, but on hardly sufficient grounds.]

VER. 6. **But this I speak as a permission, and not as a commandment.** — ['This' (τοῦτο). What? The thing is variously argued]. It refers neither to what follows in ver. 8 [as Rosen., Macknight] because of what intervenes in ver. 7; nor to ver. 2 ff. [as Beza, Grotius, de Wette, Hodge], since the command there given, that each man have his own wife, *etc.*, must in that case be taken concessively contrary to the direct obligation imposed in ver. 3; nor yet simply to the clause preceding: "and be together again," ["as the ascetics Orig., Tert., Jerome, Estius, and also Calvin, because this is but a subordinate member of the preceding sentence." ALFORD: "and the sense thus given to the passage is not consistent with the context" HODGE]; but to ver. 5, as a whole [so Alford, Meyer, Barnes]. The limitation imposed in regard to defrauding one another, he would not have taken as a command, as though persons were under obligation to practise longer or shorter abstinence by agreement. 'By permission' (κατὰ συγγνώμην)=as an allowance or concession to your weakness. ['Not as a command.' "A proof of St. Paul's authority. He is empowered to give a precept (ἐπιταγή) or to bestow an indulgence" (συγγνώμη) WORDS.].

VER. 7. **I wish rather** (δὲ) **that all men were as also myself.**—The reason why he does not wish to impose that restriction as a command, he here proceeds to state by pointing [to the different temperaments of individuals in respect to continence,] primarily to his own peculiarity. [That continence is the particularity in his condition which he refers to is assumed by Chrysostom, and is most probable. So de Wette, Meyer, Barnes. But Words. understands it of his unmarried state.] The above construction of the connection occasioned, no doubt, the reading γάρ; *for*, instead of δὲ; but it comports equally well with the latter (which is better attested), if, with Meyer, we interpret thus: 'I do not say this by way of command. I *rather* wish that all men might have the gift of perfect continence, as I myself have, so that marriage were unnecessary.'—To limit the expression 'all men' to Christians, is inadmissible. This comprehensive wish he utters in view of the near approach of Christ's second coming, when humanity would be made like unto the angels, and all marrying and giving in marriage would cease.

But each one has his own gift from God.—He here explains what he meant in ver. 6, when he said, 'by permission,' stating, on the other hand (ἀλλά), what hindered the realization of his wish. It was individual peculiarities. God had not given to every one alike the ability to practise continence. But whether by the word 'gift' (χάρισμα) he means an endowment of nature, or of grace, may be doubted. In view of the words 'all men' in the previous clause we might infer that he intended the former; a natural aptitude which existed as a Providential favor outside the sphere of redemption. But the uniform use of the word in this Epistle and in the New Testament generally inclines us to the opinion that it is the latter—a capacity granted by God within the Church, and therefore a proper gift of grace, grounded on an actual participation in Christ's redeeming power,—attached it may be, however, to a person's original disposition and temperament. Though the words 'all men' are indeed to be construed universally, yet the Apostle has here to do only with converts, and it is these that he has in his eye when he says, 'each one' and 'gift.' As Bengel observes, "that which in the natural man is a natural habit, becomes in the saints a *gift* of grace." The *gift* here is the entire habit of mind and body in the Christian, in so far, *e. g.*, as marriage or celibacy is better suited to him, along with the actions suited to each state, according to God's commandments. But in a state not voluntarily assumed, the assistance of grace is more secure to the godly." Comp. the words in Math. xix. 11: "To whom it is given." The epithet ἴδιον, *his own*, is further explained;—**one, so, and another, so.**—This can either be construed generally, or applied strictly to the two subjects in discussion, *viz.*, to continence and celibacy, on the one hand, and to the marriage state, on the other. The context inclines to the stricter construction. In this case, the second 'so' would refer to the fitness of the Christian of the marriage state, for forming and governing the family life.

VER. 8–9. A special application of the foregoing in the way of advice.—**I say then to the unmarried, and to widows,**—καὶ ταῖς χήραις, *especially to widows;* [so the καί must be interpreted, for widows being also unmarried cannot be regarded as a separate class.]—These, therefore, must be regarded as the parties singled out to be particularly addressed; while by the term, unmarried, single persons of both sexes are meant. And the emphasis is not to be placed on the latter, as though Paul were passing here to the consideration of a new topic—from the married to the unmarried; but it rests upon 'I say,' ["which is but a resumption of the 'I say' in ver. 6, and brings this advice under the same category as ver. 7." ALFORD]. It is otherwise in ver. 10, as may be seen from the position of the words: **it is good,** καλόν, as in ver. 1, **for them,** αὐτοῖς, masculine, **if they should remain as I also am,** *i. e.*, unmarried. We are not to infer from this that Paul was a widower, as Clemens, Alex., Grotius [Luther, Ewald, Selden, Conybeare and Howson] suppose, for this is in no wise here intimated [so Alf., Meyer, Bengel and others. Words. leaves the case doubtful]. In view of his own gift (ver. 7), however, he wishes this advice to be taken conditionally. **But if they are incontinent, let them marry.** Ἐγκρατεύειν=ἐγκρατῆ εἶναι, *to be master of one's self*—especially as it regards the sexual passions; a word of the later Greek. **For it is better to marry than to burn.** Πυροῦσθαι denotes the painful excitement of unsatisfied desire, which burns like a fire within, and inwardly overcomes the man, or at least disturbs and weakens the moral powers. Comp. Col. iii. 5; Sir. xxiii. 22-24. In saying 'it is better,' he intends no disparagement of marriage as being a lesser evil; but only contrasts a re-

lation which, in this case, is morally allowable and sinless, with a state that is immoral, or at least troublesome to the moral life. "A second marriage among Christians is therefore not in itself unlawful; not a grievous transgression, as the Montanists and Novatians asserted; nevertheless the Church has always regarded second marriages with dislike, if only because the single marriage corresponds better with the idea of true Christian wedlock, which is a type of the union of Christ with His Church." Bisping]. [Bisping, it must be remembered, is a Romanist].

Vers. 10, 11. **And to the married.**—This is connected directly to the foregoing, meaning those who are enjoined to marry—hence, to Christians. To limit this to such as were newly married, or to some particular parties had in mind (Rückert), is warranted neither by the expression itself, nor by the context.—**I command;** παραγγέλλω.—Here comes in the ἐπιταγή of ver. 6. It implies a stringent order, an injunction to do something (comp. Luke v. 14) 1 Tim. vi. 13. And this he exhibits as a command of the Lord Himself, *i. e.*, of Christ, the Head of the Church.—**not I, but the Lord.**—Here he has in mind the words of Christ in Matth. v. 32; xix. 4; Mark x. 12, communicated to him by a reliable tradition. To suppose that he had received a special revelation on the subject, is altogether gratuitous. [Nor are we to imagine that Paul here intends to draw a contrast between what he himself commands and what the Lord had commanded, as to the degree of authority involved in each. For as he himself states in ver. 40, 'He had the mind of Christ;' and what is spoken under the inspiration of the Spirit, is no less valid than that which proceeded from the lips of Jesus. And what he intends here is not to draw a contrast, but merely to assert the distinction just alluded to. 'He is simply telling the Corinthians, that, so far as what he was about to say was concerned, they had no need to come to him to learn it.' He was merely repeating what had already been enjoined by Christ Himself.*] The exception "except it be for fornication," which does not appear in Luke xvi. 18, nor in Mark, is here dropped out, either because the tradition which came to him did not have the words, or because an instance of this sort had not occurred in Corinth (comp., however, v. 1'), or because the matter was self-evident, fornication being itself a dissolution of the marriage bond.—**that the wife.**—The prominence given to the wife is not to be explained by supposing any reference to some existing case; but it may be accounted for on the ground of the greater inclination of the wife to obtain divorce; since she, as the weaker party, was more liable to suffer oppression, or was more naturally disposed to asceticism.—**do not separate herself from her husband.**—["Χωρισθῆναι, the natural expression for the wife as not having power to dismiss her husband; ἀφιέναι, the milder form for the husband (see last clause), although it is in ver. 13 used also for the wife. The words are taken from the phraseology of legal divorce; but the cases here spoken of are not so much regular divorces as accidental separations." Stanley].—**but and if she should be separated.**—This and the dependent clauses are a parenthesis, so that what follows is in direct connection with what precedes. The words ἐὰν δὲ καὶ χωρισθῇ point to some possible case of divorce occurring hereafter contrary to the command of Christ, and not to any supposed actual separation which might have taken place before the latter should have reached them. The καὶ does not belong to the whole clause, making it equivalent to 'even if,' *etc.*, but simply to the verb, and may be translated by 'actually,' or 'in fact.' ["This is not intended as an exception to the law, but it contemplates a case which may occur in spite of the law.—There are cases undoubtedly which justify a woman in leaving her husband, which do not justify divorce." Hodge.]—On the injunction—**let her remain unmarried**—See Matth. x. 12.—**or let her be reconciled to her husband.**—The verb καταλλαγήτω had best be taken like χωρισθῇ in a reflexive sense, 'reconcile herself.' This does not, however, exclude the mediation of others. He means that she should do her part towards becoming united to her husband, to secure his love and devote to him her love again.—The injunction on the man is very short.—**And that the man put not away his wife.**—From the similarity of instruction given to both, we may infer that what was said to the woman in vv. 10 and 11, applied also to the man (Osiander).

[* See this point discussed by William Lee: *The Inspiration of Scripture*, Sect. 4, *Am. Ed.* p. 272, and Townsend, *hoc loco.*]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Marriage, its nature and obligations.* In the Apostle's view, marriage is a vital and life-long communion between man and woman, involving an equality of claims on the part of both. As a living fellowship, it extends over the entire personality, embracing also our physical nature. And this is precisely the peculiarity of marriage, distinguishing it from all other kinds of friendly connexion. While it involves the element of friendship—as a union of hearts mutually completing each other—it has, likewise, besides this, a mutually supplementing bodily union, *viz.*, the sexual. This has, indeed, its psychical side; yet it comes to its full expression and consummation in the bodily life. Both are in this respect adjusted to each other, and each party needs the other for the proper fulfilment of its position in the sexual relations. The man requires the woman in order to the exercise of his procreative power, in which respect he is "the image of God" (xi. 7) the Creator; and the woman requires the man in order that her capacity for receiving may become an actual conception, and her constitutional fitness for being a mother may attain to its proper development and exercise.

These mutual needs, so divinely ordained, lead to reciprocal obligations and claims in their relations to each other. Each has a right in the body of the other, and each is bound to yield to the other for sexual intercourse, so that no capricious one-sided refusal is allowable. Only an occasional abstinence by mutual consent for higher moral and religious ends is permitted.

But another consideration comes in here. Men are sinful. All their sensual impulses, especially the sexual instincts—the strongest of them all—have escaped from the control of the Spirit, from which they ought to receive their first motion. Instead of being the pure expression and exercise of love—free surrender of oneself for the pleasure and gratification of another—sexual commerce has become one of the worst forms in which a degrading selfishness manifests itself—a selfishness which prompts persons to seek others only to use them for their own gratification. Among mankind thus corrupted, marriage, therefore, appears as providentially designed to guard against the inordinate and irregular satisfaction of sexual passion, so that it shall not be indulged in promiscuously, as opportunity might be afforded; but that two persons bound together during their whole life, and in their entire personality, shall devote themselves to each other even in reference to this particular, [that so, if possible, mere passion may be refined through the power of a purer affection and the discipline of domestic life].

The less now the virtue of continence—that is, the power of the spirit over the animal passions—is cultivated and trained in full strength, the more needful will it be to take care that the abstinence agreed upon for special reasons, be not too long extended, lest either party be exposed to temptation for unlawful indulgence. [See WHEWELL'S "*Elements of Morality*," B. IV. chap. VII., Art. 630. BAXTER'S "*Christian Ethics*," Pt. II. Chap. 1 and 7. "HARLESS, *Christ. Ethik*," § 52 A. a.; also "WUTTKE *Sittenlehre*, § 152, 153].

2. *Celibacy, its occasion, and how far praiseworthy.* This stringency of the marriage obligation, which indeed, carries with it a wealth of moral and religious elements, is apt to evoke a reaction through the natural effort of the Christian after liberty and holiness—after an untrammeled and undivided devotion to his Lord—after a perfect consecration of soul and body to his service, and after an undisturbed enjoyment of fellowship with Him. This effort resulting in celibacy, is morally justifiable only on certain conditions. These are: 1, Provided that it is not prompted by a carnal love of ease, and by a dread of domestic crosses, and is likewise free from all spiritual pride and ambition, which, by refraining from marriage, aspires to possess a special sanctity, and to merit a higher degree of blessedness and glory. 2, Provided it is not tinctured with mere caprice, or will-worship, or prudery, or vanity, or any such moral perverseness. 3, Provided it is prompted by a consciousness—not, indeed, of an incapacity for marriage, which would render the act morally reprehensible—but of a peculiar fitness for a single life vouchsafed by the Lord, and of a Divine call to some sphere of labor in God's kingdom, to which the married state would offer impediments; or occasioned by providential obstructions put in the way of some desired and sought for marriage connections, and by the quiet pondering of the Divine will as indicated in such occurrences; and, 4, provided, in general, a lack of inclination for marriage—which, on looking up to God and invoking His direction in the matter, comes to be regarded as a Divine hint as to duty—leads a person to remain unmarried. [When these conditions exist, celibacy and widowhood are states wherein some of the noblest traits of the Christian life may be displayed, and are no less honorable than that of wedlock. To disparage them in any way, is to put contempt on the plain doctrine of the Gospel. But no less un-Christian, not to say unnatural, is it to ascribe any inherent superior excellence to these states, and to make them the essential conditions of superior sanctity, and to impose them by authority upon any class of persons in the Church, as, *e. g.*, on the clergy. The Romish doctrine on this point is not merely utterly groundless, but contrary to the express teachings of Scripture, and to the example of most of the Apostles. Paul himself specifies "the forbidding to marry" among the doctrines of devils, and when we would expect him to counsel virginity according to Romish teaching, he says rather (1 Tim. ii. 15) "the woman shall be saved in child-bearing, if they continue in faith and charity."] Hence, where the above-mentioned conditions do not exist, and there appears to be a demand for marriage, and a well-grounded hope that it will be a fellowship in the Lord, and for the furtherance of his kingdom, and it appears to be the will of God, then does an obligation arise to enter into it [both for the good of the parties concerned, and] for the propagation of the race, and the rearing of future generations morally, socially and religiously in this relation.

The Apostolic counsels in regard to celibacy, given as they were in anticipation of Christ's speedy coming, in which case the obligation to marriage is lessened by reason of the impending dissolution of all earthly things, acquire new force whenever sure signs lead us to expect this catastrophe as at hand. [See on this subject BAXTER "*Christian Ethics*," Book ii. chap. 1; WUTTKE "*Sittenlehre*," § 295; SCHAFF *Hist. Ap. Ch.*, § 112.]

3. *Divorce, its wrong and its right.* The voluntary dissolution of a Christian marriage is a departure from a state ordained by God,—the rupture of a covenant with which members of His Church have entered with each other, in His name, and in which they have thus obligated themselves to live together as husband and wife, even under the most severe and trying circumstances, faithful unto death. A separation can properly take place only under the conditions appointed by God Himself, through Christ, *viz.*, the actual dissolution of the marriage bond by the other party in adultery or fornication, which is in fact a surrender of one's self to a third party in such wise as is allowable only in marriage, and is reserved by the ordinance of God exclusively for those thus allied. Should any one wish to separate from his consort out of disinclination to marital intercourse, or from a dread of it, under the idea that it involved defilement, or through a general desire for liberty in this respect, he would, in so doing, be guilty of violating the most solemn obligations, and become chargeable with immorality. When conscientious scruples arise in these respects, it becomes a Christian to consult his pastor, or some experienced Christian friend, and above all to lay the matter in prayer

before God, that he may be enlightened and instructed from on high, and that his partner might be induced to enter into some agreement that would not infringe on his conscience. Even though marriage has become burdensome, a person must still bear it from a sense of duty, in obedience to the Divine ordinance, and in conformity with the claims of the institution.—Mere aversion on the part of the one or the other, or of both, mortifications, maltreatment, sickness however incurable, whether of body or mind, furnish no warrant for divorce. A temporary separation, accompanied with a readiness for reunion, may, under certain circumstances, be allowed as the only means for restoring again the disturbed relations, and causing a return to a right tone of feeling, and effecting a lasting improvement.

If anything else, however, can be accepted as a ground for divorce, subsumed as it were under the head of adultery, it is *malicious desertion.* This means, the deliberate forsaking of the one party by the other, with the unmistakable or declared design of abandoning the marriage connection altogether. And this is nothing less than the actual dissolution of the bond, by which the obligation of the other party to fidelity is annulled. Yet, in this case, no right-minded person will be in haste to obtain a formal divorce. Rather he will be inclined to wait as long as possible, in the hope of seeing some change occur in the temper of the other party, which will lead to reconciliation and cohabitation once more. And such forbearance will show itself, even in the case of adultery, for even in such circumstances may the spirit of Christian faith signalize its patience.—And then, in reference to the forming of a new connection; after so severe a chastisement, which not unfrequently wears the character of a judgment on the conduct of him who suffers it—it may be for the manner in which he contracted the marriage, or for the manner in which he has maintained it—a true Christian will be naturally disposed to consider with great care, whether he ought to enter into a new relation; and with prayer for heavenly instruction he will seek to ascertain what is God's will in the matter, and whether it be not a mere selfish inclination (which we are very apt to take for God's will) that is moving him to marry again. And the whole issue of things he will leave to God, in humble resignation to His decision. And should God's providence seem to enjoin self-denial for a longer or shorter period, he will entreat Him day by day for the supplies of that grace which shall strengthen him to endure in all patience and purity.

But here a new point comes up. If the adultery committed, whether it be in the form of fornication or of malicious desertion, be not a momentary lapse not likely to be repeated, but is a settled thing, which no patience, or gentleness, or efforts at conciliation can overcome, then it will be right to infer that the Christian character of the guilty party is in such a case entirely renounced, and to treat him as standing in the relation of an unbeliever, or, still worse, of a heathen Here, then, we would have, to all intents, an instance of mixed marriage, such as that spoken of in the next section. It would be in vain, then to look for the hallowing of one party by the other; and all continuance in a connection, which only obstructs the purpose of the Divine calling, and mars our peace, for some vague hope of recovering the lost, would be wholly unwarranted, and contrary to the Divine will.

From that which, according to the rule of Scripture, is right for the individual believer, we may infer the *duty of the Church and the State in reference to marriage.* First of all, the Church acknowledges itself as bound to the work of the Lord, and can, with good conscience, sanction no divorce and marriage of the separated parties again in other connections, contrary to His expressed will. The State, as an institution, which with its enactments and executive acts is rooted in the principles of Christianity, must *aim* to conform its marriage legislation to these. But inasmuch as strict conformity is not possible for it, the State must at least grant the Church the liberty of abiding by the decisions of her Lord, and protect it in the maintenance of its right. It must not require the Church to bless those un-Christian marriages which it may feel constrained to allow; nor must it hinder the Church from enforcing its discipline upon those who form permanent connections after a manner ordained by it, when not accordant with the Divine rule. Such is the position to be clearly and distinctly taken in the case.

But it is a question whether our mixed congregations do not admit, or even require some modification of such proceedings?—whether an extension of the principle of analogy already employed in granting divorces for malicious desertion, is not proper and necessary in other cases also, which may in like manner be regarded as a dissolution of the marriage tie. This is one of the pressing questions of the day, a further investigation of which would, however, lead us too far.

Much that is not good has place under the forbearance of our Heavenly Father. And it is a question whether the Church ought not to exercise a maternal patience towards much which she cannot sanction? This, in fact, no one will deny. Nevertheless she must hold by the authority of God's word, and try to enforce it. And her wisdom will show itself in wise endeavors to combine the two in a befitting manner. Consult on this question *Ev. Kirch. Zeit. and Neue Ev. Kirch. Zeit.* for 1859 [also WHEWELL, *Elements of Morality,* § 633-635 and § 1027-1037; NEANDER, *Life of Christ,* § 155, *note,* and § 224; HERZOG, *Enc. Art. Ehe.*, BAX. *Ch. Eth.* B. 11, ch. 9].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[I. *Celibacy or the single state,* when maintained for worthy ends, being good, and in accordance with Apostolic example: 1, instead of encountering ridicule, or held in reproach, should be held in highest honor, ver. 1; 2, ought not to be preferred voluntarily, unless in accordance with the clear will of God, as intimated in the gift of continence, ver. 7; 3, should not be enforced by commandment upon any class of persons, ver. 6; 4, when thus enforced it is apt to lead to gross immoralities, ver. 2].

[II. *Marriage, too,* so far from involving spiri-

tual contamination, as ascetics pretend, is: 1, good, as a safeguard against licentiousness and a help to purity, ver. 2; 2, should be entered into with full consent to all its obligations, ver. 3; 3, involves entire self-denial in affectionate regard each for the other, ver. 4; and 4, can be suspended long only at a hazard to morals, ver. 5; though, 5, a temporary suspension, like fasting, may occasionally be advisable, as furnishing greater freedom to devotion, ver. 5. 6, Being a union for life, neither party is at liberty to move for its dissolution, and one can be released from the obligation only by the infidelity or death of the other, ver. 10].

STARKE:—In view of the race, it was not good for the first man to be alone; in view of special circumstances and gifts it may be good for particular individuals to abide alone, ver. 1.—SPENER:—Marriage is an antidote to the poison of sensuality.—HED.:—Marriage intercourse is not sinful lewdness—not a mere licensed fornication, ver. 3.—CRUSIUS:—In marriage a person parts with his liberty, and binds his entire person to another, ver. 4.—Marriage pleasures, like all others, may be suspended awhile for purposes of more concentrated devotion, ver. 5.—HED.:—Abstinence is not commanded, only allowed—hence not to practise it is not sinful. Yet even here there must be moderation and self-discipline. All immodest indulgence and abuse of this holy state is an abomination in the sight of a holy God, ver. 6.—HED.:—Without the Divine gift of continence, it were better to marry. Yet even with this a person is at liberty to marry, for thus he is better able to preserve the purity of his married life, especially if he have a partner like-minded, ver. 9.—IBID:—The desire for marriage is divinely implanted like hunger for food. But alas for the heathenish dishonor and scorn—the hypocritical contempt—the un-Christian prohibition put upon this sacred institution by priests and soldiers!—HED.:—Marriage is no exchange bank. Love must here rule. But what the devil unites, and fleshly lust knits, and avarice and ambition couples, has poor luck and little blessing or aid. Pious people endure, and are silent, and shun evil occasions, and seek peace, ver. 10.—In the married state it often happens that one is not content with the other. But the only remedy in such cases is patience. It is no longer a question, what sort of a wife a man shall have, but how he shall best adapt himself to the one in possession.

BERL. BIB.:—VER. 2. A well-regulated marriage opposes a dam to a large current of scandals.—Ver. 4. Many pretend that the man is not bound. But he is. He himself has concluded the bond and given the pledge, and both parties must recognize the debt.—Ver. 5. In making vows a person must take himself into careful consideration. Few know the depths of corruption in them and the power of Satan. We must be humble. The agreement to abstain must arise from faith, and faith is humble. Earnest progress in the Divine life requires of them who marry, because of incontinence, that they cherish a constant, heartfelt confidence in God, and devote time and energy to the mortification of the body and to prayer. But since this cannot be properly done, avoid fleshly excitements; occasional abstinence becomes needful and obligatory. Yet nature must maintain its original rights; for *it* is not sin, but only tainted with sin. When purged by the blood of Christ, it resumes its prerogatives. It is God's work, not the devil's. In attempting to destroy the latter, I must not assail the former. Yea, the flesh often gains the more power by too much tampering with the body. In attempting more than we can carry out, we fall back sadly, and then the world taunts and vilifies.—Ver. 7. Diversity of character gives rise to a variety of conditions, which must be harmonized by the unific power of Divine grace.—Ver. 8. Every mode of life has its advantages and disadvantages, and a Christian must learn to strike the balance.—Ver. 10. Marriage should be held sacred. The difficulties which attend it, God must be trusted to remove. If the law of Christianity be regarded as a law, it will, indeed, press hard; but there is mercy under such constraints, and every trouble should be considered an opportunity for the exercise of faith, hope, patience and love. Man is fickle and changeable. If now the marriage relation could be readily altered, this would serve greatly to foster this fickleness and levity, and so increase the evil. Hence, we see the holiness of the Divine ordinance even in respect to its apparent severity. Adultery alone is allowed as cause for divorce, and this because it breaks the bond. All other causes originate in a dread of the cross, and against this we must ever strive. Instead of following our natural inclinations when, *e. g.*, a man has an invalid wife, he should reflect: 'so must I remain; here is my opportunity to exercise love; here I ought to be gladly; here is a Lazarus. God is now putting me to the proof.'—Ver. 11. "Let her remain unmarried," and so let another burden press her, because she has wished to escape the burden of God's law. "Or let her become reconciled," this were better done. But it will cost more than a couple of words to do it. There will be needed earnest effort, a disposition to renew her covenant and begin it afresh in quite a different spirit from before.

HEUBNER:—VER. 1. A single life is commendable for a man only when it is maintained for the kingdom of Heaven's sake. The worth of celibacy is conditioned on personal relations and the period in which a person lives.—Ver. 4. Man and wife belong to each other—body and soul. There must be a corresponding surrender on the part of each.—Ver. 5. It is our duty to put limits on the charm of marital intercourse, in order to have time and inclination for religious exercises. There is danger of clogging from too much indulgence. Hours of solitude and prayer preserve the sweetness and purity of marriage. Christianity hits the golden mean.—Ver. 7. It is the token of a holy heart when a person can wish that all were like him.—Ver. 8. A false asceticism comes not within the scope of the Apostle. 1. What he gives is *advice*, and that, 2. suited to the times. 3. Elsewhere he gives marriage the preference (Eph. v. 2 f.), and reckons the prohibition of marriage among the doctrines of devils (1 Tim. iv. 3); 4, and ascribes no merit to celibacy, which state has worth only when the heart is pure.—Ver. 10. According to God's

law marriages are as indissoluble as is the union of Christ with His Church.

[OLSHAUSEN: — Ver. 2. An apparently low view of marriage; but only its negative side here presented in view of particular circumstances. There is implied here an indirect exhortation to proud Christians not to sink into the slough of sin by a contempt of marriage.— Ver. 3. The begetting of children, not the only legitimate end of marital intercourse. It is the outward expression of a true spiritual union].

[CALVIN:—VER. 5. The importance of abstinence in marriage for the purpose of prayer, no more proves the evil of the thing than the importance of fasting for the same purposes proves the evil of eating and drinking. But it is the part of believers to consider wisely *when* to eat and drink, and *when* to fast. So in the other case.—Ver. 6. A false estimate of virginity led to three errors: 1, pronouncing it the most excellent of virtues, and the very worship of God; 2, adoption of it by numbers who had not the gift; 3, the enforcement of it on the ministry, and their consequent awful corruption—while many prudent and pious men were kept from the sacred calling, refusing to ensnare themselves in this way. See *Inst.* B. IV. chap. XII. § 23–28].

B.—Mixed marriages. The course to be pursued by the believer in different circumstances. The general principles involved, stated and illustrated in parallel cases.

CHAPTER VII. 12–24.

12 But to the rest speak I,[1] not the Lord: If any brother hath a wife that believeth
13 not, and she[2] be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the
woman which [who] hath a husband that believeth not, and if he[2] be pleased to dwell
14 with her, let her not leave him [her husband[3]]. For the unbelieving husband is
sanctified by [in, ἐν] the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by [in, ἐν] the
husband [the brother[4]]: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.
15 But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under
16 bondage in such *cases:* but God hath called us [you[5]] to [in, ἐν] peace. For what
knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save *thy* husband? or how knowest thou, O
17 man, whether thou shalt save *thy* wife? But as God [the Lord[6]] hath distributed
[allotted] to every man, as the Lord [God[6]] hath called every one, so let him walk.
18 And so ordain I in all churches. Is [Was] any man called being circumcised? let
him not become uncircumcised. Is any [Has any been[7]] called in uncircumcision?
19 let him not be circumcised. Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing,
20 but the keeping of the commandments of God. Let every man abide in the same
21 calling wherein he was called. Art [Wert] thou called *being* a servant [slave]? care
22 not for it: but [even] if thou mayest be made free, use *it* rather. For he [the slave]
that is called in the Lord, *being* a servant [*om.* being a servant] is the Lord's free-
man:[8] likewise also [*om.* also] he [the freeman] that is called, *being* free [*om.* being
23 free], is Christ's servant. Ye are bought with a price: be [become] not ye the ser-
24 vants of men. Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God.

[1] Ver. 12.—The Rec. has ἐγὼ λέγω [with D. F. K. L.]. The oldest authorities [A. B. C. Cod. Sin.] read λέγω ἐγώ.

[2] Vers. 12, 13.—Αὕτη—οὗτος, [according to A. B. C. D.[1] F. Cod. Sin.]. The Rec. has αὐτή—αὐτός.

[3] Ver. 13.—Rec. has αὐτόν, to conform with ver. 11. The great preponderance of authorities is in favor of τὸν ἄνδρα.

[4] Ver. 14.—Ἀδελφῷ, according to the best and oldest authorities [and, as Alford says, has peculiar force here]. The Rec. has ἀνδρι, which is a gloss.

[5] Ver. 15.—The Rec. has ἡμᾶς, according to weighty authorities; and so, Lachmann [and Alf., Stanley, *et al.*]. ὑμᾶς is internally the more probable, [and is found in A. C. K. Cod. Sin.[1]].

[6] Ver. 17.—The Rec. has transposed the proper order of ὁ κυρίος and θέος on very feeble authority. [A. B. C. D. F. Cod. Sin. Syr. read as above].

[7] Ver. 18.—The Rec. has τις ἐκλήθη, in conformity with the previous one. But the best authorities have the perfect: κέκληται τις, and this is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Alf., and Stanley].

[8] Ver. 22.—The Rec. has και after ὁμοίως with K. L. It is omitted in A. B. Cod. Sin. Syr., and by Alf., Stanley].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VERS. 12–14. **But to the rest.**—By these he evidently means those living in mixed marriage, having been converted in wedlock. From this it is plain, that in what he has been saying he has had to do solely with parties who were both Christian. But now he comes to consider a relation to which the command of our Lord does not absolutely apply. That was a command for disciples alone; but here those were involved

who did not acknowledge subjection to him; and the continuance of the connection depended largely on their own free will. In this case now, the Spirit of the Lord, dwelling in the Apostle, and developing more fully and completely the injunctions given by him on earth, was called to make known what was right, in accordance with the mind of Christ. And it is to this he points when he premises—**say I, not the Lord.**—[The distinction here made, is simply one of fact as to the *form*—not one of *authority*]. His injunction is still an expression of the Lord's will—**if any brother has an unbelieving wife, let him not put her away.**—Yet this is conditioned on the pleasure of the wife—**if she be pleased to dwell with him.**—And this presupposes, on the one hand, that the husband, by reason of his higher love, and of his conviction of the sanctity of marriage, had an inclination to abide with his wife; and, on the other hand, that the wife had some respect for Christianity, and presented no obstacle to the practice of it. ["We see from this how despised the Christians were at that time by the heathen, since even wives would leave their husbands because they had been converted to Christianity." Billroth. And the threat of this is one great obstacle to the conversion of men in heathendom at this day].—Οἰκεῖν is used in the classics the same as here, and in this connection means, *to house with*. [Here Chrys. says: "He that putteth away his wife *for fornication* is not condemned, because he that is one body with her that is a harlot, is polluted; and the marriage bond is broken by fornication, but not by unbelief. Therefore it is lawful to put away a wife for the former sin, but not for the latter. But is not he who is joined with an idolatress one body? Yes, but not polluted by her. The holiness of the faithful husband prevails over the unholiness of the unbelieving wife. They are joined together in that respect in which she is not unholy. But not so in the case of an adulteress." Words.].—**And whatever woman have an unbelieving husband, and this one be pleased to dwell with her.**—In καὶ οὗτος there is a change of construction, which appears also often among the Greeks. It is the introduction of a demonstrative in an accessory clause. Otherwise it would be καὶ αὕτος, which the Rec. has. [On this *oratio variata* see Winer § LXIII. 2, 1; also on the use of ὅστις for εἴ τις see Jelf, § 816, 3, 7].—**Let her not repudiate her husband.**—The use of ἀφιέναι in reference to the wife is somewhat remarkable. It means [properly, *to put away*, and is the same word as that used in the case of the man; but] here, *to leave, to give up;* [and so the E. V. renders it, making a distinction in the rendering by reason of the diversity of the subject. Alford well says, "this is unfortunate;" and there seems no adequate reason for it, as may be seen from what follows. Robinson translates alike in both cases]. Elsewhere, Mark x. 11, ἀπολύειν is predicated as well of the wife as of the husband. Bengel, whom Meyer follows, says, "the nobler part dismisses," and this, in this instance, is the Christian party. According to Greek, as well as Roman law, the wife also had the liberty of obtaining divorce; among the Jews, too, the law in this respect was somewhat modified by Rabbinical definitions. Light. II. 191. [Hence, there is good ground for affirming that it is not simple abandonment, but formal divorce that the Apostle here prohibits. So Hodge].

The above injunction he next proceeds to establish; and opposes the tendency to desertion arising from the dread of contamination through intimate communion with an unbeliever, by pointing to the fact, that in this case [the grace of Christianity triumphs over the disparity, and] the unbelieving party, [so far from desecrating the other, is himself sanctified by connection with the believing one.]—**For the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the believing wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother.**—The verb ἡγίασται, *is sanctified*, is not to be construed subjectively; since the supposition is, that the sanctifying principle—even faith, is here wanting. Neither does it point to a future conversion anticipated, (*candidatus fidei*); still less does it imply the sanctification of the marriage intercourse through the prayer of the believing party; but it denotes the Christian theocratic consecration. The unchristian partner standing, as he does, in vital union with a believer (one flesh), participates in his or her consecration, and is not to be regarded as profane, but as connected by this link to the Church of God, and to God's people. The phrases, ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ—ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ, *in the wife—in the brother*, denote that the sanctification here comes through the Christian partner, whose character, as holy, passes over and is imputed to the unchristian partner. Hence, it followed that the marriage was still to be regarded as one acceptable to God, and that, therefore, the Christian party was to continue therein, so far as it was possible for him or her to do so. True enough it was, indeed, that the unbelieving party, by his consent to remain in such relation to the Christian community, afforded some ground for hope that he would, in the end, prove altogether acceptable to the Church, under whose spiritual influence he was thus brought; but this fact is not here distinctly expressed.

To prove this relative sanctification of the unbelieving party, through connection with the believing one, he introduces the following apagogic statement.—**Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.**—Ἐπεὶ ἄρα; *since then, i. e.*, in case this sanctification did not exist (comp. chap. v. 10). His meaning is this: if that vital communion which existed between the married parties, of which one was a believer and another not, imparted to the latter no sacredness, then it would follow that the like vital union between Christian parents and their children, would not impart to the latter any sacredness,—that the children of Christians themselves must be regarded as impure and profane, like the heathen. But to such an inference he opposes the views already held among them, that these children were holy,—that they, by virtue of their vital connection with Christian parents, were to be regarded as properly belonging to God's holy people. And if such a view were tenable, he argues a like result in favor of the unbelieving married parties; that they were similarly sanctified by a collateral union

[Hodge, however, with more correctness, states the argument differently. He says: "The most natural, and hence the most generally adopted view, is this: 'The children of these mixed marriages are universally acknowledged as holy; that is, as belonging to the Church. If this be correct, as no one disputes, the marriages themselves must be consistent with the laws of God. The unbelieving must be sanctified by the believing partner, otherwise your children would be unclean, *i. e.*, born out of the pale of the Church.'—The principle in question was not a new one, to be then first determined by Christian usage. It was, at least, as old as the Jewish economy, and familiar wherever Jewish laws and the facts of Jewish history were known. Paul circumcised Timothy, whose father was a Greek, while his mother was a Jewess, because he knew that his countrymen regarded circumcision in such cases as obligatory." Acts xvi. 1–3. Barnes most unaccountably interprets "unclean" to mean "illegitimate." Then "holy," of course, must mean legitimate, contrary to all usage.]—This whole argument militates against, rather than favors the existence of the practice of Infant Baptism at that period. (Comp. Meyer and de Wette, Stud. and Krit., 1830, p. 669ff.; [also Neander, Stanley and Alford *in loco*). Had such a practice existed, it would be fair to presume, that the Apostle would have alluded to it specifically, in confirmation of his position. Here, most of all, would have been the place to have mentioned it by name, as furnishing ecclesiastical authority for the view he had taken. The fact that he did not mention it, therefore, affords some reason for concluding that the rite did not exist.]—It is another question, however, whether this passage does not furnish an important *ground* on which to establish the rite of Infant Baptism. According to Jewish notions, the baptism of a female proselyte sufficed for that of her child, which was afterwards born of her, so that this did not then need to be baptized. But so far as baptism is a means of grace, we may infer from this statement of the Apostle, that there was a claim for it on the part of the child, who had been already consecrated to God by virtue of his having been born of Christian parents. That relation to the kingdom of God which is founded on parentage, is sealed through baptism; and the child is set apart in a solemn manner as a partaker of the fulness of grace imparted to the Church. [On the whole subject see JOHN M. MASON'S *Works*, Vol. IV., pp. 373–382, who takes this in direct evidence of Infant Baptism; and also Hodge's note, who says: "Some modern German writers find in this passage a proof that Infant Baptism was unknown in the Apostolic Church. They say that Paul does not attribute the holiness of children to their parentage; if they were baptized—because their consecration would then be due to that rite, and not to their descent. This is strange reasoning. The truth is, they were baptized, not to make them holy, but because they were holy. The Jewish child was circumcised because he was a Jew, and not to make him one. So Christian children are not made holy by baptism, but they are baptized because they are holy." See also HOOKER, *Ec. Pol. Ch. LX.*]. Ὑμῶν refers to the Christian parents generally, who in mixed marriages were not excluded. Νῦν δὲ, *but now*, logical, as in chap. v. 11. On ἅγια compare Bengel and Osiander.

VERS. 15, 16. He here considers the possible alternative.—**But if the unbelieving depart**—How then?—**let him depart.**—'That is his affair; he must be allowed to decide it for himself.' And in such a case "let the brother or sister be patient, nor let him think that anything ought to be changed which cannot be changed." BENGEL. That which follows, annexed by no connecting particle, confirms this advice.—**The brother or the sister is not bound in such cases.**—He here assigns the reasons why a divorce should be allowed on the part of the Christian; and the words cannot simply mean: 'he is not bound to crowd himself upon the other,' [to insist upon the connection, as in the case where both are Christians (as Photius, Alford, Billroth)]; but they carry the further implication: 'is not unconditionally bound to the marriage relationship like a slave,'—'is free.' Δέδεται, as in ver. 39 (comp. Osiander). The words ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις are either Masc. *by such* (not, *to* such) as separate themselves; or which is better, Neut.; *under such circumstances* (comp. Phil. iv. 11; Rom. viii. 37; Jno. iv. 37). "The Apostle only means, that in matters of religious conviction, one person cannot be the slave of another, [that a married Christian person cannot be forced to remain with a heathen consort, if the latter will not allow the exercise of his own religious views. Under such circumstances separation should be allowed; but concerning liberty to marry again, nothing is here said." NEANDER.]*—**But in peace God hath called us.**—This is directly connected with the foregoing, and confirms still further the propriety of the injunction: "let him depart."—The determination to continue in marriage against the will of the other party, would lead to hatred and strife; and this would be contrary to the peaceful character of the Christian calling.—Ἐν εἰρήνῃ, *in peace, i. e.*, either: 'to this end, that we may live in peace;' in which case it would be equivalent to: *unto peace* [according to our English version] denoting the *object* of the call;† or:

[* Here it will be seen that Neander does not find in the expression, "is not bound," all that Kling does, *i. e.*, an absolute release from marital obligation. And in this he coincides with Hammond, Whitby, Bloomfield and others, who suppose that nothing more than a separation from each other's society is here allowed. Yet the use of the word δέδεται, *is bound*, in ver. 39, where it evidently implies the marriage bond, seems to sustain Kling's view. The desertion of the unbelieving party leaves the believing free. If any restriction upon this freedom was intended, we find it only in the context (see vv. 10, 11, and 30). "This passage," says Hodge, "is of great importance, because it is the foundation of the Protestant doctrine, that *wilful desertion is a legitimate ground of divorce.*" President Wolsey, however, in his Article on *Divorce*, in the *New Englander*, April, 1867, pp. 228–233, argues with great plausibility and force against the legitimacy of the inference. The whole controversy turns upon the meaning given to the words οὐ δεδούλωται, "is not bound." Does this phrase imply absolute release from the marriage obligation, and permission to marry again? or does it simply give permission to the deserted party to live apart without feeling constrained to enforce cohabitation? Persons interpret variously, according to their predilections. In fault of any deciding element in the text, it will perhaps be best to abide by the injunctions of Christ, in Matth. v. 31, 32; xix. 3–9.]

† [Winer says that ἐν is used for εἰς after verbs of motion, for the purpose of briefly expressing at once the motion it-

'since he has proclaimed to us the Gospel of peace, the essential effect of which is peace,'—denoting the *way* and *mode* of the calling (comp. Eph. iv. 1; 1 Thes. iv. 7; Luke xi. 11). Fundamentally, both constructions amount to the same thing; and imply that any separation would contravene the spirit of the Divine calling, inasmuch as it would increase existing estrangement and cause new outbreaks. ["Hence it is that the Rabbins, and Maimonides famous among the rest, in a book of his, set forth by Buxtorfius, tells us that 'divorce was permitted by Moses to preserve peace in marriage, and quiet in the family.' MILTON.] This view corresponds to the whole train of thought, and agrees well with what follows. On the other hand, that view which regards the Apostle as here putting a limitation on the injunction: 'let him depart,' introduced adversatively by the particle, δέ, as if he meant to say: 'a separation, however, ought, if possible, to be avoided,' is at variance with his line of argument [see below].

The Apostle yet further confirms his advice by obviating a doubt which contained a strong motive for resisting separation in the case supposed, *viz.:* whether the salvation of the unbelieving party, which might be secured by a continuance of the connection, would not hereby be cut off. This he meets by pointing to the utter uncertainty of the results of any efforts directed to this end.—**For what knowest thou, O! woman, whether thou shalt save thy husband.**—The meaning is, thou canst have no assurance that thou wilt be the means of saving him. [On the force of the εἰ, see JELF, Vol. II., § 877 B.].—Σώζειν, *to save*, as in chap. i. 18, is used here in a relative sense, *q. d.*, to be the instrument of saving, as chap. ix. 22; Rom. xi. 14; 1 Tim. iv. 16.—["This verse is generally understood as stating a ground for remaining united, as ver. 13, in hope that conversion of the unbelieving party may follow. Thus ver. 15 is regarded as altogether parenthetical. But 1, this interpretation is harsh, as regards the context, for ver. 15 is evidently not parenthetical,—and 2, it is hardly admissible grammatically, for, it makes εἰ=εἰ μή,—'What knowest thou, whether thou shalt not save?' Lyra seems first to have proposed the true rendering, which was afterwards adopted hesitatingly by Estius, and of late decidedly by Meyer, de Wette, and Bisping; *viz.*, that the verse is not a ground for remaining united, in hope, *etc.*, but a ground for consummating a separation, and not marring the Christian's peace for so uncertain a prospect as that of converting the unbelieving party. Τί οἶδας εἰ thus preserves its strict sense: what knowest thou (about the question) whether, *etc.?* and the verse coheres with the words immediately preceding, ἐν εἰρήνῃ κέκληκεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός. Those who take εἰ for εἰ μή, attempt to justify it by referring to 2 Sam. xii. 22; Joel ii. 14; Jonah iii. 9, where the LXX. have for Heb. מִי יוֹדֵעַ, τίς οἶδεν εἰ, to express *hope:* but in every one of these passages the verb stands in the emphatic position, and the LXX. used this very expression to signify uncertainty." ALFORD. These arguments seem conclusive. They are received also by Billr. and Neander, and are virtually advanced by Kling, in the 1st Ed. President Wolsey, in his very carefully digested articles on *Divorce*, in the *New Englander* for Jan., Ap. and July, 1867, which are well worthy of study on this whole subject, says of the attempt to make this a dissuasive against separation: "Logic will not bend to this meaning." Words., Barnes and Hodge, however, do not admit their force. The latter says, "it is contrary to the whole animus of the Apostle. He is evidently laboring throughout these verses to prevent all unnecessary disruptions of social ties." No such special pleading, however, is apparent. If there be a point aimed at, it would seem rather to be to put the believer in the highest spiritual condition preparatory to the coming of Christ, that his obligations previously incurred would admit of. And this liberation from the bondage of a heathen partner, 'who has departed,' is one of the blessings he secures. Yet it must be added, that while the grammatical argument, and some of the logical bearings, support Kling's view, the sentiment involved in the other interpretation is thoroughly Scriptural (1 Pet. iii. 1, 2), and is favored by most interpreters because of its gracious tone. Most of the Homiletical and Practical remarks cited in this section proceed upon it.]

OBS. 1. Our passage, especially ver. 15, forms, as is well known, the Scripture ground for divorce on account of malicious desertion. But the support given is not direct or absolutely reliable. The Apostle is here speaking only of mixed marriages, in which the will of the unbelieving party is the chief thing under consideration. But for purely Christian marriages there is no other ground allowed in Scripture for divorce but adultery or fornication, which is an actual rupture of the marriage tie. The only question therefore is, whether the language of Christ is to be interpreted as giving a law literally and universally obligatory, or only laying down a principle which admits of being applied analogically, so that other circumstances also that are in fact a breaking of the bond, may be taken as furnishing good ground for divorce. In the latter case, malicious desertion would very properly be regarded as one of these circumstances.

OBS. 2. In regard to the phrase, 'is not under bondage' (ver. 15), the question arises, whether, according to the intent of the Apostle, a second marriage is allowed or forbidden. The words themselves express neither the one nor the other, and it is altogether arbitrary to supply the clause: 'but let her remain unmarried,' from ver. 11. Rather we may say with Meyer: "Because Paul does not apply our Lord's prohibition of divorce to mixed marriages, he does not intend also to apply his prohibition of a second marriage in Matth. v. 22 to such cases."

["Although a Christian *may not put away* his wife, being an unbeliever, yet if the wife *desert* her husband, he may contract a second marriage. Hence even Romish divines declare that in this case marriage is not indissoluble. Thus A. Lapide says here: 'Observe that the Apostle in this case not only permits divorce of bed

self, and the result of it, *viz.*, rest. An instance of this breviloquence he finds here. The peace is the abiding condition *in*, which those who have been called *unto* it are to rest. Nor must the use of the perfect here be overlooked.]

(*thori divortium*), but also of matrimony; so that the believing spouse is at liberty to contract a second marriage. Otherwise a brother or sister would be subject to servitude. And it is a great servitude to be held fast in matrimony, bound to an unbeliever; so that even though the latter desert you, you are not able to marry again, but must contain yourself and lead a single life.' And in support of this opinion he refers to St. Augustine, *de Adulterinis Conjugiis*, c. 13 and 19. St. Thomas and Ambrosiast., who says: 'The respect of a spouse is not due to him who contemns the Author of marriage, but a person is at liberty to unite himself to another.'" WORDS., who singularly contradicts this view in his comments on the next verse].

VER. 17. **If not to each one as the Lord hath distributed, each one, as God hath called, so let him walk.**—There are two points here in regard to which commentators differ: 1. The connection with what precedes, formed by εἰ μή; 2. The relation of the parallel clauses, beginning with ὡς: *as*,—whether they express essentially the same idea or different ideas. As it respects the second point, it is clear from what is specified in ver. 18 ff., that Paul is here speaking of that position in life in which each one finds himself when called to be a Christian. The first of these clauses, then, designates this position as a lot appointed to each one by the Lord ["it is a dramatic metaphor, which will bring to mind a celebrated passage in *Hamlet*." BLOOMFIELD]; the second, as a position in which he received his call to salvation. It is to this position that the particles "as" and "so" refer. The two clauses, then, are not tautological. The use of the title 'Lord,' in connection with 'distributeth' (ἐμέρισε) is somewhat remarkable, since Paul generally employs this title of Christ. From this fact we are to explain the change of place between the two words, 'the Lord' and 'God' in the received text; since the former would rather be regarded as the subject of the verb 'call,' although the act of calling is also frequently referred back to God. This difficulty has led some to regard 'gifts' as the implied object of 'distributed,' *i. e.*, the higher and Divinely-conferred qualifications for the state and calling of individuals (comp. ver. 7). Thus Osiander, Bengel, and others. But in ver. 7, the gift, which would then be treated of here, is referred back to God; and in the exposition which follows, so far from there being any hint of this, one would rather suppose that 'Lord' was to be taken as synonymous with 'God.' This might be explained on the score of a wish merely to change the form of expression, and of the fact that Paul was here speaking of the act of Lordship. The explanation of Reiche, who refers the words, "as the Lord hath distributed," to the beneficence of Christ (comp. Meyer, ed. 3), is neither supported by the context nor warranted by the position they occupy before the words, 'as God hath called.'

In respect to the first point, however, *viz:* the connection of this verse with the preceding by εἰ μή, it must be confessed that an explanation altogether satisfactory does not exist. If we supply χωρίζεται from ver. 15, or σώσεις from ver. 16, then it would have read: εἰ δὲ μή, or εἰ ὃὲ καὶ μή, and this would be a decided objection, apart from all other considerations arising from the unsuitableness of the idea obtained, *viz:* 'but if she should not depart,' or: 'if thou dost not save her.'—If, again, we join εἰ μη to what directly precedes, making it mean, *or not*, this would be both ungrammatical (hence the variation ἢ μή), and would only weaken the force of the question.—If, moreover, we should refer the clause εἰ μή—ὁ κύριος to the preceding words, this would be to rend asunder parallel clauses most unjustifiably, and the consequent explanation, *nisi prout quemque Dominus adjuverit*, would be both flat and inconsistent with the meaning of the words themselves. To take εἰ μή as equivalent to ἀλλά, is contrary to usage.—If we render the words by: 'only,' then there is no suitable connection with the foregoing sentence; for to go back, as de Wette does, to 'is not bound' would be a very questionable overleaping of what intervened. But, not to say anything of the fact that it does indeed serve for the confirmation of οὐ δεδούλωται, yet it does not suit, inasmuch as the contents of ver. 17 would then be put in entire contradiction to the above statement (*ov δεδού.*). We should then be obliged to supply some phrase like this: 'in case that condition, *viz:* the departure of the unbelieving party, does not occur.' It still remains for us, with Grotius and Meyer, to attach εἰ μή to ver. 16, in the sense of *except, or unless*, and to supply οἶδατε, *you know*, from 16: 'unless ye (know this, your obligation), let every one walk, etc.' How hard this construction is, every one can perceive; where, instead of going straight on with the words: 'that it is necessary for us so to walk as God hath called each one,' we have the abrupt introduction of the imperative form. Besides, there arises also an incongruity between the contents of ver. 16 and ver. 17. (See what has been observed above). We prefer here to allow a (philological) non-liquet, and accept Bengel's translation, which is most in accordance with the course of thought: 'if this be not so, otherwise (ceteroquin).' We might, perhaps, take εἰ μή in the sense of *if not*, and understand it to imply: 'provided no element comes in to destroy the purpose of the Divine calling' (ver. 15), as in the case mentioned,—the desertion of the unbelieving party. [Is it not, after all, the simplest method to consider this as resuming the implication of the previous question, and making it the basis of the following injunction, *q.d.* 'How knowest thou whether thou wilt convert thy husband? If not, if thou canst not know this fact, then let each one go quietly on his course, as the Lord has marked it out for him in his Providence. If it be to be deserted and left alone, let him accept that destiny, and not fight against it to the aggravation of all difficulties.' In such a view of the words we have no need of inserting a δέ. We would no more need it in Greek than in English. The argument is here on the rapids, and its flow is far from smooth].

[As to the two clauses, they are, as Kling asserts, by no means tautological, but seem to imply more than he states. In the first, Paul confines himself to the allotment of Providence in the case of desertion. But he at once recollects himself, as standing upon a broad principle, ap-

plicable not only to the parties directly in view, and their particular allotments (*ἐμέρισεν*), but also to all conditions and callings in life (*κέκληκε*). And here we see the reason why, in the first instance, he uses the term *ὁ κύριος, the Lord*, evidently referring to Christ. To the deserted one he intimates that it is the dear Saviour after all that rules in the lot, and it is not contrary to his or her salvation. It is a touch of tenderness. But when at once his view expands to all vocations and conditions of humanity, he uses the more seemingly universal epithet, God (*ὁ θεός*). And then it was natural for him to add]—**and so I ordain in all churches.**—He here shows the great breadth of the principle he enjoined, and the emphasis he put upon it. It was nothing framed for the case of the Corinthians alone, but ran through all his teachings. Hence, they were the more bound to abide by it. Each one every where was to continue walking (*περιπατεῖν*) in that course of life, and in that outward state, where Christianity found him. This thought afterwards is more definitely expressed by *μένειν*. "Here we learn the general fact that Christianity does not disturb existing relations, so far as they are not sinful, but only aims to infuse into them a new spirit. Hence, it opposes every thing revolutionary." NEANDER.

VERS. 18, 19. **Has any man been called who has been circumcised?**—In illustrating his general precept, he takes into consideration, first, the religious position of the individual, with its outward token showing whether he was a Jew or not when making a profession of Christianity. In the one case, as little as in the other, does he approve of a change being attempted; because nothing at all depended upon these external signs, but every thing (comp. iii. 7) upon the keeping of God's commandments (comp. Rom. ii. 25 ff.),—upon the faith which works by love (Gal. v. 6). In opposition to the externality of such self-chosen God-service he insists upon the moral character—the obedience that involves faith (comp. 1 Jno. iii. 23) as that which alone has or imparts value for the kingdom of God (comp. Calvin and Osiander). In ver. 18, as also afterwards in ver. 21, some take the clauses to be questions; others as hypothetical statements. The latter is the more emphatic. Yet we might also regard them as direct assertions, as for example: "There is one who has been called, *etc.*, let him not become uncircumcised." The word *ἐπισπᾶσθαι* denotes the drawing of the prepuce again over the glands—its artificial restoration which was effected by a surgical operation. This was often practised by the Jews of a later time, both when they lapsed into paganism, and when, from shame or fear of the heathen, in times of persecution, they wished to hide their nationality, and, also, when they appeared naked as combatants in public sports (comp. 1 Macc. i. 15; JOSEPHUS *Antiq.* xii. 5, 1; and SÜDKERT *Stud. and Crit.*, 1835, p. 657 ff.). Such were called מְשֻׁרְכִים, recutiti. A like measure must have been resorted to by the Corinthian Jewish converts, who wished not to be behind the converts from heathenism in their entire abandonment of the law, and who, therefore, wished to wipe out all trace of Judaism from their persons.—**Was any one called in uncircumcision**—*ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ*, as in Rom. iv. 10 (comp. Acts xv. 1). The desire of the heathen converts to become circumcised we are to regard as a Jewish reaction against all such Hellenism. Both vv. 18 and 19 are asyndetic by way of giving life and emphasis to the style.—**Let him not be circumcised. The circumcision is nothing, and the uncircumcision is nothing, but keeping of the commandments of God.**—[Supply: 'that, indeed, is something, yea, every thing.' "In this, as in the two exactly parallel passages, Gal. v. 6, and vi. 15, the first clause is the same. 'Circumcision availeth nothing, nor uncircumcision;' thus asserting the two sides of the Apostle's principle of indifference to the greatest of the Jewish ceremonies, exemplified in his conduct by the circumcision of Timotheus on the one hand, and by the refusal to circumcise Titus on the other. The peculiar excellence of the maxim is its declaration, that those who maintain the absolute necessity of rejecting forms, are as much opposed to the freedom of the Gospel, as those who maintain the absolute necessity of retaining them. In contradistinction to this positive or negative ceremonialism, he gives, in the several clauses of each of these texts, his description of what he maintains to be really essential. The variation of the three passages thus become valuable, as exhibiting in their several forms the Apostle's view of the essentials of Christianity—'Keeping the commandments of God,' 'Faith working by love,' 'A new creature.' These describe the same threefold aspect of Christianity with regard to man, which, in speaking of God, is described under the names of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. In this passage, where man is viewed chiefly in his relation to the natural order of the world, the point which the Apostle wished to impress upon his hearers was, that in whatever station of life they were, it was still possible to observe the 'commandments of God' (perhaps with an implied reference to the two great commandments, Matth. xxii. 36–39). In the two passages in the Epistle to the Galatians (ver. 6; vi. 15), the more distinct reference to faith in Christ, and to the new creation wrought by His Spirit, is brought out by the more earnest and impassioned character of the argument." STANLEY].

VERS. 20–22. **Each one in the calling in which he is called, in this let him abide.**—Paul here goes back to his general rule, thus finishing up the special application in ver. 18, and introducing another illustration. The demonstrative, 'in *this*,' comes in by way of emphasis. The *κλῆσις*, however, does not denote *vocation, a position in life* determined by the Divine Providence; for it nowhere else occurs with this meaning. (In Dion. H. the word *κλήσεις* is used to denote the distinctions among the citizens at Rome, *i. e.*, *classes*, which, however, does not mean the same thing). Rather we might say, with Bengel, that it denotes "the state in which the Divine calling finds one, which is *instar vocationis:* as a calling." ["As he was called, so let him remain." ROBINSON]. But as applied, usage is against it. In the New Testament *κλῆσις* is uniformly used to denote the call-

ing or invitation unto God's Kingdom. This goes out broadly to all men, of every condition in life, addressing them as they are. It says, 'thou circumcised one, thou uncircumcised, thou slave, thou freeman, believe on the Lord Jesus!' It takes the man, therefore, as he is, in his own peculiar position in society, and in this way designates this position as compatible with Christianity, and capable of being sanctified by it. Hence, no surrender of it is required. On the contrary, the injunction is to abide therein. So we at last reach the above-mentioned sense of the word, but not in such a way as to imply that *κλῆσις* carries in itself this signification of a peculiar vocation. [Of course the injunction here given is supposed to be limited by the obvious consideration that there is nothing in the person's condition which is inconsistent with the Divine vocation. If there be, a change will be necessitated.]—**As a slave art thou called.**—After specifying in ver. 18 the religious distinction, which divided the entire human race at that time in respect to its outward token, and pronouncing it indifferent in relation to the kingdom of God, he comes now to the great distinction that existed in social life,—that between slaves and freemen, and affirms that a position of servitude even is by no means inconsistent with that of a Christian, and, therefore, that the slave, who becomes a believer, need not be troubled about changing his outward state.—**Let it not concern you**—*i. e.*, as though you, in this external bondage, could not, as a Christian, and as a freeman, pray or serve God; and must be curtailed of your Christian rights.—**But if also thou art able to become free, use it rather,**—*ἀλλα᾽ εἰ καὶ δύνασαι ἐλεύθερος γενέσθαι, μᾶλλον χρῆσαι.* The meaning here is much disputed. Some supplement *χρῆσαι* with *τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ*, from *ἐλεύθερος*, take *ἀλλά* as equivalent to: 'but' (aber), and attach *καὶ*, not to the whole sentence, but to *ἐλεύθερος*, and translate: 'but if thou mayest in any way also become free, use this freedom rather.' But against this it is justly objected: 1. that *καὶ* ought in that case to stand before *ἐλεύθερος*, and 2. that what immediately precedes and what follows (ver. 22), as well as the scope of the whole clause, does not indicate that he is exhorting the slave to seek a change in condition. Rather the whole drift of the argument is the other way—to make men content with their lot, and so favors the other explanation, that which regards *ἀλλά* as equivalent to: *sondern, on the contrary*, and *εἰ καί* to mean: *even though*, and makes the being called as a slave, the object of *χρῆσαι*; and then translates: 'but even though thou mayest be made free, use your servitude rather, [as a means of discipline, and an opportunity for glorifying God by showing fidelity therein]. It may be said, indeed, that this conflicts with the general spirit of the Apostle. But in opposition to this Meyer justly observes: that the advice to improve opportunities for becoming free, which was rendered unimportant and trivial by the anticipation of the speedy advent of Christ, was, on the other hand, by no means incompatible with the exalted idea of Paul, that all men were one in Christ (Gal. iii. 28), and that in Christ the slave was free, and the freeman was a slave (ver. 22). Compare also Bengel (who adds explanatorily: for he, who might become free, has a kind master, whom it were better to serve than to seek other avocations, 1 Tim. vi. 2, comp. ver. 22: and sets aside the apparent contradiction between this and ver. 23, by saying: it is not said then, '*be not*,' but '*become not* the servants of men'), and Osiander, who, in the end, observes, that the severity of the advice becomes moderated by the consideration of the very tolerable condition of slaves in the civilized States of Greece, where, in many respects, they enjoyed the protection of law, and the masters did not have the power of life and death over them. "The question assumes a different aspect altogether in the slave States of North America; for there the slaves are prevented from becoming Christians, and in this way good care is taken that the fundamental principles respecting the position of Christian slaves cannot come into application. And this is one of the most frightful violations of Christian principle." BURGER. [Thank God! we can put this into the past tense now].*

For the slave who was called in the Lord is a freeman of the Lord, in like manner he who was called as a freeman is a slave of Christ.—The advice just given, is here sustained by a general truth, and the person who was called as a slave is comforted in

*[Stanley's comment is too important not to be given entire. "The question here is, whether to understand *ἐλευθερία* or *δουλεία* after *χρῆσαι*: whether the sense is, 'Take advantage of the offer of freedom;' or 'Remain in slavery, though the offer is made.' It is one of the most evenly balanced questions in the interpretation of the New Testament. 1. *χρῆσαι* may either be 'choose,' or 'make use of,' although it leans rather to the former, and thus favors the first interpretation. 2. *εἰ καί* may either be, 'If, besides, thou hast the offer; or 'Even if thou hast the offer,' although it leans rather to the latter, and thus favors the second interpretation. The sense of this particular verse favors the first: for, unless the Apostle meant to make an exception to the rule which he was laying down, why should he introduce this clause at all? The sense of the general context is in favor of the second; for why should the Apostle needlessly point out an exception to the principle of acquiescence in existing conditions of life, which he is so strongly recommending? The language and practice of the Apostle himself, as described in the Acts, favor the first interpretation; *e. g.*, his answer at Philippi, 'they have beaten us without a trial, and imprisoned us, being Roman citizens; . . . . nay, let them come themselves and take us out,' (Acts xvi 37); and to the tribune at Jerusalem, 'but I was free born' (Acts xxii. 28). The general feeling of the Church, as implied in the Epistles and in this passage, favors the second interpretation; it would hardly have seemed worth while to grasp at freedom in the presence of the approaching dissolution of all things; and the apparent preference thus given to slavery may be explained on the same grounds (see vv. 29, 30) as the apparent preference given to celibacy. The commentators before the Reformation have chiefly been in favor of the second; since, in favor of the first; but Chrysostom observes that, in his time, there were some who adopted the view favorable to liberty; as, there have been some Protestant divines (*e. g.*, Luther) who have adopted the view favorable to slavery. On the whole, the probability seems slightly to incline to the second; and the whole passage is then expressive of comfort to the slave under his hard lot, with which the Apostle sympathizes, and which he tenderly alleviates (as in *Philem.* 16, 17), though not wishing him to leave it. And if, as is possible, the prospect of liberty, to which the Apostle alludes, arose from the fact of the master being a Christian, this sense of the passage would be still further illustrated and confirmed by 1 Tim. vi. 2: 'Let not [the slaves] that have believing masters despise them, because they are brethren, but rather serve them' (*ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον δουλευέτωσαν*)." Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Hammond, Hodge, Barnes, and most English commentators, declare decidedly for the first view; but the best modern German Exegetes, de Wette, Meyer and others, follow the early Greek Fathers in adopting the second].

respect to his condition. The Apostle shows how the converted slave must estimate his relation to Christ, *viz.*, as swallowing up all the evils of his earthly lot, and conferring on him a blessed emancipation; and how the freeman has to regard his relation to Christ, *viz.*, as one that puts him under obligations to obey. Mark the connection between the phrases 'in the Lord' and 'of the Lord.'—By 'called in the Lord,' he signifies either, that which the calling involves, *i. e.*, to be in Christ; or, what is simpler, the Being in whom the call is grounded. Or it may even denote the sphere in which the calling is to be fulfilled—the element in which the person called is to live. Hence it may be equivalent to: has become a Christian.—In the expression: 'the Lord's freeman,' the Lord will, of course, not be understood as the person who had liberated the individual in question from His own service; since it was in Satan's service that he was previously bound, but as the one to whom he belonged in consequence of his liberation from the yoke of the other, and for which he was under deep obligations to his deliverer. Yet he belongs to Christ, not as a slave, but as a freeman, since in the sphere of Christ there is liberty (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 17; Jno. viii. 32, 36); there all slavery is done away, and the persons so liberated become His possession.—Of course the freedom here spoken of is moral and religious freedom—deliverance from the bonds of guilt, and from the power of sin; just as in the antithesis, the servitude meant is a state of moral and religious obligation to Christ—of absolute inward dependence on His grace and will. The points here contrasted belong together, as complements of each other (comp. Rom. vi. 16 ff.). "Hence the distinction between master and slave is here virtually obliterated. To be the Lord's freeman, and to be the Lord's slave, are the same thing. The Lord's freeman is one whom the Lord has redeemed from Satan, and made His own; and the Lord's slave is also one whom Christ has purchased for Himself. So that master and slave stand on the same level before Christ. Comp. Eph. vi. 9." HODGE.]

VERS. 23, 24. **Ye were bought with a price.**—The thought of belonging to Christ leads to the ground of this relation, *viz.*, the purchase of the believer by Him (comp. vi. 20).—From this the exhortation follows, not to be faithless to the obligation thus imposed, by coming under servitude to men.—**become not the servants of men.**—As the transition to the plural shows, he is here addressing the Corinthians at large. What he dissuades them from, is not simply men-pleasing in general, and compliance with their immoral demands; nor yet undue attachment to human guides; but rather such a subserviency to popular opinion as would cause them to seek a change in their external social position (so Fritzsche and Meyer). Paul is here showing the Christian slaves a trace of freedom, even under their outward yoke. The slaves who are obedient to their masters for the Lord's sake (1 Pet. ii. 13), belong in truth to no man. Hence, no Christian, dearly purchased and called from sin, death and the devil, to true liberty, should make himself so dependent on man, as to imagine that he was not really free, even though he had a master over him (Besser).—Less in accordance with the immediate connection Osiander says: "No one should abrogate his true freedom, or his true subjection, by sacrificing his faith to unbelieving masters or companions." To suppose a reference here to *slaves*, implying that they should not serve men merely (Eph. vi. 6); or to freemen, that they should not dispose of their liberty;* or, which would be better, that they should not become morally subject to men, is unwarranted.—The whole digression from ver. 17 [entered upon by way of illustration], he concludes with an exhortation essentially the same as in ver. 20.—**Wherein each one was called, brethren, in that let him remain with God.**—Here also the emphasis is on the words "in that" (*ἐν τούτῳ*); and its antecedent denotes that relation in life which a person occupied when called. The adjunct 'with God' (*παρὰ θεῷ*) is somewhat peculiar. It may mean: directing his mind towards God as in His presence (=*ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*); or: as in God's sight, *tanquam in spectante Deo*, (Grotius); (comp. Ps. xxiii. 2; Eph. vi. 6), or: in communion with God. The injunction would then be: 'let every one continue in his original condition and relations; and yet so conduct his affairs as not to disturb his fellowship with God in them.' The last interpretation is undoubtedly to be preferred as introducing a new thought more definitely, and such a one too as refers that which is hinted at in ver. 23, to its proper connection with the absolute principle of Christian life. ["To live near to God is, therefore, the Apostle's prescription both for peace and holiness." HODGE.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Christianity as the absolute religion* is distinguished by the fact, that it takes up into its own sphere every legitimate occupation or function in life; and either ennobles it by its sanctifying power, or allows it as something indifferent, so far as its spiritual work is concerned. The contrasts in religion between Jews and Heathen, externally symbolized by circumcision and uncircumcision, vanish in the Christian sphere; there the only thing which is held valid and imparts value, is the entering of man, with his entire personality, into holy covenant with God. This takes place by faith—faith which works by love; so that the uncircumcised, who is thus found in faith, is like to the circumcised, who in like manner believes. Hence, neither the one nor the other has any reason for passing out from his own state into that of the other; as though circumcision, the token of bondage to the law, were unworthy of a Christian who has been freed from the law; or as though uncircumcision, the sign of a position outside the covenant and promise, were a hinderance to a participation in the same.—The contrasts also of civil life, such as those which exist between the slave and the free, likewise vanish, so far as it respects the inward life. The slave, as be-

*["The practice of selling one's self was frequent in great slave markets, such as must have been at Corinth." STANLEY. But this plainly could not be the thing referred to here. Though Hammond, A. Clarke and others so construe the passage.]

longing to Christ, is a freeman, bound only inwardly to Christ, whom he serves in everything which he has either to do or suffer in his position; since he does and suffers everything for His sake, or because it is the will of his Lord that he should do and suffer that which his position involves, and thus should honor Him, and provo that communion with Christ makes a servant faithful and zealous. On the other hand, the freeman, as a Christian, is bound to Christ; his acts proceed not from caprice, but in constant subjection to Christ's will. As a person who is outwardly dependent on another, is a freeman when in communion with Christ, since in his devotion to Christ, all dependence upon other men is done away; so is the person who is outwardly independent of another, made a servant by his connection with Christ, since in his entire dependence on Christ, all arbitrariness, arising from his outward independence, is removed. Thus are both essentially alike; and the slave has no reason to strive after a change of his external position, as if his dignity as a free Christian man were conditioned upon it.

It is altogether another thing, however, when within the limits of Christendom a mighty irrepressible reaction arises against slaveholding, on the part of such as wish to be Christians, and to be counted a part of Christendom. For men who are destined one day to have part in Christ, the Son of Man, the Saviour of all (even though they have not as yet any actual part in Him), are even, on this account, bound to have their personality respected, and are not to be treated always as chattels. It is inconsistent, therefore, with the spirit of Christianity, for such as pass for Christians, to presume on perpetuating bondage; and Christendom ought not to rest until it has wiped out this stain. For such has been the tendency of the Gospel from the beginning. Ever since the first centuries, in proportion as Christianity has gained the ascendency, has it operated more and more to put an end to slavery.

2. *Christian Freedom.*—There is something great in the *freedom* of a Christian, into which he has been lifted by faith—a freedom whercin he is freed from all things, and is independent of all, and yet, through love, is the servant of all. (See Luther's remarkable treatise, which has this title). In that faith, which apprehends the eternal word of God, and beholds the unseen and future world disclosed therein, he acquires the pilgrim-sense, which looks on the fashion of this world as passing away, and keeps from all entanglement in its business, in its connections and possessions, in its use and enjoyment; nor allows himself to be captivated by it. Yet, on the other hand, so long as he is outwardly occupied with it, he overlooks or neglects nothing; but rather bestows upon it all requisite duty, care, and oversight; attending to it, while he stands inwardly about it. His chief occupation, *viz:* his care for the kingdom of God and for a participation in it, he in no way suffers to be disturbed; and, for the sake of the highest good, he is always ready to sacrifice everything else, however dear; indeed, in all his having, and holding, and using, he is intent only upon how he can serve the Lord, further His ends, prove himself to be His follower, and do every thing in His name and to his honor (x. 31. Col. iii. 17).—So also in marriage he aims at the same thing, by his tender solicitude for his wife, by pious domestic discipline, by acquisition of a livelihood, by skill and fidelity in the use and enjoyment of temporal goods, by moderation, beneficence, *etc.* The same holds good, also, of joy and sorrow, and of the various experiences arising from the vicissitudes of life. In this also does the Christian maintain his inward freedom. Not that he is devoid of feeling—not that he affects a stoical apathy; rather, in the midst of deep emotions, his aim is to preserve a mastery over self, and keep composed in God; so that joy ever resolves itself into filial gratitude; and pain, into filial resignation; he is enthralled by no affections, he is carried away by no passionate desires.

[3. *Importance of unity of religious faith in married life.*—According to its true ideal, marriage is the union of a man and woman in their entire personalities, and for their entire earthly existence. Being mutual complements of each other, they combine to form a larger and complex whole; "for they are no more twain but one flesh." But in order to the perfection and harmony of this union, and for the fulfilment of ends for which it was instituted, it is necessary that there be a prevailing fellowship in thought and feeling, in ends and aims, in interests and pursuits, not only in respect to their natural, but also in respect to their spiritual life. Thus only can their influence on each other be kindly, and they prove mutual helpers in joy and sorrow, in cares and labors; thus only can they properly contribute to the happy development of each other's character, and suitably coöperate for the training of their children and management of their household; thus only can that good be realized, in all its fulness, which was contemplated when it was ordained that 'man should not live alone.'

It follows, therefore, that precisely to the extent that the fellowship above spoken of fails, there will be a lack of sympathy and coöperation, and occasion furnished for alienation, strife and separation. The perfect oneness of the flesh is in danger of being interrupted and broken, when there is not also oneness of spirit. And to such evil and bitter consequences do those Christians expose themselves who become voluntarily allied in marriage to the children of this world. Supposing their faith sincere, the bond which unites them to their partners can only be the lower one of the natural life. In all their deeper experiences, in all their more important hopes and aims, there is essential and irreconcilable antagonism. "For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" Harmony, in such cases, can be preserved only by "agreement to disagree," or by an inconsistent and irksome compliance of each with the wishes of the other in the greater part of those pursuits and pleasures which involve their common action. And when there is not in the worldling a conviction of the superior worth of

religion, and a considerate affection, which tolerates what it cannot share in, the effect upon the religious life of the other can only be disastrous. Instead of that kindly sympathy and furtherance so needful to the cultivation of piety, there is perpetual obstruction interposed in the way of every higher duty. Household religion becomes impossible. And so also the religious instruction and training which the Christian parent would exercise upon the children, is neutralized by the irreligious example of the other.

For such evil results there can be no responsibility incurred when conversion has taken place after marriage. But those who have voluntarily hazarded them under earthly inducements must bear the burden of the blame and take the consequences, as the penalty for consenting to be unequally yoked, contrary to the very nature of the marriage rite. For the Christian the condition of a blessed marriage is, "in the Lord." This is at once highest reason and Divine precept].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[Ver. 12–24. This section shows I. *the method in which Christianity entered into, and revolutionized human society.* 1. It assailed no existing social institutions from without; marriages, callings, conditions were to remain as they were. 2. It wrought from within, sanctifying and ennobling the individual character. 3. It employed the existing bonds of society, as conductors through which to diffuse its saving power—sanctifying wives through husbands, and husbands through wives; children through parents, and parents through children, and even servants through masters, and masters through servants. 4. It aimed at the preservation of peace, as far as possible, in consistency with being in God. 5. It ignored outward distinctions—counting the external condition as of little moment, in comparison with the inward state. 7. It begot contentment with the outward estate, by imparting a blessing which more than counterbalanced all earthly ill. 8. It reconciled the opposite poles of human condition, freedom and obligation in the love it engendered, making the slave a freeman, and putting the freeman under obligations to serve, and making all alike free, and alike obligated. And 9. It placed all in the presence of God, in whose sight it constrained believers to live; whose honor it urged all to subserve; and from whom it invited all to derive their chief good. II. *The true mode of preaching the Gospel.* It is 1, to bring the individual to believe in, love and serve the Lord; 2, to teach him how to improve the circumstances of his condition to the discipline and improvement of his character; 3, to show him how he is to make the very evils that press upon him a means for illustrating the greater power of the Gospel, and for promoting the glory of God.]

Starke (Hedinger):—1. To the pure all things are pure (Titus i. 15). As it does not injure a pious man to dwell under godless rulers, so also does it not injure a believer to dwell with a heathen wife, [*i. e.*, in case he finds himself living with her when called, and she consent to dwell with him without interfering with his religious obligations]. 2. Where married people profess one Christ and one Gospel, and yet, one party, if not both, cleave to the world, there is then certainly an occasion for exercising patience and charity, ver. 12, 13. And 3. If one of the married parties is a believer, then is the other party sanctified by the communion of the marriage state, and the children are holy in virtue of that gracious covenant which God has instituted with believers and their seed. Gen. xxii. 7. 4. A pious partner may be able to win and convert his irreligious companion, by means of the word, prayer, and Christian conversation. (1 Pet. iii. 14). 5. If one of the married parties becomes faithless, and withdraws from his covenant, and can be recovered by no instrumentality, then is the other party free, and the Church authorities themselves declare him free, ver. 15. 6. It is not enough that married people should hold together in friendship and in earthly communion, but each ought to assist in promoting the salvation of the other. ver. 16. Starke:—Since one condition and calling is in itself the same as another before God, it becomes every one to be content with 'whatsoever state he is in.' ver. 17.—We must forget what we were before we belonged to Jesus, and think only of how we may sanctify our hearts for Him now.—In Christ no regard is paid to external conditions, whether it be for honor or contempt. Outward circumstances pass for nothing before God; they neither hinder nor help in the matter of our eternal salvation. Acts x. 34. God is no respecter of persons. ver. 18, 19. It is a glorious proof of the preëminence of Christianity, that it adapts itself to all nations, communities, ages and conditions in life, and is to them what salt and seasoning is to our food. ver. 20.—Thou poor man! art thou doomed to live in servitude and oppression; be of good comfort! Thou mayest yet please God, and attain to everlasting liberty (Eph. vi. 8). ver. 21.—To be a servant in the eyes of the world, and a freeman in Christ before God, is honor, comfort, and blessedness enough. Gal. iii. 26, 28. Hast thou been made free, abuse not thy freedom for a cover to iniquity (1 Pet. ii. 16); but serve thy Lord, Christ, in righteousness and true holiness (Tit. ii. 14). ver. 22.—Away with all lords and masters, who are opposed to Christ.—Gratefully should we estimate the great benefit of freedom of conscience which we have in the Evangelical Church, and improve it all the more worthily, Phil. i. 27. ver. 23.—Although one vocation in life may be subject to more temptations than another, yet every one nevertheless stands under the providence of God; and if sufficient care be taken, we can remain with God in all. So, then, this remaining with God in every calling should be the first thing sought for and practised. 1 Pet. i. 15, ver. 24.

Berlenb. Bib.:—When married to a heathen, or an infidel, a Christian ought simply and earnestly to consider the providence of God herein, and not cut himself loose arbitrarily. Rather he should regard and improve such a state as a happy opportunity for exercising the spirit of Christ; and to this end he should pray for this spirit, and endeavor to convince and win the unconverted spouse at least by his good conduct alone, if by nothing else.—Thou art not at liberty

to refrain from any possible means for effecting, at least preparatorily or initiatively, the conversion of thy associate. Since we all belong to each other, God uses all conditions and occasions for sanctifying one person through another. God desires, therefore, that we all aim at this point. This is a sacred thing in His sight. Therefore our conditions and circumstances are wisely ordered with reference to this end.—*The children are holy.* By prayer they are taken from Satan and consecrated to God as their rightful Lord. vv. 12-14.—Liberty should be enjoyed with a readiness to suffer if need be; then it is good, and one can accept it. This is better than arbitrarily to consent to be a slave.—God does not begrudge us *peace.* But, at all events, we are not to think of our own trials, but to look to the sanctification of the other.—Suffering comes from sin. If a way, however, is open to a better condition, let a person improve it. Not that we should shrink from necessity and privation; but if God shows a way of escape, let us escape; and then be prepared to suffer again, if God will.—Where God appoints, there I abide in peace. But peace is often lost, simply because people are not prepared for all circumstances. ver. 16.—Each one has his own duties. Hence we are not to look upon others. Be thou only true on thy part. God wills not that any should perish; but, in the apportionment of other matters, we must concede to Him His absolute right. —Each one stands under the providence of God, and as that eye leads, so let each one walk suitably to his calling, and do nothing in and of himself. Let no one undertake anything which he is not certain in his own conscience that God would have him do. Only on such terms can a man be sure of God's blessing.—In spiritual matters we should faithfully follow the promptings of the Spirit of God. But in externals, the Gospel as little requires us to imitate the ways of others, however innocent, as it allows others to enforce their ways upon us. All arbitrariness is hereby cut off; and our conduct exhibits all suitable obedience to God, industry and fidelity, submission and patience,—in short the whole round of Christian duty towards God, our neighbor and ourselves.—On such righteous behaviour in our calling, our well-being for time and eternity depends. Not that we become blessed through such external performances, but our mode of life is so closely connected with the spiritual state of our souls, that the one cannot exist aright without the other. He, who in external matters lives disorderly, falsely and iniquitously, cannot possibly remain sound and honest within. He who, on the contrary, is in heart well ordered, governed and protected by God, can also conduct himself rightly in external things.—Inward perfection consists in following one's gifts.—Outward perfection consists in discharging one's own obligations in such conditions and callings as God has placed us in. ver. 17.—Men often gladly pass by the essential commands of God, and take up some incidental matters as the main objects of their regard (comp. Matth. xxiii. 23); but Paul says: 'nothing is as you apprehend it.'—But to perform the will of God—to be obedient to His light, and Spirit, and word—this is of consequence; and the new creature in Jesus Christ is every thing (Gal. vi. 15). ver. 11.—Most men make themselves servants to each other; but O! let each man recognize the greatness of his own soul, and what it has cost. It has cost the blood and life of God, which is more than all the world,—yea, hundred thousand worlds. And yet, oftentimes, this soul, so great, so noble, is sold for a trifling enjoyment—a little piece of foolery.—All those, who in any respect act upon Christ, their true pattern, have passed into the imagination and thoughts of men, and so have become their servants. But so far as thou art a servant of men in any other sense, thou withholdest from God His due. The Lord tolerates no rivals: He also needs no vicegerent, nor anything of the sort. He is alone, and there is no second. His honor He will give to no other. (Is. xii. 8). He is the bridegroom, and to Him only the bride shall listen. He is the Lord, and to Him only shall men hearken. ver. 23.—So great is the value put upon the immortal soul, that God takes upon Himself the labor and the care of it, calls each one especially out of His own free grace, and appoints certain ways and methods, in which each one may and should pass his life on earth beneficially and well. For this also he furnishes all the means requisite, and wisely ordains the result; and everything which He gives into our hands, He sanctifies to our use, if we will but follow Him. But each one must be certain of his calling; and in this calling let him remain and improve his gifts to the general good. Let us adorn the place to which God has appointed us, so that everything may stand and go on well in His house.—Our calling and its use must be sanctified by remaining with God and in His presence. Apart from this, our calling is subject to a curse, although in itself it were never so proper and promising. Each one must learn to look upon his state and calling wisely, and remember how it has become corrupt in and through the fall, and how the best things in life also have become vitiated by a will alienated from God, and how much that is impure cleaves to most of the modes of life, and how all such things continue only under the forbearance of a holy and merciful Creator. Bethink thyself, accordingly, how humbly and worshipfully thou hast to live in thy station before God. The blessing to spring from it must be sought from God and in communion with Him. What comes from God is good, and can also transpire in the name of God.—Faith is quiet communing with God; and while it is nothing pusillanimous, neither is it at the same time audacious. It is God in us.—Were we always calm in that position where we happened to be, and only sought to fulfil these, the ordinary duties of a true Christian satisfactorily, this would be the best thing for us, and the most acceptable to God.—There is no station in which one cannot attain to blessedness—in which he may not live in God and abide in Him; and this we can do through love—an affection which we may cherish in all circumstances. 1 Jno. iv. 16. Everything then turns on this, that each in his own station abide with God and keep near to Him. ver. 24.

Rieger:—Vers. 20, 21. If God has not allowed thine external circumstances to hinder His

bringing to thee His heavenly calling, and to advance thee thereby to the glorious possession of our Lord Jesus Christ, suffer thou not such circumstances to hinder thee from walking worthily in the Gospel, but regard thy station in life as a most favorable opportunity for serving the will of God in thy day and generation. Do not defer the inward duty, *viz.*, obedience to the heavenly calling, because of some external circumstance. Think not to effect this or that change first, but in whatever circumstances God summons thee, and deems thee worthy of His calling, in those be assured that He will bring thee successfully through. Everything turns on the amount of light a person has from the Lord, to enable him to fulfil his vocation conscientiously, and to make it tolerable also for himself. God does not adviso us to change our external condition, but to change our hearts. But if any mode of life can be spent with God, and in the light of His presence, let a person therein abide with God.

[Barnes:—Ver. 20, 24. Change in a man's calling should not be made from a slight cause. A Christian should not make it unless his former calling were wrong, or unless he can by it extend his own usefulness. But when that can be done he *should* do it, and do it without delay. If the course is wrong, it should be forthwith abandoned. No consideration can make it right to continue it for a day or an hour; no matter what may be the sacrifice of property, it should be done. If a man is engaged in the slave trade, or in smuggling, or in piracy, or highway robbery, or in the manufacture and sale of poison, it should be at once and forever abandoned. And in like manner if a young man who is converted can increase his usefulness by changing his plan of life, it should be done as soon as practicable.]

C.—Apostolic counsel in reference to remaining single; a. for the unmarried generally, b. for maidens and their fathers, c. for widows.

Chapter VII. 25–40.

25 Now concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord: yet I give my judgment,
26 as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful. I suppose therefore that
this is good for the present distress, *I say*, that *it is* good for a man [person, ἀνθρώπῳ,]
27 so to be. Art thou bound unto a wife? seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from
28 a wife? seek not a wife. But and if thou marry, [But if also thou mayest have married][1] thou hast not sinned; and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned. Nevertheless such shall have trouble in the flesh: but I spare you. But this I say, brethren,
29 the time [henceforth] *is* short [narrowed down]: it remaineth,[2] [*omit*, it remaineth,
30 *insert*, in order] that both they that have wives be as though they had none; And
they that weep, as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as though they re-
31 joiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not; And they that use this world,[3] as not abusing [overusing] *it:* for the fashion of this world passeth away.
32 But I would have you without carefulness. He that is unmarried careth for the
33 things that belong to the Lord, and how he may please[4] the Lord: But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, and how he may please[4] *his* wife.
34 There is difference *also* between a wife and a virgin.[5] The unmarried woman careth
for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit: but she that
35 is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please *her* husband. And this I speak for your own profit;[6] not that I may cast a snare upon you, but for that
36 which is comely, and that ye may attend upon the Lord without distraction.[7] But if any man think that he behaveth himself uncomely toward his virgin, if she pass the flower of *her* age, and need so require, let him do what he will, he sinneth not: let
37 them marry. Nevertheless he that standeth steadfast in his[8] heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart that he will
38 keep[9] [in order to keep] his virgin, doeth[10] well. So then he that giveth *her* in
39 marriage[11] doeth well; but[12] he that giveth *her* not in marriage doeth[10] better. The wife is bound by the law[13] [*omit*, the law] as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, [sleep, κοιμηθῇ] she is at liberty to be married to whom she will;
40 only in the Lord. But she is happier [more blessed] if she so abide, after my judgment: and I think also [*om.* also] that I [also] have the Spirit of God.

[1] Ver. 28.—Γαμήσῃς, the Rec has γήμῃς in conformity with what follows; the former is better attested [and preferred by Alf., Stanley]. Others [D. E. F. G.] read λάβῃς γυναῖκα—a gloss [found in D. E. F. G.].

[2] Ver. 29.—The various readings are ἐστίν before, or after τὸ λοιπόν; some repeat ἐστὶν λοιπόν with and without τό. The older authorities have το λοιπὸν ἐστιν (see Exeget. and Crit.).

[3] Ver. 31.—The Rec. τῷ κόσμῳ, a correction. The right text is τὸν κοσμόν (without τουτον, which originated in what follows). [So A. B. D. F. G. followed by all good editions].

[4] Ver. 32, 33.—Ἀρέσει; Lachmann ἀρέσῃ: less probable, because more common. [Yet it is found in A. B. D. E. F. G., and is preferred by Stanley. Alford reads ἀρέσει.]

[5] Ver. 34.—Many readings and punctuations. See Exeget and Crit.

[6] Ver. 35.—Συμφορον. The Rec. συμφέρον. The former is supported by the older authorities [A. B. D.[1]]

[7] Ver. 35.—Εὐπάρεδρον is better supported than the Rec. εὐπρόσεδρον, being found in [A. B. D. E. F. G.].

[8] Ver. 37.—Αὐτοῦ is strongly supported, and is indeed original.

[9] Ver 37.—The τοῦ before τηρεῖν is indeed omitted by good authorities, but is nevertheless strongly supported [A. B. D. E. F. G.], and besides is the more difficult reading [Meyer, de Wette, Alf., have it; Stanley rejects it].

[10] Ver. 37, 38.—Lachmann reads ποιήσει with good, but not sufficiently adequate authorities.

[11] Ver. 38.—Ὁ ἐκγαμίζων. So Tisch., Meyer, Lachmann [Alford] and others [after A. B. D. E.]. The reading γαμίζων τὴν παρθένων ἑαυτοῦ, though indeed sustained by important authorities, is nevertheless perhaps a Gloss.

[12] Ver. 38.—Καὶ ὁ. The Rec. ὁ δέ. The former is the original [found in A. B. D. E. F. G.], the latter was substituted by reason of the contrast implied.

[13] Ver. 39.—The Rec. has νόμῳ taken from Rom. viii. 2 [omitted in A. B. D. F.], and by Alford, Stanley, and other critics.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VERS. 25–28. **But now concerning virgins.**—In what follows Paul speaks indeed of unmarried men also, but it by no means follows from this that the word παρθένος, *virgin*, should be extended to both sexes.* This would not suit with New Testament usage, for in Rev. xiv. 4, it stands only as a predicate, and describes a state; [Hodge, on the contrary.].—Virgins, properly so-called, are the ones to whom his counsel here applies. Yet a reference to other unmarried persons is also involved. Schott (in his studies upon the Epistles to the Corinthians, *Luth. Zeit.* 1861–4) supposes him to denote such single persons of both sexes as had chosen the celibate state to serve the Lord in, whether as Deacons or Deaconesses, or in the free exercise of their gifts; [similarly Bengel, Olsh. But Meyer, *et al.*, limit the designation to the female sex.] The δέ indicates an advance in the discussion, which now returns from its digression to its proper theme, and contemplates the same in a new aspect.—**I have no commandment of the Lord; but I give my judgment.**—Ἐπιταγή, *commandment*, just as in ver. 10. "We see here how important it was, in the view of the Apostle, to distinguish the positive commands of the Lord, from all others. This care of his presupposes with great probability the existence at that time of not merely an oral, but also a written tradition of the discourses of our Lord. Here we have a sure fixed point against the theory of the mythical origin of the Gospels." NEANDER. ["This passage has furnished the two words γνώμη and επιταγη, which the Vulgate translates "consilium" and "præceptum," *advice* and *command*—the origin of the famous distinction of later times, between 'counsels of perfection' and 'precepts.' In this passage the distinction lies only in the fact that one was a command of Christ, and the other his own opinion, although pronounced with Apostolical authority." STANLEY.] Respecting γνώμη consult on chap. i. 10. Here it means, *best judgment, advice, counsel*, (as in ver. 6, συγγνώμη). But this advice he presents as something important and worthy of consideration, by adding—**as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful.**—In this he, on the one hand, brings to view his Apostolic authority, showing that he is worthy of reliance, and that what he advised was something which ought to be accepted as agreeable to the mind of the Lord, even though it may not have been credibly handed down in any express precept of His, according to the saying of Christ, "Whosoever heareth you heareth me." But, on the other hand, he speaks as in 2 Cor. iv. 1, in all humility giving honor to the grace of Christ, who had lifted him out of the depths of misery into this Apostolic office, and had given him the Spirit of truth, and had so revealed to him his own mind, that the advice he gave should merit perfect confidence (comp. ver. 40).—Πιστός, as in 1 Tim. i. 12, 15, Rev. i. 5, not exactly in the sense of *believing* (Olst., Meyer, de Wette), nor yet precisely as *true* (Billr. and Rückert), but, *faithful* [as a steward, and dispenser of the hidden things of God. Winer, sec. iv. 2; and so Stanley. Bloomfield says: "as one worthy of credit," referring to 1 Thess. ii. 4. "Faith makes a true casuist." BENGEL].—In ver. 26 ff., he gives his advice, first, in reference to the unmarried in general, and comes to speak of virgins in particular, not until ver. 36. The judgment is then introduced with a modest νομίζω ["which seldom, if ever, denotes in Scripture an absolute authority or decree, but a matter of opinion or private judgment, Matth. v. 17; x. 34; xx. 10; Luke ii. 44; 1 Tim. vi. 5, *etc.*" BLOOMFIELD].—**I suppose, therefore, this to be good on account of the present distress, that it is good for a person so to be.**—*i. e.*, unmarried. [Perhaps better, οὕτως, *so i. e.*, as he is, married or single. This better suits the context; and the other is too far-fetched]. From the infinitive construction, he passes over into that, with ὅτι, to which he might have been prompted by the subject of the clause, τὸ οὕτως εἶναι, so that we need not assume, with Meyer and others, an anacoluthon here. [Yet it is very like one, and is so regarded by Alford and Stanley]. De Wette renders ὅτι, *because*, and τοῦτο, as referring to the being unmarried; and makes the sense: 'because it is, in general, good for men to be unmarried;' but here, he inserts the words: 'in general,' and his explanation by no means tallies with the clause: 'on account of the *present distress*:'—Κάλλον here designates that which is *fitting*, or *advantageous*, as may be seen in the ground alleged. [Ἀνθρώπῳ—general term, including females, and might be rendered *person*]. By "the present distress,"

* Bloomfield says, Crit. Dig.: "The most eminent modern commentators are agreed that it must refer to both sexes, and thus be equivalent to our *single persons;* a sense not only recognized by the ancient Lexicographers, but occurring also in the Classical writers. So Krause, Lampe, Schleusner."

he means either some then urgent necessity,—according to some, the famine under Claudius, according to others, marital cares and sufferings (?), and, according to others, the oppressions and persecutions of Christians, according to Mœhler, the eradication of the sexual impulse in marriage; or it were better to understand by it some impending catastrophe just on the point of occurring,—it may be the fearful crisis and bitter conflicts just preceding the coming of Christ (*dolores Messiæ*) which was anticipated as near. [So Alford and Stanley (comp. Matth. xxiv. 8, 19, 21). At all events, the reference must be to something extraordinary. This is implied in the epithet 'present.' And it is nothing more than "a Popish perversion," as Bloomfield says, "to change this from a special to a general admonition"]. This ground avails naturally also for the explanatory clause,—**Hast thou been bound to a wife? do not seek a separation. Hast thou been loosed from a wife? seek not a wife.**—In the latter clause, his advice to single persons already introduced by *ἀνθρώπῳ*, in a general way, is more plainly brought out. This appears in the form of a contrast, as repeating the injunction of ver. 11, evidently for the sake of avoiding a misconstruction by opposers, of what had been previously said. [So Meyer and de Wette; but Alford more plausibly questions this, and takes the conjunction to be simply explanatory of his 'so to be']. Here also, as in vv. 18, 21, various grammatical constructions are possible. It is best to regard the introductory clauses as either hypothetical or declarative: "If thou art bound, then," *etc.;* or: "Thou art bound, seek not," *etc.*, the sense is the same. The *γυναικί* stands as in Rom. vii. 2, *ἀνδρί*: Dative of communion.—*Δέλυσαι*, *'hast thou been loosed?'* implies primarily the dissolution of a connection before existing, whether by death, or otherwise. [If this be insisted on, the subsequent injunction of the Apostle must then be interpreted of a second marriage]. But in this connection the simple fact of *being* free *or unmarried*, in general is meant; and the expression is introduced simply for the sake of harmonizing with *δέδεσαι, hast thou been bound?* [so Alford; and Bengel, who says "that the latent participle here has the force of a noun." 'It is also remarked by Grotius and others, that passives in Heb. and Gr. are often used as neuters']. That the injunction: "do not seek a wife," is to be taken merely as *advice*, is plain from what follows.—**but even if thou shouldest have married, thou hast not sinned.**—Not so, however, would it be in the other case. There would be sin in a married person seeking to be loosed. Hence it was only the last clause that was advice. ['From these words it has been rightly inferred that there were among the Corinthians persons, like those spoken of (1 Tim. iv. 3) forbidding marriage, as if it were sinful.' Bloomfield]. *Γαμήσῃς* lit.: *'If thou shouldest have married.'* In like manner *γήμῃ*. The word *γαμεῖν* can be predicated also of the woman, if no accusative is appended. Otherwise the phrase is *γαμεῖσθαί τινι, to be married to some one.*—After quieting all doubts of conscience in the matter, he points to another consideration which was closely connected with the present distress.—**Tribulation in the flesh, however, will such people have.**—If with Calvin and others we here conceive an allusion to domestic troubles, these must be understood as intensified by the 'distress,' since the relations entered into by the married people (their cares for husband, wife and children, and bodily needs) involve peculiar perplexity in times of persecution and of other troubles (comp. Luke xxiii. 28; Matth. xxiv. 19). The words: 'in the flesh,' are to be connected either with 'tribulation,' or with 'shall have;' the sense is the same. *Σάρξ, flesh*, denotes the lower sensuous life, with all its interests; here it refers to the domestic life, with its manifold solicitudes about food, and clothing, and the preservation of things appertaining to it from all injury, *etc.* *Οἱ τοιοῦτοι, such people, i. e.*, such as marry—**But I spare you.**—Paul here expresses his paternal benevolence; *q. d.*, 'in giving you such advice, I would fain obviate all your troubles.' *Φείδομαι* stands here for *φειδοίμην ἄν, I desire to spare you.* Paul is not here ascribing to the unmarried any greater moral excellence than to the married, as Romanists imagine; but is only contrasting the comparative outward ease of the one, with the burdens which will press on the other by reason of approaching troubles. [Another interpretation given by Augustine and the Latin Fathers, and preferred by Estius, Newemacher, and Bloomfield, is: 'I spare you the pain of dilating on those evils'—parallel to 2 Cor. xii. 6]. This seems to be confirmed by the following, *τοῦτο δὲ φημι*: 'but this I do say'].

Vers. 29–31. He now proceeds to confirm the advice above given, and to render his readers more inclined to follow it.—**But this I say, brethren.**—*Τοῦτο, this*, might refer to what precedes, provided only the *ὅτι, because*, were genuine. But now it can serve only to introduce what follows, and that, too, in such a way as to exhibit the importance of this opening—**the time henceforth is shortened, in order that.**—Here the punctuation and reading are contested. The reading best accredited is *ἐστὶν τὸ λοιπόν.* In this case, as in the reading *το λοιπόν ἐστὶν, τὸ λοιπόν* may be connected with what precedes, as well as with what follows. On the contrary, were *ἐστίν* repeated, it could only be joined with the latter; hence, we might suppose that this reading originated in the idea that *τὸ λοιπόν* must be connected with what follows. Then it would mean: 'it remains that,' *etc.* [as in the E. version]. This would be opposed neither by the article, nor by the *ἵνα*. For even in Plato the article is found in such a mode of speaking: *τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἤδη ἡμῖν ἐστι σκέψασθαι* (Passow II. 1, 81). But the *ἵνα* shows that he is treating here about the solution of a moral problem: 'what remains is, that they may be,' *etc.* But if we connect it with the foregoing, then it must be taken as a more exact qualification of the clause, *q. d.*, 'henceforth, for the future.' The decision in regard to this case depends upon which connection yields better sense. [Most commentators decide for the latter view. Among these Meyer, Alford, Bloomfield, Hodge. It certainly yields the best sense.] But what are we to understand by the declaration: *ὁ καιρὸς*

συνεσταλμένος ἐστίν. Some [Rosen., Rückert, Olshausen] explain it: 'the time is full of straits—grievous.' But in those passages from which this signification is attempted to be proved (Macc. iii. 6; x. 3), the word is used only of persons, and then means *humbled, cast down*, which terms cannot be predicated of time. There remains, therefore, only the other interpretation, *contracted, limited, shortened*. ["Συστέλλεσθαι and συστόλη are the regular grammatical words used for the *shortening of a syllable* in prosody"]. In any case, however, ὁ καιρὸς is not to be taken for the earthly life-time of individuals, [as Calvin and Estius]. The context rather points to the period of time from thence onward, until the second advent. But does it here denote the simple period of time in itself, or does it mean favorable time (opportunity)? *i. e.*, the time in which one can yet ensure his salvation, or prepare himself for that great change concurrent with Christ's second coming, which is to wind up the entire present condition of the world—the καιρὸς δεκτός: "the time accepted," (2 Cor. vi. 2; comp. also Gal. vi. 10). In this case the predicate would suit still better, and also the adjunct τὸ λοιπόν: and we should render: 'the time (the opportune period) is compressed, or shortened henceforth.' The final clause—**in order that those having wives**, *etc.*—may be either referred to: 'this I say,' as if by declaring the time short, he arrived at the thing here stated; or, which is better, it may be taken as assigning the reason why the time is shortened, so that it indicated the Divine purpose in this curtailment. [So Hodge, Alford]. And this is confirmed by the subsequent declaration brought in as proof: 'for the fashion of this world passeth away,' ver. 31. In this way a good meaning is obtained. But the other mode of punctuating yields also good sense: 'it remains,' *i. e.*, no other choice is left, but that those having wives, *etc.* This, however, is somewhat harsh, and the other merits the preference. But, perhaps, a still better one is afforded by the connection of τὸ λοιπόν with what follows, maintained by Meyer (3 ed.) in the sense of: *henceforth*, implying that "henceforth the relations should be regarded differently, from what they had been hitherto." Ἵνα is postscribed as in Gal. ii. 10, and elsewhere.—**may be as those not having them, and those weeping as though they wept not, and those rejoicing as though they rejoiced not, and those buying as those that possessed not, and those using the world as not using it.**—These clauses denote an internal loosing of the spirit from all bonds (even the closest), and from all circumstances, and from the possession and use of all earthly goods; in short, they enforce the maintenance of a personal independence of all external worldly relations (Meyer), the refusal to be fettered by these things in our communion with God and Christ, so that the sacrifice of all of them could be readily made when called for (comp. Luke xiv. 20). Accordingly, we are taught that no conjugal love, no sorrows over disasters and losses, no exultation over good fortune, should be allowed to possess the spirit, so as to impair that divine communion. And as Christians must ever be inwardly free from what is transient, in order to maintain that eternal blessing, so it becomes them to hold lightly by the earthly inheritance. They must ever remember that it is no abiding possession, and are not to cleave to it fondly; and finally, in reference to the use of the world, they should use "as using not." The word 'buying' comported well with the circumstances of the Corinthians. Corinth being a great emporium, the people were given to traffic, especially to buying. In regard to καταχρώμενοι, expositors are divided; some take it as equivalent to χρώμενοι, κατά being only intensive; others translate it, *abuse;* but the latter meaning does not sustain the analogy with the foregoing clauses. [Alford renders it: "'using it in full,' implying an extreme and greedy use, which turns a legitimate use into a fault"]. The κατά was, perhaps, suggested by that in κατέχοντες just preceding. Χρῆσθαι, *to use*, takes its object here in the accusative [the only instance of the kind in the New Testament], (comp. *Passow* No. II. 2, p. 2496). The Rec. τῷ κοσμῷ is a change made in accordance with the more common construction. By 'the world,' we are to understand the totality of the visible creation, of all objects, goods, relations, belonging to the present age. It comprises in one, all the objects expressed or implied in the previous clauses. Hence, the following sentence, also, extends to these,—**for the fashion of this world passeth away.**—(παράγει—τὸ σχῆμα.)—By this we are not to understand a mere change of scene (an image drawn from the theatre)—a daily shifting of events belonging to the present; nor yet the transientness of earthly things in general; but the mighty revolution attendant upon the advent of Christ—the entire vanishing or destruction of the form of this world, its outward appearance and mode of existence, of which mention is made in 1 Jno. ii. 17; Rev. xxi. 1. This great change presents itself to him as one close at hand, and, therefore, he speaks of it in the present. (Meyer: 'is on the point of passing away'). "The disposition which Paul here inculcates in view of the expected palingenesis of the world, is one demanded at all times. All earthly things are vanishing and in perpetual flux; we are ever approaching a new order of things. The woes which Paul saw, have often repeated themselves, and will often be repeated, until the final catastrophe breaks in." Neander. Since this sentence does not assign the reason for an exhortation, but is brought in to substantiate that which has been previously set forth as a Divine purpose, we cannot directly annex to it the following verse, putting a comma after τούτου. But we are to regard this (ver. 32) as a new thought introduced—a still further reason assigned for recommending the single state. It is, however, directly joined to what precedes, in so far as Paul's will and wishes aim at having them free from the care which belongs to the things of this world, which is so fast hastening to its end.

Vers. 32–34. **But I would that you were without care.**—By ἀμέριμνοι, he means, freedom from care about the *things of this world*, as set forth in the 33d verse; for the care which he first speaks of,—**he that is unmarried careth for the things of the Lord**—can only

be something which must command approval. It is perfectly right for a person (with undivided heart) to be solicitous for that which belongs to his Lord. And in what way, he explains further by the expression,—**how he may please the Lord.**—To the unmarried, *i. e.*, to him who has the gift of continence, and who remains single, in order to devote himself to the interests of God's kingdom, untrammelled by earthly bonds (comp. Matt. xix. 12), it belongs to occupy himself in the concerns of his Lord, and that with the simple desire of pleasing Him.—While the Apostle here has in his mind, those who, like himself, were in the true sense *ἀγαμοι, unmarried*, in what follows, on the other hand, he exhibits to view the ordinary experience of mankind, [and explains the nature of the care from which he would have them relieved].—**But he that is married careth for the things of this world,** *etc.*—Here he shows that on entering the married life, they have at once a divided heart, become entangled in the occupations of the earthly life, and exhibit a tendency to consider how one party may please the other, how the one (even in these worldly interests), may do right by the other, *etc.*—Yet in this Paul does not intend to set forth the evils which are necessarily involved in the very nature of marriage, but only to state what is usually found to be the case in actual experience. He does not mean to disparage the divine ordinance, as though it was necessarily calculated to promote estrangement from God, (Burger.)—In carrying out of this thought in reference to the wife (ver. 34) Paul continues:—**Divided also is the woman and the virgin.**—Μεμέρισται καὶ ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἡ παρθένος.—We encounter, first, a great diversity of readings and punctuation. The first consists in the following variations:—1. On good authorities Lachmann reads *καὶ μεμέρισται καὶ*,—and after this, although on fewer authorities, *ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἀγαμος*. 2. Tischendorf, with Griesbach and Scholz: *μεμ. καὶ ἡ γυνὴ καί*—supported by authorities, in part equally weighty, and in part more preponderant. 3. The received text drops the *καί* after *μεμ.*, but without sufficient authority.—The punctuation, apart from the various untenable experiments of Griesb. and Scholz, may be twofold. Lachmann and Rückert attach the *καὶ μεμ.* to what precedes, making *ὁ γαμήσας* the subject of it; and read, 'he that is married is divided, *i. e.*, distracted with cares.' Καὶ ἡ γύνη then begins a new sentence, translated thus: 'both the unmarried wife (= widow) and the unmarried virgin cares,' *etc.* On the contrary, Tisch. and Meyer begin a new sentence with *μεμ.* 'And there is a difference between the wife and the virgin; the unmarried careth,' *etc.* [In his edition of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, Tisch. follows the punctuation of Lach. and Rückert, given above, putting a period after *καὶ μεμ.*]. The difference, according to De Wette and Meyer, is to be explained from the fact that *μεμ.* was not understood (and therefore entirely left out), or was misunderstood (as meaning: 'distracted with cares,') and therefore was attached by *καί* to the foregoing; consequently, *γυνή* was necessarily taken to denote, *a widow* (Esth. *vidua*), and as the result, *ἡ ἀγαμος, the unmarried*, was either put before (*Vulgate*), or inserted after (comp. Reiche. *Comm. Crit. Spec.* III. Gött. 1839). But *μεμέρισται, is divided*, indicates the diversity between the woman and the virgin, in respect of care (*μεριμνᾶν*). They are divided, separated, in their interests. (Comp. *μερίζεσθαι*, Matt. xii. 25.) Theoph.: *μεμερισμέναι εἰσὶ ταῖς σπουδαῖς*. "The man is divided between the Lord and his wife." Neander. Luther's translation: 'there is a difference,' is not sufficiently definite. The use of the singular is to be explained from the position of the verb, and because the whole female sex is here embraced as one idea (Meyer.)—**The unmarried cares for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy in both body and spirit.**—For 'virgin,' he now says the 'unmarried;' and instead of 'how she may please the Lord,' he now puts, that which leads to this, 'that she may be holy,' *i. e.*, entirely devoted to the Lord, to serve Him with her whole person, and all her powers. First, he specifies 'in body,' because the marriage state primarily obligates the body in an earthly or worldly relation, and involves power of the man over the body of his wife (ver. 4), and easily occasions a defilement of the physical life. But the sanctity of the body, if it is of the right sort, is rooted in the sanctity of the spirit (comp. Osiander). The *καὶ* before *σώματι* has the predominance of authorities in its favor; a few support Lachmann in reading *τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι*. ["The word *holy* has the sense that it has in ver. 14, and so often elsewhere. It is not in purity and spirituality that the virgin is said to have advantage of the wife; but in freedom from distracting cares. In ver. 14, even the unbelieving husband or wife is said to be sanctified, or made holy. And it is in the same general sense of consecration, that holiness is here predicated of virgins, as distinguished from wives. It would be to impugn a divine ordinance, and to contradict all experience, to say that married women, because married, are less holy than the unmarried. Paul advances no such idea." Hodge.]—**But she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband.**—[This is not charged upon her as sin, but it is a part of her obligation of marriage, and is therefore expected of her. And if she has 'married in the Lord,' then even this very effort to please her husband may be a part of the service she renders unto the Lord. Yet while this is so, the obligation to the husband, it must be confessed, not unfrequently presents a temptation to a divided service, and in her endeavors to gratify his wishes, especially if he is of a worldly, or even partially sanctified spirit, is often betrayed into acts which militate against her piety, and interfere with her higher obligations. This is how it happens that many a Christian woman comes to be found absenting herself from the place of prayer, frequenting the ball-room and theatre, giving parties on the Sabbath, and in other ways compromising her conscience to her own spiritual injury and the discredit of her profession. And it is to the danger of such evils, incurred by marriage, that the Apostle points.]

Ver. 35. **And this I speak for your own profit.**—Here he obviates misapprehension, and assures them that his commendation of the sin-

gle state, did not flow from any selfish motives—out of a desire to rule their conscience, or to obtain honor by enforcing upon them his own celibate condition; but only out of regard to their own advantage, whether it be to spare them trouble (ver. 28), or, as the following context would indicate, to render the maintenance of their Christian profession at that particular crisis a little easier. This is the profit which he now develops antithetically:—**not that I may cast a snare over you**—(*βρόχον ἐπι βάλω*) [a figure borrowed from hunting, and means lit., *to fling a noose*]. Here he applies it to mean the ensnaring of their conscience, and binding them to his opinion. In like manner we have the expressions "to put a yoke," "to lay a burden," in Acts xv. 10; Matth. xxiii. 4. Less plausible is the explanation: 'to awaken scruples of conscience,' or, 'to endanger your purity by withholding you from marriage.' And just as little may we connect either of these interpretations with the first. The 'profit' above spoken of is more fully explained by the phrase—**but with a view to seemliness**,—*ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ εὐσχημον.* Προς here denotes the final end, as in chap. x. 11, *etc.*,='for the furtherance of what is comely; that is, *honestum*, the worthier, more independent position—the one free from worldly cares (comp. Rom. xiii. 13; 1 Thess. iv. 12).—As a further definition of this, he proceeds,—**and that ye may attend upon the Lord without distraction.**—By this he means a perpetual engagedness with him, without being diverted hither and thither by another's influence. This is "the caring for the things of the Lord," mentioned above, a life entirely devoted to the Lord and His cause—the opposite of being "troubled about many things" (Luke x. 41)—the practice of holiness (ver. 34). The whole is=*εὐσχημονεῖν καὶ εὐπάρεδρον εἶναι* (Meyer, Ed. 3. The exhibition of the inner life in its entire outward manifestation in a mode corresponding to this devotion to the Lord; the whole moral consecration and self-discipline, so far as it expresses itself in demeanor, in speech, posture, behavior, as the true outward type of the Christian life). ["The image here conveyed is exactly expressed by the story in Luke, of Mary "*sitting by the side of Jesus' feet*" (*παρακαθίσασα*, comp. *εὐπάρεδρον*), and Martha, "who was *cumbered* (Περιεσπᾶτο) with much serving," and "*careful* (*μεριμνᾷς*) about many things." STANLEY].

VER. 36. **But if any man think that he behaveth himself unseemly towards his virgin,**—He now comes to speak particularly of virgins [and addresses himself especially to fathers, since, according to the custom of Jews and Greeks, and most oriental nations at this day, the disposal of daughters in marriage rested with them]. The *δέ* introduces in contrast with the 'seemliness' above spoken of, an unseemliness (*ἀσχημονεῖν*). This word means *to act unsuitably, unbecomingly* (xiii. 5). It may also mean [see Wetstein], 'to suffer something unbecoming, to be disgraced.' [And so most of the Gr. fathers, and Grotius interpret the word here. 'The disgrace, which, according to the opinions of the East, female celibacy involved, extended from the *virgin* to the *father* (comp. Ecclesiasticus xlii. 9).' Hence their desire to marry their daughters as speedily as possible (Bloomfield)]. But only the former meaning suits with *ἐπί*, which indicates the direction of an action [so Hodge, Robinson], *towards*, or *in respect to* [JELF's *Gr. Gram.*, § 635, 3, 6, comp. § 905, 3, 6]. If it had the latter signification, we would rather expect *ἀσχημονήσειν, that he will suffer disgrace, etc.* Both significations, however, lead to the same thing; for he does not here allude to the disgrace of living unmarried, and so becoming an old maid, which would be brought upon the virgin, but to the disgrace of the temptation which would be occasioned by refusing her marriage; [so Alford, Hodge]. 'His virgin'=his daughter,—**if she be of full age.**—Παρθένος *ὑπέρακμος* means one who has passed the years of her youth (according to Plato, the *ακμή* of a woman was at twenty years of age), an age when, by the refusal of marriage on the part of the father, a surrender to her lover on her part was more to be feared than in earlier years.—**and it must needs so be,**—*καὶ οὕτως ὀφείλει γίνεσθαι.* These words cannot be made dependent (Rückert) on the *ἐάν* preceding, on account of the indicative; neither can *γένεσθαι* ever be=*μένειν*, *q. d.*, 'so she should remain single.' They depend rather on *εἰ* [understood]; and by *οὕτως γέν.* he means that which is expressed in the following clause, *viz.*, the marriage of the daughter. The *ὀφείλει* (=*oportet*, Passow II. 2, p. 1029) implies that the temperament of the daughter, [or some other equally cogent circumstance for the phrase, may include those of every kind, whether existing in the father or in the daughter] makes marriage necessary. It introduces a further objective element, in addition to the subjective one, expressed in *νομίζει.*—**let him do what he wishes**—Ὃ *θέλει* denotes not mere caprice, the arbitrary wish of the father, but a purpose grounded upon his best judgment (*νομίζει*) [and here it will be seen that the whole authority in the premises rested with the father].—**let them marry.**—The subject of *γαμείτωσαν* is easily understood, *viz.*, the virgin and her lover. "It can also be the plurality implied in the single subject 'virgin,' *παρθένος, q. d.*, 'let the virgins marry.'" NEANDER. [Freedom of opinion and action is wisely allowed in matters morally indifferent. As to what is the specific duty each person must decide for himself].

VER. 37. **But he who**—Here he introduces a case directly the opposite, and with unmistakable approval, as is shown by the last clause. In contrast with the previous one, who has the negative virtue of sinning not, this one 'doeth well.' The same may be inferred from the imperatives, which are to be construed as permissive. First, he brings prominently to view the steadfastness and independence of conviction and resolve shown,—**hath stood steadfast in his heart,**—in contrast with the weakness and dependence of the other, in ver. 36 (*ἑδραῖος, fast grounded*, found also in xv. 58 and in Col. i. 24). ["This allusion here is to a statue standing firm on its pedestal." BLOOMFIELD]. The points in which this firmness is shown are more fully defined in the two following clauses, which are to

be considered as the positive and negative explanation of the first.—**having no necessity,** —in contrast with the necessity occasioned by the temperament of the daughter, [or any other constraining circumstances] (ver. 26)—**but has power.**—There is an anacoluthon here ἐχει (instead of ἐχων)—**over his own will**—*i. e.*, to do as he chooses. ["Often the will is one thing, and the power is another." Bengel]. And what this will is he next states,—**and has resolved this in his heart.**—By 'this' (τοῦτο) he means, but doesn't say: 'to keep her unmarried.'—**in order to preserve his virgin.**—τοῦ τηρεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παρθένον. If it read, τηρεῖν, or, τὸ τηρεῖν, then we would simply have here the explanation of what goes before; but since the correct reading, τοῦ τηρεῖν is to be regarded as a final clause, this, according to all well established usage, cannot be. We are therefore to take τηρεῖν τὴν παρθένον not as a periphrasis for: 'to keep her unmarried;' but it means: 'to preserve her in her virgin state, so that she may be holy both in body and in spirit.' [Hence we might render it: 'in order to keep her as a virgin']. Not, however, for the sake of his own paternal interests, as Meyer assumes. This by no means follows from the ἑαυτοῦ, and it must be regarded as a selfish motive, altogether inconsistent with the spirit of the Apostle's exposition. The whole matter rests upon the paternal authority acknowledged not simply among Jews and Greeks, but also in the sphere of Christian life. And to this also the words τὴν παρθένον εαυτοῦ. refer. But the very manner in which the Apostle treats the affair, indicates that it is not a despotic, reckless rule, but the exercise of an authority which is considerate of the nature, the circumstances and the well being of the daughter, so that the resolve expressed in κέκρικεν is to be regarded as a well considered one. The exclusive action of the father in this case, however, indicates a distinction between the customs of antiquity and those of our modern times (comp. Grot. in *hoc loco.*)—**doeth well.**—[An approval which went right in the face of Jewish and Gentile opinions and prejudices—a commendation of a course of conduct, which in view of the exigencies of the times, and probabilities of good it involved, might seem desirable; but yet might not be adopted, because of the prevailing views of marriage; and which therefore required the special sanction of the Apostle to strengthen persons in the adoption of it.]

Ver. 38. **So then both he that giveth her in marriage doeth well, and he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better.**—Here he reaches the result of his discussion. The καί—καί, *both—and*, suit properly only to a repetition of the words, 'doeth well,' (hence the var. δέ, in which case the first καί might be translated, *also*). It appears as if Paul intended originally to repeat the words, 'doeth well;' but then found it more suitable to the relation previously expressed ('he sinneth not'—'he doeth well'), to put the second clause in the comparative. The former is well done, as being in accordance with the circumstances, and avoiding disgrace; [indeed, the man would have done wrong, had he acted otherwise]; the latter is better, according to what is said in ver. 34,—[better, not in moral worth, as the Romanists pretend, but in point of advantage, considering the times, and the duties to be performed.]

Vers. 39, 40. **The wife is bound by the law so long as her husband liveth.**—That which he has said in reference to the marriage of virgins, he now applies to the remarrying of widows. ["There seems to be no doubt entertained respecting the second marriage of the man, probably because in the case of widowers a new marriage was generally of pressing importance, on account of the motherless children; therefore the question here is only touching the woman. The limitation, 'only in the Lord,' moreover, must be regarded as referring also to the man (2 Cor. vi. 14, 15.) Olshausen]. After that he has expressed the woman's release from obligation to her husband in case of his death, and her liberty to marry again according to her pleasure, on the sole condition that it be a Christian union, he points to the higher satisfaction of remaining in widowhood. But he sets this forth as his own view; which, however, is to be regarded as the view of one who has the spirit of the Lord. The word δέδεται, *is bound*, as in ver. 29, Rom. vii. 2, excludes the idea of divorce and marriage with another.—**but if her husband 'sleep,'** *i. e.*, is dead. Rom. vii. 3. The καί before κοιμηθῇ, which Tischendorf has accepted, is not sufficiently well attested. In that case it would necessarily be translated: "but in case the man should *even* die.'—**only in the Lord.**—These words do not simply mean: 'in a Christian spirit,' but they teach that the marriage should be in fellowship with the Lord,—hence a marriage with a Christian (ver. 12 ff. refer to marriage before conversion). This only gives to this limitation its proper significance; μονον, as in Gal. ii. 10.—**But she is more blessed.**—He presupposes the possibility of an undisturbed devotion to the Lord and His cause, such as shall insure to a Christian woman higher contentment (comp. ver. 34); not simply freedom from tribulation, nor yet higher blessedness in heaven.—**if she so remain,** *i. e.*, unmarried (comp. ver. 26); "it being supposed that she can preserve herself pure." Bloomfield.—**according to my judgment.**—[Is this a modest way of uttering what should be deemed by us authoritative, as coming from one who was inspired by the Spirit; or is it simply the expression of an opinion, which, though coming from an inspired Apostle, was not intended to bind the conscience? In short, is this advice which we are at liberty to set aside, or is it obligatory precept? This question, one would suppose, ought to be decided by the consideration of the source whence it comes. If it proceeds from a person who, however sound in judgment, is still fallible, and has no authority over us, then there would be in us the liberty to differ. But if it comes from the all-wise God, advice at once partakes of the character of a command; for not to follow the best light, not to do the best thing, is certainly sin. Who, then, is the author of the advice—Paul, as a counsellor or friend? or Paul, as an inspired Apostle? This depends on how we interpret the next clause.]—**I think also,** *etc.*—There is here a polemic side-glance cast at his opponents, who disparaged him, and refused to recog-

nize him as an Apostle endowed with the Spirit of God equally with the others. Δοκῶ, an ironical Litotes. "The κἀγω, *and I*, presents an antagonism against those who ascribed to themselves alone the possession of the Spirit; we detect in these words a side-glance at the Judaizers who refused to acknowledge the authority of the Apostle, and especially contemned the single life so much esteemed by him." NEANDER.—[If this construction be correct, then the expression: "I think I have," is not to be taken as implying any distrust on the Apostle's part as to his actual possession of the Spirit. On the contrary, there is here, as most commentators concede, "an emphatic *meiosis* expressive of full persuasion and certainty." The inference then is, that the "judgment" issuing from this high source, is entitled not only to deference, but to obedience. When it is God that advises, who will venture, or has the liberty to say, Nay?]

[OBS.:—"The arguments by which the Apostle here recommended celibacy to the Corinthians, have been urged by the Papists in support of the rulers of their Church, who oblige the clergy and the monastic orders to live unmarried. And it must be acknowledged, that at first sight, these arguments seem to be properly applied by them. Nevertheless, when it is considered, that the Apostle's advices were suited to Christians in the then persecuted state of the Church, and were addressed only to such as could live chastely unmarried, it may fairly be presumed, that the Papists have stretched his advices farther than the Apostle intended, when they represent them as binding in all ages and countries, on those who wish to live piously." MACKNIGHT.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Duties of parents towards their children in the matter of marriage.* Among the most delicate problems of human life, calling for the exercise of firmness no less than of consideration, of wisdom no less than love, is the right conduct of parents in reference to the marriage of their children—especially of daughters. To insist upon their settlement unconditionally, is, without doubt, unworthy of a Christian, and must be looked upon as the token of a worldly, unbelieving, or, at least, little-believing temper. At all events, regard should be had to this, that a Christian should marry one like-minded. Here, that which is inculcated upon widows in v. 40, holds good absolutely—'only in the Lord.' Matrimonial connections between believers and children of this world, entered into out of mere carnal complacency, or with an eye to property and brilliant position in society, and in the hope that some saving influence may at the same time be exerted, are, to say the least, exceedingly hazardous; and they more commonly result in a way directly the opposite of the one counted on—the secularization of the believing party (comp. Gen. vi.). All such connections Christian parents should aim to hinder, rather than help; yea, they should endeavor, by all the means in their power, to restrain and hold back their children from them, even though it be at the cost of much pain and bitter struggle. Cases may indeed occur, when yielding will be unavoidable; but, at all events, consent should not be granted without giving earnest warning of the sad mistake committed, and of the great responsibility and danger incurred.—Again, if it be seen that a daughter has little or no inclination to marry, and that she is endowed with special gifts for the service of the Lord in her virgin state, and that she takes delight in such service, then does it become the parent to stand fast against all solicitation on the part of suitors and relatives, and to sustain their child in her endeavors to devote herself to the Divine calling. But the deliberation in the case must be a comprehensive one, weighing well all circumstances, and attended with earnest prayer for that Divine wisdom, which will enable the parents to examine the inward and outward condition of their daughter, and to distinguish clearly between caprice and prudery and carnal desire to consult her own convenience on the one hand, and a true spiritual firmness and proper regard for the service of the Lord on the other; and also for that simplicity of heart which shall exclude all selfish interests, and leave no room for after regrets to come up and harass when it is too late.

2. [Marriage being a Divine institution, and designed to subserve the highest moral and spiritual interests of mankind, and being then most truly blessed when occurring "in the Lord," it is eminently fitting that the solemnization should be a religious act, performed by a minister, and under the sanction of the Church. "The custom of thus making it an ecclesiastical ceremonial," says Besser, "is as certainly in harmony with its character as a union in the Lord, as the popular cry for civil marriage accords with the declaration: 'We will not have this man to reign over us.'"]

3. ["The *practice of the highest duties of Christianity is compatible with every station and condition of life* that is not in itself unlawful. If even the degraded state of slavery be consistent with the cultivation of the true spirit of Christian liberty, if even the great religious divisions of Jew and Gentile may be regarded as alike compatible with the service of God, then in all other states in life equally the spirit of the Apostolic injunctions may be observed where, in the letter, they seem most disregarded. Freedom from worldly cares may be maintained in the married as well as in the single state; indifference to worldly gain may exist in riches, no less than in poverty. Our nearness to God depends not on our desertion of one religious community for another, but on our keeping His commandments in whatever religious community His providence has placed us." STANLEY].

4. [*Right and wrong*, though absolute in their essential principles, yet, as determinable *in the forms of human conduct, can seldom be defined and enforced by specific rules.* Much here depends on the peculiarities of personal condition and circumstance. What may be proper and beneficial for one, may prove equally unseemly and hurtful for another. Yea, the particular duty of a person in reference to the same thing, is often modified or even reversed by changes of time and place. Hence, in relation to the details of conduct, the best course to be pursued, is simply to state the general principles which should

govern, to prescribe the ultimate ends to be sought, and then leave it for each one to ascertain and decide for himself upon the proper methods to be adopted by him in the discharge of his own specific obligations. To aid in discovering what the specific duty is, the *advice* of judicious friends and of Gospel ministers may, and ought to be, both sought and given. But when, instead of advice, there are imposed the prescripts of unwarranted authority, then the inevitable result is injury and ruin to the very cause these were unwisely intended to further. Either the morality secured is that of a legal, slavish obedience that crushes out the joy of a true divine service, or the natures thus put under bondage rebel in secret, and thus fall into grosser sins, and incur the greater guilt. An instructive illustration of these disastrous consequences is seen in the history of Romish monasticism. And similar mistakes are constantly made in the measures resorted to for the promotion of temperance, and the maintenance of the Sabbath, and the suppression of many sorts of public amusements, and the regulation of other departments of morals. Too great reliance is placed on law, and too little upon moral religious instruction and advice. Sound morality can only be established and furthered by the enlightenment of the conscience, and the instruction of the understanding as to the best means by which behests of conscience can be fulfilled; and it can coexist only with a degree of liberty of judgment and action in things indifferent. What are the proper functions, bearings, and limitations of law in this direction, is a question too broad to be discussed here].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—VER. 25. In all matters and questions which are not expressly decided by the written word, it is the part of a true and well-qualified teacher to understand how to counsel the conscience according to those fundamental principles which are found in the Scriptures. Hence, he must be able to comprehend and apply these principles in a divine light.—Ver. 26. Even now, in consequence of the corrupt state of the Church, the domestic peace of Christians is often embittered by the influences of an evil world. Hence, we may infer that Paul would still give many the same advice which he gave of old, provided they were endowed with the gift of continence, and could preserve a virgin modesty by prayer and self-restraint (ver. 7 ff.) (Heu). The constraints arising from persecution are one thing, and the constraints of a cloister entered into by an inconsiderate vow are another thing.—Ver. 27 (Spener). He who has received the gift of chastity, may abide by it or not, according as he may judge it serviceable to the greater honor of God and the better performance of that to which he has been called by God.—Ver. 28. Marriage is, in itself, a sacred ordinance, and no one must accuse himself of sin in having married, unless he did so from impure motives. Many a person neither learns nor surmises the burden of the married life; experience makes them rue it when too late. Let those who will be married, make up their mind for all chances. But if the married parties are united in love and in fear of God, they will be able to lighten each other's burdens.—Ver. 29. Husbands should, indeed, love their wives with peculiar affection, but this affection should be tempered with self-denial, and not allowed to grow inordinate. Yea, they must hold themselves prepared for, and resigned to, a separation when God calls.—Ver. 30. Creature enjoyments should be received as from God. In this way, they may be assimilated to our spiritual enjoyments. The fear of God, and regard for His will, loosens our hold on the earthly, moderates our temporal pleasures, makes us submissive amid losses (Job i. 21), consoles us in trouble, comforts us in our tears, and causes us to cleave lightly to all our possessions.—Ver. 31. Believers here are as upon a journey; one is at liberty to use every thing at the inn; but further than this he takes no interest in it, and he is content if he has some good to expect at the end of the journey. Augustine: *Boni ad hoc utuntur mundo, ut fruantur Deo; mali contra, ut fruantur mundo, uti volunt Deo.**—Ver. 32 (Heu.). The statement here must be taken generally. Marriage is not absolutely, and without exception, a hinderance to Christianity, nor is a single life equally a help to it. Many a one finds more hinderance to good in a single than in married life; and marriage is, in itself, a God-service, for it is God's holy ordinance, and the duties therein are commanded by Him, and, therefore, are a holy work, just as much as prayer. Let him who would please God acceptably in a single state, refrain from all self-complacency, and especially from the false notion that he is the more acceptable to God on this account.—SPENER:—Marriage furnishes numerous occasions for other exercises of godliness, for the acknowledgment of the Divine goodness, *etc.* And God often blesses more effectually the few quarters of an hour devoted to Him amid its cares, than whole hours of monastic vigils. Ah! how many persons remain single only that they may serve the world better, and indulge more freely in personal luxuries!—Ver. 33. Things of this world, in themselves allowable (1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 8), such as nourishment, clothing, habitation, and the like, often so absorb the entire regard, as to keep a person from diligent attention to spiritual things. In this respect the unmarried have less of a hinderance, provided they have the gifts and calling requisite for celibacy. Between the two extremes of excessive severity towards the wife in imposing on her the whole burden of domestic cares, and of excessive indulgence in allowing her to rule, there runs the middle course, that of controlling one's wife wisely, by a manifestation of affection and the exercise of patience.—Ver. 34. SPENER:—Even the love which the wife cherishes towards her husband, and the obedience she owes to him, often constrain her, for the sake of avoiding displeasure, and creating disturbance, to interfere in some way, either by commission or omission, with the engagements in which she would otherwise seek to please the Lord.—Ver. 35. No preacher is

* [Good men use the world that they may enjoy God; the bad, on the contrary, wish to use God that they may enjoy the world].

lord over the conscience; but he should be indulgent and not make a point of conscience where there is none to be made. In single life a person can often devote himself systematically to the study of God's Word, for his own personal edification, while in married life there is much to prevent this. A mother, for example, having a child either on her bosom or perpetually around her, cannot concentrate her mind in devotion. Yet, what she does is none the less acceptable to God.—Ver. 36. HEDINGER:—The authority of parents over their children is, indeed, great; but woe to those who would constrain them to an unwilling marriage, only for the sake of money or honor. And woe to those, also, who allow them in all manner of foolery for the sake of catching husbands. But what does watching avail, if the fear of God in the child does not guard the door.—Ver. 37. If the child's desire to remain unmarried agrees with the will of the parents, such a child is blessed in its release from many cares in the life she has chosen. —Ver. 39. He who would *do* or *suffer* anything for the Lord, must first *be* in the Lord, and hold communion with Him by faith.—Ver. 40. It is not mere solitude that makes the widow blessed; she is so, provided only that she places her hope in God, and continues day and night in prayer and supplication (1 Tim. v. 5).

BERLENB. BIBEL:—ver. 27. Men would often gladly part from that they have, and seek that they have not. Let each one take heed to his own *spirit*.—Ver. 28. Great confusions arise from affirming that to be sin which is not. Married people may have more troubles in the flesh; but single people also have their own temptations, which may easily choke the Word. Watchfulness is the best safeguard. A pious man is cautious and self-distrustful.—Ver. 29. With Christians of the present day, time often hangs heavy; hence pastimes and amusements are sought for. Let us rather work while the day lasts, ere the night comes, for time is short. Therefore hasten, O Soul! See to it that thou lovest God! We have no hundred years leisure for keeping vigils with God.—Even in marriage we have opportunities for self-denial, and, when occasion calls, we can let all its good things go in obedience to the Divine will. But such self-denial can neither be undertaken arbitrarily, nor for the parade of holiness, nor in self-wrought labor, but only in dependence on the mercy of God, into whose hands alone those should yield themselves, who have long become ashamed, despairing of their own strength, and feel their need of higher aid. And this aid comes with earnest prayer, and strenuous struggles against sin, and with fervent desires for the love of God in Jesus Christ. His urgent entreaties, and winning attractions draw the heart away and beyond itself, to live in the light and under the sight of God, so that all it does, however trivial, shall be done in God. So should it be with all things in this world; we should learn to lay them all down for God, and so restrain ourselves that the heart may be freely lifted heavenward. Even whatsoever is most seemly and innocent, should be held and used as if we had it not. Our aim should be to strengthen the weak senses by becoming earnestness, and in sorrow to be always rejoicing (2 Cor. vi. 10); not to carry out our enjoyments into the flesh, but to rejoice with trembling; and to cleave to nothing which may be taken from us at any hour. In this we can succeed only through prayer. Prayer, while it knits us to God, severs us from self. He who cleaves to himself easily clings to things which may yet enhance his suffering. But he who is free cleaves only to God, and whatever is not in God, appears foreign to him. Ah, then, cast aside everything which hinders communion with Christ.—Ver. 31. What is transient is the fashion and the quality, the show and the glitter, the outward form, or, as it now appears, the present quiet peaceful state, of this world which is spared unto Christians. How all this will pass away we need not care to know; but only that we pass not away with it.—Ver. 32. God forbids only the care which distracts and torments. It is not His intention that we should be entirely free from all cares. Cares will come; only we must take heed and not be absorbed in them.—The celibacy of such pure souls only as are indifferent, and unconcerned about all events, who have nothing which pleases them aside from Jesus, who entirely renounce the friendships of the world, and everything which is sweet, and dear, and pleasant to the flesh, is properly sanctified; they alone are fit to walk confidingly with God.—Ver. 33. A married man often finds himself constrained, or is of himself inclined to consider how he may please his wife, who is frequently exacting even when she has enough. But so is the progress heavenward hindered, if the man becomes ensnared in earthly occupations. Yet God can aid such in other ways; and so also believers when married, can and should attend to Divine things as well even in the midst of their work.—Ver. 34. She only is the true virgin who cares solely for the work of the Lord, and does the will of her bridegroom.—A married woman often sticks fast under the burden of worldly things, and is obliged to endeavor to suit her husband. In such a relation what chances may not befall!—Think on this, how thou art pleasing Christ—that husband who has delivered thee from the service of sin; and take heed that thou wanderest not from Him with a roving heart. This heart must be wholly devoted to thy true bridegroom, who would fain possess thee wholly.—Ver. 35. Even the best doctrines closely resemble fetters upon the conscience. Conscience is a very tender thing. If a man is to return to God and become one with Him in highest blessedness, he must cleave to God without reserve, and learn to abide in Him with all his powers. Can we enjoy perfect communion if one-half of us clings to the creature? The best and nearest way to perfect blessedness, is to free ourselves, more and more from the stains of our shameful apostacy; and it is a part of this work to withdraw the body also from the filth of the world, that it may be presented as an offering to the eternal Creator, in all holy service. If a person is bound in spirit to a creature, much energy of will, and much precious time is withdrawn from God. Yet the Good Spirit would not hereby intimate either that the marriage state was damnable, nor the single state alone beatific. But this is the meaning: that God

wishes to have the entire man unto Himself, for His possession and enjoyment, and that we must wholly offer up, and surrender ourselves to Him, body, soul, and spirit, to be by Him sanctified and preserved. And then he tells us how well such persons should live, and how such an inward independence of all outward things, is yet possible, so that those who are married should be, and remain, as if they were not; and finally, what great happiness would arise among married people, who in their earnest conflict with the flesh, with mutual accord learn to refrain from all things in order to please the Lord and His pure Spirit.—Ver. 36. Everything must, at all events, turn upon the person's will, that nothing be done in a legal spirit. Christ wants our will for a bride, not for a slave. Our nature furnishes material for good, and for evil, but grace must prepare it.—Reason is not to be deified, and neither also is it to be contemned.—Ver. 37. If the will of man is armed with the Gospel, it can accomplish more than the severest vows made under the law. An indescribably kingly power lies in the will of man—in his will disenthralled and endowed with the energies of the Gospel, when he comes to exercise confidence and courage in God, so that he is able resolutely to determine on anything he deems to be for the glory of God and the good of others.—Ver. 38. Marriage stands between a better state in the spirit, and a worse one in the flesh.—Ver. 39, 40. If both parties are related in the Lord, then is their marriage sanctified.

Besser:—Vers. 29–31. This is the true virginity common to all Christians, that what they have during their short lives here does not sunder them from their heavenly possessions, or detain them on their journey.—Ver. 35. God's prohibitions are not snares for the Christian, but gentle bridlings of the Spirit, who expresses himself in the spiritual law (Rom. vii. 14); but man's interdicts which forbid what God allows (1 Tim. iv. 1–3), are snares by which the consciences of men are bound away from God and to other things in superstitious thraldom.

CHAPTERS VIII–X.

THE RELATION OF THE STRONG AND LIBERAL-MINDED TOWARDS THE WEAK, IN THINGS INDIFFERENT.

Chapter VIII. 1–13.

A.—*Not knowledge, but love the rule.*

Now as touching things offered unto idols, we know that we all have know-
2 ledge. Knowledge puffeth up, but charity [love] edifieth. And [*om.* And[1]] if
any man think that he knoweth [has known[2]] anything, he knoweth [has known[3]]
3 nothing yet[4] as he ought to know. But if any man love God, the same is known of
4 him. As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice
unto idols, we know that an idol *is* nothing in the world, and that *there is* none other[5]
5 God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in
6 earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,) But to us *there is but* one God, the
Father, of whom *are* all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom
7 *are* all things, and we by him. Howbeit *there is* not in every man that knowledge:
for some with conscience[6] of the idol unto this hour[7] eat *it* as a thing offered unto an
8 idol; and their conscience being weak is defiled. But meat commendeth [will not
affect[8]] us not to [before] God: for [*om.* for[9]] neither, if we eat, are we the better
9 [worse]; neither, if we eat not, are we the worse [better[10]]. But take heed lest by
any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to them that are weak.[11]
10 For if any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall
not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened [edified, οἰκοδομηθήσεται] to
11 eat those things which are offered to idols; And [For] through[12] thy knowledge shall
[*om.* shall] the weak brother [*om.* brother[13]] perish, [perishes[14]—the brother] for whom

12 Christ died? But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak con-
13 science, ye sin against Christ. Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.

[1] Ver. 2.—The Rec. has δέ after εἴ, [according to D. E. F. G. K. L. Syr. and many Gr. fathers] but this is a connection not found in good codices [A. B.] and is rejected by the best critics [Meyer, Lach., Alf., Stanley].

[2] Ver. 2—Rec. and Meyer [and Alford] read εἰδέναι [according to J. K. and some Greek fathers] but Tisch. [Stanley] and others, ἐγνωκέναι, which is more strongly supported [A. B. D. E. F. G.] but is regarded by Meyer as a sort of Gloss made to suit what goes before and after.

[3] Ver. 2.—Lach. [Stan.] read ἔγνω [with A. B. D.[1] F. G. But ἔγνωκεν is preferred by Meyer, Alf., and others, according to D.[3] E. J. K.]. The κε was probably dropped out in consequence of the eye of the transcriber passing from κ of the κεν to κ of the καθώς following.

[4] Ver. 2.—Lach. and others [Stanley] read οὔπω ἔγνω, according to good authorities, A. B. and others, but Meyer deems it as probably not original.—[not found D. E. F. G. J. K. and Alf., says that "probably after the erasure of οὐδέν as unnecessary, οὐδεπω thus standing alone was altered to οὔπω."]

[5] Ver. 4.—Ἕτερος is rejected by Lach. [Stan.] according to important authorities. But the rejection can be better explained than the insertion. [It is found in J. K. most Syr. MSS. and in the Greek fathers] (comp. Meyer).

[6] Ver. 7.—Lach. [Tischen. Stan.] and others read συνηθείᾳ, *in intercourse with*, not without good support, [A. B. and many versions]; but συνειδήσει is the more difficult reading [found in D. E. F. G. J., in most MSS., and the Gr. fathers. "The great weight of authority is in favor of the common reading." Hodge].

[7] Ver. 7.—In the Rec. ἕως ἄρτι, *until now*, comes after τοῦ εἰδώλου—a change on account of the difficult structure; but it is poorly sustained. [The true reading is συνειδήσει ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου, "with conscience until now of the idol." and so also Alf., who says 'the transposition was made, apparently for the purpose of bringing the clauses logically connected more closely together'].

[8] Ver. 8.—The παρίστησι of the Rec. was occasioned by the present tenses of the following clauses, [and is found in D. E. J. The true reading παραστήσει, occurs in A. B. several cursives—and Gr. fathers, and is adopted by Tisch., Lach., Alf., Stan.].

[9] Ver. 8.—The γάρ after οὔτε is an interpolation [not found in A. B. and other good authorities].

[10] Ver. 8.—[Kling inverts the order of these two clauses according to D. E. F. G. J. therein following Tisch., Meyer, Lach. Ed.].

[11] Ver. 9.—["The Rec. ἀσθενοῦσιν is apparently a correction to suit ἀσθενῶν below; ἀσθενέσιν is found in A. D. D. E. F. G." Alf.].

[12] Ver. 11.—Ἐν instead of ἐπί is well authorized; Meyer regards it a gloss for the less common ἐπί; [see note].

[13] Ver. 11.—The ἀδελφός of Rec. is feebly supported [not being found in A. B. D. E. F. G., and is omitted by all the later critical editions. Ὁ ἀδελφός, however, appears after γνώσει in A. B. D. F. Cod. Sin.]

[14] Ver. 11.—The Fut. ἀπολεῖται of the Rec. was made to correspond with the foregoing οἰκοδομηθ. [and is found in D.[3] E. F. G. J. The pres. ἀπόλλυται appears in A. B. D.[1] and in several ancient versions. Alf. says: "The sentence has probably been tampered with to get rid of the apparent awkwardness of the question being carried on through ver. 11." Some authorities put καὶ before ἀπόλ, which Kling calls a gloss for γάρ understood; others have γάρ, and others still, οὖν after ἀπόλ.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The instructions and exhortations contained in this paragraph, relate to a still further question proposed to the Apostle in the letter from Corinth, and to the conflict which had arisen in consequence, between two parties in the Church. On the one side were those who, as they believed in the nothingness of idolatry, and were fully conscious of their Christian liberty in reference to all that which was not in conflict with the nature of their calling, maintained their perfect right to buy and eat the meat offered for sale in the market, which had been sacrificed to idols, and also to partake of that which was set before them at table in the houses of heathen—yea, even to participate at their sacrificial feasts,* because, as they affirmed, this flesh was like all other flesh, and that in partaking of it they came into no injurious connection with idols, since idols were nothing in themselves, and so, incapable of harm. On the other side were those who utterly reprobated such conduct, and deemed it pollution; for they still believed idols to be veritable, active agents, that exerted a malign and defiling influence on those who in any way came in contact with them—as, for example, those seemed to, who ate of the flesh of beasts sacrificed to them. That the latter were heathen and not Jewish converts, is to be inferred from verse 7th, where the expression: "unto this hour," points to the continuance of an earlier state, and implies, that those spoken of had been heathen, and were still held captive by their old heathenish notions about the reality of idol gods whom they had come to regard as subject to the one supreme God. This inference cannot be disputed; although it must be conceded also that even by the Jews (Jewish converts) idols were regarded as demons, that were exerting a veritable power in heathendom, and exercised a baleful and defiling influence upon all those who in any way came in contact with heathen forms of life. ["To offer 'polluted bread' upon the altar of the Lord, or to eat the meat of idolatrous princes, had been condemned by the warning of Malachi (i. 7–12), the good example of Daniel (i. 8), and Tobit (i. 10, 11), and the evil example of Israel at Baalpeor (Numbers xxv. 2; Ps. cvi. 28)." Stanley]. And this class also must be supposed to have felt a holy horror at the polluted meat, and shown no little solicitude as to the manner it was to be dealt with. The dispute which thus originated, we have no reason to believe had anything to do with the party divisions spoken of in chap. 1. There is no propriety, therefore, in supposing that the more stringent, scrupulous ones, belonged to the party calling themselves after Cephas or after Christ; although

*[On this point Stanley remarks: "Most public entertainments and many private meals were more or less remotely the accompaniments of sacrifice; most animals killed for butcher's meat had fallen by the hand of the sacrificer; the very word for 'feast' in Hebrew was identical with 'sacrifice,' and from thence in Hellenistic Greek, the word originally used for 'killing in sacrifice' (θύειν), was diverted to the general signification of 'killing' (Acts x. 13). This identification of sacrifice and feast was carried to the highest pitch among the Greeks 'Sacrifices' are enumerated by Aristotle (*Eth.* VIII., 9, § 5) and Thucydides (II. 38) among the chief means of social enjoyment; and, in this later age of Greece, it may well be conceived that the religious element was even still more entirely thrown into the shade by the festive character of the meal which followed."—These feasts, it must be remembered, were ordinarily held in the temples themselves. (See Judg. ix. 27; Eneid. VII. Book 174; Herodot. I. 31)].

it were more plausible to regard the more liberal-minded as belonging rather to the Paulinists, or Apollinarians.

In his theoretic convictions Paul, as we shall see, sides with the liberals. But he rebukes their reckless application of these principles, and also that pride of knowledge which they manifested; and for the regulation of their conduct in this case, he enjoins the exercise of a self-denying love, that subordinated the use of its liberty, to a regard for weak brethren, and gladly renounced its rights in order to avoid all occasions for scandal. And in support of his injunction he points to his own example as set forth in his official labors. (chap. 9th).

["The importance of the controversy which thus arose is obvious. Closely as the whole social life of the ancient world was interwoven with its religious worship, the decision of this question affected the whole relations of the Christian society with its heathen neighbors; and, in fact, involved all the similar, though more complicated questions, discussed in the first four centuries of the Christian Church, respecting the lawfulness of attending on the spectacles or receiving the honors of the Roman Empire. Accordingly, this, although the chief, is not the only passage in which the point is discussed. See Rom. xiv. 2, 21; Rev. ii. 14, 15; Acts xv. 29." STANLEY].

Ver. 1–6. **Now concerning.**—[Here we have the introduction of a new topic with *περὶ δὲ*, just as in chap. vii.],—**idol sacrifices,**—*εἰδωλοθύτων*. This is a topic which we see to have already been brought up in discussion, and a decision rendered upon it in the first council at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 29). To that decision it is remarkable that Paul makes no allusion. ["Probably this is to be traced to his wish to establish his position as an independent Apostle, endowed with the Holy Spirit sufficiently himself to regulate such matters." ALFORD].—**We know that we all have knowledge.**—[Many commentators regard these words as quoted from the Epistle to the Corinthians, and assented to, at the start, in a general way, and in a conciliatory manner. They are not, therefore, to be interpreted strictly, nor is "all" to be emphasized. Kling questions this view (see below), but hardly on sufficient grounds. It is quite in the spirit of Paul]. From ver. 1 to ver. 3, there is a logical parenthesis, as may be seen from the resumption of these words in ver. 4. Before the contents of the knowledge here alluded to are brought out, he introduces an observation respecting knowledge and love, designed to furnish a rule for the whole subject. This parenthesis some [Luther, Bengel, Griesb., Winer, Bloom., Olsh.], regard as beginning with the words: *ὅτι πάντες*, which is then construed as a casual sentence, and the meaning would be: "We know,—(because, or for, (*ὅτι*) we all have knowledge," [—'we as well as you'). OLSH.]. But, in such a case, the clause following ought to read: *ἡ δὲ γνῶσις*, "*but* knowledge," *etc.* It is also opposed by ver. 4, where the *ὅτι* following *οἴδαμεν*, *we know*, plainly means, as it does here, *that*. The parenthesis, then, must begin with the clause: "knowledge puffeth up"—a thought suggested by what just precedes. [So Chrys., Beza, Grot., Calv., Meyer, Alford]. The 'things offered to idols' were the remnants of victims, whose bitter portions only had been offered in sacrifice, the rest falling partly to the priests, and partly to the offerer. These were sometimes sent to market for public sale, and sometimes appropriated to festivals, either at the temple, or in private houses. And it was about the propriety of Christians eating of these that the question arose. The knowledge Paul speaks of, must be understood to denote a practical insight into the real nature and effects of the things offered (ver. 4); from which, however, it by no means follows that *περί* is grammatically dependent on *γνῶσιν ἔχομεν*. And certainly it is remarkable that while claiming this knowledge for all in ver. 1, he says precisely the opposite of this in ver. 7: "but all have not this knowledge." By way of reconciling this contradiction, some suppose that these words, as also the clause beginning at ver. 4: "that an idol is nothing"—unto the end of ver. 6, were taken from the letter of the Corinthian Church, and that Paul contradicts these in ver. 7. But in this case Paul would not have introduced these words without some formula of citation; [but is this necessary when some sentiment of another is simply re-affirmed?] and he would have inoluded the observation (ver. 1–3) in his counter statement; [not necessarily, for that was directly suggested by the word *γνῶσις*, and should follow upon it]. Others make a distinction between *γνῶσις* and *ἡ γνῶσις*, taking the former to mean a certain degree of knowledge in general, and the latter a definite insight into the relation between the form and the influence of idolatry. (Olsh.). But this is arbitrary, since *γνῶσις*, *knowledge*, is already defined as to its contents in vv. 1 and 4. Another supposition is, that the Apostle is speaking generally and theoretically in ver. 1, and then in ver. 7, with direct reference to the Corinthians (De Wette [Stanley, Hodge, Alford]). But with this the *πάντες* in ver. 1, compared with ver. 7, does not suit. [But why not? As Alford says: "The common sense view of two such statements would, in ordinary preaching or writing be, that the first was said of what is *professed* and *confessed*, the second of what is actually and practically apprehended by each man. Thus we may say of our people in the former sense, '*all are Christians; all believe in Christ;*' but in the latter, 'all are *not* Christians; all do not believe'"]. Still again, a fourth device is to apply *ἐν πᾶσιν*, *in all*, to strangers coming to Corinth (Schrader); but of this the text gives no hint. Finally, the existence of the "knowledge in all," is distinguished from the "having knowledge," as being more thorough-going, while the latter is supposed to imply a more superficial knowledge; but this is arbitrary. The simplest solution of the difficulty is [?], that in ver. 1 Paul is speaking of himself, together with the more liberal-minded; but in ver. 7, where he speaks in the third person of all, he takes the word in a wider sense; so Theoph. and Meyer. In this case there would be no necessity for resorting to the supposition of an ironical statement (Grotius), which would be inconsistent with the general tenor of what is said in the following verse.

The disposition to pride oneself on this posses-

sion of knowledge, he earnestly opposes, by condemning those aspects in which it showed itself, as among the liberals of the Corinthian Church.—**Knowledge puffeth up.**—[The parenthesis is introduced without any particle of connection. This abruptness of transition is characteristic of Paul, and indicates the rapid rush of his thought. It makes an impression of force, which must not be weakened by any attempt to supply the lack. "Ἡ γνῶσις, *knowledge*, abstract,—scil. when *alone*, or improperly predominant, knowledge, *barely*." ALFORD]. This higher insight so much prized—this knowledge which professes to rise superior to all manner of prejudices, wherever it prevails for its own sake alone, proves an element far removed from Christian perfection,—yea, injurious to it through the influence it exerts on the person possessing it. Its effect is to fill the mind with pride, and so to undermine the foundation of that perfection, and disqualify the possessor for furthering the same among others; since for this work there is required, above all things, condescension of spirit,—a disposition to enter humbly into the position and necessities of those whom we would instruct. This, however, is just what love (ἀγάπη) begets,—**but love edifieth.**—In opposition to the self-exaltation, manifested by those who, with their higher insight, look down upon others as narrow and bigoted, love empties a person of self, and prompts him to enter into another's condition, and makes him ready for every service, even to the offering up of his own for others' benefit. Accordingly, while knowledge works injuriously and destructively upon the Christian life of others (comp. vv. 9–12), love works edifyingly, building up that life either in the salvation of a brother, or in the well-being of the Church (comp. οἰκοδομεῖν, chap. xiv. 24; Rom. xiv. 19; Eph. iv. 12; and Osiander, in *hoc loco*). "The thought and expression in οἰκοδομεῖ, *edifieth*, is altogether peculiar to Paul's mode of looking at and speaking of things. The whole Christian life is contemplated by him as a building, resting on the one foundation, Jesus Christ—a figure which finds a point of connection with our Lord's statement concerning the house built on the rock and on the sand. The edification here meant combines the theoretical and practical elements, and comprises every thing which serves to advance the Christian life." NEANDER. The contrast thus briefly indicated, is now further expanded. While the "knowledge which puffs up" is stigmatized as something purely imaginary, as something which in its very effects shows itself to be wanting in the truth, love, on the other hand, is declared to possess the highest intelligence.—**If any one thinks that he has known any thing.**—In place of γνῶσις, he here puts, δοκεῖ εἰδέναι (ἐγνωκέναι) τι; and to a person of this sort he denies any such knowledge of a thing as one ought to possess.—**He as yet knows nothing as he ought to know it**—(καθὼς δεῖ γνῶναι). By this he means that full, deep, penetrating, exhaustive, morally effective knowledge, which, as a moral necessity in the sphere of true religion, exists in Christianity, and to which Christianity, wherever it has its full moral effect, inevitably leads (δεῖ—*oportet*). Some adopting the reading, οὔπω ἔγνω, take καθὼς δεῖ γνῶναι as the objective clause to ἔγνω: 'he has not the substance of that knowledge which belongs to it;' 'he has not apprehended it;' but this is contrary to the usage of καθώς. The full, entire morally effective knowledge, exists only where *love* is (comp. ch. xiii. 2). [Hodge's comments on the profoundness of this seemingly incidental aphorism of Paul are excellent. He concludes: "The relation between the cognitive and emotional faculties, is one of the most difficult problems in philosophy. In many systems they are regarded as distinct. Paul here teaches that with regard to a large class of objects, knowledge without feeling is nothing; it supposes the most essential characteristics of the object to be unperceived. And in the following verse he teaches that love is the highest form of knowledge. To know God is to love him; and to love him is to know him. Love is intelligent, and knowledge is emotional. Hence, the Apostle says, If a man thinketh that he knoweth any thing; that is, if he is proud or conceited, he is ignorant"]. From this we should now expect the statement to follow: 'but if any one loves, he knows as he ought to know.' But Paul at once mounts higher. Proceeding from the love of neighbor to its root in the love of God, and from human knowledge to its fountain-head, even Divine knowledge, he says:—**But if any man loves God, the same is known by him.**—Where love for God exists,—of which love his affection for his neighbor is the essential consequence and expression (comp. 1 Jno. iv. 20),—there the individual is known by God. God has, in knowing him, taken him up into Himself, and by this he is translated into the sphere of the spiritual light and life of God, whence there streams into him the very light of knowledge. Thus the being known by God has intelligence for its essential results, even as the love of God begets in us the love of neighbor, (brotherly love). "The active knowledge of God follows the passive knowledge. He was known, and, therefore, he knoweth." BENGEL. (Comp. Osiander: "the assimilation of love and knowledge with their objects"). Without recognizing this inward connection, Meyer says, Ed. 3: "This is a case of pregnant construction. Instead of saying in full:—'such a person not simply has knowledge of the right sort, but is also himself known of God,' Paul simply states the latter, the more important thing, from which the former is understood of itself. The fact of being known by God, exhibits the high worth of love, for if God knows a man, there is presupposed in this no indifferent and ineffective relation of God to man, but an activity of God which passes over upon the man, so that he, as the object of the Divine knowledge, experiences also the efficacy of that kindly feeling in which and with which God knows him, and hence becomes a partaker of His love, and of His kindly care, *etc.* The idea consequently is that of an effective knowledge on the part of God, which becomes an inward experience on the part of man, a knowledge which is *causa salutis*, so that God in knowing the man, carries out in him that salvation which had been decreed in His own counsels." That the Divine knowledge

includes in itself a loving participation and complacency, is clear also from other passages (Jno. x. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 19; Gal. iv. 9; Matth. vii. 23; Ps. i. 6). This is all evacuated in the explanation: *approbatus est* (Grot. and others); and that given by Calvin: *inter filios censeri*, goes beyond the meaning of the word. But the Hophal construction: *edoctus est, is taught by Him*, adopted by Nösselt and others [Augustine, Beza, Locke, Mackn., Hodge, Bloomf.], and also by the Church fathers, is directly contrary both to the usages of the New Testament and of the classic Greek. [Yet it was very natural to one accustomed to the Hebrew forms of thought and speech, as Paul was]. Billroth hits the truth more nearly when he translates the phrase: 'God perceives Himself in him;' but he puts it in a speculative, pantheistic form. The mystical view of Olshausen, that in γινώσκεσθαι, the bridal relation of the soul to God is indicated, goes both too far and not far enough—too far, in as much as the context alone affords the analogy; not far enough, in as much as the relation, not of the bride, but of the bridegroom is indicated by the word γινώσκειν, when taken in a sexual sense.

In ver. 4. the Apostle turns to the exposition of the subject in hand, which is at once defined more particularly — **concerning therefore the eating of things offered to idols.**— ["The οὖν, therefore is epanaleptic, and simply resumes the thread of discourse"].—And the thing known is,—**that no idol exists in the world** (ὅτι οὐδεν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ). —Judging from the position of the words, and from the parallel clause, we can hardly separate οὐδεν from the subject, and make it a predicate as if it were: 'is nothing:' [as in the E. V., comp. x. 19; Jno. xxi. 24; Jer. x. 3]. He means that there is no such thing as an idol in the whole world of realities. Of course it will be understood that by the word 'idol,' not the image, but the object represented by it—the idol god is meant. To this he denies all reality, within the sphere of existing things. But according to ver. 5, and chap. x. 20, this cannot be taken to mean the veritable non-existence of the objects of heathen worship, but only that they do not actually exist in the form conceived and honored by the heathen, *e. g.*, in the forms of a Jupiter, Apollo, *etc.*,—that these as divinities dwelling in the images are but heathen fantasies, and that there is no god, but the One. The εἰ μή is to be referred simply to οὐδείς.

This statement, that there is no other god but One, he at once proceeds to explain and confirm in vv. 5 and 6.—**For even supposing that.**— Εἴπερ, which, when the main clause confirms and intensifies the hypothetical one, means, *if indeed, if otherwise, if namely*, in those instances where the latter is contrasted with the former, is to be translated, *even if*, or *although indeed* (Passow I., 2, 197).—**there are.**—Εἰσι from its antecedent position, carries the emphasis, and in both clauses denotes not merely ideal existence in the opinion of the heathen, but real existence as is evident from the subsequent confirmatory ὥσπερ εἰσί.—**those called gods.**—By the epithet 'called' (λεγόμενοι) he here limits the seeming concession, and brings his statement into harmony with ver. 4,—they are only called gods, and are not the Divine powers which the heathen imagine.—**whether in heaven, or whether upon earth.**—The terms embrace the whole sphere of pagan divinities, [who were scattered about, occupying distinct realms above and below, and thus stood in marked contrast with the Christian's God, who filled all things]. This clause is not to be connected with the following, and so made to imply that by "gods" were meant the good angels resident in heaven, and by "lords" the demons precipitated to earth, as some suppose.—**as there are gods many and lords many.**—[There is a question as to the real import of this parenthesis. Does it concede the fact that there are supernatural powers that are entitled to the name of "gods" and "lords," carrying the chief emphasis in the word "are?" or are we to supply the word 'so called,' and regard it as merely stating that the imaginary deities of the heathen were many in number? The latter is the more common view, adopted by de Wette, Stanley, Barnes, Scott, *etc.* But the former is best maintained as being most in accordance with the position of the words, and entirely in harmony with Scripture doctrine. Hodge referring to Deut. x. 17; Jos. xxii. 22; Dan. ii. 47, says: "These passages show that the words *god* and *lord* are applied in a wide sense to other beings than to the true God." And while it must be affirmed that "the whole heathen mythology is a fable—there are demons in abundance, of various ranks and powers, called gods. The two things which the Apostle means to deny are: 1. The existence of such beings as the heathen conceived their gods to be. 2. The real divinity of those supernatural beings, who do really exist, and are called gods; they are mere creatures." Such is essentially the interpretation of Meyer and Alford. But Kling says]: It might be inferred from x. 20, that the beings intended were demons, the κοσμοκράτορες of Eph. vi. 12; comp. ii. 2. But it is by no means necessary in this verse to look for a declaration respecting the reality of the objects of heathen worship; since, as we have seen the words εἰ περ εἰσὶ may also express a hypothetical putting of a case, where the speaker plants himself upon a position of doubt. Neander says: "Εἰσί, *are*, expresses nothing but a subjective reality. The subjective stand-points of the religious consciousness are merely put into objective statement; *q. d.*: 'with the heathen heaven and earth are peopled with divinities; we, however, recognize but one God and Lord;—in general there are many gods, but only for the heathen.'" —By not connecting the clause: "whether in heaven or earth," with this, so as to carry the implication that the term *gods* referred to the good angels still found above, and the term *lords* to those who had been precipitated to earth and there become demons, we might be left at liberty to refer both these terms to the angels, who are called *gods*, on account of their participation in the Divine majesty and worth, as the types and representatives of the same, and *lords* on account of the influence they exerted in their own spheres and their active relations to each other (in their higher and lower orders), as well to mankind and subordinate creatures (Ps. cix. 4; Dan. x. 13). Comp. Osiander, who at the most concedes "a secondary reference to the demons

here, in so far as they had an original part with the good, and also a show of divinity with a certain degree of reality still cleaving to them."

VER. 6 contains now the positive declaration, corresponding to the *εἰ μὴ εἷς*. The connection is: 'although so-called gods exist, yet they have nothing to do with us Christians; they stand in no relation to us, and exert therefore no influence upon us,—are for us, as if they were not.—**But for us there is only one God, the Father, from whom are all things, and we unto him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, also we through him.**—Since we in faith hold communion with the one God, the Father, who is the source of all things, and on whom all things depend,—yea even those "gods many" whom the heathen worship, and who is the goal of our existence,—for whose glory we live and in whose service we therefore stand; and since we hold communion with the one Lord who mediates the being and condition of all things,—yea, even of the lords many, whom the heathen fear, and who is the mediator of our existence, *viz.*, of that by virtue of which, the one God the Father has become our end, and therefore of our new divinely consecrated life: therefore are we delivered from all the power and all the controlling influences of those gods and lords; and those things, which the heathen suppose to be related to them and to mediate their influence—such as the flesh offered in sacrifice,—have for us none of this significance; they belong to the 'all things,' which are from God and through Christ, and can inflict no injury upon our new life, which has God for its object, and is mediated through Christ. The *ἀλλά* as chap. iv. 15.

The expression "the Father," indicates that which Christians have in God. "It brings out prominently the contrast between the standpoints of the heathen and the Christian; for the heathen have no father in this sense. God has become a Father to Christians only, by redemption." NEANDER. From this proceeds their spiritual childhood; hence it was not necessary to add: 'and we from Him;' and the statement: 'we unto Him' has its foundation already. By the words, "from Him" (*ἐξ οὗ*) God is set forth as the creative principle; but these are to be no more construed according to the Pantheistic theory of emanation, than the words, "unto Him" (*εἰς αὐτόν*) can be taken to denote a corresponding absorption of all things in Him. But the "all things," must in both clauses be alike understood, of the sum total of the universe, and be referred to the natural creation, whose mediator is the Son of God (comp. Col. i. 16), just as much as He is the Mediator of the new spiritual creation, which is implied in "we through Him" (comp. Eph. ii. 10). In *ἡμεῖς εἰς εἰς αὐτόν*, as well as in *ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ*, the phraseology turns into the demonstrative, as in ch. vii. 13. To take *εἰς αὐτόν, unto Him*, as equivalent to *ἐν αὐτῷ, in Him*, is by no means required by the relation of the two phrases, and is contrary to usage. It designates here the destination or tendency to communion with God, and with this to the recognition and the honor of God. But by "we" in this connection, we are to understand, not men in general, but believers.—And by the term "lord" as distinguished from "God," he intends as little to deny the divine equality, or the essential divinity of Jesus, as he does by the phrase "through Him," as distinguished from "from Him:" since the all-embracing character of His mediatorial work, far more than the title "Lord" (comp. ch. i. 2.) points conclusively to this very thing (comp. Osiander h. l. and Gess. pp. 88 and 51). Among the Jews who spoke Greek, *κύριος*, Lord, was a designation of Jehovah himself. In this text the whole theistic, Christian consciousness is brought out. Billroth and Olshausen here find an exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity; Meyer disputes it. Certainly we do violence to the words if we insist on detecting here an intention to set forth this doctrine; its fundamental relations, however, are all here denoted. "God is the original ground of all existence, Christ is the mediating principle, and God again becomes the final cause of all through the operation of the Holy Spirit." NEANDER. In what follows the apostle turns to consider the practical side of the question, in regard to refraining from eating for the sake of the weaker brethren.

VER. 7. From what has been said it is plain that the eating of sacrificial flesh has for Christians, by reason of their higher stand-point of faith, no religious significance whatever, and can be accordingly nothing defiling. But, he continues, this consciousness, this knowledge, is not in all. There are some whose Christian faith is not yet so emancipated from the religious convictions of their old heathen state, and who are still in the bonds of their former conscience, moulded by heathen ideas. This was in fact an infirmity of their new life, and of their Christian conscience,—yet an infirmity which was to be treated with mildness and consideration:—**Howbeit there is not in all this knowledge.**—In reference to the seeming contradiction between this and ver. 1, compare what is said on ver. 1. The article before *γνῶσις, knowledge*, indicates it as one which has just been spoken of, and is equivalent to *this*.—The antithetic positive statement is introduced by *δέ*, and introduced in such a manner that the reason of the weakness of some, perhaps a small portion of the church, conspicuously appears.—**But some in conscience of the idol even until now eat as a thing offered to an idol,**—therefore, not as common flesh, which "as a creature of God is good" (1 Tim. iv. 4, comp. 1 Cor. x. 26), but as something that would bring them into real connection with idolatry, (Osiander). According to the order in the received text, the words "until now" belong to the verb "eat;" but for critical reasons, these words ought to be placed before *τοῦ εἰδώλου*, '*the idol*,' and thus taken to qualify *τῇ συνειδήσει, in conscience*, to which it is attached without the article, according to classic usage, and as in 2 Cor. xi. 23; Phil. i. 26. (comp. Meyer, [Hodge]).—*Συνειδήσις* does not mean opinion in general, or judgment, or conviction, but, as uniformly in the New Testament, it means *conscience*, a person's consciousness in its moral and religious aspect. *Συνειδήσις τοῦ εἰδώλου*, then, denotes this consciousness as having for its contents or object, an idol, and that too, according to the context, as a real in-

fluential power, just as in 1 Pet. ii. 19, *συνειδήσις θεοῦ*, means a conscience testifying of God. Here it denotes a conscience possessed with the idea that an idol is a real being; so that this idea influences his judgment in regard to his conduct: and in this case it stamps the eating of that flesh, as an immoral, sinful act, altering the whole religious state and relations of the Christian who eats, because it is the eating of something connected with a veritable idol, and therefore defiling in its nature.—**and their conscience being weak.**—The weakness is found in the fact that it cannot deliver itself from these false notions; nor assure the person of the entire nullification of his relations to idols and to all their defiling influences by his fellowship with Christ, or of the restoration of his true relations to God, and consequently also to the totality of all things, as dependent on God alone and belonging to Him (*πίστις*—Rom. xiv. 23). By reason of this, its weakness, it—**is defiled**—*i. e.*, by eating. The defilement consists in a conviction of guilt, the conscience being troubled by a sense of the Divine displeasure pervading it. "Conscience—the moral sentiment of honor—the watchman of our moral purity, is itself pure so long as it remains true to its own determinations; hence *μολύνεσθαι, to be defiled*, is a striking expression, denoting the desecration of that which according to its nature and intent is holy." Osiander. If we take the reading *συνηθείᾳ*,—which may be a correction for *συνειδήσει* on the ground that it was unsuitable, or else a gloss—the sense would be: 'by their habitual contedness to idols, *i. e.*, because they had hitherto accustomed themselves to idols, had held intercourse with them, the idea of their presence, especially in the eating of the sacrificial flesh, was to them a common one.' In any case the Dative shows the ground on which the defilement takes place.—After this exposition of the real facts in the case, he proceeds to exhort the Corinthians in reference to the conduct which the more liberal-minded among them, ought to adopt. And first of all he points to the utter indifference of the matter of eating or not eating in a religious point of view, and cuts off all pretext for their unwillingness to adapt themselves to the weak.

Ver. 8. **But meat will not affect our relations to God; for neither if we eat are we the worse; neither if we eat not are we the better.**—It is not to be assumed that Paul is here citing the language of the Corinthians themselves in vindication of their eating of idol sacrifices [Barnes], since there is no formula of citation. Nor does the supposition of Osiander, that he is here obviating the scruples of the narrow-minded agree with Osiander's own exposition further onward. [Rather, he is laying down a broad principle, applicable to all parties, showing the weak the error of their scruples, and the strong why they ought to accommodate themselves to the weak, and not insist on their rights. This is shown in the selection of words, and in the more critically approved order of the two latter clauses]. The *δέ* is not adversative, but progressive. By many *παραστήσει* is construed as precisely equivalent to *συνίστημι, to recommend* (which also appears in the gloss *συνίστησι*); but this has no foundation in usage. The idea is not that of a presentment before God as a punitive judge (context), nor that of an offering in sacrifice (on account of the subject *βρῶμα*, if nothing else), nor yet that of a presentation of one's self for service (for the same reason); rather it is that of placing in specific relation, as *vox media*, so that the two following clauses may be subsumed under it. Accordingly, the meaning is: 'meat will in no way affect our relations to God; neither so that we shall lose standing with Him in case we eat not, nor so that we shall be better in His sight in case we eat.' [So Alford; though Olsh., Robinson, Hodge, Bloomf., keep to the common rendering. The one given above has, however, the decided advantage, as it suits with the following clauses alike]. This explanation of *παραστήσει*, however, may, perhaps, be too abstract, and we might underlay it with a conception of God as Judge, and regard the presentation as taking place before Him in that capacity; yet it must be in such a way as to anticipate alike a favorable as well as an unfavorable judgment. The sense would then be, that meat had no influence upon God's judgment concerning us, to determine it in one direction or the other (akin to Rom. xiv. 17). So Bengel: "neither to please him in judgment, nor yet to displease him." "Paul reminds those who ate idol sacrifices out of opposition, in order to demonstrate their liberal-mindedness, that they by this means were not rendered purer and better." Neander.

Ver. 9–13. Here follows the warning itself against all reckless use of the liberty [above asserted], or of superior intelligence [in regard to it], grounded upon the injury which would thereby accrue to the weaker brethren, resulting in great coldness of affection, and in severe offences against Christ Himself.—**But.**—The *δέ* is not merely transitional, but also adversative, *q. d.*, 'eating and not eating are, in themselves, morally indifferent, but,' *etc.*—**take heed lest your power.**—'Ἐξουσία=power to do or let alone—liberty of choice springing from the indifferent character of any act in a religious point of view—**become a stumbling-block to the weak.**—Πρόσκομμα, *any thing over which a person stumbles and falls;* here, an occasion to sin by awakening an inclination to imitate conduct that is in conflict with conscience, —["a practice above all others dangerous to a Christian." Alford]. (Com. Rom. xiv. 13, 20). This he at once explains more fully.—**For if any man,**—*i. e.*, any one who is weak in the sense above mentioned.—**see thee who hast knowledge** (comp. ver. 4) ["This seems to imply that the weak brother is *aware of* this, and *looks up to thee* as such." Alf.].—**sit at meat,** [*κατακείμενον* lit. *recumbent*, the usual posture at meals].—**in an idol's temple.**—*Εἰδωλεῖον, an idol temple*, just as in 1 Macc. i. 50; x. 83. ["This is a term used only by Jewish writers, apparently to avoid designating heathen temples by the sacred word *ναός*, used to express the temple at Jerusalem. It is a kind of parody on the names of temples as derived from the divinities to which they are dedicated." Stanley]. This extreme exercise of liberty he here touches upon only in reference to its prejudicial conse-

quences. It is in x. 14 that he first comes to oppose it with earnest dissuasions, after he has cast light upon it from another side. Some expositors, for the sake of abating the scandal of such procedures, construe εἰδωλεῖον with a local signification, making it mean only a feast furnished with idol sacrifices; but this is contrary to usage. Others (Osiander) take it to denote a sort of domestic chapel, where sacrificial feasts were held; which is not impossible, but very doubtful. As a rule, the sacrificial festivals were certainly observed in the temple. The consequences of beholding a Christian at such places, are introduced with an earnest interrogative.—**Shall not the conscience of him who is weak be edified?**—The verb *οἰκοδομεῖσθαι* is not equivalent to *impelli*, or *confirmari, to be determined thereto, to be betrayed*, or, *to be strengthened, i. e.*, in the purpose to do something not allowable; but, as in the New Testament throughout, *to be edified*,—only that it is here used antiphrastically, in an ironic sense. [So Alf., Stan., Mey., de Wette. But Hodge, without good grounds, says the interpretation "is out of keeping with the whole tone of the passage"]. It is an *ædificatio ruinosa*, as Calvin expresses it, a being furthered to something which is destructive to a person that is weak in the faith (comp. ver. 11)—a bad way of enlarging the spiritual edifice, inasmuch as it comes to the doing of something heretofore avoided, and that, too, without any conviction of its rectitude, but simply after the precedent of another who has no scruples in the matter, by reason of his superior insight, and in comparison with whom one is unwilling to seem contracted. Any conjectural change of reading is needless. Also the surrender of the interrogative form (on account of *οὐχί*, and because then *εἰς τό* should be equivalent to *ἐν τῳ*) is ungrammatical. The assumption that there is a play upon words in the Epistle to the Corinthians is gratuitous.—Ver. 11, whether we read with the Rec. *καὶ ἀπολεῖται*, or *καὶ ἀπόλλυται*, might be construed as continuing the question, [as in the E. V.]. But it would be more emphatic to suppose here a new affirmative sentence,—**for there perishes.**—But the most probable text is *ἀπόλλυται γάρ, for there perishes.* And since the *for* created difficulty, some put *οὖν, therefore*, instead of it; others, since they found both *γάρ* and *οὖν* in different manuscripts, rejected the one as well as the other, and wrote *καί* before *ἀπόλλ.* [so Lach. and Stanley]. The *γάρ* serves for the solving of the antiphrastic irony involved in *οἰκοδομηθήσεται*, and that, too, in a fearfully emphatic way, *q. d.*, 'a fine way of edifying, indeed! for, instead of building up, this is a tumbling to utter ruin.' The destruction (*ἀπώλεια*) here meant is the same as in i. 18, *viz.*, the forfeiture of salvation, that everlasting destruction which comes from acting without faith and against conscience; not, as Bengel says, the loss of faith itself; and still less, a gradual apostasy or moral depravation, or a loss of inward peace. If the word is taken passively, *is ruined*, the guilt of the person causing this ruin by the abuse of his liberty, will appear still more prominent—**over this thy knowledge.**—Whether we read *ἐπί*, or *ἐν τῇ σῇ γνώσει*, the sense is the same. We have here the cause of the ruin. This is a reckless and unloving use of knowledge. *Τῇ σῇ, this thy, i. e.*, 'which thou hast, and in which thou boastest.' The guilt involved appears enhanced still further by three particulars, which stand out yet more distinctly in the proper collocation of words now critically verified (*ὁ ἀδελφός* after *ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ γνώσει*).—**the weak one,**—the one who, of all others, ought to be treated with considerate forbearance, and from whom nothing should be exacted beyond his strength.—**the brother,**—a person bound to thee by the closest tie, and who ought to look to thee for assistance in the way of salvation, rather than for a stumbling-block over which to fall and perish. ["The isolated and final position thus given to 'the brother' gives a pathetic close to the whole sentence." Stanley].—**for whom Christ died.**—And this is the most aggravating circumstance of all—'thy conduct frustrates the purposes of Christ's atoning death (comp. Rom. xiv.), since thou, in behalf of him, for whom this great sacrifice was made, hast shown thyself unwilling to make the petty sacrifice of surrendering thine own right' [(comp. Rom. xv. 1–3). There is a pathos and power in these words not to be overlooked. But mark the possibility implied—that persons, for whom Christ died, may perish. But whether they ever will or not, will be decided by each one according to the type of his theology]. The result of such conduct next follows.—**In so sinning against the brethren.**—He here passes over into plural, and gives them also to understand that he is now treating of no indifferent matter. [The manner in which they had used their liberty, had rendered the otherwise allowable act positively sinful]. As explanatory of this, he adds:—**and wounding their weak consciences.**—*Τύπτοντες, striking*, and thereby painfully affecting, inasmuch as the conscience thereby is rendered evil and impure. [The word is used to exhibit more forcibly the meanness of the conduct in question; for what is meaner than to *strike* a thing that is weak]?—**Ye sin against Christ.**—Here is where the act culminates and exhibits its exceeding guiltiness. In what way this is done, is shown in the previous clauses. It thwarts the ends of the Saviour's death. It is true that Christ, as the head of the body, suffers also in the affliction of his members; but this is not the thought here brought out, (is not even indicated in the words: "the brethren"). "As in the main clause, the third item mentioned in ver. 11 is again taken up, so are the first two, in the participial clauses." Osiander. This unloving use of liberty he shames to the very lowest, in expressing, as the result of these deliberations, his own purpose of self-denial.—**Wherefore if meat make my brother to offend.**—The verb *σκανδαλίζειν*, found in 2 Cor. xi. 29; Rom. xiv. 21, and frequently in the Gospels, means literally, *to cause a person to fall* by laying a snare in his path; hence, to *seduce* or *betray into sin*, especially by bad example.—**I will not eat flesh:**—*κρέα*, the particular food of which he is speaking.—**for ever;**—*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*: "while the world standeth"—a strong hyperbole, intensifying the strong negative *οὐ μή*. "Here, in ver. 13 the ethical principle for regulating the use of things indifferent, is shown to be love."

NEANDER. ["The whole argument closely resembles Rom xiv. 19–22, even to the particular phrases employed." STANLEY].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Knowledge and love are essentially identical.* For all true knowledge implies, above all things, a going out from self, and all selfish aims and selfish isolation, and an entrance into something else, in order to apprehend it, and to unite it with ourselves, and ourselves with it; and to assimilate it to ourselves while we assimilate ourselves to it, or, in other words, penetrate into its essential idea, give ourselves up to it, and then recast it, as it were, within ourselves. This is an act of the Spirit, in which all rigidity of mind is subdued, in which the individual descends from the isolated heights of his own separate individuality, surrenders or annihilates all mere self-serving; and at the same time confesses that he is not sufficient for himself, but stands in need of another, and only in connection with that other can find true satisfaction and the fulfilment of his own destiny. Thus humility appears as an essential element of all true knowledge; and from this it follows, that where there is self-exaltation—where a person means to aggrandize himself by his knowledge, there true knowledge cannot exist. Aside from this also, experience teaches us that those, who have gone down into the profundities of knowledge, are always truly humble; that with them, in presence of the greatness of the object studied (which, the more it is explored, exhibits the more its inexhaustible fulness and depth), their own individuality gradually dwindles and is lost from sight.—But it is precisely in this also that *love* consists. In its exercises, self passes out of its exclusiveness, and enters into some other object; and for the sake of this, it opens all its inner treasures in order to impart them—to have them no more for itself alone, but to enjoy them in fellowship with it. And this, in the sphere of personal life, by reason of the reciprocity and communion implied in love, is followed by a supplementary action, since the person beloved loves in turn, and requites his lover with all he has. In such self-renunciation, humility is an essential element; it implies a readiness to be abased—a willingness to live for others, for their service and the furtherance of their welfare. And this is so even with the more gifted as well as with those less endowed; as is seen in the simplicity with which the latter accept, and the former impart gifts; and also in the readiness with which the former refuse to avail themselves of their superior insight and larger liberty in the enjoyment of things morally indifferent, and in the assurance which the latter feel that the others may be acting rightly even where they, contemplating the matter from their position, do not feel at liberty to consent to the same, and to imitate them.—Such humble love includes a sound reciprocal knowledge; as, on the other hand, sound knowledge involves such love. But the root of both lies in the *knowledge and love of God.* The soul that opens itself Godward, that apprehends God's truth—His living creative thoughts, is thereby made able and willing to search for the imprint of these thoughts in the rational as well as in material creation, to pass out of self into them, to become absorbed in them, and by appropriating them to become itself enlarged, or to fill with them all forms of existence that, by virtue of their resemblance to God, carry in themselves the types of creaturely life.—And this is an activity in which the individual can no longer remain egotistical, self-seeking and self-satisfied. But in carrying it out, he must renounce himself more and more, losing himself, as it were, in the depths of God and His creation, yet by this very means becoming more truly great, and rich, and glorious.—But such an opening of the intelligence towards God is at the same time an opening of the loving heart towards Him, which carries with it an opening of the heart towards all creaturely life that is grounded in the life of God, and is loved and cherished by Him,—especially that personal life which bears God's image, and was formed for communion with Him; and, consequently, it implies a personal devotion to it for the sake of communicating some good to it in humility and self-denial.—But where there is such a love for God, there the person *is known of God;* and this involves a *being loved* by Him. And this is the primal source of all human knowing and loving. While God opens Himself lovingly toward the creature which He hath made out of sheer love —for an urgent desire to impart His own fulness to something needing it, He by this means draws it closely to Himself; and the more it follows this Divine attraction in hearty devotion, and thus loves God in return, the more is it recognized by Him as His—as belonging to Him by a voluntary determination, and taken up into the light of His Divine life, and illuminated by this light so that it becomes truly intelligent and knowing.

["For the connection of knowledge and love, see 1 Jno. iv. 7, 8: 'Every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God; he that loveth not knoweth not God, for God is love.'—For the identification of God's knowledge with His love, comp. Exod. xxxiii. 17; 'Thou hast found grace in my sight, *and I know thee* by name." Also Jno. x. 3: "He calleth His *own* sheep by *name.*"—For the identification of God's knowledge of man with man's knowledge of God, comp. the similar blending of the spirit of man with the Spirit of God in Rom. viii. 15, 16; 1 Cor. ii. 11; also Jno. x. 15: "As the Father knoweth me so know I the Father."—And then for the general turn of the whole expression, as implying that every part of our redemption, but especially our knowledge of God, is more properly His act than ours, see 1 Cor. xiii. 12: "Then I shall know, even as also *I am known;*" Gal. iv. 9: "Now having known God, or rather *having been* known by Him;" Phil. iii. 12: "If I may apprehend that for which *I am apprehended* by Christ." STANLEY].

2. *Christian liberty, its nature and limitations.* According to Luther's spirited exposition in his tract entitled "The freedom of a Christian," a Christian through faith becomes free from all men, but through love is made the servant of all. This truth finds application also here as well as in chap. vii. 29 (see "Doctrinal and Ethical" *in*

loco). In the consciousness of his fellowship with God the Father through Jesus Christ the believer knows himself to be exalted above all things. His Father is the one God who is the ground of all things and on whom all things depend; and the mediator of this new life in fellowship with God is the one Lord through whom are all things. In this their relation to God through Christ, then he ought to regard and use all things. However these may be regarded and used by others, *to him* they are nothing else than the works and gifts of God; through them, the Supporter of their being and existence becomes the Supporter of his life in the family of God; to him are they furnished for free use and enjoyment, entirely apart from all other associations which they may awaken in the consciousness of others. Thus to the Christian the flesh of those beasts, which have been offered to idols, is only the component part of a creature of God, the enjoyment of which is granted him by the Creator; and so far as he partakes of it with thanksgiving for the goodness therein shown, it is to him pure and harmless (comp. 1 Tim. iv. 3).—But although free through faith, the believer is, on the other hand, bound through *love*, and comes into dependence on his brethren. If the use of the creature in question is a matter of indifference as it respects his fellowship with God and his worth in God's sight, while yet, on the other hand, in the view of his weaker brethren, who have not acquired that fulness of faith, and whose religious convictions on the point are still wavering, such conduct is questionable, by reason of its seeming contact with idolatry, and if they are not yet sufficiently independent to refrain from following the example of a person held in repute for superior discernment, then love demands that we pay regard to such characters, and not set before them an example which will betray them into sin, nor do aught that will prove a stumbling-block in their path. To be reckless on this point and to enjoy our liberty regardless of how we defile the consciences of others, undermine their relation to God, and hazard their eternal salvation, is to evince an utter lack of love by reason of which not only is the weak brother injured, and fraternal obligations violated, but also the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, who for the sake of this very brother offered up His own life, is aggrieved in the frustration of the ends for which His sacrifice was made. Hence it follows that the love of Christ—this love which embraces alike the weak and the strong and by faith becomes an indwelling and controlling power in the heart of every true Christian, must prompt the strong to condescend toward the weak, and to become as weak to the weak (ix. 22), and in their conduct relatively to them to seek to avoid whatever for themselves may be of indifferent character whenever there is reason to fear that the religious life of the weak may be endangered.

["This is a principle, however, the *application* of which must be left to every man's conscience in the fear of God. No rule of conduct, founded on expediency, can be enforced by church discipline. It was right in Paul to refuse to eat flesh for fear of causing others to offend; but he could not have been justly exposed to discipline had he seen fit to eat it. He circumcised Timothy and refused to circumcise Titus. Whenever a thing is right or wrong according to circumstances, every man must have the right to judge of those circumstances." HODGE. The same holds good in regard to the drinking of wine, engaging in amusements, observance of the Sabbath and the like].

3. [*The intelligent conviction of right is essential to all right action.* The demands of a sound morality are not satisfied by the blind copying of another's example, however highly the person may be esteemed. As beings endowed with moral discernment, and subjected to conscience, it becomes us to go farther, and endeavor to ascertain the fundamental principles which should rule in the conduct, and which make a thing right in itself, and right for us, and then govern ourselves by these. It is to these principles—enthroned in the conscience, informing and enlightening it—that our prime allegiance is due. The mature will can acknowledge no other sovereignty without being false to itself, and losing its own integrity.—And still less can we go against the dictates of conscience in following some other assumed rule. The authority of conscience is paramount over all other, and its veto is a sufficient interdict upon all differing standards of action. Even that which is right in itself, becomes wrong for any individual when his conscience pronounces it wrong. Yea, paradoxical as it may seem, it must be affirmed that although it may sometimes be sinful for us to obey conscience—since it may sinfully enjoin wrong—it is always sinful for us to disobey it. Accordingly, when it prohibits wine-drinking, and theatre-going, and indulgence in games of chance, and the giving of sumptuous entertainments, and extravagance of attire and the like, then must these things be avoided, even though sanctioned by the practice of thousands of Christians deemed reputable. But while it is our imperative duty to obey conscience as it is, it is our business to do all we can to enlighten and instruct it in the truth. This private monitor, like the watch we carry for our constant convenience, may be inwardly deranged, and go wrong; and, like that, it needs to be regulated by some absolute standard. And this standard is the Sun of righteousness, as it shines upon us through the Divine Word and Spirit. These, therefore, must be consulted more and more, until conscience be purified from all errors, and obedience to it become perfect righteousness]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

AUGUSTINE:—VER. 1. What art thou, O man, thou who art inflated with conceit! Let it suffice thee that thou art full (Eph. i. 23)! He who is full, is rich; who is puffed up, is empty.

BERNHARD:—VER. 3. So much as thou lovest, so much thou knowest.

STARKE:—VERS. 1–3 (Hed.). Pride corrupts all, even the best things. Knowledge is good; but with pride, poison; a bubble in its iridescence is beautiful to look upon, yet full of wind. The knowledge even of divine things, not possessed with humility, nor applied to right uses, is vanity in the sight of God.—Love must be tho

queen of life; heart, of the understanding; aim, of the undertaking. Love is the infallible token of those in favor with God.—Vv. 4–6. There is, indeed, only one God. But does not every sinner make to himself as many gods as there are creatures he loves, and so erect idols in his heart? Let each search and see (Col. iii. 5; Phil. iii. 19). O joy! many lords, yet only One; they have the title, but the One alone has the right and the might of lordship; and He is Christ unto whom it becomes us to live and to die (Rom. xiv. 8).—Ver. 7. Were Christians more clear and settled in divine knowledge, they would drop much which they consider right, and do many things they now condemn as sinful.—As the smallest grain of sand causes to the eye great pain, so does the slightest deviation from God's law cause to the wakeful conscience great disquiet.—Ver. 8. Food belongs to the outer man; therefore, of itself can have no effect on our Christianity.—Vv 9, 10. The strong in faith must take heed to his conduct for the sake of the weak, lest they see and hear of something which may cause them to stumble and perish (Matth. xviii. 6).—Vv. 11–13. Even the weakest brother is of great account; since for him Christ died no less than for the strong; and those whom Christ honors are not to be lightly esteemed. The contempt put on such falls on Christ (Matth. xviii. 10 ff.). All sins against our neighbor are also sins against God, who has commanded us to love our neighbor. And this statement holds good of all such acts which, though not in themselves sins, yet cause others to offend, such as associations, amusements, fashions, and the like. Who says, 'Why should I care? Let him be scandalized who will? God knows my heart, that I do not cling to these things,' let such a person understand that he has neither repentance, nor faith, nor love in his heart. God knows that he clings not only to these things, but to the world, and the devil, too. What! Thou wilt not yield a hair, and carest not whether thy neighbor find life or death in thy doings!

Berlen. Bible:—Vers. 1–3. A great outrage is committed when people say: We have clearer knowledge; we have no scruples; we know the matter is of no consequence. A Christian must do nothing except on good grounds, and for this he himself must be grounded in love. Gospel knowledge consists not in vain, lifeless notions, which inflate the mind, but it is a quickening power [which, while it illumines, also sanctifies. Life is the light of men]. Knowledge alone intoxicates; but love sobers. A sound knowledge is essential to Christianity; and this begins to show itself as soon as one loves the right. For as soon as a person turns to God in penitence, God turns and shines on him. He who desires only to love, and for this will humble himself to the very ground, will be instructed of God. As he unites love with knowledge, God will accept him; and being approved by God in his knowledge, he will then, for the first time, rightly know, *viz.*, in the love and power of God; since he will then have the power of the Spirit in his own soul, and feel and possess the Spirit's presence and operations. Of this kind of knowledge, humanly taught scholastics know nothing.—Vv. 4–6. An idol does, indeed, exist only in the fancy of its worshippers, yet we are not on this account to deal with it at random. Often are we obliged to be on our guard, even when we see nothing.—Is God verily to us the sole God? The faith which *is held* is not sufficient; there must also be a faith which *holds*. God must be to us the all in all. It is then we honor the Father as the father of all that bear the name of children; and who is also our Father; and to whom we shall again return suitably to the purpose of our creation. Christ has battled for us unto blood; hence, He has become anew our Lord, after the flesh. Apart from this, He was our Lord from all eternity.—Ver. 7. What is not done with assurance of faith, is done lightly or wantonly.—Ver. 8. Boldness in eating [*i. e.*, in the maintenance of our liberty as to matters indifferent] is no indication of growth in Christianity.—Vv. 9–11. It does not follow that because an act is in itself allowable and harmless, it may be done without reflection. Nothing that does not accord with the rules of faith and love ought to be practised. A freedman of the Lord does not seek his enjoyment in a lawless liberty.—Many eagerly long for, and quickly grasp at, liberty. But to be truly free, a person must be able and willing at times to give up his freedom. A love that is free looks not to its own advantage, but to the good of others; especially to those whose spiritual foundations are disturbed by the liberty they see taken by their fellows. That is a poor sort of edification—a building upon the sand, when a person blindly abandons himself to another's guidance, and imitates him on the presumption that he is a wise man.—Take heed that thou provest not the means of destroying the smallest heartfelt obedience in the humblest Christian novice. Consider how near that person stands to thee for whom Christ died.—Vv. 12, 13. To look more to one's self than to others to sin against those to whom we owe affection, to break the bruised reed—this is to sin against Christ—that Saviour who was ever moved to pity and uphold others.—It is a delicate thing to have to deal with a tender conscience. A truly Apostolic spirit voluntarily makes himself the servant of all. Even when in the right, love makes us surrender our rights whenever and because the mind of Christ is in us.

Rieger:—Vers. 1–7. To be known of God as His, and so to become assured of our knowledge, that it is exercised in the fear and love of God, this is the main thing. God is the origin of all knowledge. In this fact lies the foundation of all humility; and the end and aim of all knowledge [on earth] is the edification of our neighbor.—Through the light of the Gospel shining from the sole Godhead in heaven and upon earth, all false fears and all vain confidences are banished; and we have only to keep our hearts collected in faith, and prayer, and worship, towards this one God, and towards our Lord Jesus Christ, and to maintain fellowship one with another.

Heubner:—Ver. 1–3. Knowledge is subject to a double danger, *viz.*, that it be without love, and become an end in itself, and that it step beyond Scripture limits, and beget vain self-conceit and contempt toward others.—The conceit of superior

wisdom is a mark of folly; true wisdom humbles us, and teaches us how little we know, and brings us to recognize the right end and aim of knowledge in the glory of God and in the salvation of our neighbor.—The humble person, in whose heart love dwells, has the faculty for clear discernment.—Vv. 4–6. There is only one God; but His worship is injured if we fasten our affection on vanities as if they were realities. Much, in itself innocent, becomes criminal by reason of the thoughts and intentions connected therewith. Even the creations of our fancy may become sin. The vanity of idol-worship should teach us the infinite worth of worshipping the true God, and the great merit of Christianity in that it eradicates this deeply-rooted and widespread superstition. The sum of Christianity, as distinguished from Heathenism and Judaism, is this, that the one God, the Creator, has revealed Himself as the Father through Jesus Christ.—Ver. 7. The lack of liberal insight is no sin, and can involve no disgrace: but to act against one's own conscience, and to betray others into doing the like—this is sin. By this rule is every enjoyment to be judged. The question is not, 'What is it in itself?' but, How does it appear to others? Hence, the injunction: spare weak consciences.—Ver. 8. Freely to allow all things, makes no one better; self-restraint, renunciation, obligation, dishonors not. But the fear of appearing weak and pious—this is what makes truly weak.—Ver. 9. True strength and genuine freedom are best shown in being able to limit our freedom through love to God, and in behalf of others. The stronger, the tenderer, and the more sparing! If thy freedom betrays others, thou fallest thyself! Unfortunate knowledge, which occasions others the loss of a good conscience! Conscience is the holiest, the tenderest thing in man, and it suffers from the slightest touch. Also Christ's heart is wounded, if we wound one of His believing ones. The enjoyment of our liberty at random, and the offence committed, stand in no comparison with each other. The former is vain, worthless, needless; the latter is corrupting and criminal.

Besser:—Ver. 1. The first person puffed up was the devil. All refined opinions, which keep superstition far aloof, all correct views of God's being and word, are empty as wind clouds which bring no rain, when they bring not forth the fruits of love.—Ver. 2. Not one single item of divine truth has attained to power in us as it should, if it does not divest us of our conceit and selfishness.—Ver. 4. In the world an idol is nothing; for the world is God's work, wherein nothing has being which man's thoughts have created. But in the heart of man, ah! there the idols are, indeed, a frightful something, and "no joke," as Luther says.—Ver. 8. Thanks be to Thy mercy, O God, that Thou furnishest to us in Thy Gospel the precious truth (Heb. xiii. 9), that that heart becomes established which is made so not by meats, but through grace.—Ver. 11. Not merely a conscious obstinacy in disobedience to God's commands, but also a trifling readiness for any thing which stains the conscience, because it is weak, is sufficient to destroy faith in the heart. So intimate and tender is the bond of fellowship between believing souls and Christ, that it is broken just so soon as any portion of our outward life is withdrawn from the control of the Spirit of grace.—Ver. 12. Not only do the strong and mature belong to Christ, but also the weak and novices no less.—Ver. 13. To yield to the arrogant, is to deny Christ; not to spare the weak is to sin against Christ. He who walks in love, avoids both.

[Barnes:—Ver. 6. Christians, though truly converted, yet may have many erroneous views and feelings in regard to many things. The morning dawn is, at first, very obscure. And so it may be in conversion. This should lead us to *charity*, towards imperfections; to *carefulness* not to mislead; and to *moderation* in our expectations from young converts, especially those in heathen lands.—Ver. 1–9. Love is a *safer* and more *useful* guide than knowledge.—Ver. 10, 11. Nothing is of more value than a correct Christian example, particularly in those occupying the more elevated ranks in life. The ignorant look to them for guidance, and their conduct should be such as will conduct safely.—Ver. 13. A noble instance of Paul's principles. If all Christians had Paul's delicate sensibilities, and Paul's strength of Christian virtue, and Paul's willingness to deny himself, in order to benefit others, how soon would the aspect of the Christian world change! How many practices now freely indulged in, would be abandoned! (*Ad sensum*)].

B. *An Illustration of Self-denial drawn from the Apostle's Life, in the Renunciation of his own Rights and Liberties for the Good of others.*

CHAPTER IX. 1–23.

1. Statement of his own rights as an Apostle.

VERS. 1–14.

AM I not an apostle? am I not free? [Am I not free?[1] am I not an apostle?]
have I not seen Jesus Christ [*om.* Christ[2]] our Lord? are not ye my work in the
2 Lord? If I be not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you: for the seal
3 of mine[3] apostleship are ye in the Lord. Mine answer to them that do examine
4, 5 me is this:[4] Have we not power to eat and to drink? Have we not power to lead
about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and *as* the brethren of the Lord,
6 and Cephas? Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working?[5]
7 Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and
eateth not of the fruit[6] thereof? or[7] [*om.* or] who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of
8 the milk of the flock? Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the
9 same also?[8] For it is written in the law of Moses,[9] Thou shalt not muzzle[10] the
10 mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? Or
saith he *it* altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, *this* is [was] written:
that [because] he that plougheth should plough in hope; and that [*om.* that] he that
11 thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope[11] [in hope of partaking]. If we
have sown unto you spiritual things, *is it* a great thing if we shall reap[12] your car-
12 nal things? If others be partakers of *this* power over you,[13] *are* not we rather?
Nevertheless we have not used [did not use] this power; but suffer all things, lest
13 we should hinder the gospel of Christ. Do ye not know that they which minister
about holy things live *of the things* of the temple? and they which wait[14] at the
14 altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they
which preach the gospel should live of the gospel.

[1] Ver. 1.—The precedence of this clause [thus reversing the order of the two as they stand in our version], is established by A. B. [Cod. Sin.], by almost all the versions, and by other old authorities. ["Possibly the original order was changed to bring the weightiest question into prominence." ALFORD].

[2] Ver. 1.—The Rec. has Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν [with D. K. L.]; others have Χριστόν Ἰησοῦν. Χριστόν is an addition not found in A. B. [Cod. Sin., and is omitted by Alford, Stanley].

[3] Ver. 2.—Lachmann, Tischendorf [Alford, Stanley], have μου τῆς [to correspond with τὸ ἔργον μου] (instead of τῆς ἐμῆς); but it is not sufficiently attested.

[4] Ver. 3.—Αὕτη ἐστίν; Lachmann [Alford, Stanley] read ἐστὶν αὕτη, which also is not sufficiently attested. [Yet it is found in A. B. Cod. Sin.].

[5] Ver. 6. The omission of τοῦ is, indeed, strongly attested, but is to be explained as an attempt to conform with the foregoing clauses.

[6] Ver. 7.—Rec. has ἐκ τοῦ καρποῦ in conformity with what follows, but it is more feebly sustained.

[7] Ver. 7.—Ἢ is rejected by Lachmann according to weighty testimony; it was, perhaps, omitted to accord with the foregoing clauses.

[8] Ver. 8. The Rec. has ἢ οὐχὶ καὶ—ταῦτα λέγει [with K L.]—feeble authority. A probable alteration of what seemed unintelligible. [The true reading: ἢ καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα οὐ λέγει, is found in A. B. C. D. Cod. Sin.].

[9] Ver. 9.—Griesbach reads: γέγραπται γὰρ [omitting ἐν τῷ Μωυσέως νόμῳ], but without sufficient authority.

[10] Ver. 9.—κημώσεις [with A. B.[2] C. D.[2] K. L. Cod. Sin.]; instead of with the Rec. and Lachmann [Stanley], read φιμώσεις. The former is best supported and more probable, because not found in the Sept.

[11] Ver. 10.—In the former of the last two clauses, the best supported order is: ὅτι ὀφείλει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ὁ ἀροτριῶν ἀροτριᾶν, instead of which the Rec. puts ἐπ' ἐλπίδι before ὀφείλει, which is a variation of the order. In the second clause some of the better authorities have: τῆς ἐλπίδος αὐτοῦ μετέχειν, to which the Rec. appends the original ἐπ' ἐλπίδι. The best accredited text is: ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τοῦ μετέχειν [found in A. B. C. Cod. Sin.]. So Meyer [Alford, Stanley, and Wordsworth].

[12] Ver. 11.—The Rec. and Lachmann read θερίσομεν, [and so Alford, Stanley, and Wordsworth]. The subj. θερίσωμεν is strongly supported, and might have been crowded out by the future form, because grammatically objectionable [A. B Cod. Sin. have the future].

[13] Ver. 12.—ὑμῶν ἐξουσίας is far better accredited than the Rec. ἐξουσίας ὑμῶν [being found in A. B. C. D. F. Cod. Sin.] But τινὰ ἐγκοπὴν is not so well authorized as ἐγκοπήν τινα.

[14] Ver. 13.—Παρεδρεύοντες is better supported than the Rec. προσεδρεύοντες.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VERS. 1–3. The fundamental principle and purpose of his, having been briefly stated in viii. 13, he now proceeds to enlarge upon it, by showing how he had, in fact, been practising self-denial out of love to the Lord and his brethren, and how he had, in a far higher manner than he had demanded of them, renounced his own rights and prerogatives for the sake of winning souls and spreading the Gospel.—["This whole passage, thus incidentally introduced, is one of the most elevated, heavenly, and beautiful discussions in the New Testament, and contains one of the most ennobling descriptions of the virtue of self-denial, and of the principles which should actuate the Christian ministry, any where to be found. All classic writings, and all records of antiquity, would be searched in vain for an instance of such pure and elevated principle as is presented in this chapter." BARNES].—He begins with four questions [abruptly introduced, which bring to view the position from which he acted, and answer any objections they might be inclined to make against his appealing to his own conduct. "It would almost appear as if he had properly concluded the subject at viii. 13, and then returned to it from this new point of view on the arrival of fresh tidings from Corinth, informing him of the imputations which he now proceeds to dispel." STANLEY]. In the first question [see critical notes] he asserts his independence,—a circumstance which might appear to exempt him from the need of such circumspection as he above speaks of: in the second, his high function as an Apostle, which fully warranted this independence, and rendered him responsible to Christ alone, whose ambassador he was; in the third, the grounds of his Apostleship in respect of the Lord; and in the fourth, the seal of his office in the Corinthian Church itself, and in his labors there. He thus takes ground from which naturally to pass over and speak of his own right to support—a right, however, of which he had made no use out of regard to higher interests. [And this is the point in his example which he wished to enforce as a lesson upon his readers]. **—Am I not free?**—*i. e.*, independent, [not in a *moral* sense, as having knowledge, and thus emancipated from foolish prejudices; but in a *civil* or *legal* sense, as at liberty to act as he chose, without being accountable to any man]. This point is resumed again in ver. 19; and the fact that it is not discussed until after the full statement of his Apostolic rights, might have occasioned the transposition of the two questions in the Rec. ["The order here followed is not only that of the most ancient MSS., but is also in conformity with the sense. His freedom, and not his Apostleship, was uppermost in his thoughts, and was the special occasion of the digression." STANLEY.—But still more.—**Am I not an Apostle?**—and so, placed even in a position of authority over others]? But, because this fact was disputed by his opponents, he is disposed to linger here a little; and, by way of proof, asks still further,—**Have I not seen the Lord?**—He here implies that his Apostleship rested on the same foundation as that of the other Apostles, *viz.*, the immediate call of Christ and the eye-witness of His glorified life. In this respect, therefore, he was their equal. The sight of Christ he speaks of refers primarily to that first manifestation of the Lord to him which effected his conversion (xv. 3; Acts ix. 22–26); yet not exclusive of the later revelations mentioned in Acts xxii. 17, and xviii. 9, by which he was confirmed in his labors at Corinth. In no case are we to suppose any reference to his having seen Christ during his earthly life; this would have no significance whatever for the Apostleship of a Paul. That he says this with an eye to the Christ-party, as one that laid great stress on having visions, so that this were an *argumentum ad hominem*, is a very doubtful assumption. In opposition to Rückert, who supposes that Paul here alludes to his ecstatic vision in the temple, NEANDER says: "It is impossible that such a vision should legitimate Apostleship."—**Are not ye my work in the Lord?**—The designation, "in the Lord," does not qualify merely "my work," [*q. d.*, 'ye are the Lord's work, not mine' (Chrys.)], but it belongs to the whole question. They were his work as an *Apostle*, and were introduced by him into their new life, and constituted a Church of God, in the Lord, *i. e.*, by virtue of his fellowship in the Lord. The phrase designates the element in which he wrought (comp. iii. 5 ff., and iv. 15). This thought he further expands.—**If I be not an apostle to others.**—By the *others* he means those coming into the church from abroad, it may be emissaries from Palestine who sought to mislead the Corinthians in regard to his Apostleship. Ἄλλοις is the Dative of judgment: 'in their view or opinion.' Οὐκ εἰμί expresses the fact as it was; hence, οὐ, not μή.—**Yet, doubtless, I am to you.**—The γέ strengthens ἀλλά: 'yet, at least,' or 'yet surely.' More in full: 'Ye certainly cannot but acknowledge me as an Apostle; for *ye yourselves*, by the simple fact of your conversion, serve to confirm my claim.' There is no allusion here to the miracles of the Apostle (Chrys.). These were wrought also by those not Apostles. But that his preaching produced such results as could only be ascribed to the power of Christ, this was the proof of his assertion that he was Christ's ambassador (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 2).—**for the seal of my apostleship are ye in the Lord.**—Σφραγίς, *seal*, that wherewith one concludes, designates, and confirms any thing; then, *confirmation, witness, original testimony.* The words "in the Lord" belong here, also, to the whole clause, and imply that the fact asserted was of the Lord, inasmuch as it was He that had vouchsafed to the Apostle so glorious a result in setting up a church so richly endowed in one of the chief seats of heathenism. ["This, although valid evidence, and as such adduced by the Apostle, is very liable to be abused. First, because much which passes for evidence is spurious; and, secondly, because the evidence of success is often urged in behalf of the errors of preachers, when that success is due to the truth they preach; thirdly, because small real success may be taken as evidence for more than it will fairly warrant." "Still, there are cases when the suc-

cess is of such a character, so undeniable and so great, as to supersede the necessity of any other evidence of a divine call. Such was the case with the Apostles, with the reformers, and with many of our modern missionaries." Hodge]. —These suggestions he concludes with ver. 3.— **This is my answer to them who examine me.**—Here the words ἡ ἐμὴ ἀπολογία stand first by way of emphasis, just as αὕτη ἐστιν come last for the same reason. The phraseology is that of the courts,—ἀπολογία, *apology, defence*, followed by the dative expressing the parties to whom it is made (2 Cor. xii. 19).—ἀνακρίνειν, *to judge, investigate*, as magistrates at a trial, and here, for the purpose of opposition ["a direct allusion to his antagonists." Stanley]. Αὕτη, *this*, is the subject and not the predicate of the sentence (as in Jno. i. 19; xvii. 3), and relates to the fact expressed just before, *viz.*, "the seal." To connect this sentence with what follows, [Chrys. and the E. V.], as introductory to it, is inconsistent with the contents there found; ["for what follows is no answer to those who called his Apostleship in question." Hodge].

Ver. 4–6. He comes now to the first point touched, *viz.*, to his power, his civil rights which he had voluntarily renounced. The indisputableness of these he indicates by employing the form of a question—**Have we not power to eat and drink?**—Οὐκ ἔχομεν, taken together, expresses one idea (comp. xi. 22, Rom. x. 18); [so that "μή asks the question, and οὐκ ἔχομεν is the thing in question; lit. *Is it so that we have not power?*" Alford]. He here passes over into the plural, because he now takes into view his associates also, or because he desires to be regarded, not in his private capacity, but in that official position which he had in common with all the apostles and servants of God. [This, however, is doubted by Alford, who says that, "at all events, it will not apply to ver. 12, where the emphatic ἡμεῖς *is* personal."] In the matter of 'eating or drinking,' he has no reference to the Jewish laws respecting food [as though he were claiming exemption from them (as Billr. and Olsh.)], since this would be remote from the context; nor yet to the flesh offered in sacrifices (as Schrader); but, as is shown in what follows, to his right to live at the expense of the Church, a right which was grounded on his apostolic office. The same principle is applied to his journeying officially in company with a Christian wife; for this is what he means when he says— **Have we not power to lead about (with us) a sister wife?** (ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα).—The allusion here is not to a serving matron [whose business it should be to minister out of her substance to the wants of the apostle as he went from place to place, according to the interpretation of Aug., Jerome, and most of the early fathers, and as is still maintained by the Romish commentators in the interest of celibacy—an interpretation which very early gave rise to great abuses], for the subsequent reference to Peter forbids this (Matt. viii. 14), and it is inconsistent also with the qualifying term γυναῖκα (comp. Osiander). Nor is it the right of marriage which is here in debate, for this is simply presupposed. The point made is Paul's right to have a companion in travel *at the cost of the Church*, and for this he refers to the precedent set by the rest of the apostles,—**as also the other Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas.**—The allusion here is general, and we are not to conclude from it that all these parties were married. But does he here use the word 'Apostles' in its broader or strict sense? Osiander infers the former from the mention made of the brethren of our Lord in a way which seems to assert for them a higher position. These did, indeed, occupy a very comprehensive sphere of mission labor and important responsibility (as James, Gal. i. 19); but there is no reason to believe that they stood higher than the twelve. But who are these "brethren of the Lord?" A prevailing dislike, existing even among evangelical churches, of regarding the mother of our Lord, who was conceived in her by the power of the Holy Ghost, as the mother of other children also, born in lawful wedlock, has led to the supposition, either that they were only brothers in a broader sense, being the cousins of Jesus on the mother's side (since such cases occurred among the Apostles, though never with this designation, see Luke vi. 15 ff. and the parables in Matt. x. and Mark iii.), or that they were the sons of Joseph by an earlier marriage. "The statement, 'born of the Virgin Mary,' is an article in the Church's creed; but the question, whether she bore children afterwards involves no point of Christian faith."—Burger. Both the intimation given in Matt. i. 25, as also the repeated association of these brethren with Mary by the evangelists, which points to a closer relationship with her than that of step-sons (comp. Acts i. 14; Matt. xii. 46, xiii. 55), render it probable that they were, in a literal sense, the sons of Mary, who at first followed in the train of Jesus with their mother (Jno. ii. 12), and later became estranged from Him (Jno. ii. 3 ff.; comp. Mark iii. 21); but, finally, having rid themselves of their prejudices and unbelief by reason of His resurrection, entered the circle of His disciples (see Acts i. 14, where they are expressly distinguished from the twelve).* Among this number James stood preëminent. Him our Lord deemed worthy of a special manifestation of Himself after He was risen (1 Cor. xv. 7); and he was highly esteemed, and exercised great authority in the Church of Jewish converts (comp. Acts xv. 13; xxi. 18; Gal. i. 19; ii. 9; also see Osiander and Meyer). By referring to the authority of James (in which his brethren shared according to their measure), Paul here puts them next to the Apostles in order to establish his own apostolic rights upon the matter in question more firmly against the opposition of the Judaizers. Osiander's inference, therefore, in regard to the "rest of the Apostles" is untenable. In further self-justification, he adduces more particularly the example of Peter— **and Cephas**—who occupied so high a position in the apostolic college (Neander) among the Jewish Christians. The assumption of a climax here, which makes Peter out to be the first of

* [See this subject fully discussed in Andrews' *Life of our Lord*, pp. 104–116; Neander, *Life of Christ*, § 22; Lange's *Leben Jesu*, § xiii.; Kitto's *Enc.*, 2d *Ed. Art. Jesus Christ*, p. 530; and Schaff's exegetical note in Lange's *Commentary*, Matt. xiii. 25.].

the Apostles (Cath.), is contradicted by ver. 6—**Or I only and Barnabas**—Paul here associates with himself his early co-laborer, a man of high apostolic consideration (Acts iv. 36; xi. 22 ff; xiii. 14). ["This is the only mention of him in conjunction with St. Paul since the date of the quarrel, in Acts xv. 39." STANLEY. "It is not improbable that after his separation from our apostle he may have maintained the same self-denying practice of abstaining from receiving sustenance by those to whom he preached, which he had learned from Paul at the first." ALFORD. "Observe his humility of mind, and his soul purified from all envy, how he takes care not to conceal him whom he knew to be a partaker with himself in this perfection." CHRYS.]—**Have we not power to forbear working?**—The power or right (*ἐξουσία*) which he here speaks of is not distinct from those above mentioned, but is a consequence of the denial of them, apagogically introduced, *q. d.* 'In that case, then, it would appear that Barnabas and I are not at liberty to forbear working.' By 'working' (*ἐργάζεσθαι*) he means laboring for support (iv. 12; 2 Thess. iii. 8; Acts xviii. 5); hence the sense is: 'are we alone under obligation to work for our livelihood while we preach?' The Vulgate, by omitting the *μή*, translates *hoc operandi, i. e.*, according to the Latin expositors, *faciendi quod ceteri faciunt*, according to Ambrose, 'of giving instruction for the sake of support at the cost of the churches')!

VERS. 7–14. He next passes to establish the right claimed; and, first, from the analogy of secular laborers who are, at the same time, striking illustrations of the nature of apostolic labor (iii. 6; 2 Tim. ii. 4). (1). *The soldier.*—**Who ever goes to war?**—Στρατεύεσθαι, means, *to march to the field*, and is used alike of generals and soldiers, the same as in the active voice. Here it denotes the service of a private (*Passow* II. 2, p. 1562).—**at his own charges?**—Ἰδίοις ὀψωνίοις, the Dative of ways and means; *i. e.*, so that he bears his own expenses. Ὀψώνια, *rations, cost, stipend* (Luke iii. 14; Rom. vi. 23), ["pr. 'whatever is bought to be eaten with bread.' Hired soldiers were at first paid partly in rations of meat, grain, fruit." ROB. *Lex.*]. "Paul here is arguing on the ground of natural right." NEANDER.—(2). *The husbandman.*—**who planteth a vineyard, and eats not its fruit.**—Τὸν καρπόν, the accusative, instead of genitive after the *ἐσθίειν, to eat*, is to be taken as the simple objective (KÜHNER, II., p. 181)]. (3). *The shepherd.*—**who feeds a flock, and eats not of the milk of the flock.**—Ἐκ τοῦ γάλακτος, *of the milk* [JELF, § 621, 3, i.]. The wages of the shepherd in the East is, even to this day, a portion of the milk. [And this is partly converted into other articles of food, and also partly sold to obtain other commodities. Hence the case of the prep. *ἐκ*, with the gen. (Alford)].—From the analogy of human relations and usages, he passes to Scripture for proof, thus sustaining his position by a positive Divine ordinance.—**Say I these things as a man?**—*Κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*, in a different sense from that in iii. 3; here it stands in contrast with the Law of God, [and means, *according to the modes of talking and acting prevalent among men*]. "Paul here puts an argument derived from human customs, and one taken from the Law over against each other." NEANDER.—**Or does the Law, too,** (*καί*) **not speak these things?**—*καί* introduces the higher instance as something additional. Ἤ, *or* stands apagogically as in ver. 6 (Meyer). *q. d.*, 'I would not appeal to human analogies had not the Law also spoken in the matter.' On account of the *καί*, which would otherwise be superfluous, it were better to treat this as a question antithetic to the foregoing one, and specifying something in advance=*ἢ οὐ (οὐχί) λέγει ταῦτα καὶ ὁ νόμος.* But this would put *ὁ νόμος* first, as the object on which the emphasis lies, as the Rec., making a correct gloss here. Λαλεῖν and *λέγειν* [the former used by the Apostle of himself, and the latter, of the Law] are to be distinguished as 'say' and 'speak,' the latter having special reference to the contents (comp. Rom. iii. 19), (Meyer). ["Λαλεῖν expresses the general idea of talking, whether reasonably or otherwise,—*λέγειν* implies speaking in a rational, intelligent manner." W. WEBSTER, *Syn. of the Gr. Test.* This discriminating use of terms, is an incidental evidence not only of Paul's accuracy of language, but also of his delicate humility].—The legal statute referred to is introduced with *γάρ*.—**For in the Law of Moses it is written, Thou shalt not muzzle an ox which treads out the corn.**—This law is found in Deut. xxv. 4. The same allusion occurs in 1 Tim. v. 18, ["from which passage the reading *φιμώσεις* probably came." ALFORD].—**Is it for oxen that God is concerned? or does he say this altogether** (*πάντως*) **on our account?**—The most direct and natural reason of this command, *viz.*, kindness to brutes, is here left out of view by the Apostle, since he disavows for the great Lawgiver (God) a special care for oxen in this provision, and applies it, not as an inference from the less to the greater, or by way of accommodation, but directly to *teachers*, as to persons engaged in a higher kind of service, *viz.*, the preparation of spiritual nutriment for the people (not, as Philo does, to men in general, as creatures endowed with reason). This interpretation of the Law rests on the correct presumption that the Law has a typical character, and that its enactments provide for higher relations, of which those specified are but the shadow (Col. ii. 17). In the rapid reasoning of the Apostle the intermediate thoughts are not brought out; but the higher intent of the words is directly exhibited, to the entire omission of the more obvious one, which here seems to be denied, as though God did not care for oxen. The attempt to modify the language by supplying the word 'only,' is arbitrary. "We are not to press this language too far. Taken literally, it would appear as if Paul denied a general providence in contradiction to what our Lord says. All he intends here is to obtain from the particular Mosaic statute a more general ethical principle, applicable to the relations existing between man and man; and in doing this he does not separate between the interpretation and the application." NEANDER. And so Meyer says: "This class of creatures were *not the* object of the Divine solicitude in this statute; that which

expresses care for oxen was said not for their sakes, but on our account." ["Every duty of *humanity* has for its ultimate ground, not the mere welfare of the animal concerned, but its welfare *in that* system of *which* MAN *is the head*, and therefore *man's* welfare. The good done to man's immortal spirit by acts of humanity and justice, infinitely outweighs the mere physical comfort of a brute which perishes." ALFORD].—Presupposing an assent to the second question, he proceeds to argue in its favor by explaining the statute in its higher sense.—**For on our account was it written.**—[The *γάρ, for*, gives the reason for the assertion implied in the previous question].—**that,**—*ὅτι*, is neither to be rendered 'because' [as, Alford, Hodge, Stanley], since what follows cannot possibly be construed as a possible reason; neither is it intended to introduce a supposed quotation [as Rückert, who finds here the language of the Apocrypha]; but it is merely explicative, as pointing to the practical result.—**he that plougheth should plough in hope, and he that threshes, in the hope of partaking.**—[See Critical notes]. The designations 'plougher' and 'sower,' are not to be taken literally, as denoting either the oxen themselves, or the persons who engage in husbandry, since we are now in the higher range of thought; but they are to be interpreted spiritually, as exhibiting typically the labors of Christian teachers in accordance with the language of the statute and under the forms of agriculture. The emphasis here lies on the words "in hope," [which accordingly in the Gr. come first]. The obligation to plough rests on hope, *viz.*, the hope of enjoying the products of the field (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 6). And so in the matter of threshing. [The language here is elliptical]. As in the first clause we must supply to the word "hope" what is mentioned in the second, *viz.*, "of partaking;" so in the second we must supply the verb 'to thresh,' or 'should thresh,' as suggested by the first. From ignoring this, persons have been betrayed into attempts at alteration, as is shown in the various readings in different MSS. (comp. Osiander). The meaning is: 'that the teacher is bound to his office in hope of enjoying its compensations' (Meyer); or, to express it more generally: the obligation to laborious efforts in our calling as laborers in the field of God (iii. 9), rests upon the hope, *etc.*—In ver. 11 he applies what has been said to the particular relation which he and his fellow-laborers sustained to the Corinthian Church in respect of their rights.—**If we sowed unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?**—A like antithesis occurs in Rom. xv. 27. There is no reason for including Barnabas under the strongly prominent *ἡμεῖς, we*, since nothing is known of his labors in Corinth. We may say with Meyer, "that Paul, though speaking categorically, means in fact himself alone. The corresponding collocation in *ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν —ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν—we to you—we yours*, is emphatic. But the justification of his claim appears all the stronger, from the fact that the recompense to which the laborers are entitled, involves something far inferior to the blessings they have conferred. "Spiritual things" are the blessings which proceed from the Holy Spirit, the doctrines of revelation through which the germs of a Divine life are implanted in the heart which unfold themselves in knowledge, faith, love and hope; "carnal things" are such as belong to the lower natural life. In the figures of 'sowing' and 'reaping,' it is implied that the obtaining of the lower good is a natural sequence upon the bestowment of the higher, even as the harvest follows upon seed-time. The question: "is it a great thing?" points, however, to the disproportion which exists between the one and the other, *q. d.*, 'It is a very small thing.'—The subj. (*θερίσωμεν*) after *εἰ*, occurs commonly both in the more ancient Greek (Homer and the lyric poets), and in the later impure style. According to Osiander, it denotes something midway between definiteness and indefiniteness; a definite assertion of the right, with an indefiniteness in regard to its application.

Having thus established his claim to recompense on the ground of having imparted to them an incomparably higher good, he proceeds to set forth his case in still stronger light by comparing himself in this respect with other teachers who, with far less cause, still used their right to support.—**If others.**—The allusion here is not to false teachers precisely, (as in 2 Cor. xi. 12-20), since he is treating of a veritable right; but only to those whose title to their help stood far below his (*μᾶλλον*).—**be partakers of this power over you.**—(*τῆς ὑμῶν ἐξουσίας*)—Ὑμῶν is the objective genitive as in Matt. x. 1; Jno. xvii. 2, *power of you*, for *power over you, viz:* in reference to the reaping of carnal things, ver. 11.—**are not we rather.**—The ellipsis is easily filled up from the preceding clause.—After this strong assertion and maintenance of his right, he states what his course had actually been, and the reason of his conduct.—**nevertheless we did not use this power,**—[not because he dared not, as some might suppose, and thus infer a consciousness on his part of lacking apostolical authority].—**but we bear all things.**—Στέγειν, as also in xiii. 7, and 1 Thess. iii. 1, lit. *to cover, to protect*, so that nothing shall penetrate, [used of vessels containing and holding without breaking], hence, *to hold off, to hold out, to forbear, to endure in silence.* (*Passow* II. 2. *a p.* 1526,)—**in order that we may not present any hinderance,**—*ἐγκοπήν, a cutting into the path*, hence, *impediment, hinderance.* This would arise from charges of covetousness and self-seeking in the work of the ministry, which his independence of them would obviate.—**to the Gospel of Christ,**—[a prominent statement of that whose claim overrides every other, and in behalf of which it is fitting that one should do, and endure all things].—After this preliminary statement of how he had renounced his own rights, he adds yet another proof of his title, taken from the analogy presented by the Jewish priesthood. Observe, not heathen priests, for there would be no fitness in appealing to the usages of those in support of his position, since they were not divinely instituted. And to the usages of the Levitical priesthood he refers, as to a matter already familiar to his readers.—**Do ye not know, that those performing the things of the temple.**—Οὐτὰ *ἱερὰ ἐργαζ-*

ὁμενοι, so the priests are first designated.—This may imply the care and ministration of offerings, as *ἱερόν* often occurs in this sense among classic writers; or the performance of temple services in general. The latter is to be preferred, because the second designation points definitely to the duties at the altar.—**live of the temple,**—*ἐσθίουσιν*, lit. *eat, i. e.*, obtain support from the temple, from the tithes, first-fruits, shew-bread, and other gifts brought hither ["Comp. the speech of the Zealots in Jos. B. J. V. xiii. 6, *δεῖ τοὺς τῷ ναῷ στρατευομένους ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ τρέφεσθαι*," STANLEY].—**those waiting at the altar.**—*παρεδρεύειν* comp. vii. 35. The reference of the first of these designations in this verse to the Levites and the second to the priests, is untenable. Both relate to the latter alone, and these only are analogous in their office to the Christian teachers.—**share with the altar.** *Συμμερίζονται* indicates that they received a portion of the sacrifices, and so partook with the altar of what was offered.—**even so,**—points to ver. 13. (Parcus on the contrary: "In consistency with all that has hitherto been said").—**the Lord**—*i. e.*, Christ, whose language in Matth. x. 10; and Luke x. 7 the Apostle has in mind. "Here we meet with a citation from the sayings of our Lord, which affords fresh proof that Paul must have already had a collection of our Lord's discourses." NEANDER.—**also,**—*καί*, in addition to the precepts of the old covenant to which this of our Lord's corresponds. Were *ὁ κύριος*=*ὁ θεός* it would have read: *καὶ τοῖς—καταγγέλουσιν ὁ κύριος διέταξε* (Meyer).—**commanded those preaching the Gospel.**—["It was a command to ministers themselves not to seek their support from secular occupations, but,—**to live of the Gospel,**—as the priests lived of the temple. This law of Christ is obligatory on ministers and people; on the latter to give, and on the former to seek a support from the church, and not for worldly avocations. There are circumstances, as the case of Paul shows, under which this command ceased to be binding upon preachers. These are exceptions, to be justified, each on its own merits; the rule, as a rule, remains in force."—HODGE. To defraud ministers of their due is *to rob God.* — WORDSWORTH].—*ζῆν ἐκ. i. e.*, the Gospel should be to them the means of support:—["Observe, that here the Apostle is establishing an analogy between the rights of *the sacrificing priests* of the law, and of *the preachers of the Gospel. Had those preachers been likewise themselves sacrificing priests*, is it possible that all allusion to them in such a character should have been here omitted? But as all such allusion *is* here omitted, we may fairly infer that no such character of the Christian minister was then known. As Bengel remarks on ver. 13:—"If the mass were a sacrifice Paul would certainly have shaped to it the conclusion in the following verse."—ALFORD.].

2. Testimony to his own self-denial in relation to his rights and powers.

VERS. 15–23.

15 But I have [*om.* have] used[1] none of these things: neither have I written these
things, that it should be so done unto me: for *it were* better for me to die, than that
16 any man should make my [cause for] glorying void.[2] For though I preach the gos-
pel, I have nothing to glory of: for necessity is laid upon me; yea, [for[3]] woe is unto
17 me, if I preach not the gospel![4] For if I do this thing willingly, [of my own accord]
I have a reward; but if against my will, [obligatorily] a dispensation [stewardship]
18 *of the Gospel* is committed unto me. What is my[5] reward then? *Verily* that, when
I preach the gospel, I may make the gospel of Christ[6] without charge, that I abuse not
19 [use not to the full] my power in the Gospel. For though I be free from all *men*, yet
20 have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. And unto the Jews
I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as
under the law, [*ins.* although I myself am not under the law][7] that I might gain them
21 that are under the law; To them that are without law, as without law, (being not
without law to God,[8] but under the law to Christ[8]), that I might gain[8] them that are
22 without law. To the weak became I as [*om.* as[9]] weak, that I might gain the weak:
23 I am made all things[10] to all *men*, that I might by all means save some. And this
[all things[11]] I do for the gospel's sake, that I might be partaker thereof with *you*.

[1] Ver. 15.—Οὐ *κέχρ. οὐδενί* [found in A. B. C. D.[1] F. Cod. Sin.] is better sustained than *οὐδενὶ κεχ.* and the Rec. *οὐδενί ἐχρησαμην.*

[2] Ver. 16.—Tischendorf reads: *ἵνα τις κενώσει*; the Rec. *κενώσῃ* feebly supported. Others simply *τις κενώσει.* The original is undoubtedly *οὐδεὶς κενώσει*, of which *τις κενώσει* and the Rec. text are emendations. [Kling understanding an aposiopesis after *ἤ*, renders the passage thus: "It is better for me to die than—my glorying no man shall make void"]. In "Exegetical and Critical," also Meyer, [also Stanley's note].

[3] Ver. 16.—Γάρ is far better supported than the δέ of the Rec. [which Alford calls "a clumsy alteration," not seeing that γάρ explains ἀνάγκη. The γάρ is found in A. B. C. D. F. Cod. Sin.].

[4] Ver. 16.—Εὐαγγελίσωμαι is more credited than ζωμαι (Rec.), or ζομαι (Lachmann). [It is found in A. B. C. D. F.].

[5] Ver. 18.—Μου; Rec., Lachmann, [Stanley] μοι, tolerably well authorized, but by some put after ἐστιν.

[6] Ver. 18.—The addition, τοῦ χριστοῦ, found in the Rec., is opposed by the best authorities, [being omitted by A. B. C D.[1] Cod. Sin., and by all good editions].

[7] Ver. 20.—The clause μὴ ὢν αὐτος ὑπὸ νόμον, omitted in the Rec. [probably by oversight of the copyist"], is to be accepted according to the most decisive authorities [A. B. C. D. F. Cod. Sin.].

[8] Ver. 21.—The Rec. has θεῷ, χριστῷ κερδήσω. Instead of which θεοῦ, χριστοῦ (genitives of dependence) and κερδάνω are better authorized. In κερδήσω we have a conformity with ver. 20.

[9] Ver. 22.—The Rec. has ὡς ἀσθενής, according to many, but not preponderating authorities. It was introduced in conformity with the preceding ones.

[10] Ver. 22.—The Rec has τα before πάντα, contrary to all the best authorities.

[11] Ver. 23.—The τοῦτο of the Rec. is very feebly supported. Meyer calls it: "a more accurately defining gloss." [A. B. C. D. F. Cod. Sin. all read πάντα].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VERS. 15–18. After again reminding his readers that he had not made use of his rights, so clearly established, he goes on to protest, in the most positive manner, against the suspicion that he *designed* to avail himself of these arguments in the future.—**But I used none of these things**—*i. e.*, not the proofs adduced (Chrys.), but (comp. ver. 12) the right itself in its several particulars (vv. 4–5). —**And I wrote not these things in order that it might be so done,** —*i. e.*, as I have written, or "after the examples I have alleged,"—**in me,**—*ἐν ἐμοί*, as in Matth. xvii. 12, *in my case*, and this he confirms with great emphasis.—**for good were it for me,**—*καλόν, suitable, reputable, honorable.*—**rather to die.**—There is no need of interpreting *ἀποθανεῖν* to mean death by hunger [as Chrys., Estius, Billr]. In what follows, the text is much disputed. If, with Lachmann (who, instead of *ἤ*, supposes *νή*, comp. xv. 31), and with Meyer, we read *οὐδείς κενώσει* (according to B. D.* [Cod. Sin.], then there is no need of punctuating, as Lachmann, *μου οὐδεις*: but it were better to assume, with Meyer (2d ed.), an aposiopesis,* so that after *ἤ* we are to supply something like *χρῆσθαι τῇ ἐξουσία ταύτῃ*, or *μισθὸν λαμβάνειν* (which it was incompatible with his feelings to express). Then upon this a new independent sentence would follow. The whole would then be rendered thus: **Good were it for me rather to die than (to use this my right, or to receive my reward); my cause for boasting no one shall make void**—*καύχημα, matter for glorying*, not the act of glorying itself; and this, as appears from the context, was the preaching of the Gospel without compensation. "Paul can here mean only a glorying in the presence of men." BURGER.—From a failure to perceive the aposiopesis above asserted there have arisen various attempts at amending the text. Because *οὐδείς* did not suit, *τις* has been adopted (by others *τίς*), to which a *ἵνα* still appeared requisite, making it read: 'than that any one, *etc.*;' and finally the fut. ind. has been changed into the aor. subj. This is the received text. In behalf of *οὐδεὶς* we have the authority of [Cod. Sin. and] A., which read *οὐδεὶς μή*. But if the aposiopesis is not allowed, then we must decide for reading of B. *ἵνα τις κενώσει*: 'than that any one shall make void.' Meyer, in Ed. 3. regards the aposiopesis too bold, and takes *ἤ* as=*or, on the other hand*, in the sense of, *otherwise, in the opposite case.* He would then translate: 'Better for me to die,' *i. e.*, 'rather than suffer myself to be supported, I will prefer to die; or, on the other hand, if such a thing need not occur, my boasting none shall make void.' But this understanding of the passage appears so forced, that we are still disposed to prefer the aposiopesis. [Alford adopts the reading *ἵνα τίς κενώσει*, and translates: 'than that any one should make void my (matter of) boasting.' Wordsworth the same, with the exception of *κενώσῃ* for *κενώσει*. Stanley puts a colon after *μου*. and makes *οὐδεὶς κενώσει*, a separate clause, rendering the whole thus: 'It were better for me to die than my boasting: no one shall make it void.'].

In ver. 16, ff. he assigns the reason for putting so great a stress on discharging his office gratuitously.—**For if I preach the Gospel there is for me no matter of boasting.**—*Καύχημα* ver. 6, (*materies gloriandi*). He means, the *mere* proclamation of the Gospel was not, in and of itself, anything in which he could boast, in contrast with his opponents. His advantage lay in renouncing his right and preaching without recompense. To interpret *εὐαγγελίζομαι* to mean: 'if I take a reward for preaching,' is, at all events, contrary to the New Testament usage, and inconsistent with the use of the word in the context.—Why the mere fact of preaching was no ground of boasting he goes on to explain. It was a duty imposed on him, from which he could not escape.—**For a necessity is laid upon me.**—[It was a moral necessity, put upon him by the call and commission of Jesus, and by the immeasurable obligations he was under to His pardoning grace]; and how imperative this necessity was he shows by pointing to the effects which his refusal to submit to it would draw down upon him.—**For woe is unto me if I should not preach the Gospel.**—*Οὐαί*, properly an interj. is here to be taken substantially, and *ἐστίν* to be supplied. It refers to the Divine judgments which would fall on him if he ventured to disobey the heavenly call. Hence the fearful nature of the necessity, originating primarily in the Divine will, demanding a punctilious obedience, and also the impossibility of any boast in fulfilling it. In this "necessity" Neander thinks he discovers something which distinguishes Paul from the other Apostles. The others had joined themselves to Christ of their own accord; while he had been, as it were, constrained to enter the service. Accordingly, we discern in this word the sense which Paul had of the overwhelming urgency of his calling.—This last statement (and so also the preceding ones, whether the first or the second, but these not primarily) he illustrates and confirms by a denial of the opposite.

*[1] "A figure of speech, in which the speaker breaks off suddenly, as if unwilling or unable to state what was in his mind"].

—**For if I do this voluntarily**, *i. e.*, on my own motion, of my own accord, without having been obliged thereto—**I have a reward**,—*i. e.*, from God,—**but if involuntarily** [*i. e.*, obligatorily, having been called to it by another, whom I could not disobey],—**with a stewardship have I been entrusted**,—my position is that of a steward, who, when he has done all that he could, has no more than discharged his obligations, and so has no title to a reward, (comp. Luke xvii. 10). The first of the above cases, he means to say, does not suit his case ["a hypothetical statement," de Wette says]; since he was constrained to preach by the obligations put on him by a higher will; hence he was in the condition of a steward, who was absolutely dependent on the will of his master, and who, while expecting no reward for the faithful discharge of duties, might yet look for punishment in case he failed. [Stewards, it must be remembered, were usually selected from among the slaves of the establishment, as was Eleazar by Abraham, and Joseph by Potiphar]. This interpretation of Meyer, and in part that of Osiander [adopted also by Hodge, Alford, de Wette] fully satisfies the words and the context.* To translate the words ἑκών and ἄκων, *willingly* and *unwillingly* would hardly suit, if we are to understand the last clause as describing Paul's case, since we can in no wise predicate reluctance or unwillingness of him in the discharge of his ministry.—But if we unite εἰ δε ἄκων οικ. πεπίστευμαι in one clause, rendering it: 'but if I am unwillingly entrusted with the stewardship,' then the word 'stewardship' loses its significance for the argument; and it would be the same if we put: 'I am entrusted with a stewardship,' in a parenthesis; and to supply the ellipsis of, "if unwillingly" with the words, "I do this" is in any case simpler than to make an apodosis by the addition of 'I have no reward.' But to take the words following as the apodosis would be inadmissible on account of the *οὖν, then*.—The meaning would be entirely changed if overleaping the two clauses: 'woe is me, *etc.*,' and: 'a necessity is laid upon me,' we find here the confirmation or explanation of the beginning of ver. 16, so that the idea of gratuitousness (gratis) is involved in ἑκών, and that of the opposite in ἄκων, and in the phrase: 'I have a reward,' we understand him to speak of his 'matter of boasting.' [Billroth, Bloomfield]. The ἑκών would then indicate that he was managing the thing as his own affair, and was omitting nothing which would serve to further it, and produce results happy and honorable for himself, in which 'he would have his reward;' but ἄκων would mean that he was discharging his direct obligations, only so far as to escape the penalty of neglect, and so was acting as a steward, *i. e.*, a slave charged with the domestic economy, so that all reward or boasting would be out of the question. But in such an interpretation there would be 1, a foisting into the words ἑκών and ἄκων as well as into οἶκον. πεπίστευμαι of something foreign to them; and 2, he would, in what follows, be designating that as his *reward*, which, a little before, appears to be the *ground* of his having a reward.

After having substituted the term 'reward' for that of 'boasting,' in ver. 17, he retains the expression, and referring back to ver. 15 (τὸ καύχημά μου,* he asks—**what then is my reward?**—To take this question as implying a negative answer (Meyer) in immediate connection with what precedes—as though the meaning were: 'since I am a steward, not acting at my option, no reward can avail me, in order that (in accordance with the end appointed by God) I may preach unsupported' (which, as lying beyond my obligation now really merits a reward) —is, on the one hand, somewhat forced, and, on the other, leads to that which Dr. BAUR (*Tub., Theol., Jahrb.*) objects to Meyer's interpretation, that it involves the germ of the doctrine of supererogation, in entire contradiction with Paul's whole mode of thought, since if Paul regarded the gratuitous proclamation of the Gospel as conducive to its success, he must have recognized such a course as obligatory upon him. As Burger says: "not according to the rights belonging to him, but in accordance with his estimate of his own personal relation to his high office (xv. 8, 9; Eph. iii. 8; 1 Tim. i. 15, 16), did Paul consider himself bound to do what was not incumbent on the other apostles, and in order that he might demonstrate through his whole life the earnestness and depth of his GRATITUDE for the salvation so undeservedly conferred on him, and the office entrusted to his charge.—[If, however, we regard the first of the two previous clauses as expressing Paul's case—that in declining support he was showing how freely he accepted the obligation, he was thus rising above the condition of a steward, who was merely discharging his office from necessity, and so was having some occasion for boasting—some reason to look for a reward, we must here regard Paul as proceeding to state what reward he was looking for]. The answer to this question [is variously found; it either] lies in the following words, beginning with ἵνα εὐαγγελιζόμενος [and which may be rendered as in the E. V.],—**That when I preach I shall make the Gospel without charge.** —This was to him remuneration enough, that the Gospel which he proclaimed should prove no burden to the Church, [that he could enjoy the satisfaction of offering salvation without money and without price to all whom he addressed]. The ἵνα would then introduce the object had in view: "Wherein then does my reward consist?

* [Calvin, Wordsworth, Stanley, however, adhere to the strict meaning of ἑκών and ἄκων as given in the E V., *viz;* 'willingly' and 'unwillingly.' They apparently regard the γάρ, not as confirming what immediately precedes, but as resuming the general argument. 'For if I preach the Gospel willingly,—which indeed I do, notwithstanding the obligation imposed upon me, as my unremunerated labor shows, and for the sake of showing which I renounced my claims,—I have a reward, *i. e.*, from God, though not from you; but if I do it unwillingly, and simply because I am compelled to, why then I reduce myself to the condition of a domestic servant who merely acts as he is bidden.' This interpretation makes Paul intent on showing that he had made that which was a matter of bounden obligation his high privilege, and was fulfilling it in such a manner as to have praise from God. Here was the reason why he would never seek support from the church. One advantage of this view is, that in making the first of the hypotheses state Paul's case, we naturally connect the expectation of a reward here expressed with the inquiry which he goes on to answer, "What then is my reward?" On it our author goes on to comment].

* [But why not to what just precedes: 'I have a reward?' This were the more natural].

Why, in this, that I make, *etc.*" Thus the original signification of *ἵνα* is preserved. *θήσω*, fut. indic., which elsewhere accompanies *ἵνα* (yet oftener *ὅπως*) when some continuous act is spoken of. [Or we may, with Alford, consider these words as simply continuing the question and stating the circumstances in which he is looking for his reward.—**What then is my reward, that I while preaching shall render the Gospel without charge?**—"*ἵνα*, like *ὅπως* in classical Greek, with a fut. indic. points to the actual realization of the purpose with more precision than when followed by the subjunctive. The question in other words would be: "What reward have I in prospect *that induces me to preach gratuitously?*" The answer to the question would in this case be found in the next verse.].—**unto the end that,** (*εἰς τό*).—This may denote either the design in view ('in order that'), or the simple result ('so that I shall not, *etc.*').—Either would consist with the use of language.—**I shall not use my power.**—*Καταχρῆσθαι* [not as in the E. V. *abuse*, for this would yield no fit sense here], but as in vii. 31, *to use to the full.*—**in the Gospel,**—*i. e.*, in proclaiming the Gospel; [or, still better, "conferred upon me by preaching the Gospel."—Stanley].

Vers. 19–23. **For being free from all, I enslaved myself to all.**—The "for" indicates a connection between this and the previous words: "that I may not use my power." This connection may be understood, either as implying only a remote relation between the expressions "power" and "free," and introducing proof of that self-denial, which prompted him to renounce his right, as shown in other respects (so de Wette; in like manner, Osiander: "With an easy transition from the matter of his self-denial hitherto discussed, he passes rapidly on to show how he had exhibited the same in another and indeed the highest degree"); or, in a stricter manner, as though by the expression "my power," he designated his Apostolic prerogative in general, and the "freedom" he here speaks of were included under it (ver. 4); (so Meyer). At all events the connection is moderated by the thought that it was, with him, a fundamental principle, to make no use of his right,—only to give and not to take; and so also to devote himself to others instead of subjecting them to himself or making himself dependent on them, rather than make them dependent on him. [Stanley gives yet another view: "In the first instance, the idea of enslavement to all is suggested by the servile labor he had undertaken, as distinct from the free independence which he might have enjoyed as an Apostle; but he rapidly passes from this to his accommodation to the various feelings of all his converts, in the hope that of this mass he might gain the greater part to the cause of Christ. For the same transition from the idea of servile labor to that of serving generally, comp. Phil. ii. 7 (*δούλον.*)." Alford here finds the answer to the question: What is my reward? "**For** (*q. d.*, the reward must have been great and glorious in prospect) **being free from,**" *etc.*].

This principle of his he exhibits more fully in connection with the purpose he had in view, wherein at the same time his matter of boasting (*καύχημα*) in this respect may be seen. First, he mentions in general, how, for the sake of a higher object, he surrendered his independence, since, though as Christ's Apostle, he was dependent on no man, he had made himself dependent on all, had accommodated himself to their customs and prejudices, and in the plenitude of his Apostolic power, had, for their sakes, descended to the low condition of a slave.—**that I might gain,** *κερδήσω* is explained by the concluding *σώσω* (ver. 22). It means *a winning* for Christ or for God's kingdom by conversion (comp. 1 Pet. iii. 1; Matth. xviii. 15). This was ever deemed by Paul a 'reward,' a 'cause for boasting' [1 Thess. ii. 19, 20], although the word in this context is not to be referred precisely to this thought. [Bengel, on the contrary, finely says: "*κερδήσω, I may gain*, this word well suits with the consideration of *a reward.*" But Alford adds: "This is not enough; it is actually the answer to the question: "What is my reward?" and it is for this reason that *ἵνα—κερδήσω, is three times repeated*].—**the greater number.**—*τοὺς πλείονας*, as in x. 5, the larger portion of this company (not: 'the more' [as in the E. V.]; nor: 'as many as possible;' not yet, because of the *τούς*, with Olsh.: 'those ordained unto salvation by God'). [Alford says: "the largest number of any: that hereafter Paul's converts might be found to be *οἱ πλείονες*, the more numerous." This certainly accords with the ambition of Paul].—The following details point in part to diversities conditioned upon the ante-Christian position of the parties mentioned (Jews, Heathen, ver. 20 ff.), and in part to weaknesses existing in the pale of the Church, that required consideration (ver. 22), wherein he more nearly approaches his main theme. But because the same purpose is expressed here also as in what precedes, this, too, must be referred to the ante-Christian state, but not to the exclusion, however, of all allusion to that spoken of in the whole paragraph.—**and I became to the Jews as a Jew, in order that I might gain Jews.**—To interpret *τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις* to mean Jewish converts, and the subsequent designation: 'those under the law,' of the stricter Pharisaic class among them, is inconsistent with the object in view, *viz.*, that he might *gain* them, for such were already in a measure gained; and also with the contrast in ver. 21. [Examples of how he became a Jew may be found in Acts xvi. 3; xxi. 26].—**to those under the law.**—This is only another designation for Jews, describing them according to their peculiar characteristic (Rom. vi. 14; Gal. iii. 13; iv. 21); and it denotes neither Jews of the stricter Pharisaic class, nor proselytes of righteousness, nor Samaritans, nor Sadducees, who only held to the Pentateuch.—**as under the law.**—The word *as* denotes only a conformity in respect to customs, modes of life, and methods of instruction. That he preserved his independence in circumstances where Judaism was insisted upon as the condition of salvation, is evident from Gal. ii. 3 ff. Besides he asserts the maintenance of his own personal freedom from the law in the following participial clause not parenthetical [which does not appear in the Rec.].—**not being myself under the law.**—

μὴ ὢν αὐτός, etc. Here *μή* denies the thing as a matter of consciousness, [it being the subjective negative]. That he hereby intended to repel a charge of capricious self-exemption from the law to which he was properly bound, is a doubtful assumption.—**to those without law.**—By these are not meant proselytes of the gate, as persons who were bound by the law only in part; nor yet such parties as would no more submit themselves to the law's control; but heathen, properly speaking (comp. Rom. ii. 12–14), and so designated in contrast with the Jews, since they were not bound by the Mosaic law, and in which respect he conformed to them. **—as without law,**—in so far as he cast off Jewish ordinances in his intercourse with them (comp. Acts xi. 3, 7), and presented the truth to them, not in Jewish, but in Hellenic forms of instruction (comp. Acts xvii. 28; [1 Cor. viii. 1–7; ix. 24–27]). ["The word by which he here describes himself (*ἄνομος*) is the expression used to designate him in the forged Epistle of Peter to James (ch. ii.) in the Clementines; and seems, therefore, to have been a well-known term of reproach against him among the Judaizers." STANLEY]. For the purpose [therefore] of guarding against all mis-application of the term, as well as under the impulses of pious feeling [being "unwilling to appear, even for a moment, independent of God"], he repels all thought of any heathenish lawlessness (*ἀνομία*) being here intended, and asserts that, so far as this law had been revealed in its perfection through Christ, he both lived and moved in it.—**being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ.**—Ἔννομος χριστοῦ, comp. *νόμος χριστοῦ*, Gal. vi. 2; Jno. xiii. 34.—*θεοῦ* and *χριστοῦ* are genitives of relation and dependence ("Without legal dependence on God, legally dependent on Christ." MEYER). To be "under law to Christ," is different from being "under the law," inasmuch as the consciousness of obligation in one who *has become justified in Christ in order to* walk worthy of Christ, and to imitate Him in doing the will of God is different from servitude to the law, as the *means of justification* before God (comp. Rom. x. 5; Gal. iii. 10 ff.). [Here again the subjective nature of the assertion as indicated by *μή*, instead of *οὐκ*, must be noted. "Being conscious of not being,—remembering well in the midst of my 'lawlessness' (*ἀνομία*) that I was not." ALFORD. "*Paulus non fuit anomus, nedum antinomus.*" BENGEL].—**to the weak.**—Under this term he includes those previously mentioned (vv. 20, 21), persons who, lacking the higher power of Christ's spirit, require considerate treatment—when Jews, a mode of intercourse suiting with their law; when heathen, a freedom from the law. [So Stanley. But Alford, on the contrary: "The *ἀσθενεῖς* here can hardly be the *weak* Christians of ch. viii. and Rom. xiv., who were *already won*, but *those who had not strength to believe and receive the Gospel*" (Rom. v. 6). To this Hodge well replies; "The word *κερδήσω* means merely, *to win over*, to bring to proper views, and therefore may be used in reference to weak and superstitious believers as well as of unconverted Jews and Gentiles."]—**I became weak,**—*i. e.*, I entered into their condition in one way and another. This condescension to their peculiarities was, in appearance, a weakness; but, in truth, it was indicative of the highest moral power. If, with de Wette, we understand by the term "weak," a lack of ability to apprehend the higher moral truths, then the expression, "I became weak," would denote an accommodation on Paul's part in the methods of his instruction of them; but this has little in its favor.—Summing up all he concludes—**To all**—(*i. e.*, "to those just mentioned." OSIANDER; "to the generality of men with whom I had to do." MEYER).—**I became all things.**—"*Omnibus omnia factus est compassione misericordiæ, non simulatione fallaciæ, non mentientis astu, sed compatientis affectu.*" AUGUSTINE. It was an all-sided adaptation of himself to others,—within the limits of truth, of course, and in those things which were morally indifferent, according to the rule and direction of a love that was intent upon the salvation of souls. ["There are two things to be carefully observed in all cases of concession to the opinions and practices of others: first, that the point conceded be a matter of indifference; for Paul never yielded in the smallest measure to any thing that was in itself wrong. In this his conduct was directly the opposite to that of those who accommodate themselves to the sins of men, or to the superstitious observances of false religions. And secondly, that the concession does not involve any admission that what is in fact indifferent, is a matter of moral obligation. Paul's conduct in relation to Timothy and Titus shows the principle on which he acted. The former he circumcised because it was regarded as a concession. The latter he refused to circumcise, because it was demanded as a matter of necessity." HODGE].—**in order that by all means I might save some.**—[*πάντως, omnino*, or as Meyer, *in all ways*. Stanley says: "*by all means*, with the double meaning as in English"].—**and all things I do.**—*πάντα δὲ ποιῶ*, [see Critical notes]. The "all things" do not refer exclusively to what have just been spoken of,—as would be the case with the feebly supported reading *τοῦτο, this*—although these are not to be excluded. The meaning is: 'all things which I do, I do,' *etc.* ["St. Paul did not become *totally* and *at once*, but *severally* and *singly*, not *absolutely*, but *respectively*, all things to all men." WORDSWORTH].—The object of this—**on account of the Gospel.**—(*διὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*). It is a question whether we have here an independent thought, or whether it is only a more general expression for that which is stated more fully in the following objective clause,—**that I may be a fellow partaker of it (with you).**—In the latter case, *συγκοινωνός* is either taken=*to further, i. e.*, an active participation in the *work of spreading* the Gospel (which, however, does not accord with usage, and would only be a repetition of what has just been said, while by the connective *δέ* a progress of thought is indicated); or as denoting a participation *in the salvation offered* by the Gospel—a thought hinted at in the previous clause. In the former case *διὰ τό εὐαγγ.*, must be construed as expressing the object aimed at in spreading the Gospel: "in behalf of the Gospel, for its honor and glory;" but interpreted as expressing the further

aim of 'his doing all things on account of the Gospel,' the clause *ἵνα—γένωμαι*, must be taken in the sense of becoming a fellow-participant in the salvation of the Gospel. But here again we have the exceptionable repetition (in *διὰ τὸ εὐαγγ.*); hence the assumption of an epexegesis, with the above correct rendering of *συγκοιν.*, deserves the preference. The meaning then is, that all he did aim at was to become a partaker with them in the salvation of the Gospel. At the same time, the objective end of that concerning which he had just spoken, is not excluded; but he only brings out now the other side, in order to let them see in his own example how his solicitude for his own salvation in fellowship with others, is something which must lie very near the heart of the Christian in all he does; and that this, in all his varied activity, is not a matter to be presumed upon, but must be striven for with the utmost earnestness.—In this thought we find the point of transition to the subsequent exposition, in which by pointing to his own example he presses on the Corinthians the importance of greater solicitude for their own salvation, and of sparing no pains or sacrifices in the attainment of this end (ver. 24 ff.). ["Here a new thought is introduced. Up to this point he has been speaking of his self-denial for the sake of others; here he begins to speak of it as for his own sake. It is no longer 'that I may save some,' but 'that I may be partaker of the Gospel *with you*.' 'Do not think that I do not require this for myself. In order to *do* good we must *be* good. To extend our Christian liberty to the utmost verge, is dangerous not only for others, but for ourselves also.' This argument he proceeds to support first from his own example and secondly by the warning of Israelitish history." STANLEY].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The Ministry—its claims and its obligations.* The regular and professional ministration of God's Word, requiring the expenditure of time and strength, in providing stated spiritual nutriment for a congregation and in the cure of souls; and in qualifying himself for which a person has spent his property either entirely or in part, founds a claim to the support both of himself and his family, in a manner suited to the position he occupies. This is an ordinance of the Lord himself, who has said: "The laborer is worthy of his hire." It is a rule, moreover, which reaches down to the lowest grades of animal labor performed for man, and runs through all departments of human society, and must be binding in proportion as the work done is excellent. It must, therefore, be most of all in force in that sphere where the relation of that which is given to that which is received is that of the "spiritual" to the "carnal."

On the other hand, it becomes a workman on this holy soil to show himself, in accordance with our Lord's example, to be one to whom "it is more blessed to give than to receive;" so that he shall not only discharge his more general obligations, the neglect of which would subject him to rebuke—not only perform what he is paid for, but shall also be ready to offer all manner of aid at the cost of time and strength, even in cases where no legal obligation binds him so as in this respect to fulfil the Scripture: "Freely ye have received, freely give." He must appear, not as one dealing in temporal affairs, looking ever for his equivalents, but as one carrying in himself a large liberal spirit, free from ambition and avarice, and all forms of selfishness. By his whole attitude and conduct, by word and deed, he must let it be seen what a joy it is to take that which has freely flowed in upon him, especially that which a partial love has conferred, and let it flow out again in all manner of gracious bestowments, relieving the afflicted, the sick and the needy, and helping on the work of the Gospel, both at home and abroad, promoting the enlightenment and the salvation of mankind at large, of every kind and degree, both within the limits of Christendom and in the regions beyond.

2. *Accommodation in the Ministry.* Self-denying love is exercised, not only in the renunciation of one's own rights to support, and in unrewarded toils and sacrifices for others' welfare, but also in condescending from the heights of superior knowledge and liberty to enter into the narrownesses and weaknesses of others, to accommodate oneself to their spiritual defects and necessities, to freely conform to their ways so as to infuse in them confidence as towards one of their own kind, to speak with them in their own language—with children in a childlike manner, and with adults according to their several powers of apprehension, and so to become all things to all men. And this will be done so genially that those with whom we converse shall not feel it to be a condescension. On the contrary, our whole speech and deportment will seem natural, through the blending power of a sympathizing love. Thus will love fit itself to every variety of forms and customs and habits, and to all spheres of life, doing whatever may be requisite for kindly intercourse, and avoiding or removing whatever hinders it, and holding itself ever ready to enter into all hearts, and win them towards the highest good.—And all this will be done for Christ's sake, and in accordance with the example of Him who, out of His own Divine love, entered into human nature, stooping to its lowest bent of infirmities, in order to redeem sinners, and lift them up to a life in God.

But as in Christ there is truth, and nothing but truth, so must this conformity be kept within the limits of truth. As in Him there was no self-seeking, no selfish fear of men, or vain desire to please men, so will it be with a proper accommodation. It will be unwarped by such faults. That were a false, immoral compliance, to adapt oneself to the ways of others, especially their religious rites and customs, either for the sake of avoiding persecutions, or of courting favor, or of gaining coveted emoluments and applause, just as did the Jesuits in their missionary labors, as many Christians have done in their intercourse with the heathen, and as Evangelicals did towards the Romanists during the Interim. It is also an exceptionable accommodation when a preacher or teacher, for the sake of maintaining his position, or of obtaining one with a view to subsistence, comes down from the height of his lofty views and clear conceptions,

to profess his faith in, and inculcate opinions which are objectionable and degrading, because untrue and superstitious. Equally unworthy and immoral is it also to gesticulate or speak as a worshipper in presence of, or in company with others who believe in a personal God, who can be approached in prayer, although one is a stranger to that faith, and considers such practices as follies, belonging to a lower grade of conceptions; and the more reprehensible is such conduct in proportion as the motives which prompt to it are low and selfish, (comp. Heubner).

[3. *The doctrine of supererogation.* The Romish divines, as is well known, adduce the 16th verse in support of their doctrine, which teaches the special meritoriousness of works, which, under the promptings of love, exceed the scope of the command enjoined. The reward which Paul here looked for, according to the "annotations in the Rhemish version," was the "reward of supererogation, which is given to them, that out of aboundant charitie do more in the service of God than they be commanded, as St. Augustine expoundeth it." The fallacy here consists in making specific precepts, which are mainly relative and prudential, the absolute rule of duty. Determined by the highest and most universal law, every good that it is possible for man to do, is a matter of obligation. "He that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," *etc.* If Paul therefore knew that by renouncing his right to support he would avoid the appearance of selfishness, remove a stumbling-block in the way of the Gospel, and strengthen his influence, he was bound to renounce his right; and in so doing he obtained only the reward which belongs to all works done in love—the reward of grace. His self-denial was a work of supererogation only in relation to man, but not in relation to God. See Calvin *Inst.* B. III. ch. 14, § 14 ff; B. IV. ch. 13, § 12 ff.].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

[In this chapter we have a self-drawn portrait of the great Apostle—a portrait which vividly represents to us the man, not only through the particular features described, but also in the free, courageous style in which the sketch is made. The object in thus bringing himself to view is to enforce the precepts contained in the previous chapter by his own example, and to prove his right to teach as he did, by his own practice. Accordingly we observe here: 1. Paul's position *a.* as a man—"free," bound by no legal obligations to any, and capable of taking care of himself; *b.* as an office-bearer—"an Apostle," holding the very highest authority in the church, as proved by his having seen the Lord, and having had the seal of the Spirit put to his ministry (vv. 1, 2); *c.* in his rights, first to domestic solaces (ver. 5), and secondly to maintenance, as proved, *α.* in accordance with the principle of compensation for work (ver. 7), *β.* by the law of Moses (vv. 8, 9), *γ.* by the analogy of the Levitical priesthood (ver. 13), *δ.* by the command of Christ (ver. 14). 2. His conduct, *a.* abnegation of legal claims to support (vv. 12, 14); *b.* endurance of privations and toil (ver. 12); *c.* condescension even to the position of a servant (ver. 19); *d.* kind accommodation to the weaknesses and prejudices of others. 3. His purpose. He designed to continue this course of self-denial at all cost, and rather die than abandon it (ver. 15). 4. His motive—the desire of the reward which belongs to the workman who counts duty a privilege, and exceeds the limits of legal obligation in the excess of his love (ver. 18), and which comes from gaining the larger number of souls to Christ (ver. 19), and which is found in the more certain enjoyment of the Gospel, in fellowship with those for whom he labored (ver. 23).

The traits which here shine conspicuous are: consciousness of perfect integrity; a sense of personal dignity as a man and an Apostle; frankness; courage; love in its highest forms of self-sacrifice, condescension and zeal; and wise prudence in the methods chosen for gaining the highest ends.

In all this we have: 1. an instructive picture of a true minister of Jesus Christ; 2. an illustration of the power obtained for the enforcement of precept by appealing to one's own example; 3. an exhibition of the might and majesty which resides in a self-denying spirit].

Starke.—Ver. 1.—Faithful ministers find their best support in their calling and office, in their good conscience and Christian walk; and their best apology in their deeds and not in their words.—Ver. 2: There are bad preachers who are praised, and good preachers who are blamed; look at the fruits: if these are good then the tree is good also.—Ver. 7: Avarice and ingratitude are alike great sins,—the former in ministers, if they labor only as hirelings for a reward; and the latter in the people if they let their ministers suffer.—A three-fold illustration of a right-minded minister (ver. 7): the first (that of a warrior) tells of valor and unshaken courage in overturning the kingdom of darkness by the right use of spiritual weapons (ver. 25; 2 Cor. x. 4, 5); the second (that of a vintner) tells of unwearied labor; the third, (that of a shepherd) tells of constraining love and official fidelity (Ez. xxxiv.; Jno. x.).—Ver. 11:—The blessings conferred through the ministry are more precious than can be adequately requited by temporal good. Ye hearers, be rich in love; ye ministers, rich in contentment (1 Tim. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 11);—ver. 13 ff: A faithful worker is worthy of his reward; but lazy, reluctant, luxurious ministers deserve not the good they enjoy.—ver. 16: Preachers *must* preach; and hearers hear. There is no escape from this. On these things hang life and death.—ver. 17: It is the sure sign of a faithful minister that he discharges his office with such yearnings of affection toward Christ and toward his hearers, as admit neither of indifference, nor idleness, nor reluctance (1 Pet. v. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 8).—Fidelity in office is no special merit (Luke xvii. 10); yet a faithful servant may look for a reward of grace from Christ (Matth. xxv. 23). — Not ministers only, but all Christians equally should endeavor to remove whatever obstructs the cause of Christ. —Ver. 19: The servants of Christ, while exer-

cising Christian love and kindness, and gentleness towards all, must, at the same time, take care to preserve a good conscience, and in no way prejudice their abiding in Christ.—Let those who rule consider themselves as the servants of all (Mark x. 43); and so in matters indifferent let them overlook, yield and suffer much, in order to win those under them, and promote their improvement. This is the method of true love.—ver. 20: A blessed sort of menpleasing, when it is without sin, unto edification! (Rom. xv. 2).—ver. 21: Those who associate with the godless for their good, must be careful to abide by the law of Christ; otherwise they will deteriorate rather than improve.—ver. 23: A minister who does not labor himself to become a partaker of the Gospel will never properly labor to make others partake of it.

Berlenburger Bible.—Ver. 10: We must not abide by the shell of Scripture; but break into the kernel. The shell reads "oxen;" but the inner sense means *us*, patient, laborious ministers, who plough the field of the church, labor in the fear of God, take firm steps in the Divine ways, and spare not but trample on the flesh, in order that the hidden kernel of the spirit may burst the hull, and move men to repentance and the mortification of their earthly affections. And such should be enabled to enjoy the fruits of their spiritual labor in the tokens of gratitude.—Ver. 11: It is the part of a true minister to be unwearied in laying in the heart a good foundation, and planting good seeds therein for an after abundant harvest.—Ver. 12: To abstain from one's right is a proper offering.—Ver. 13: Men eat at God's table. He feeds His servants when He gives them of that which belongs to Him.—Ver. 16: The *must* here is not a slavish, but an evangelical *must:* the love of Christ constrains.—Ver. 19. In Christianity froedom and service stand together. Where the former is not, there there is not in the heart such a willingness to engage in service. This is true Christian magnanimity—to be free from all, and yet to devote one's self to all. He who has not the love so to devote himself is certainly not free, but acts under constraint.—Ver. 20 ff: Genuine condescension goes counter to flesh and blood; since it is only through a Divine love that a person can be induced to endure, to wrestle, to fight, to turn and twist like a worm in order to accommodate himself to the circumstances and whims of poor ignorant souls, and to surrender, willingly yield, or share in any thing innocent, for the sake of winning them to Christ the better. A minister must bring with him into his office a large pity, since he will be obliged to see much want, and not be able to shape everything on one last. It costs something to associate with the weak and distressed, and the like, whose society men are apt to shun. The mind and example of Christ are to us sufficient law; by these our minds are taken captive and sufficiently assured.—Ver. 23: He who labors much to impart the Gospel obtains in return a proportionate share of its blessings. The peace of God which he dispenses will return upon him.

Rieger [is omitted, being substantially a repetition of the above].

Heubner.—Ver. 1: The work which alone endures is that which is performed on the human heart, and a faithful minister has the best opportunity for erecting a monument which shall outlast human records.—Ver. 3: Every person is bound to vindicate his conduct to his friends.—Ver. 7: There may be claims to a reward without the undue coveting of a reward.—Unthankfulness towards ministers merits earnest rebuke.—Ver. 8 ff: A man should wait for his reward in hope, not demand it before his work is done.—Ver. 11: Manual labor, and the expenditure of time, may be appraised, but not the nobler toil, the superabundant blessing, and faithful heart of a true minister. These God alone can reward with His love.—Ver. 12: It is precisely the most faithful minister that has to encounter human wickedness in its most outrageous forms. The most meritorious are often the most poorly paid. In many spiritual occupations one does the work and another gets the pay. Like the Apostle, we should be ready in needful cases to work without reward, and find our recompense in our good works and in the approval of God. The more a minister lives under the pressure of hardship, the brighter will the light of his religion shine. [But this fact will not justify the people in putting the pressure on].—In all doubtful cases the conscientious minister will inquire by what course the Gospel will most be benefited, and act accordingly.—Ver. 14: A minister should desire only what is necessary for his support, no more. The church should not give him luxuries.—Ver. 15: The disinterested minister may, for the sake of vindicating himself, remind his people of his magnanimous conduct.—A minister must have a reputation for disinterestedness. If there is a chance for making large gains, and at the expense of a good name, let him surrender the chance.—Ver. 16. How foolish it is to boast of having done our duty! The higher the office is, the more disgraceful to our trust. The constraints of duty, to which a pious man freely yields, are irresistible. 'God has put me here'—this thought should accompany the minister to his latest breath. To retire from work, when not compelled by age or other circumstances, is a very questionable procedure.—Ver. 18. Joy in serving God, and being assured of his love, is the most strengthening reward. A sense of this makes free and happy ministers.—Ver. 19: A faithful laborer assumes many burdens not legally imposed. But when can he ever do more than his duty (Luke xvii. 10)? We cannot fully perform even what we ought.—Our labor is at best piece-work. In saving souls nothing is too burdensome, nothing too lowly.—Ver. 20 ff: A pious man may be many sided; for nothing is more manifold than the ways and means of Divine wisdom in the execution of its designs But there is a great difference between the noble legitimate accommodation of the Christian and the slippery by-ways of worldly cunning.

C. *Exhortation to earnest self-denial as the condition of obtaining an incorruptible crown; and a warning against carnal security.*

CHAPTER IX. 24.—X. 13.

24 Know ye not that they which run in a race [race course, *σταδίῳ*] run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain [really lay hold of it, *καταλάβητε*].
25 And every man that striveth for the mastery [contends for a prize, *ἀγωνιζόμενος*] is temperate in all things. Now they *do it* to obtain a corruptible crown [chaplet,
26 *στέφανον*]; but we an incorruptible. I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight
27 [box, *πυκτεύω*] I, not as one that beateth the air; But I keep under [beat black and blue, *ὑπωπιάζω*][1] my body, and bring *it* into subjection [enslave it, *δουλαγωγῶ*]: lest that by any means, when I have preached [been a herald, *κηρύξας*] to others, I myself should be a castaway [a rejected one, *ἀδόκιμος*].

Moreover [For, *γὰρ*],[2] brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that
2 all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all baptized [had themselves baptized, *ἐβαπτίσαντο*][3] unto Moses in the cloud and
3, 4 in the sea; And did all eat the same spiritual meat; And did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them [out of a spiritual, following Rock, *ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας*]: and that Rock was
5 Christ.[4] But with many [most, *τοῖς πλείοσιν*] of them God was not well pleased:
6 for they were overthrown [strewed about, *κατεστρώθησαν*] in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples [became types for us, *τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν*], to
7 the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted; Neither be [become, *γίνεσθε*] ye idolaters, as *were* some of them; as it is written.[5] The people
8 sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play. Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in[6] one day three and twenty thousand.
9 Neither let us tempt [put to the full test, try fully, *ἐκπειράζωμεν*] Christ,[7] as[8] some
10 of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents. Neither murmur ye, as
11 some of them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer. Now all [*om.* all][9] these things happened unto them for ensamples [typically, *τυπικῶς*][10]: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come [last of the ages have come, *τὰ τέλη τ. αἰώνων κατήντησεν*][11].
12, 13 Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall. There hath no temptation taken [trial seized upon, *πειρασμὸς εἴληφεν*] you but such as is common to man [human, *ἀνθρώπινος*]: but God *is* faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with [in the midst of (Tyndale), *σὺν τῷ π.*] the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye[12] may be able to bear *it*.

[1] Ver. 27.—*Tischendorf* has *ὑποπιάζω*, but the Rec. and *Lachmann*, in accordance with the most reliable MSS., have *ὑπωπιάζω*. [A. B. C. Γ. (1st and 4th hand). Sinait. many cursives, Orig., Ephr., (one MS.) Chrys., Theodt., Theophyl., Œcum., have *ὑπωπιάζω*. F. G. K. L., with more than 30 cursives, Euseb., Scrap., and a number of copies of the Greek Fathers, have the Attic. *ὑποπιάζω*. The Latin writers and versions do not clearly indicate what reading they followed; they have *castigo* (vulg.) *subjicio, macero, affligo*, and *domc. Reiche, Matthei* and *Tischendorf* have defended *ὑποπιάζω*. *Meyer* thinks that this originated in the error of some unskilful transcriber, to whom *ὑπω* with *ω* was offensive. The word *ὑπωπ.* is found, however, in classic and Hellenistic Greek (Robinson's Lexicon), and occurs also in Luke xviii. 5. As an agonistic phrase, it seems to accord well with a number of expressions in this whole passage. The English critics have unanimously adopted it.—C. P. W.].

[2] Chap. x. 1.—The Rec. has *δέ* instead of *γάρ*, but in opposition to decisive authorities. The change originated in a mistake with respect to the proper connection.

[3] Ver. 2.—*Lachmann* has *ἐβαπτίσθησαν*, on the authority of good but not decisive MSS.; and as the more difficult reading, *ἐβαπτίσαντο* (of the Rec.) deserves the preference. [The passive form is more usual among Christian writers, especially with reference to infant baptism, and is given in A. C. D. E. F. G. Sinait. and 15 cursives; but the middle form is attested by B. K. L., Orig., Chrys., and others, and its reciprocal signification was demanded by the Apostle's purpose, and need not have given offence with regard to the subjects of apostolic baptism. Theophyl. gives *ἐβαπτίζοντο*, and thus confirms the conjecture that *ἐβαπτίσθησαν* was a correction.—C. P. W.].

[4] Vers. 3, 4.—The different positions given to the words in verses 3 and 4 by different MSS. have no effect upon the sense of the whole passage (see Tischendorf). [A. C., *et al.*, omit *αὐτὸ*, and Sinait. omit *τό αὐτὸ*. D. C. (2d hand) and Sinait. put *πνευματικὸν* before *βρῶμα*, and A., with some cursives, put *πνέυμ. ἔφαγον.* before *βρῶμα*. In like manner in

v. 4, A., *et al.*, omit αὐτὸ. The Rec., with D. F. K. L., *et al.*, place πόμα before πνευμ. ἔπιον, while A. B. C. Sinait, *et al.*, place it after those words. The Rec. also puts δὲ immediately before πέτρα, with A. C. D. (2d hand) K. L., and some patristic MSS., but with no cursives of much authority.—C. P. W.].

[6 Ver. 7.—Instead of ωσπερ, the Rec. has ὡς, but it is probably a correction to conform to the more usual word.

[7 Ver. 8.—B. D. F. Sinait. omit ἐν before μιᾷ, but A. C. D. (2d and 3d hand) E. K. L. insert it.—C. P. W.].

[8 Ver. 9.—Lachmann and Meyer have κύριον with B. C. [Sinait.], et al. Meyer thinks that Χριστὸν and θεὸν (A.) are attempts made to explain the true text. But even if Χριστόν had been the true reading, it could easily have given offence to some, who did not see how Christ could be tempted before His incarnation, and so it might have occasioned the insertion of κύριον. [The only authorities for θεὸν are A., two cursives, two MSS. of the Slav., and Beda. Χριστὸν is adopted by *Elzevir*, (Rec.) *Scholz*, *de Wette*, *Osiander*, *Tisch.*, *Bloomfield* and *Wordsworth*, after D. E. F. G. K. L., a number of cursives, the Ital., Vulg., Syr. and other versions, and Theodt., Marcion, Chrys., Œcum., Theophyl., Iren., and several Latin Fathers. *Alford* and *Stanley* prefer κύριον, as more likely to be explained by the insertion of Χριστὸν and θεὸν from the margin. On the other hand, Dr. *Hodge* thinks Χριστὸν the more difficult, and so the more probable reading, and that "while the temptation was strong to change χρ. into κύρ. no one would be disposed to put the former word for the latter." Much zeal has been shown with respect to these various readings on account of their supposed bearing upon the preëxistence of Christ; and Epiphanius does not hesitate to charge some with an intentional falsification of the text.—He says: ὁ δὲ Μαρκίων ἀντὶ τοῦ κύριον Χριστόν ἐποίησεν.—C. P. W.].

[9 Ver. 9.—The Rec. after καθὼς has καὶ, but the authority for it is too feeble. [A. B. C. D. F Sinait. omit it, while only D. (3d hand) K. L., *et al.*, the Syr., Chrys. and Theodt. insert it. It was probably inserted as more usual before καθὼς, while the only reason for its omission would have been to conform to ver. 8.—C. P. W.].

[10 Ver. 11.—The Rec. has πάντα after ταῦτα δὲ, but it is wanting in B. C., *et al.*, and has different positions in the sentence, thus giving reason to suspect that it must be an addition. [C. K. L., with several versions and fathers, insert it, and D. F. Sinait., and some versions and fathers, read: πάντα δὲ ταῦτα.—C. P. W.].

[11 Ver. 11.—*Lachmann* has τυπικῶς, and his reading is well sustained. It is possible that τύποι (Rec.) is an attempt to make the passage conform to ver. 6. [Lachmann's reading is supported by A. B. C. K. Sinait., and some versions and fathers. —C. P. W.].

[12 Ver. 11.—Rec. has κατήντησεν, but *Lachm.* and *Tisch.* have κατήντηκεν. The latter is better, but both readings have good authorities. [B. D. E. F. G. Sinait., and some Greek Fathers, have the perfect, and Meyer and Alford think the other an instance of the alteration which copyists frequently made of the perfect into the aorist form. The other word, however, may be an equally appropriate instance of the alteration which the Alexandrian critics frequently made of the aorist into the perfect.—C. P. W.].

[13 Ver. 13.—The Rec. inserts ὑμᾶς after δύνασθαι, but it is feebly sustained, and it is probably an addition naturally suggested by the context for the completion of the sense. [It is cancelled by *Lachm.*, *Tisch.*, *Alford*, *Stanley* and *Wordsw.* after A. B. C. D. E. F. G. L. Sinait., and most of the versions and Fathers.—C. P. W.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VERS. 24–27. [Having in the last verse (23) of the previous section mentioned, as the second reason for the renunciation of his rights, his desire that he might thereby become partaker of the Gospel with those he labored for, he next proceeds] to bring home to the consciousness of his readers the extent of that self-denial and earnest endeavor which is requisite for the full attainment of the blessing in question. This he does by a reference to the Grecian games which were celebrated in their vicinity, *viz.*, the Isthmian games. ["It must be remembered in reading the Apostle's allusions, that from the national character and religion of the Greeks, these games derived an importance which raised them above the degrading associations of modern times. How intense an interest these contests still excited may be seen from Suetonius' graphic description of the agony of Nero in his desire to succeed; an exaggerated instance, doubtless; but yet illustrative of the general feeling. The *stadium*, or race-course, of which he speaks, was not a mere resort for public amusement, but an almost sacred edifice, under the tutelage of the patron deity of the Ionian tribes, and surrounded by the most solemn recollections of Greece, its white marble seats rising like the foundation of a temple in the grassy slope, where its outline may still be traced, under the shadow of the huge Corinthian citadel, which guards the entrance of the Peloponnesus. The *race*, in which all run; the pugilistic contests, in which they strove *not* "*to beat the air*," were not merely exhibitions of bodily strength, but solemn trials of the excellence of the competitors in the 'gymnastic art,' which was to the Greeks one-half of human education. As the friends and relatives watched with breathless interest the issue of the contest, they knew that the victor would be handed down to posterity by having his name sung in those triumphal odes, of which Pindar's are the extant model, and his likeness placed in the long line of statues which formed the approach to the adjacent temple. The 'prize' which he won from the appointed judges, who sat in state at the end of the course, was such as could awaken no mean or mercenary motives; its very simplicity attested its dignity; it was a garland of the Grecian pine, which still, under its classical name, clothes with its light green foliage the plains of the Isthmus, and which was then consecrated to the sea-god, around whose temple its groves were gathered. (See Conybeare and Howson, 20).—The application of the metaphor of the race to the progress of the Christian, here occurs for the first time. Afterwards, compare Phil. iii. 12, 14; 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8; Heb. xii. 1. STANLEY].—**Know ye not.**—[An abrupt and forcible appeal to a familiar fact, analogous to the case in hand, fraught with obvious lessons]—**that those who run in the race-course.**—Here is the first illustration—the race (δρόμος).—**run all, but one receiveth the prize?**—The βραβεῖον is the prize (ἆθλον) awarded by the arbiter (βραβεύς), ["Lat., *bravium*, IREN. IV. 7, whence the English, "bravo." WORDSWORTH]. The point thus made is stated by Osiander in the practical remarks: "The danger of failing of the end of our faith thro' a lack of persistent earnestness—the large number of the called, and the few that are chosen; or, as mere running on the course does not ensure the prize, so simple companionship with those who are striving for salvation does not ensure its attainment."—Hence he briefly and forcibly enjoins.—**So run that ye may obtain.**—The simplest interpretation here would be to refer οὕτω, *so*, to ἵνα, *that*, in the sense of ὥστε, *as*: 'so run as to obtain.' But it certainly would be more in accordance with usage to make the reference to what precedes: 'as that one runs who obtains the prize, so run ye in order that ye may obtain.' [Alford, on the contrary, makes the allusion more general: "after this manner, *viz.*, as they who run all, *each endeavoring to be the one who shall receive*

the prize; for the others strive as earnestly as he.—The οὕτως is presently particularized by one point of the athletes' preparation being specially alleged for their initiation"]. After "obtain," the word 'prize' must be supplied as the object understood. The use of the καταλαβεῖν suggests the personal effort shown in the matter, literally: 'that ye may seize, or grasp, the prize;' as in 1 Tim. vi. 12, ἐπιλαβέσθαι, in distinction from which the simple λαμβάνειν would denote the mere receiving, or accepting the thing presented. The recommendation accordingly is to a course of conduct corresponding to the laudable race of him who wins the victor's wreath, in order that they may obtain possession of salvation, [may 'work it out'].—That for this an earnest self-denying course was requisite, he shows from the example of the combatants.—**now every one.**—["The δέ, *now*, specifies, referring back to οὕτως. And the emphasis is on πᾶς, *every one*, thus showing οὕτως, *so*, to refer to the πάντες, *all*, who τρέχουσιν, *run.*" ALFORD].—**that strives.**—The general term, ἀγωνίσεσθαι, includes indeed in itself the idea of running in the race; but here the primal reference is to the preparatory training. ["The article (ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος) brings out the man as an enlisted and professed agonistes (or athlete), and regards him in that capacity. Had it been πᾶς δὲ ἀγωνιζόμενος, the sense would have been, 'now every one *while contending*,' *etc.*, making the discipline to be merely accidental to his contending—which would not suit the original antitype, where we are enlisted for life." ALFORD].—**is temperate in all things.**—To this there belongs self-control in every particular: *abstinere venere et vino*, and especially a strict diet, to make one light, nimble and fit for the conflict. ["The discipline lasted for ten months preparatory to the contest, and was at this time so severe, as to be confined to the professional athletes. The diet is thus described by Epictetus: 'Thou must be orderly, living on spare food; abstain from confections; make a point of exercising at the appointed time, in heat and in cold; nor drink cold water or wine at hazard;—in a word, give thyself up to thy training-master as to a physician, and then enter on the contest." STANLEY].—But as the prize set before the Christian agonistes is nobler than that which awaits the earthly athlete, so much the more ready must the former be to practice that self-denial which is the condition of success.—**they indeed.**—[μὲν οὖν, *immo vero:* "οὖν connects it with the general train of thought, and μεν gives emphasis." JELF, § 730, *b.*].—[The ellipsis here must be supplied from the previous clause: 'practice temperance'].—**in order that they may receive a corruptible crown.**—Such was the prize of the racer in the Isthmian games, a mere garland of pine leaves; [and elsewhere, of olive, parsley or bay leaves].—**but we**—He here includes himself in their ranks as a fellow-contestant. The ellipsis must be again supplied as above—yet carrying the implication of a higher sort of temperance, even a moral one, according to the nature of the contest entered into.—**an incorruptible.**—*i. e.*, blessedness and glory eternal as the reward of grace (comp. 2 Tim. iv. 8; Jas. i. 12; 1 Pet. v. 4).—In ver. 26 f., he turns now to speak of himself particularly, showing his own method of training and striving as an example.—**I then**—['Εγώ is emphatic,—recalls attention from the incidental exhortation and reminiscence of the Christian state to the main subject, *viz.*, his own abstinence from receiving support and its grounds.' ALFORD]. τοίνυν, serves to introduce particulars under a general proposition (Passow). So here where Paul comes to present himself as a specimen of the true athlete, who has put himself through a thorough discipline.—**so run as not uncertainly**—sc., 'running.' Ἀδήλως, either, *unobserved, unmarked*, in contrast with one who distinguishes himself and makes himself noted, or, which corresponds better with the parallel clause, *uncertainly*, (1 Tim. vi. 17), *viz.*, in reference to the goal, being certain of the issue. "In direct course to the goal." MEYER. (There are various modifications of this interpretation in relation to the goal itself, or to the reaching it, or to the way thereto, comp. Osiander),—**so fight I.**—He here passes over to another kind of contest, *viz.*, boxing (πυκτεύω).—**as not striking the air.**—This refers to those random strokes which instead of hitting the antagonist, spend themselves in the air; and not to the sham fight which is preparatory to the real conflict. He is representing himself as engaged in actual fight, and not in the safe prelude to it, as Chrys., Theoph. and others. The whole verse is a description of one occupied in the very heat of the conflict. In the positive exhibition of his conduct, he abandons the participial construction (as in iv. 14), which a further explanation renders necessary, because he passes out of the metaphor to the literal fact.—**but I bruise my body.**—Here we have the adversary mentioned on which he was thus planting his effective blows. It was his body ("the body of the flesh," Col. ii. 10); the "members," Rom. vii. 23, as the seat of sin—that which in its affections and lusts was ever hostile to the inner man—the spirit. His energetic treatment he expresses by a term borrowed from the pugilistic combats: ὑπωπιάζειν, *to smite under the eyes*, so as to make them black and blue; more generally, *to batter, to benumb.* According to Osiander, he means by it the mortification of the flesh by privations, labors, sufferings endured in consequence of his devotion to his calling, and, especially, of his renunciation of all right to support. We might also conceive an implication here of ascetic severities, such as fasting and the like,—but not to self-flagellation [the absurd practice of which grew out of an abuse of this expression].—**and bring it into subjection.**—δουλαγωγεῖν implies a complete conquest *quasi servum trahere*—"so as to bring the body under the control of a moral will." (MEYER, *Ed.* 3). His motive for this he expresses negatively.—**lest somehow, having proclaimed to others.**—By κηρύξας, it is questioned whether Paul intended the preaching of the Gospel, which the word elsewhere means in the New Testament; or whether in the prosecution of his metaphor he alludes to the functions of a herald. The latter is the more probable, as the term ἀδόκιμος in the next clause, belongs to the same category. The herald is one who calls the

champions into the lists and proclaims the names of the victors. Paul also was a herald, who summoned men to the Christian warfare, announced the terms of the conflict, and was himself also a combatant.—**I myself should prove rejected.**—ἀδόκιμος [*unworthy, disapproved, reprobate*]; by this we are not to understand 'disqualified for the conflict,' but 'unsuccessful in the issue.' ["An examination of the victorious combatants took place after the contest, and if it was found that they had contended unlawfully, or unfairly, they were deprived of the prize and driven with disgrace from the games." ALFORD]. *Apostolus suo timore nos terruit; quid enim faceit agnus, ubi aries tremuit?** "If we compare this passage, in which Paul so earnestly suggests the possibility of his own short-coming below the true standard of a Christian life, with ver. 18, from which the Romanists would fain draw their doctrine of an *opus supererogativum*, implying a distinction between *consilia evangelica* and *precepta* (general Christian duties), we shall readily see how far removed Paul was from fancying that he could do aught transcending his moral obligations—a notion which stands in direct conflict with the whole ethical view of the Apostle." NEANDER. ["What an argument and what a reproof is this! The reckless and listless Corinthians thought they could safely indulge themselves to the very verge of sin, while this devoted Apostle considered himself as engaged in a life-struggle for his salvation. The same Apostle, however, who evidently acted on the principle that the righteous scarcely are saved, and that the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, at other times breaks out in the most joyful assurance of salvation, and was persuaded that nothing in heaven, earth or hell could ever separate him from the love of God. The one state of mind is the necessary condition of the other. It is only those who are conscious of this constant and deadly power of sin, to whom this assurance is given. In the very same breath Paul says, 'O wretched man that I am!' and, 'Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory,' Rom. vii. 24, 25. It is the indolent and self-indulgent Christian that is always in doubt." HODGE].

VER. 1–5. The illustration derived from Grecian life is followed up by one taken from Jewish history. The thought set forth and established is the same just considered, *viz.*, the necessity of earnest self-denial for a participation in the Gospel salvation. Having expressed his own anxiety lest, with all his labors for others, he himself should fail of approval, he proceeds to substantiate his apprehension by referring to the case of the fathers. The connection is indicated by γάρ [which is the correct reading, and not δέ, as in the Rec. See Crit. notes].—**For I would not that ye should be ignorant, brethren.**—The logic is: 'there is reason to fear that I may become a castaway; for the early history of our nation proves that however close may be the relation sustained by men toward God, and however glorious the promises made to them, it is nevertheless possible for such to be rejected at the last.' In this respect he holds up the people of the ancient covenant as a warning to those of the new, showing, *first*, the rich experiences of Divine favor enjoyed by the former, in which he beholds a type of those dispensed under the N. T.; and, *secondly*, how the majority did nevertheless fall at last beneath the Divine judgments, by yielding to temptations, complying with their impious passions, and resisting God. By the expression: 'I would not that you be ignorant,' in which he does not so much remind his readers of something well known, as open up before them something new and for them significant (comp. Rom. i. 13; xi. 25), he calls their attention directly to what he has to say, and presses it on their earnest consideration. Grammatically it points primarily to facts, familiar even to the heathen converts, which he brings out in vv. 1-4; but, in reality, to the significance of these facts for the case in hand, *viz.*, that of a number (πάντες) participating equally in gracious relations to God, the greater portion (οἱ πλείονες) through their misconduct fell short of salvation (comp. ix. 24, πάντες—εἷς).—**that all our fathers.**—'Our fathers'—this is not said from the Jewish stand-point (Meyer), but the expression squares with the true Apostolic view of the relation subsisting between the people of the O. T. and the N. T. The Israelites were the spiritual ancestors of the Christians (comp. Rom. iv. 12; xi. 17).—**were under the cloud.**—The cloud was the symbol and medium of the Divine presence for Israel (Ex. iii. 21), which spread itself over the people, protecting them while on their march; hence the term ὑπό: *under* (comp. Ps. cv. 39). Beneath this marvellous covering and shield the wonderful passage through the Red Sea was effected (Ex. xiv.).—**and all passed through the sea.**—Both acts taken together, as accomplishing the critical deliverance of the people from a hostile power, are regarded by the Apostle as a type of baptism.—**and all were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.**—The cloud is, in a measure, taken together with the water (not symbolically of the Spirit) as the element into which they entered, and wherein they became, as it were, submerged, in order thence to emerge again. According to the true reading, he says, ἐβαπτίσαντο (Mid.): *they baptized themselves*, inasmuch as in the baptism of adults there is a voluntary entering into the Divine bestowments of grace and a free surrender to them. As Melancthon says: *fiducia verbi Mosis commiserant se aquis.**—The words, 'unto Moses,' cannot mean *sub auspiciis Mosis*, but as always with the verb 'baptize' they denote the relation or fellowship into which they entered with Moses, who, as the servant of the Lord, was the mediator of the Divine manifestations. With this there is connected the obligation to follow him faithfully as the leader given unto them by the Lord, and legitimated by Him (Ex. xiv. 31).

From the type of baptism which introduces into a fellowship of the redeemed, he proceeds to the type of the Lord's Supper, which was the confirmation and seal of the former, *viz.*, the fact

* [The Apostle terrifies us with his own fear; for what shall the lamb do when the ram trembles]?

* [Confiding in the words of Moses, they had committed themselves to the waters].

of the feeding upon the manna miraculously sent, and the drinking of the rock, by which means the preservation of the ransomed people was secured. "This connecting of baptism and the Lord's Supper as the two sacraments in the N. T., whose O. T. analogies Paul here adduces, is exceedingly noteworthy. It is a testimony in favor of the Protestant view of the *duality* of the sacraments." NEANDER.—**and did all eat the same spiritual food.**—The "spiritual food" or manna (Ex. xvi. 13 ff.) is distinguished from all earthly food, either because of some supernatural quality in it, or because of its supernatural origin. Here unquestionably we are to suppose the latter. The epithet 'spiritual' denotes that the food came from the Spirit—was produced by a Divine miraculous power (comp. Ex. xvi. 14). ["It is here employed in special reference to its descent from heaven and its designation in Ps. lxxviii. 24, 25 as "the bread of heaven" and "angels' food." STANLEY. "Thus, also, Isaac is called, Gal iv. 29, 'he born after the Spirit,' in opposition to Ishmael, who is spoken of as 'born after the flesh.'" ALFORD. WORDSWORTH, however, quoting from Bp. Fell, says: "the food and drink are called 'spiritual' because they are Christ's body and blood in types."—Why may not all the significations given be recognized? Scriptural phraseology has a fulness of meaning which ordinary language has not; for there was more "in the mind of the Spirit" who inspired it than the writers themselves even knew]. If we assume a supernatural quality in the "food" and the "drink," we must also suppose that they were at the same time aliment for the Spirit; but this thought is the less tenable from the fact that we cannot admit the referring of the τὸ αὐτό to the believers of the N. T., as if it meant, 'the same with ourselves,' nor allow the identification of these objects with the elements in the Lord's Supper, as Calvin does. The expression 'the same' is rather to be joined with the word 'all,' which accordingly holds the emphatic place, and is five times repeated. They all united in partaking of the same gifts—a fact, however, which did not prevent the majority from incurring a terrible retribution. In the phrase—**they did all drink of the same spiritual drink**—(to which also most of the above remarks apply), Paul has in mind the occurrence mentioned in Ex. xviii. 6, also Numb. xx. 10. To this an explanation is appended ["and it was needed, because the tradition to which it refers is not found in the O. T." STANLEY].—**For they drank of that spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ.**—The imp. ἔπινον, *were drinking*, was intended to denote their continuous drinking all through the entire march in the wilderness. In the previous sentence we have the aor. ἔπιον, signifying the simple fact of drinking.—But what do these statements import? Certainly not that the term 'rock' stands for the water flowing from the rock [Lightfoot, Meade], which the Israelites conducted along by their side in channels, or took with them in leathern bags, or which in some way did not further fail them, which water meant Christ; or that the rock was a symbol of Christ, as of one out of whom streams of living water flow. In such a case it would have read, not "was Christ," but, "*as* Christ." According to a Rabbinical tradition, the rock followed the children of Israel throughout their journey. [STANLEY says that "they maintained that there was a well formed by tradition the spring in Horeb, which gathered itself out of into a rock, 'like a swarm of bees,' and followed up the people for forty years, sometimes rolling along of itself, and sometimes carried by Miriam; and always addressed by the elders when they encamped, in the words of Num. xxi. 17: "Spring up, O well, sing ye unto it"]. Meyer thinks that Paul fastened on this tradition to convey the idea that it was Christ who, in the form or apparition of this wonderful rock followed the host; as indeed also the Targum on Is. xvi. 1, and the Book of Wisdom x. 15 ff.; xi. 4, assert that the Messias, the Wisdom, was by the side of the people for a protection in the wilderness. But, however, we may reject some of the absurd details only of that tradition, still it must ever be considered a monstrous supposition—at any rate, one in no wise hinted at in the Scripture, that the Messiah, or the angel Jehovah did in reality accompany the Israelites in the form of a rolling rock. Christ, the preëxistent Messiah, the Lord who went with the people on their march, as the proper source of this wonderful drink, which, according to the bodily sight, streamed out of the *natural* rock, is called in contrast with this a *spiritual* rock—a rock of a supernatural kind, which carried in itself a divine power. "The miracle of bringing water out of the rock, happened not once, but at least twice (Ex. xvii. 6; Num. xx. 11). It was therefore not one particular rock which was concerned in the miracle; but as often as a like necessity occurred, there on the spot was also the water-yielding rock again." Now since every rock could render the same service by the same influence, so it appeared as if the rock accompanied the Israelites. The material rock, in this case, is non-essential; the water-giving power is the chief thing. This power was God's, that same God who has manifested Himself to us in Jesus Christ. And He is called the Rock that followed them, because it was through His agency that the several rocks, one after the other, acquired the same water-yielding power." BURGER. In like manner, substantially, Abarbanel [Wordsworth, Hodge. But Alford detects here a typical allusion to Christ in the sacraments of the New Testament].—Observe also the preposition used; it is not ἀπο, but ἐκ., which is not causal, as if it meant *thro' the operation of*, but it denotes the origin and source from which a thing comes. They drank *out of* a Spiritual Rock, which was Christ [Wordsworth]. Comp. Osiander, who, moreover, in the drink, as well as in the food, assumes the presence of a supersensuous element along with the sensuous, by which these objects become so much more real types of that offered in the holy Eucharist. To this we would not object. The analogy abides the same: on both sides there is a food and drink of supernatural origin—a bestowment of divine life, nourishing and refreshing the human life, which, in the agency of the Rock that accompanied Israel in the wilderness, even Christ, ensures refreshment from itself, primarily to the

earthly food; a shadow (σκιά) of the refreshment furnished to the spiritual life out of the fulness of the incarnate and now glorified Christ, who has finished the work of a spiritual redemption. We must here hold fast to what our Lord said respecting the contrast between the Old and the New Testament manna (Jno. vi. 49 ff.). "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread that cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die."

To these lofty experiences of God's gracious manifestations, of which all were partakers, the following words form a powerful contrast.—**but with the greater part of them God was not well pleased.**—*i. e.*, they forfeited God's favor and failed of the promised salvation. The proof of this—**for they were overthrown in the wilderness.**—On καταστρώθησαν comp. Num. xiv. 16. [The identical language of the Septuagint]. (Heb. iii. 17, ἔπεσον). The word πλείονες, *the greater part*, comprehends more than those who were destroyed by the particular judgments, of which he afterwards speaks. It denotes the entire older generation, who, with the exception of Caleb and Joshua, must have died in the wilderness, and thus failed of the promised land.

VERS. 6–11. **Now.**—δέ, transitional. He here begins the application to his readers, by exhibiting the occurrences of the Old Testament in the form of τύποι.—**these things.**—ταῦτα, *i. e.*, the judgments implied in the word "overthrown,"—judgments which they incurred in consequence of their God-provoking conduct,—and which he proceeds to illustrate in particular instances.—And these were intended to teach Christians what they would suffer under like circumstances.—**happened as figures of us.**—The word τύπος, whence our *type*, in the more definite, theological sense, means not simply an image, in general, to which the antitype (ἀντίτυπος) corresponds; but it is used to express any event, institution or person that, by a divine appointment, foreshadows, upon a lower stage of theocratic life, events, institutions or persons belonging to a higher sphere. Here, however, the word is taken in a purely ethical sense, and means *example of warning, figures.*—The plural ἐγενήθησαν is here used because of τύποι.—"Figures of us"—*i. e.*, of our lot in like conditions. This construction is analogous to that in ver. 11; hence it is not to be supposed that the subject of the verb is the 'the fathers,' understood, and that we are to take ταῦτα as the accusative, meaning 'in respect to these things,' including here the manifestations of divine grace, as well as of judgment.—[A view of which, Alford says, "I know not by whom suggested, but I find it in Dr. Peile's notes on the Epistles"].

The divine intent in furnishing these examples is thus stated—[" of course an *ulterior* purpose, for they had their own *immediate* purpose as regards the literal Israel." ALFORD.]—**in order that we might not be lusters after evil things.**—Here we had better understand all manner of evil lusts, rather than the specific inordinate lust of pleasure (as Grotius). And so the following phrase,—**as they lusted,**—is not to be explained simply by the event recorded in Num. xi. 4, but by the manifold exhibitions of wicked passions made by Israel at that time. Ἐπιθυμητής means one who is habitually governed by desire. The word occurs also in Num. xi. 34. Under "evil things" we are to include whatever is a violation of duty or a denial of love to the Lord or to the brethren. Of this sort was the eating of things offered unto idols (εἰδωλόθυτα) by the Corinthians. "The lusting of the Israelites after flesh was a wicked caprice involving contempt of God's provisions." OSIANDER.—Under this general head he next selects a particular instance, which is introduced by μηδέ—**neither**—a particle which does not necessarily connect matters coördinate.—**become ye idolaters, as were some of them.**—*i. e.*, by partaking of things sacrificed to idols at the altar feasts, which was a species of idolatry. This is what the record in Ex. xxxii. 6 refers to. There we have an account of the worship of the golden calf, and of the offering of sacrifices, accompanied by sensual indulgences. In this clause, of course, Paul could not include himself; hence the second person, 'become ye,' NEANDER. By "some of them," Osiander thinks that Paul intended the choristers, perhaps the stiffest of them who lead off in the dance and song, and were afterwards slain by the Levites. It has been finely observed that as the Israelites, so also the Corinthians did not regard their conduct as actual idolatry, but both were on their way to it.—**as it is written, The people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play.**—The word παίζειν, *to play*, here refers to those lively dances which occurred at heathen festivals (comp. xxxii. 18 ff.). [And many of these dances, as is well known, were directly designed to provoke the most licentious passions—dances, of which many of those now practiced in fashionable society are the direct lineal descendants. Hence the close connection between idolatry and fornication, which appears all through this epistle. Hammond, however, has a long note, which goes to prove that παιζειν was used to denote not only dances, but all manner of wanton lecherous sport, just as kindred words are used in many modern languages to express the same thing]. Idolatry ought, moreover, to be regarded as more than the fountain, for we may say, with Osiander, that it is the vilest fruit of an intensified sensualism.—**Neither let us commit fornication as some of them committed.**—Participation in superstitious practices led easily to the commission of that sin, from which he now proceeds to dissuade them—going back to the use of the first person—"let *us*."

This, indeed, was also a part of heathen worship, especially in the Corinthian temples, devoted to Artemis and Aphrodite; but it might also lead to idolatry, as was the case in the instance just alluded to (Num. xxv.), where the Moabitish women enticed the men, whom they had seduced, to idol festivals and so betrayed them into idolatry—a danger to which the Corinthians were much exposed (comp. chap. v. and vi.). — **And fell in one day three and twenty thousand.** — The number given in Num. xxv. 9, and also by Philo, Josephus and Rabbins, is twenty-four thousand. The discrepancy is, perhaps, best accounted for by supposing a failure of memory. Besser says: "Twenty-four thousand, yet not perhaps 'destroyed in one day.'" [Hodge says: "Both

statements are equally correct. Nothing depended on the precise number. Any number between the two amounts may, according to common usage, be stated roundly as either the one or the other"]. The feebly authorized *τέσσαρες* is an emendation; other attempts at harmonizing are arbitrary (comp. Meyer and Osiander).—How indefinite the word *τινες, some* is, and how it may be used to comprise a great multitude, is shown from this passage.—**Neither let us tempt.**—*ἐκπειράζωμεν*; *ἐκ* is here intensive; it is found also in Matth. iv. 7, *tempt beyond endurance.*—**Christ, as some of them also tempted.**—The allusion here is to the event recorded in Num. xxi. 4, where the people becoming weary of their journey, reproached Moses for bringing them out of Egypt, and expressed disgust at the manna. To tempt God means to put God to the proof to see how far His patience would go, and whether He would suffer men's unbelief and impatience to pass unpunished; or it may denote an impatient demand on God to help in some extraordinary way, and a conditioning of faith upon the result (comp. *πειράζειν*, Deut. vi. 16; Ex. xvii. 2, 7; Ps. lxxviii. 18 ff.; Acts v. 9; xv. 10). According to Meyer, it expresses the discontent of the Israelites at their condition in the wilderness; he takes Paul's warning as aimed at the dissatisfaction of his readers with their oppressed circumstances during the time of their waiting for the second coming of the Lord. But there is nothing in the context which indicates this; but rather the contrary. Possibly Paul might have had in mind the sacrificial feasts and the desire of the Corinthians for enjoying them, inasmuch as in this there was manifested a disgust at what the Lord had furnished to them in their Christian state, akin to the loathing of the manna by the Israelites. In such conduct he might discover a tempting of the Lord, a trial of His patience. "The Israelites demanded that God should appoint them a mode of life suited to their liking, that He would restore them the flesh pots of Egypt. In like manner the Corinthians seemed to demand of the Lord that He would allow them their old heathenish enjoyments." NEANDER. Or, he regards them as putting God's grace and power to the test, in that they were exposing themselves to the danger of a relapse, and so raised the question, whether He would preserve them by increased bestowments of His grace—in which case then we should find in the Old Testament precedent a challenging of God's power and goodness, as to whether He could nourish His people with something else besides the manna in the wilderness (Osiander, Stanley). The first of these explanations squares best with the circumstances presented in Num. xxi. 4, where the disgust of the Israelites at that which God had provided, was such a 'temptation' as the Apostle speaks of. ["It was a daring Him, in trying His patience by rebellious conduct and sin." ALFORD; so also Hodge]. Other attempts at explanation need not here to be taken into account, as they are too forced. —The verb 'tempted' takes for its object the pronoun 'Him' implied—though Winer takes it as absolute—and by this we may very well understand 'Christ' (comp. ver. 4; Ex. xxiii. 20; Is. lxiii. 9 ff.). If we adopt the reading *κύριον*, then still Christ might readily be understood by the term, although the relation to the Old Testament would be satisfied if we took it to mean God. [Hence whichever of the two readings we adopt, we have in this verse strong evidence of the fact that Paul regarded the Jehovah of the Old Testament as none other than Christ Himself, the Eternal Word, who in various ways—in natural phenomena and in the form of an angel, manifested Himself to the Fathers of the ancient dispensations, and was the real Ruler and Guide of Israel].—**and perished.**—If we adopt the reading *ἀπώλλυντο*, then the Imperfect here would denote the progression of the fact: 'They were being destroyed' (Meyer). Yet the reading *ἀπώλοντο* is more strongly supported [and is adopted in all the later critical editions]. —**by the serpents,** —[*i. e.*, the well-known serpents; "The article is so often *omitted* after a preposition, that wherever it is *expressed* we may be sure there was a reason for it." ALFORD].—The last warning is against murmuring—a sin of which the Israelites were frequently guilty (Num. xxi. 4; Ex. xvi. 8; Num. xiv. 1 ff.; 36 ff.; xvi. 41).—**Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured.**—The particular instance here referred to, must be inferred from the judgment pointed to;—**and perished by the destroyer.** —The *ὀλοθρευτής* or *ὀλοθρεύων, destroyer*, appears in Ex. xii. 23, and it denotes the organ of the Divine retribution—the angel executing it; but this is not to be regarded as an evil angel (comp. Macc. xv. 22 ff.). Since only some are particularized as murmuring (be the number greater or less), likewise their destruction by an extraordinary judgment, the event alluded to cannot be the one narrated in Num. xiv. In that case the whole congregation rose in rebellion, and the judgment inflicted was the gradual dying out of the whole elder generation (unless we restrict the affair to the ten spies, who were the cause of that uprising, and who died of a plague before the Lord, ver. 36 ff.). More suitable to our text is the circumstance mentioned in Num. xvi., where 14,700 persons were snatched away by a sudden visitation (ver. 49). Primarily the murmuring here was against Moses and Aaron, because of the destruction of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, with their company, which was charged upon these servants of the Lord. But, in fact, it was a murmuring against God from whom the judgment came [a judgment "which though it is not so specified *there*, was administered on another occasion by a destroying angel, 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, 17." ALFORD].—In its application to the Corinthians, we are not to suppose that the murmuring they were cautioned against was on account of inferior spiritual gifts, or because of the restriction of their pleasures through the regulations demanded in the Christian life, or at their general condition as Christians; but rather it was the opposition which they were disposed to manifest against the teachers given them by God, and especially against Paul, an opposition which struck directly at the Lord Himself (Osiander and others). To make the parallel perfect, we must suppose the murmuring occasioned by Divine retributions, such as that hinted at in xi. 30: "On this account many are weak and sickly,

and some sleep."—These references to the Old Testament he concludes as he began,—**Now these things were befalling.**—*συνέβαινον*, [the plural verb, where the Gr. idiom would require the singular, "expresses the plurality of events separately happening"]; and the imperfect (were befalling) hints at the constant repetition of the case (Osiander and Meyer).—**them typically,**—*τυπικῶς* as above *τύποι*, not in the theological sense, but 'for example,' *i. e.*, in such a way as by a Divine intent to indicate what would befall God's people in like circumstances under the new dispensation. This point is more definitely brought out in the following statement.—**and are written,**—*ἐγράφη*, singular, expresses the union of these transactions in the record of Scripture as one complete whole.—**for our admonition.**—Here is the purpose of the sacred narrative as ordained by God (comp. iv. 14).—**unto whom.**—The relative refers to 'our' (*ἡμῶν*), and introduces an allusion to the near approach of the great judicial crisis, thus confirming his warning.—**have come,** or 'into whose life-time have entered, and even now exist' (perf.),—**the ends of the ages,**—*τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων*. By this phrase the same is meant which is elsewhere termed *συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων*, "the consummation of the ages" (Heb. ix. 26); or *τοῦ αἰωνος*, "of the age" (Matth. xiii. 39); also briefly *τὸ τέλος*, "the end" (i. 8; xv. 24; Matth. xxv. 3; *et al.*); or *πάντων τὸ τέλος*, "the end of all things" (1 Pet. iv. 7). The "ages" here are the great world-periods preceding the manifestation of Christ, and out-goings of which mark the incoming manifestation. The *αἰὼν οὗτος*, *the present age*, is contemplated in its progressive unfolding through manifold periods, whose exit finally leads to the last decisive crisis which passes over to the *αἰὼν μέλλων*, *the future age*. Now the Apostle regards his time as the time of this grand crisis—accordingly as a time of severe trials for the faithful, in which it became them to be on their guard, and for which it was important for them to prepare with earnest self-denial; and he presses it upon the Corinthians not to expose themselves to the extreme of danger by indulging in a false security. "Paul had always good reason for considering the final catastrophe as near at hand, although he held the last time to be much shorter than it really was to be. Christianity is the goal and end of all earlier revelations, and no new one follows it. Hence the Christian is justified in considering himself as the terminus to which all the earlier developments of revelation point and conduct onwards." NEANDER.—Next there follows a caution, to which a word of encouragement is annexed for despairing minds.

VERS. 12-13. **Wherefore,** *ὥστε* [lit.: *so that*, is used with the Imp. or Subj. to introduce an inference from what precedes. (WINER P. III., § XLI. 5, note 1)]. Here it fitly leads in the practical exhortation deduced from the foregoing discussion. 'Since these events which teach us how those who stand in so close a relation to God and partake of such exalted privileges, may incur fearful judgments by their evil conduct, have been recorded in accordance with God's purposes as warnings for us who live in this last most critical period of trial, and are going on to the final judgment—**let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall,**—*i. e.*, beware how he indulges in a false security. The verbs 'to stand' and 'to fall,' taken from the phraseology of the ring, admit of a twofold interpretation. 1. The former: to stand fast in goodness and in faith; and the latter: to be betrayed into sin. 2. The former: to abide in the possession of salvation, to be sure of a gracious state; and the latter: to forfeit salvation. The second interpretation best suits the connection, and it presupposes the first. [HODGE puts the case more forcibly. The security cautioned against "may refer either to security of salvation, or against the power of temptation. The two are very different, and rest generally on very different grounds. False security of salvation commonly rests on the ground of our belonging to a privileged body (the Church), or to a privileged class (the elect). Both are equally fallacious. Neither the members of the Church nor the elect can be saved unless they persevere in holiness; and they cannot persevere in holiness without continued watchfulness and effort. False security as to our power to resist temptation rests on an overweening self-confidence in our own strength. None so liable to fall as they who, thinking themselves strong, run into temptation. This probably is the kind of false security against which the Apostle warns the Corinthians, as he exhorts them immediately after to avoid temptation"].—Though the Romish interpreters think they find evidence here against Luther's doctrine of a *fides specialis*, according to which a Christian can with the greatest assurance be confident of his own justification and of his perseverance in it unto the end, yet they are opposed alike by the experience of Paul himself (2 Tim. i. 12; iv. 8, 18), and of many a Christian after him who has enjoyed that *certitudo fidei* which, as a general thing, the Corinthians could not possess from want of firmness.—**no temptation**—*πειρασμός*; this denotes either an *ordeal*, especially by means of sufferings and persecutions, to which the verb "to bear" may refer; or, *temptation*, *i. e.*, enticement to sin, to which the connection with what precedes, and the hortatory intent of the whole paragraph would point. Both meanings coalesce in the thought that their Christian character had been put to the proof by painful circumstances, as well as by sinful enticements, so as to show whether faith was strong; love, of the right kind; and hope, firm.—**has taken you but such as is human.**—All apology in reference to the temptations they had hitherto experienced, though not now existing, and all despair in regard to the severer trials before them, Paul here meets by the statement that what they had thus far encountered was altogether 'human' *ἀνθρώπινοι*, *i. e.*, either: proceeding from men (such as the fascinations of the surrounding heathen life), in contrast perhaps with the properly demonic temptations of the last evil time which was to precede the revelation of Christ: or: suited to man, to his power of endurance, in contrast with the fascinations of a more dangerous sort, for overcoming which supernatural grace is required. [Hodge prefers the latter as the more natural and so the common interpretation. Ol-

shausen, the former]. For their encouragement in the future he points to the fidelity of God—**but God is faithful**—*i. e.*, true to His calling and covenant, consistent in His love and purpose (i. 9), which would appear wholly unreliable if he allowed temptations to befall His people that transcended their powers of endurance or resistance,—**who**,—*ὅς* for *ὅτι οὗτος, because He*,—**will not suffer you to be tempted beyond what ye are able.**—This expression seems to sustain the second interpretation given to 'human' above,—showing that a moderate temptation is meant by it. Compare the expression, Hos. xi. 4; 2 Sam. vii. 14. Besides, it must be said that every temptation, though coming primarily from men, is to be ascribed to Satan as the ultimate cause (comp. vii. 5; Eph. vi. 12), [and men and devils are alike under the control of the Almighty, who permits or restrains at pleasure, and to the degree that He sees fit.] The limit of permission is the ability to endure which God Himself has conferred. And this implies that with the later, severer temptations God will cause the strength of His chosen to increase (Neander). The same is true in respect to the time the temptation will last, of which he finally speaks.—**but will with the temptation make also the escape**—*ἔκβασις* literally means *escape, the passing out from*, the *ἀπαλλαγὴ τοῦ πειρασμοῦ* of Theoph.; but here it denotes the *way of escape*, or *the end* (=*τὸ τέλος κυρίου*, Jas. v. 11). The 'with' (*συν*) cannot indicate contemporaneousness; but it implies only that the escape is connected with the temptation, that the latter will never be without the former. The use of the verb "make" in relation to temptation does not conflict with that of "suffer," inasmuch as the Divine permission involves a direct providence. Even the tempting cause stands under the Divine sovereignty, and in its action is dependent on God. The emphasis lies upon *τὴν ἔκβασιν*. **—in order that ye may be able to bear** (it), —*τοῦ δύνασθαι ὑπενεγκεῖν*.—This clause may be taken either as interpreting "escape," showing that it will consist in the ability to endure; but this does not comport with the idea of an escape: or it may be construed as an objective clause as rendered above, intimating that the result would be such as will comport with the designs of a faithful God. The verb *ὑπενεγκεῖν, to bear*, suggests the idea of a burden carried, and very appropriately, inasmuch as all temptation is for the believer as an oppressive weight, or that of a hostile attack under which one has to hold out, to endure.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

[1. A sound belief in the *doctrine of the saints' perseverance* is ever accompanied with a conviction of the possibility of failure and of the absolute necessity of using our utmost endeavor in order to final success. No experiences of Divine favor in the past, no circumstances, however advantageous, furnish such a guarantee of salvation as to warrant spiritual repose. There is no perseverance without conscious and determined persevering, and the requisite effort can be put forth only under the influence alike of hope and fear. And he who apprehends no danger of being ultimately a castaway through neglect or transgression, will lack the motive necessary to urge him triumphantly to the goal].

2. *The spirit of the true Christian agonistes as contrasted with that of the false one.* "This poor life entire for an eternal crown,"—so A. Knapp pithily describes L. Hofacker's spirit; and this is the spirit of every true Christian warrior. In view of the crown of life, he hesitates at no sacrifice, is ready for all self-denial, does violence to his own nature, and never grows weary of mortifying the flesh through the might of the Holy Spirit (Rom. viii. 13; Gal. v. 24; Col. iii. 5). Such as desire to belong to Christ, yet are ever yielding to their natural inclinations, and deal tenderly with the flesh even though the spiritual life may suffer thereby, and they in consequence are detained in the heavenly race, are put to shame by men of this world, who for the sake of temporal gain or renown, willingly strain every nerve and incur the most painful privations, yea, even hold life cheap in order to attain their end (Luke xv. 8). Those who do not earnestly contend against whatever endangers their heavenly crown, and strive not with all their might to overcome the obstacles in their way, and so become weak and uncertain in their warfare, or who covertly entertain that which they ought to oppose, opposing it only for the sake of appearances, resemble pugilists who spend their blows in the air. Especially shameful is it for a person who is called to give others direction and encouragement in the holy warfare not to engage earnestly in it himself, and to shrink from the requisite self-denial and to tire in the race and grow lukewarm in the fight, so as to appear like the herald, who, having proclaimed the terms of the conflict to others, has been found himself unworthy of the prize (ix. 24–27).

3. *Carnal security, its fatal character.* The reason of lukewarmness in temper, of deficiency in self-denying earnestness, of abandonment to all manner of impure inclinations, of entanglement in ungodly objects, and worldly lusts, of idolatrous cleaving to the creature even to the lowest self-debasement, of strife with God and His providence both in disgust at the gifts He sends, and in murmurs at His judgments—the ground of all such bad conduct in those who would still be Christians, lies most frequently in a false security, in the vain conceit that there can be no failure—that the goal of salvation will certainly be reached, because a person has once been received into the fellowship of believers. All such false security in His people, God has taken pains to counteract from the beginning, and in their history He has furnished warnings against it for all time to come. In the judgments which befell that earlier generation, so distinguished for the marvellous bestowments of His grace—judgments inflicted because of repeated offences against their covenant God, a threatening has been issued to the Church of the New Covenant of a similar fate in like circumstances, according to the abiding law of the Divine rule (x. 1–11).

4. *Frowardness and false security readily give place to despair when severe temptations arise.* As

in opposition to the former, we must point to the Divine retributions in order to awaken a salutary fear; so in opposition to the latter we must point to the truth of God and the steadfastness of His love. God never ceases from His work of grace, and will not fail to furnish needful assistance to honest fighters; and He will moderate the measure and duration of the temptation according to the strength He has afforded; so that at the right moment He puts an end to the trial, in order that those who are tempted may be able to endure in the conflict (vv. 12, 13).

5. BURGER:—A person may be endowed with all the seals and tokens of Divine grace, and yet through personal infidelity be lost (x. 15).

6. *In Christ all the threads of the history of the Divine revelation run together.* He is the true and sole manifestation of the eternal God. In the midst of the ages He entered into the human race, and took upon Himself personally our nature, in order to perfect the work of redemption and carry out the purposes of God's holy love, and prepare the way for the final judgment of the world, in which He as judge will determine the lot of every man in accordance with the manner in which he has treated the Divine grace proffered him in His word and works. But this whole work He has prepared and foreshadowed under the older dispensation alike in the promise, and in the law, and in the manifoldness of His operations and providences, whereby both are led, established and confirmed in life, and secured against unbelief and disobedience. As the messenger of Jehovah, on whom Jehovah's name is written, who bears imprinted on Himself the Jehovah-character, and carries the image of the unchangeable, holy, merciful and true covenant God stamped in every word and deed, He is Israel's deliverer from bondage, his protector and helper in extremest necessities, his wondrous guardian and supporter in want which no natural means may relieve, who out of His own fulness furnishes him the life-sustaining manna, who pours out for him the life-refreshing water, who bears with him in unspeakable patience, but also at the same time exercises toward him a judicial severity. And what He does, ordains, or controls through His own personal manifestation, He has previously indicated both through individuals and their doings, and through manifold ordinances, administrations and judgments, intended for the instruction, for the comfort and warning of us in these last days.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—Ver. 24. The running includes: 1. a turning from sin; 2. a turning to the goal, *i. e.*, God (Acts xxvi. 18); 3. the exercise of the powers of the new man in the obedience of faith and the mortification of the sinful life; 4. the refraining from all hinderances, such as the lusts of the flesh, the lust of the eye and the pride of life—and indeed not simply from what is evidently sinful in itself, but also from things otherwise lawful, by which a person may either injure himself or put a stumbling-block in the way of others.—Ordinarily only one person obtains the prize; but in Christianity we can all obtain it, even though one may run faster than the other, provided only that we are steadfast. For as the faith is the same for all, so also is the race; although the degrees of glory attained may be various.—In the race no account is made of what man does in his own strength, or of his own will (Rom. ix. 16); but if God chooses to draw us by His word, and we resist not, then He grants the ability to come to Christ, and to follow Him, and to run with patience the race set before us (Heb. xii. 1 ff.).—HED.:—If they who run fail of the prize, what hope can those have who sit still, or fall back, or stop in the way? Ah! the obtaining of salvation is no child's play. Earned indeed was it without our labor; and now the prize being there, we must strive for it. Earnestness, earnestness, fear and trembling (Phil. ii. 12) are necessary to reach the spot where the crown is put on the victor's brow (2 Tim. ii. 5).—Standing and running both belong to the true Christian—standing, as opposed to falling; running, as opposed to idleness and standing still, and to unfaithfulness in falling back (chap. xvi. 13; Heb. xii. 1).—We should press to God through all things, and rest in nothing but in God (Matth. xi. 29).—With beginners Christianity is only a walk—they go step by step; but with the experienced it is a race.—Ver. 25. A Christian is bound to refrain from whatever obstructs his course, and to use all means for increasing his spiritual strength. The particular things to be avoided must be determined by each one for himself.—A person must be converted to God before he can have peace with God, and the pledge of salvation in his own soul, and can with a watchful eye avoid whatever may disturb his peace or injure his neighbor, and therefore ought to be denied.—The hope of an eternal crown keeps us from carnal gratification, and is a great incentive to perseverance (Rom. ii. 7).—Vv. 26, 27. LUTHER:—As a combatant who swerves from his course must fail of his goal, or in fighting makes false strokes, and wastes his strength in the air, so is it with all who would do good works without faith; for they are altogether uncertain as to how they stand with God: hence all their doings are misruns, mis-strokes and mis-doings.—The faith which works by love hits the foe squarely; since faith allows not of despair, nor love admits a false security.—He instructs best who teaches by example.—He who is void of spiritual life, runs by his own strength, and so runs into error and sinks at last.—What we venture on in the name of Jesus, and at His bidding, obtains the crown. What we do apart from Him, is lost work.—How many air-strokes and mis-strokes are given by those who have not the mind and weapons of Paul!—air-strokes in preaching, in the supposed vindication of truth, in prayer, and the like, under the idea that the foe has been finely hit or utterly laid low, and that a good work has been well done (1 Tim. vi. 3 f.)!—Something of the old Adam still clings to the best of Christians: hence they have to fight with themselves daily, and as Christ did towards Peter (Matt. xvi. 23) show the devil the door.—The flesh must obey the spirit, and for this, discipline and self-crucifixion are necessary. Woe to those who take the covenant of God into their mouth, and

hate discipline (Rom. ii. 17–23)!—Chap. x. 1: The pillar of cloud is a type of Christ, a token of God's gracious presence, for in Christ the Father's glory dwelleth (John i. 14).—*The cloudy pillar* was to the Egyptians a horror; to the Israelites a comfort: so is Christ to the godless an object of dread: to the faithful a source of consolation. The cloudy pillar departed not from the people day nor night; Christ is with us evermore. Ver. 2; Baptism is a token of God's grace and beneficence, just as was the passage through the Red Sea; it slays the old man and makes the new man live. Pharaoh dies but Israel survives. As God, by His miraculous favors, assured the Israelites of His gracious presence and aid, so is holy baptism a strong seal of the divine promise, and a sure witness of divine grace. As the Israelites were pledged by their deliverance to believe in Moses' doctrine, so are we pledged by baptism to believe the word of Christ and follow His commands. Ver. 3. *The manna* was a type of Christ: 1. as to its source—Christ was the bread from heaven; 2. as to the place where it was given—the wilderness is an image of this troubled life; 3. as to the mode of gathering it—we must seek Him early; 4. as to its enjoyment—the true Israelite enjoying Christ, with all His blessings; 5. as to the taste—Christ, the bread of life, surpasses the most delicious and refreshing food; 6. as to the punishment which follows upon contempt; 7. as to the provision made for remembrance—Christ has ordained a holy supper as His enduring memorial (John vi. 31–35). Ver. 4; The *rock* is a type of Christ, the Rock of our salvation, and the foundation of His Church (1 Pet. ii. 6), who, smitten by His sufferings, has poured out for us the water of life. Ver. 5. Hed.: *The manna, the gushing rock*, and the *pillar of cloud* could not hinder the destruction of Israel. Where was the failure? It was in obedience to the truth, and in that holiness without which no man shall see the Lord. So also may those who have been made partakers of God's grace, in Christ, be finally lost, if they do not remain steadfast in such grace through faith. Ver. 6. Where sin is there punishment ensues; on pleasure follows pain. The terrible histories of Holy Writ ought to serve as the perpetual preachers of repentance, and stand as abiding monuments of the ever-burning wrath of God. If evil lusts were not sin, God never would have said: Thou shalt not covet (Rom. vii. 7).—Ver. 7. It is an abomination to confer on a miserable creature the honor which belongs to God alone.—Most banquets, and especially marriage feasts, among Christians of the present day are a very subtle, yet really wicked idolatry; and an evidence of such an inward apostasy from God as would justify our calling the participants godless, *i. e.*, persons standing in no covenant of faith and love with God (ver. 31; Tit. ii. 12).—Ver. 8. The regenerate do, indeed, at times, feel the excitements of impure lusts; but they allow not themselves to be betrayed thereby; they sigh over the evil, resist it by the grace of God, and try to quench the spark, and pray for forgiveness (Gal. v. 16–24).—Whoredom is a three-fold sin—against God, whose temple is desecrated; against our neighbor, who is partly offended and partly disgraced by it; and against ourselves, by the violation of our conscience and the defilement of our body.—Ver. 9. Let us not step out of our calling and scorn the means ordained for our temporal and eternal welfare. For Christ means to rule us, and not to be ruled by us.—Ver. 10. Those who murmur against pious government and faithful preachers, sin not against man, but against Christ Himself. What do people mean by complaining that God does not do rightly by them? If they only considered how far they fail of acting in accordance with God's will, what reason would not every one find to complain of himself! Complain against your own sin, otherwise God will begin to complain of you. What can follow then but ruin and damnation (Lam. iii. 39)!—Ver. 11. We are more fortunate than the ancients; for we not only have the same commands of God which they had, but also their examples for our instruction, exhortation, warning and comfort. Many other advantages have we also; they have the shadow, we have the substance (Col. ii. 17); they were servants, we are children (Rom. xiii. 15); they were under the yoke, we are free (Acts xv. 10); they were taught by Moses, we are taught by Christ (Heb. i. 1 f.).—Ver. 12. Hedinger: How easy to fall! Watch, pray, trust neither the foe nor thyself. But many think that they are standing, even though they have not yet arisen, but are lying buried in the filth of sin. Prove thyself!—If we are imagining ourselves firm and strong, then have we the most reason to fear our weakness and our inability. Distrust of one's self is the ground of the Christian's strength.—We shun many a fall by lying beautifully low upon the earth (Prov. xxviii. 26). Shunning all hinderances to good, and all temptations to evil, and industriously using the means which serve for our confirmation. It is a very common temptation with young converts to trust themselves too much and not to be rightly observant; and hence they are easily entrapped by the treacheries of sin, and betrayed into a fall; therefore this warning is very needful for them.

Ver. 13. Hed.:—Those temptations are called *human* which do not require us to resist unto blood (Heb. xii. 4), and which do not yet amount to the fiery darts of the devil (Eph. vi. 16; 2 Cor. xii. 7). Among the temptations of Satan are to be reckoned all those severe trials which believing souls are constrained to endure under the divine permission; although Satan is not altogether quiet in those human temptations which spring from original sin, and from evil examples and seductions. Besides these, there are yet divine temptations, wherein God puts our faith to the proof (Gen. xxxii.), purifies and confirms us through all measures of suffering (1 Pet. i. 7, 9, 12 f.; Jas. i. 3; Heb. xi. 11), and also for our good delivers us to Satan that he may sift us (Luke xxii. 31), and thereby prove that Satan can avail nothing against us (sixth petition in the Lord's Prayer). Why do ye then complain, ye tenderlings? The cross is not so great but that the strength to bear it is greater; the cross carries us, and not we the cross; for in the cross there is power, and there is none in us. With the cross comes power, and with the power the cross.

Berlenburger Bible. Ver. 24. Genuine Christianity is a real race-course, but the proper

running on it is no rambling. If people learn that they can be made happy by the Gospel, and observe that a good thing may be made out of Christ, they will devote themselves to Him outwardly, and run after a certain fashion. Many do this in a more exact sense when they taste the good word of God a little, and submit to repentance, and begin a pious and honorable life. Many continue earnestly in prayer, and in all manner of good practices, their life long; but yet maintain their own secret designs. But because they run in their sinful nature, and not in their divine nature, they never reach the goal. The Lord Jesus Christ, who Himself ran the race, is the Judge and Rewarder of those who run it after Him; and besides, He gives unto them strength and courage for running. All may reach it, provided they are only earnest in their endeavors. Why should we run without such a hope? But the realization of it takes place only in the birth, and in breaking through the strait gate into the new divine life, and this demands the deepest earnestness and death-struggle, in which body and soul may often perish before the gate of life is reached and found open. All power which is capable of furthering our right race towards a sure prize, must be obtained from Christ by the prayer of faith. He, by His Spirit, extends to us His hand, and leads us by this secret way. Observe well where your *desires* run, in order that, under a fair show, you may not after all be seeking your own ends. We must not only run so as merely to imagine that we may succeed; but we must earnestly strive actually to succeed. Spiritual running consists in the eager stretching and straining of the spirit after the promises of God in Christ Jesus; from this there follows an earnest pressing forward to the new birth, together with all needful watchfulness, fidelity and diligence in the daily obedience of faith, and mortification of the sinful man. Above all is it necessary to keep one's self disentangled. Besides, the soul must abide unwearied in its endeavors to rise to the highest good; and even when it would fain stand still, or sink down, must it rally again in daily repentance, through the power of God, and hasten zealously along its course. It is the selfish and treacherous carnal understanding which often plants itself in the way, and perverts the powers of the soul to such things as not only bring no reward, but also hinder our obtaining one.—Ver. 25. He who means to race makes himself light, and lays aside needless incumbrances. If the heart stands open to the Lord, and to His Spirit, free from all inordinate delight in and cleaving to visible things, and to itself, then it is strong in the Lord and filled by Him; and all powers of darkness, and the hidden might of sin are bound and cast out by Jesus Christ, the Lord of victory.—Not that suffering and striving *earn* salvation; but the great Awarder of the prizes deems no one *worthy* who does not value that which is precious and dear to him above everything else.—The *prize* is Jesus, in His Spirit, the great mystery of godliness. Those who rightly win it have an eternal satisfaction therein. We can only stand before the Father in the Son. But of Him can we become partakers only in the new birth, by which He is formed in the human heart. Therefore must the lovers of Jesus direct their aim and desire only toward Him; in Him will the hungry soul alone delight itself; therefore do all its energies go out after Him, for whom it counts all things but loss, that it may win Christ and be found in Him (Phil. iii. 8, 9). Draw us and we will run after thee! Confirm those whom Thou hast drawn, and give us ever new power that we may never be weary in pressing forward to this prize until it has been obtained.—Ver. 26. Ordinarily there is a lack of clear knowledge and certainty as to what is the true prize, and what the way to it. The path to life is confusedly and wrongly apprehended, and a person's own choices often get mingled in with it. One falls upon this and that outward duty, engages zealously in prayer his life long, reads all good books he can get, exercises himself outwardly in good works, mortifications, alms-giving, mean clothing, and thinks thus to force salvation by his own running and striving, whether he has Christ already or not; this is to run uncertainly.—*Beatings of the air* are the strokes which are not given by the Spirit in the soul. Those persons only beat the air who do not hit the foe whom they ought to ward off. They are very zealous about others; but have no just perceptions of themselves; they will engage in outward lip-devotion, and forget at the same time the inward prayer of the Spirit, and earnest striving against all sin; they will busy themselves in studying and speaking about Divine things, or even in disputing about and criticising others, and prefer this to actual fighting themselves; or they will cease from warfare because nature recoils from a complete extermination; or they will devote themselves to the society of other pious persons, and entirely forget their own duties; or they will rest content with keeping up simply fair appearances. And even when one has begun in right earnest, what numerous beatings of the air often take place in the conflicts of the heart, which the Spirit of Wisdom discloses afterwards to each one when he comes truly to seek God! In general, it may be regarded as an ineffectual warfare when a person is loth to cross his own will and flesh, or does not lose his own life even unto a true self-mortification, but always keeps something secretly in reserve. These the arch-enemy still holds in a subtle snare of secret lust, just as he may yet hold others through fear that they will not properly deny themselves every thing out of dread of detraction and mockery. Art thou letting go all things seen for the sake of something better? Art thou closing up thy sense and heart against that which wrongly entices thee? And art thou striving earnestly against all uprising lust? Art thou wrestling also earnestly with God, and holding on until He blesseth thee? Art thou risking body and soul, and all things for the sake of winning the pearl? Holdest thou no agreement with Satan and the world, and thine own flesh? And hast thou renounced these things forever?—Ver. 27. He whose senses are not yet slain can never become spiritual; but remains always carnal. Each one, according to his own condition and his predominant affections and temperament, is required by God to refrain particularly from that which

is most apt to take him captive. We must bring our body into subjection in order that we may not fall into subjection to it. This is the right sort of theology—that the teacher himself hearken to the word of truth, in order that he may appear as an example to the flock, and show that obedience is possible. He who in this respect follows Christ is acceptable to Him and useful to men.—Chap. x. 1 ff. It is possible to effect an entrance, and then to stand still and lose all that has been gained.—In the true baptism we acquire every thing. Therefore it becomes us to enter renewedly every day into the death of Christ, and allow the old false disposition to lie buried in His grave, and also daily to put on the new life in the might of Christ through the prayer of the Spirit.—The true bread from heaven gladly imparts life to the world, provided only that we are eager to partake of its fulness. As Christ gives Himself for our food, so may He also serve as a drink to all who thirst after righteousness by means of His Spirit, which is the true water of life.—Christ is not a remote, but an ever-present Saviour. He ever walks with us.—Ver. 5. Many may commit themselves to the protection of God (the cloud) and pass through floods of tribulation (the sea); they may be baptized, and enjoy the Lord's Supper with great interest and devotion. Yea, they may actually partake of the Lord Jesus in their own souls, and yet, after all, fail of the prize, and apostatize from God, so that He can have no pleasure in them.—Ver. 6. *A type*—a sketch such as shall be preserved for all time. This is grounded on the uniformity of the ways of God. —In all our conflicts and self-restraints we must begin with our desires and lusts, which are the root of all evil. The temptations to sin are to be attacked in the very first motions towards it within us, and suppressed by the Spirit.—Even the best things may be turned into occasions of sin if they are sought with a selfish will. All desires which depart from God and go after the creature are impure and reprobate: for God demands our entire affections for Himself.—Christ is our pattern to be imitated. The example of Israel, on the other hand, is held up for a warning.—Unstable souls are easily seduced to that which is false ere they are aware; hence the importance of shunning promiscuous intercourse and putting a tight rein upon our desires.—Ver. 7. How fares it with the Christianity of the time and its festal days? In the morning, if convenient, people perform their intended prayer and worship; then they feast according to their appetites, and finally rise up to play, or to pass time in gossipping, or to indulge in corrupt practices. And is this the service to which the Israel of God is called?—He who will walk surely must beware of devious paths, and, for the sake of his Saviour, avoid the charms of false affections, and all idolatry of the creature, and all sectarianism, which beguiles him from his Lord: then will God also preserve and keep him.—Ver. 8. It is the part of true temperance to avoid the occasions of sin and all corrupt conversation, for we can seldom leave such things undefiled. Our fidelity to our proper Bridegroom is manifested by our carefully avoiding all defilement of the flesh and of the spirit, and by abstaining from all spiritual adultery through illicit attachment to any creature. Both these sins incur sore judgments.—Ver. 9. All discontent and murmuring against God and His gifts is a tempting of Christ —(Since His incarnation it has become far easier for us to assail His Light, His Word, and His Spirit, because He has declared that He is with us every day; especially by doubting whether He will fulfil His office in us, from the fact that we do not as yet experience any victory over sin, or feel the power of His presence and love. He who breaks the law and follows his inordinate affections, and still desires that God should redeem him, is guilty of tempting God.—Ver. 10. A fearful commotion often arises in the breast of man if his flesh is not gratified: he blames God for His ways, and murmurs at God's instruments. In this way the mystery of the Cross is assailed, and the great enemy overpowers the soul and suffers it not to come and bow before God.—Ver. 11. Since we have the example of so many centuries before our eyes, the greater watchfulness is demanded of us unto whom these last times have come, inasmuch as the harvest and the sifting is at the door, and Satan rages against all who are hastening out of Egypt, knowing that his time is short.—Ver. 12. If a person intends not to fall, he must ground his salvation not upon his own strength, and on the fact that he stands, but he must cleave to God alone. For if by clinging to the Lord we become one spirit with Him, it follows that those who do this can no more fall than He can fall.—Ver. 13. Man, because he intends to be on the lookout, feels safe and fears not danger. But when he is assailed, he looks only to the temptation and despairs. The heart is a deceitful and desperate thing (Jer. xvii. 9).—Aside from those *human temptations* which occur in ordinary life, and spring directly from human corruptions, there are others of a superhuman and spiritual character; these fall upon us like an armed man. Nevertheless they cannot injure the faithful (1 John v. 18).—The faithfulness of God here stands like a pillar, firm and strong, around which all things rage and storm in vain. But it is His own pure, unfalsified inclination and love to the soul which causes Him to deal with it in all respects so prudently and savingly, and which prompts Him to omit nothing which is for its welfare, and to allow nothing which is for its injury. Temptations, so far as they are beneficial to the soul, only reveal God's holiness and love; and He soon puts an end to the same, so far as their power to overcome is concerned. In the converted man there is a certain degree of *ability*. It is God's power bestowed through the Holy Spirit, in which Paul claimed to be able to do all things (Phil. iv. 13). Therefore it is the fault of our indolence if we think ourselves incapable of overcoming any temptation. In all truly anointed Christians their ability is equal to their temptations. Let one only learn to pray aright, and to understand what it means when we ask, "Cast us not away from Thy presence!" God knows already how much He will permit; and how to counterbalance it. He permits and does not permit. His truth remains fast. The eternal, almighty, faithful, righteous God must indeed be greater than that which attacks us

(Jno. x. 29). God is not unrighteous in the slightest particular; He asks only what He has given. Learn then to know thy abilities, O soul, and what thou hast in thee of Christ's power! Regard not the might of sin as greater than the power of God. He has loved thee, and in love He will keep thee; for thy spirit, which is from Him, is a costly jewel in His eyes; this He must lay claim to and rescue from all danger. He cannot deny Himself in regard to it. When He appoints a temptation, He at the same time also sets the bound to it, and opens a way of escape. Of this a man may assure himself by committing himself only to God. The ways of escape are as numerous as the temptations. When reason sees no termination, then God opens a wide door through which the heart that had been driven into a corner suddenly discovers broad spaces before it; therefore hope in Him at all times (Ps. lxii. 9). If He imposes a burden, He likewise will help, and will not impose too much. He will measure all things by your capacities; for we have a faithful High-priest who has compassion on our weakness, and will make all things possible for him who trusts. He who looks one-sidedly, or only at temptation, and not at the God, who is with us in the strife, must certainly fear and tremble whenever the waves appear ready to engulf us.—Ver. 27. The Apostle here regards the body as that which binds us to the visible world, by means of which all outward temptations press, and wherein also our natural desires seek their satisfaction and become at last tyrannous habits. Besides, it is the body with its needs which gives a plausible pretext for many weak compliances with the wishes and fashions of the world. He who holds this near foe in subjection rids himself at the same time of many others who through it acquire power over us. If we treat it rigorously as something which must soon be given up to death and corruption, and the final dropping of which is for the spirit a desirable deliverance, then will all which affords us advantage only so long as we are in the body appear insignificant and trifling.—Chap. x. 1 ff. The developments of God's grace continue steadily onward, and grow in importance.—Temptations to apostatize press most amid circumstances seductive to the flesh; hence the injury of incorporating into our religion many such things as are attractive to sense, and strike our natural feelings. Of this sort are processions, pilgrimages, gaudy shows, the pomp and parade of dress, by means of which our spiritual faculties are rather overpowered than cultivated.—Ver. 11. Persons often feed the flesh on the histories of the Old Testament, especially on the sins of the ancient saints. But they should also remember the judgments which fell in consequence.—The Old Testament, so far from being "played out," has at the present an application clearer and fuller than ever before.—Ver. 12. The world often talks strangely. Concede to it the power of godliness in any degree, and it suddenly becomes very weak, and begs to be excused, knows nothing of such matters; but warn it of danger, then how it rouses itself, and refuses to acknowledge the presence of temptation. The circumspection of Christians it derides as pure weakness, and their acknowledgment to divine grace for ability as sheer pride.—Ver. 13. God's Word does not aim to make us anxious, but only to increase our confidence in God, and take from us presumption.

HEUBNER:—ix. 24. What a variety of runners are seen in the lists of this world, differing in strength, zeal and aim. This whole life is a running after something, and each is anxious to get ahead of the other. But the number of those who are striving for an eternal goal is small. The fewer there are, however, who attain the goal, the greater the honor, and this should awaken in Christians a holy ambition.—Ver. 25. The Christian should exercise a stringent self-control. Refrain from defilement of the body and spirit through love of pleasure; beware of earthly cares, of idleness and sloth, of vanity, ambition, cowardice, and of all cross-shunnings! Always remember that eternal glory is at stake! Like the fading wreath, all earthly things possess only an imaginary worth, and therefore soon lose it. What do worldly men gain at last for all their cares and labors, their restless toil, their self-humiliations and fawnings, their search and strife? A hand full of sand, a glittering puff of worldly honor. There is no reality save in what is heavenly and divine.—Christianity an earnest gain. The prize at stake there is the highest.—Ver. 26. The Christian warfare is no uncertain conflict—no snatching at phantoms, but a striking for a definite object. This definiteness imparts consistency to the Christian, and gives clearness to his endeavors (Heb. xiii. 9).—Ver. 27. In a strife which requires opposition to every evil lust, and where, instead of coaxing and pampering, we must deny the flesh all satisfaction, it is necessary to maintain a steadfast perseverance and an indifference to pain.—He who intends to teach must be doubly watchful over himself. "In the preacher three things must preach: heart, mouth, and life. The life must illustrate what the mouth speaks, and the mouth must speak what the heart feels." H. Müller.—X. 5. The liberation of the children of Israel is an instructive type of our redemption; Pharaoh is the image of Satan; the servitude in Egypt represents the tyranny of sin; the pillar of cloud God's gracious protection. The Christian must march through the sea of this world; his way lies through the wilderness, and he seeks a Father-land in heaven.—Even in the Old Testament the divine agent is Christ, and with the believer now He is omnipresent, giving us the water of eternal life forevermore.

CHAP. ix. 24–x. 5.—*Pericope* on *Septuagesima*: I. Exhortations to *earnest endeavors* after salvation, drawn, 1. from a comparison with the zeal shown by men of the world (ver. 24); 2. from the glory of the end sought (ver. 25); 3. from the certainty of obtaining a prize (ver. 26); 4. from the shame of that destruction which would overtake us, in case of failure (ver. 27); 5. from the proffered means of grace (chap. x. 1 ff.). II. Warnings against pausing in our Christian career, drawn, 1. from the consequent loss of the end in view; 2. from the loss of the points gained, and subsequent lapse into bondage to the flesh (ver. 27); 3. from the stagnation of our Christianity (chap. x. 1–5). III. The strife of the Christian: 1. as to its peculiarities, *a*, its aims, *b*, its foes; 2. as to the prize; 3. as to its means. IV. Christianity in *reality* and in *ap-*

pearance: 1. the former—an earnest striving after perfection, which alone, yet surely leads to salvation, and by which man becomes a pattern to his fellow, and acceptable to God; 2. the latter—a mere outward union to the Christian Church, confession with the mouth, a formal partaking of the sacraments without any inward strengthening and confirming of the heart upon the rock of salvation, and consequently without any real improvement, and therefore displeasing to the Lord. V. The causes *of a sad mediocrity* in Christianity: 1. the lack of earnestness; 2. disregard of the prize; 3. neglect of means (Heubner).

OETINGER:—What is requisite in order that a fighter for the crown may be temperate in all things? 1. He must know what is costliest in this world; 2. He must esteem the blood of Christ and its preciousness above his own life, and above all precious substances.—L. HOFACKER: "*The Christian's race*" for the heavenly crown: 1. concerning some deviations from the true course; 2. concerning the true course itself, comp., also, J. M. SAILOR, "Saint Paul's glimpses into the depths of wisdom," p. 176 ff. If thou wilt succeed in thy race for the goal, in thy contest for the crown, pray, watch, deny thyself, and thou wilt find in God eternal life, thy prize and thy crown.

LOHE, chap. x. 9:—To those who ask for bread, God does not give a serpent (Matt. vii. 9, 10); but to those who will not have His bread, He sends fiery poisonous serpents.

CHAP. x. 6 ff. (Heubner):—Ver. 6. *The history of the Jewish nation* is a mirror for all mankind. Every portion of it can be made an example to quicken and to warn.—Do not many Christians yet say, that Christianity begets a joyous life, and sigh after earlier and forbidden enjoyments?—Ver. 7. In all men there lingers some proneness to heathenism; to deify nature, the visible and the material. Subtle poisons are more dangerous than the grosser ones. Luxurious living is a species of idolatry; worldly enjoyments allure the heart into apostasy from God; the sinfulness of these things consists in the fact that they kindle desire, and lead to actual excesses. Hence the importance of insisting upon conversion. The truly converted turn of themselves from the world.—Ver. 8. Sensual indulgences among the more refined nations are worse than among the uncivilized, and inflict greater mischief.—Ver. 9. Oh that every one in the commission of transgression would consider that he is tempting Christ; that he is, as it were, challenging Him to inflict punishment! This we do when we oppose His Word in unbelief or disobedience; when we are not pleased with His laws, and try to devise some easier course. The serpents which will destroy us are the gnawings of a guilty conscience.—Ver. 10. Murmuring is opposition to God's providence, complaint at His ways and allotments; and this is a denial of the divine goodness and wisdom.—Ver. 11. We Christians live in the last period of the world. The thought of the speedy winding up of the world's history should make us more faithful.—Ver. 12. The fall of others should make us more careful about ourselves. He who thinks he has nothing to fear from such temptations is most exposed to a fall; order, but the authority for such an 13. The power of m[illegible]ke, and then was reinserted where most of the cursives, the Syr. and there are temptations[illegible]e. Some MSS., including A. C. theless, we may say that[illegible]ting εἰδωλόθυτόν in the former, temptations; since God [illegible]Æth., Aug., Ambrst., Pelag., the power of every man, [illegible]the interpolation of τὰ ἔθνη so that the temptation never[illegible]in accordance with A B. To beginners He gives easi[illegible]both. Copt., Sahid., Syr. The text as given by further advanced, heavier ones.[illegible]ey place the second

M. F. BESSER.—Chap. x. 1 ff.:

unheeded the warning which is co
five gracious experiences of Israel, a[illegible]ely indicates apostasies of that ungrateful people. considered marched out of Egypt, and they all u[illegible]tic: 'ye baptism in the cloud and in the sea, and manner enjoyed the first-fruits of the covenant; an[illegible]judg- so God has redeemed all of us Christians ou[illegible]ich the world of corruption, and called us to the fe[illegible]n lowship of His Son, through holy baptism, and has placed us upon our way to a heavenly home, blessed with the benefits and powers of His kingdom. But only those who run in faith to the end obtain the prize.—Vers. 3, 4. The mere eating and drinking at the sacrament alone will not serve. It not only profits nothing, but it also fearfully injures a person to belong to those whom Christ waits upon and refreshes, if through unspiritual or unbelieving conduct, those who eat and drink make themselves unworthy of the spiritual gift.—Ver. 5. No Christian merits the divine complacency by virtue of his obedience and holy life, but only by virtue of Jesus Christ (Eph. i. 6). But although our good Christian works may not merit God's favor, yet our evil unchristian works, if we remain impenitent, will drive God's favor from us.—Ver. 6. The proverb —*history is the instruction of life*, is especially true in regard to sacred history, which is no lifeless narrative, for says Luther: "the work and government of God in His Church, is the same from the beginning to the end of the world, even as also God's people, or the Church, is thro' all time, one and the same.—Ver. 7. The spirit of the world sets up, sometimes one and sometimes another form of idolatry as the order of the day Whether the world, in its banquets and balls, and theatres, actually crowns idolatry, as at Corinth, or whether it deifies the things and persons themselves, in which it takes pleasure, and uses them as its highest good, it is idolatry all the same. What happened in the camp at Sinai is still reflected before our eyes. The Sundays and feast-days of the Church are selected as the favorite pleasure-days. [Holy days have become holidays]. Lord, lead us not into temptation!—Ver. 8. *Balaam's device* pleases the world when it sees that it is not possible to rob Christians of their crown by violence. It knows well what "takes away the heart" (Hos. iv. 11), and it loves to present the wine of temptation to those who have once escaped from the mire of the world. Let us watch and pray that we enter not into temptation.—Ver. 11. In this last time (1 John ii. 14), this N.T. time of the end wherein we live, those temptations to apostasy occur preliminary to the judgments which are indicated by the types of the earlier times. The five temptations of the fathers in the wilderness (*viz.*, to greedy lusting, idolatry, whoredom, provoking God, and murmuring) are our temptations

also, and we should seek eye-salve from the Holy Spirit (Rev. iii. 18), in order to enable us to see these temptations in their present form, unbetrayed by the spirit of the world, which gives to evil an innocent or venial name; which calls the pursuit of pleasure, liberty; gives to idolatry and whoredom the name of progress and enjoyment of life; and to murmuring and tempting of God, the name of independence and manliness.—Ver. 12. See to it, that thou dost not fall! The tempter can throw no standing Christian by force.

VERS. 6–13. *Pericope* on the ninth Sunday after Trinity: I. Heathenism among Christians: 1. Description, *a*, as to its source—the evil, godless mind; *b*, its immediate effects—excesses and crimes (7, 8); *c*. final result—unbelief and despair. 2. Application for self-examination, mourning and quickening. II. The mode of avoiding falling in the midst of temptations. 1. By observing the multitude of temptations (ver. 6), especially those which are particularly dangerous to ourselves (7–10). 2. By laying to heart the punishments which will be inflicted in case we fall—both physically and spiritually (8–10). 3. By humility, by the recognition of our own weakness, and by realizing the consequences of error (11–12). 4. By trust in God, and prayer for support (ver. 13).

[BARNES, ix., ver. 27:—1. Ministers, like others, are in danger of losing their souls. 2. The fact that a man has preached *to many* is no certain evidence that he will be saved. 3. The fact that a man has been very *successful* in the ministry is no evidence that he will be saved. 4. It will be a solemn and an awful thing for a *successful* minister to go down to hell. 5. Ministers should be very solicitous about their personal piety.

R. SOUTH, x. 13:—*How, and by what means, God delivers us from temptations.* I. If the force of the temptation be chiefly from the vehement importunities of the evil spirit, God often puts an end to the issue by rebuking and commanding down the tempter himself. II. If the force of the temptation be from the weakness of a man's mind, God delivers by mighty, inward, unaccountable supplies of strength. III. If from unhappy circumstances, by a providential change in the whole course of his life. IV. If from the powerful sway and solicitation of some unruly affection, by the overpowering influence and operation of His Holy Spirit. Two considerations: 1. The strongest temptations to sin are no warrant for sin; 2. God delivers only those who do their lawful utmost to deliver themselves].

D. *A dissuasive from partaking of idol feasts, as involving a fellowship with idolatry, and therefore hostile to all fellowship with Christ in His supper.*

CHAPTER X. 14–22.

14, 15 Wherefore, my dearly [*om.* dearly] beloved, flee from idolatry. I speak as to
16 wise men; judge ye what I say. The cup of [the, τῆς] blessing which we bless,
is[1] it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is[1] it
17 not the communion of the body of Christ? For we *being* many [Because we, the
many, οἱ πολλοί ἐσμεν] are one bread, *and* one body: for we are all partakers[2] of
18 that one bread. Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the
19 sacrifices, partakers [common participants, κοινωνοί] of the altar? What say I
then? that the idol is any thing, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is
any thing [that that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing, or that the
20 idol is any thing]?[3] But *I say*, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they
sacrifice[4] to devils [they sacrifice,[4] they sacrifice to demons, *om.* Gentiles] and not
to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship [be communicants, κοινω-
21 νοὺς γίνεσθαι] with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of
devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils.
22 Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? are we stronger than he?

[1] Ver. 16.—The verb ἐστίν, is sometimes placed after κοινωνία, and sometimes after Χριστοῦ. The latter position has the best authority in its favor. [Tischendorf, in both questions of this verse, puts ἐστίν immediately after κοινωνία. In the first question he follows A. B. Sahid. Copt. Syr. Cyr. Aug. Beda. Lachmann, Bloomfield, Alford, Stanley and Words., place it at the close of the sentences, not only on account of external evidence (C. D. F. K. L., Sinait., Ital., Goth., Chrys., Theodt., Ambst.), but because the other order seems to be a correction to avoid the harshness of this verb at the end of the sentence, and in such close proximity to the other ἐστίν. In the second question, the Sahid. omits ἐστίν altogether, and B. agrees with those authorities which placed it after Χριστοῦ in the first, in putting it at the end of this sentence; and only A. Copt. Syr. Cyr. Aug. and Bede make it precede τοῦ σώματος.—C. P. W.].

[2] Ver. 17.—Before μετέχομεν, D E. F. G., the Ital. and several copies of the Vulg. (not amiat.), Ambrst., Pelag. and Bede insert καὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς ποτηρίου. D. and E., however, omit ἑνὸς.—C. P. W.].

[3] Ver. 19.—In the Rec. the words εἰδωλόν and εἰδωλόθυτόν occur in their inverse order, but the authority for such an order is feeble. The second word was probably thrown out by the copyist through mistake, and then was reinserted where it seemed most fitting (the cause before the effect) [The Rec. is sustained by K. L. and most of the cursives, the Syr. and Gothic versions, and Chrys. and Theodt., and is adopted by Bloomfield, Osiander and Reiche. Some MSS., including A. C. (1st hand) Sinait. and Epiph. entirely omit the question relating to εἰδώλον. In favor of putting εἰδωλόθυτόν in the former, and εἰδώλον in the latter question, we have B. C. (2d hand) D. Sinait. (1st hand), Vulg., Copt., Æth., Aug., Ambrst., Pelag., Bede, and this order is preferred by Tisch., Alford, Stanley and Wordsworth.—C. P. W.].

[4] Ver. 20.—Rec. has θύει τὰ ἔθνη, δαιμονίαις θύει, but it is opposed by decisive authorities. The interpolation of τὰ ἔθνη made necessary the alteration of θύουσιν into θύει. Lachmann puts the second θύουσιν after θεῷ, in accordance with A. B. C., *et al.* [In favor of τα ἔθνη, we have A. C. K. L. (placing the words after ὅτι), Sinait., *et al.*, Vulg., Goth., Copt., Sahid., Syr. Chrys., Theodt., Orig., Aug., Bede. In favor of θύουσιν (twice) we have A. B. C. D. E. F. G., Sinait. The text as given by Tisch. is: ὅτι ἃ θύουσιν δαιμονίοις θύουσιν καὶ οὐ θεῷ. Alford and Stanley have the same text, only they place the second θύουσιν after θεῷ.—C. P. W.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 13. [Having enforced the duty of renouncing their rights and restricting their liberty by a reference to his own example of self-denial and its motives, he now returns to his main subject, from which he digressed at the commencement of chap. ix., *viz.*, participating in the sacrificial feasts of the heathen. "But whereas before he dwelt only on the scandal to others, he now in accordance with the train of thought, begun in ix. 23, dwells chiefly on the evils to themselves. And the sense of this evil is enhanced by the recollection incidentally introduced in x. 3, of the only Christian institution which bore any resemblance to these feasts." STANLEY].—**Wherefore,**—διόπερ shows that the following exhortation is deduced from what goes before. And this may be either the whole paragraph from ver. 1, as: 'in view of the judgments inflicted upon Israel and recorded for your warning, flee,' *etc.;* or it may be what directly precedes, as: 'since the faithfulness of God pledges to you the results of such watchfulness,' *etc.;* or: 'since ye have a God so faithful, therefore shun whatsoever would cut you off from His fellowship.'—What is expressed generally in ver. 12, is now resumed with particular reference to the case in hand.—**flee from idolatry.**—By this he enjoins the avoidance of every thing, which, however remotely, would imply participation in idol worship. The preposition 'from' (ἀπό) adds force, *q. d.*, 'keep yourselves aloof from.' ["The only safety is in keeping at a distance. This includes two things; first, avoiding whatever is questionable; and, secondly, avoiding the occasions and temptations to sin." HODGE]. The use of the simple accusative as the object of 'flee,' would not, however, necessarily indicate that they had been already involved in idolatry (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 22). For what follows it appears that he had in mind attendance at idolatrous festivals.—The address—**my dearly beloved**—imparts to the exhortation an urgent and affectionate tone.

VERS. 15–21. **As to wise men I speak.**—In proof of the fact which occasioned the above exhortation, *viz.*, that they by participating in idolatrous feasts, were taking part in idol worship—a proceeding which was one with the worship of devils, and wholly inconsistent with the Christian profession, he appeals to their own insight and good sense, which placed them in a position to judge for themselves of the correctness of what he was about to say. In so doing he at the same time gives them to perceive his own strong conviction of its truth, which he held to be so palpable that he could safely entrust it with their decision. The 'as' merely indicates the point of view from which he considered them.—**judge ye**—ὑμεῖς, is emphatic: 'ye yourselves.' Whether in this winning manner there lurks a delicate slant at their lack of judgment, some touch of sarcasm, is a question which we will not now discuss.—That participation in idol altar-feasts involved participation in idol worship, is shown, first, from the analogy of the Lord's supper. He starts with the cup, while that which naturally follows is connected with the bread. ['This mention of the cup first, before the bread, both here and at ver. 21, is remarkable. Why was this? 1. Perhaps there was more danger of those immoral and lascivious consequences, against which he is writing, from excesses in the *wine* at the idolatrous feasts, than in the *meats*. 2. The Apostle has thus shown the *essential independence* of the cup as a necessary part of the Holy Communion, and supplies a caution against Romish error. 3. Each of the elements is variously put first in the Holy Scripture, to show their equal dignity and the equal necessity of receiving each.' WORDSWORTH].—**The cup**—τὸ ποτήριον is undoubtedly accusative, corresponding to τὸν ἄρτον by attraction (comp. Matth. xxi. 42). Of course the contents are intended.—**of blessing**;—so called, either from its effects, as it brings a blessing [so Olshausen]; or, preferably, from the act which immediately precedes, so that the words—**which we bless**—are epexegetical of it. By this we may understand the thanksgiving alluded to in (xi. 24; Matth. xxvi. 27), and interpret: 'which we receive with thanksgiving'—an interpretation which transcends the meaning of εὐλογοῦμεν; or the consecration (comp. Lev. ix. 16), and then interpret: 'which we set apart by prayer to a holy use'—an act which certainly included thanksgiving. The expression is derived from the observance of the Passover, when the third cup which went round was called הַבְּרָכָה כּוֹס.* The subject of the verb 'we,' denotes the whole congregation, which unitedly consecrated the cup by prayer and thanksgiving.

* ['It is observable that two of the Evangelists, Matthew (xxvi. 26) and Mark (xiv. 22), use the word εὐλογήσας, *having blessed*, in their description of Christ's action at the institution of the Lord's Supper, before the consecration of the bread; and Luke (xxii. 19) and Paul (1 Cor. xi. 24) use the word εὐχαριστήσας, *having given thanks;* but in the benediction of the cup Matthew (xxvi. 27) and Mark (xiv. 23) use the word εὐχαριστήσας, whereas Paul uses the word εὐλογία here. This variety of expression gives us a fuller and clearer view of the nature of the act here spoken of. It was eucharistic and also eulogistic; it was one of thanksgiving and one of benediction, and in the application of each of the terms to each of the elements, we learn, more fully and clearly what the true character of the Holy Communion is, and what are our duties in its administration and reception.' WORDSWORTH (*ad sensum*)].

["Observe the first person plural is the *same throughout;* the blessing of the cup and the breaking of the bread—acts of consecration, were not the acts of the minister, as by any authority peculiar to himself, but only as representative of the whole congregation (*οἱ πάντες*). And so even Estius, but evading the legitimate inference. The figment of a sacerdotal consecration of the elements by transmitted power, is as alien from the Apostolic writings as it is from the spirit of the Gospel." ALFORD. And Stanley also comments to the same effect.]—**is it not the communion.**—*κοινωνία* is not the precise equivalent of 'communication' [as the Rheims version translates it, and as some insist on rendering it, in support of a sacramental theory]; even in Heb. xiii. 16; Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 13, it may denote participation, which, however, is certainly not without communication. But the word here is used by metonymy for the means of communicating or participating (comp. Jno. xi. 25). [So Hodge: "The *means* of participating." Alford translates "*participation.*" Calvin: "It is that *connection* which we have with the blood of Christ, when He ingrafts all of us together into His body, that He may live in us and we in Him." Tyndale and Cranmer give "*partaking.*" But the E. V. seems to hit the meaning best: "communion of," which implies a *fellowship*, a *common sharing* in the blood of Christ, according to the meaning of the root, *κοινός, common*, whence *κοινωνέω, to have a thing in common, to have a share of a thing.* This derivation shows that the idea of *fellowship* in the partaking is prominent in the word. It ever denotes a social act. And this idea is essential to the argument of the Apostle.] The strong literal sense of the verb "is," must also be retained. This is not employed in a symbolic sense, as though it meant *signifies;* but it simply affirms the fact. The eating of the bread *is* the communion. This is required by the argument. ["If we render *ἐστιν, symbolizes*, the argument is made void." ALFORD. So HODGE: "He who partakes of the cup, partakes of Christ's blood." But it may be asked here: 'in what sense?' This, of course, is not here explained. But it is in some real, veritable way predicable of *all* who partake. Otherwise the parallel with the idolatrous act rebuked, would not be sustained. Paul means to show that as by means of the sacrament we truly come into communion with Christ, so in the idolatrous feasts, whether a person intends it or not, he does worship the idol. Hodge, however, says: "This of course is true only of believers." But if the fact of communion turned upon the presence or absence of faith, the participant at the idol feast might fairly reply, 'I am not guilty of idolatry in this, for I eat without faith in the idol.' And this was precisely what Paul designed to preclude by asserting the veritableness of the communion in drinking of the cup.] But does this view lead to the doctrine of a substantial identification of the wine with the blood of Christ, of a union of the elements with the matter of the sacrament (*res sacramenti*)? The Apostle is treating primarily of the participation of individuals in that to which the thing they partake of refers; or, in other words, of the fact that they, through that of which they partake, come into fellowship with that particular religious sphere to which the thing partaken of belongs. Here in the instance before us, it is with the blood of Christ, the ground and seal of the New Covenant; in the other case with idols, the sphere of a devilish heathenism; hence with devils themselves. Meanwhile, if nothing else hindered, we might suppose a real communion between the wine and the blood, since *κοινωνία* may be variously interpreted according to different analogies.—**of the blood of Christ.**—*i. e.*, the blood shed on the cross, not His bloody death, as may be seen from the parallel term, "the body." It is the blood of the covenant by which the forgiveness of sins and the whole salvation it includes is purchased (comp. xi. 25; Matth. xxvi. 28), [the blood which has in itself also the Eternal Life, and to partake of which secures a pardon unto life eternal].—**the bread which we break.**—[The breaking of the bread was a formal public act, a part of the solemnity of the sacrament, in accordance with the example set by Christ, significant of the breaking of Christ's body for us. The custom therefore of having the bread ready broken put on the table, as practised in some churches, or that of the Romanists in putting a wafer unbroken on the tongue of the communicant, must be condemned as contrary to the precedent of the early Church.] The consecration is here presupposed. —**is it not the communion of the body of Christ?**—It is a question here whether the word 'body' is used figuratively of the Church, which is the body of Christ, as some would interpret it, both here and in ver. 16. The parallel with the word 'blood,' decides this in the negative, since there is nothing in this connection which the blood can be understood to symbolize; nor is there aught in the context which constrains us to such an interpretation. "It appears from this passage that the Lord's Supper has been instituted as a real communion, and not as a mere symbol." NEANDER.—**because one bread, one body we the many are.**—*ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος ἓν σῶμα οἱ πολλοί ἐσμεν.* It would be natural to assume here a protasis and an apodosis, as: 'because there is one bread, therefore are we the many one body.' But to this it must be objected, 1. Paul very seldom introduces a protasis with *ὅτι* (xii. 15 f.; Gal. iv. 6, are doubtful cases); 2. the course of thought would in this way be interrupted, and we should have here a logical parenthesis, which is not to be supposed unnecessarily.—The *ὅτι, because*, evidently introduces an argument for the leading thought in the previous verse, *viz.*, that the bread is the communion of the body of Christ. This is established by the effect produced in the Christian consciousness through partaking of the bread, that is, the union of Christians in one body, as a complex organic whole. This union is grounded in the fact that the bread is the veritable communion (*κοινωνία*) of the body of Christ. The sacramental bread is such a means of union in so far as it mediates the fellowship with the body of Christ, surrendered to death in behalf of all, and hence, a living fellowship with Christ the Saviour of all. But in educing this argument from the text, we are not to take the expression,

"one bread," as parallel to that of "one body," making them both alike the nominatives after 'we are,' rendering the sentence [as the E. V. does]: "we are one bread and one body," because, if for no other reason, in the next sentence which adduces a proof of what is here stated, "one bread" stands for the bread of the supper, while it here would be a figurative expression for the unity of believers, just as "body" is. The *εἷς ἄρτος, one body*, must therefore be taken as an independent clause with *ἐστίν, is*, supplied. The relation of the two clauses then will be either that of a comparison: 'as there is one bread, so are we one body,' or they will stand related as cause and effect: 'since there is one bread, therefore are we, the many, one body.' [So Meyer and Hodge, also Hammond, Locke, Whitby, Calvin, Beza, Bengel, and the Syriac version; but Alford, Stanley and Wordsworth adhere to the E. V. Alford says: "We are one bread by the assimilation of that one bread partaken." "But this," says Hodge, "is to make the Apostle teach modern physiology"].—The above rendering is confirmed by what follows,—**for we all partake of that one bread.**—(*ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχ.*). This again is variously explained. We may either take *ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου, from that one bread*, as the direct object of *μετέχομεν, partake*, and read [as the E. V. does]: "we all have part or partake of that one bread"—which is contrary to the otherwise uniform construction of *μετέχειν* (which requires the Gen. or the Accus. after it), and may be accounted for by supposing *ἐσθίειν*, or *κλᾶν*, understood. Or we may, as in ver. 30, make *τοῦ ἑνὸς σώματος, of the one body*, supplied from the context, the object of *μετέχομεν, partake*, and regard *ἐκ* as expressing the cause of such partaking, rendering it *because of*. Then the clause would be an explanation and confirmation of what precedes. [So Meyer; but this seems artificial and far-fetched, and is contrary to all the versions and the majority of the commentators. It is better to adopt the common rendering]. "The 'body of Christ,' of course, is to be conceived of spiritually; the idea, therefore, is not the same as in what precedes. The mediating thought between the statement, that the sacrament of the Supper communicates the body and the blood of our Lord, and the statement, that the Church is the body of the Lord, is this, that individuals by celebrating the Supper come into communion with each other. Bread and wine are to the Apostles vehicles through which communion with Christ is realized." NEANDER. The declaration, "there is one bread," obliges us to conceive of the bread at the Supper as one whole, whether it is one loaf that is broken, or several. But this oneness leads us back to the *κοινωνία* of the body of Christ as its ground.—In ver. 18 we have a second analogy to prove the unsuitableness of Christians partaking of idolatrous altar feasts. It is drawn from the Jewish feasts following sacrifice.—**Behold Israel after the flesh.**—Ἰσραὴλ *κατὰ σάρκα*, one idea; therefore without the article before *κατὰ σάρκα*. The designation is in contrast with that of "Israel after the spirit" (comp. Rom. ii. 28; Gal. iv. 29; Chap. vi. 16); it means the Israel which is so, not by virtue of a Divine spiritual life arising from faith (Gal. iii. 7), but by natural descent. —**are not those who eat the sacrifices.**—[*i. e.*, those parts which are not sacrificed. For the practice of eating the remainder, which was left after the parts specified, Lev. iii. 3, were offered up, see] (Deut. xii. 18; xvi. 11).—**partakers with the altar?**—*κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου* may be interpreted either, 'associates of the altar,' inasmuch as they shared the flesh of the victim offered with the altar (comp. ix. 13); or: 'persons standing in communion with the altar,' *i. e.*, in religious connection with it, inasmuch as the festival acquired a religious significance by its relation to it. Therefore it is he does not say, 'partakers *with God*,' by which only the more general communion would be denoted, but not this stricter one (Meyer). To subjoin therefore "with God," is needless and unsuitable. [Stanley says the reason why he did not say 'with God,' was "chiefly because communion with God was too high a thought to be brought down to the level of the mere outward ceremonial of the fleshly Israel." But this idea is contradicted by Rom. ix. 4, 5. As Hodge well puts it: "The question is not as to the intention of the actors, but as to the import of the act, and as to the interpretation universally put upon it. To partake of a Jewish sacrifice as a sacrifice, and in a holy place, was an act of Jewish worship. By parity of reasoning to partake of a heathen sacrifice as a sacrifice, and in a holy place, was an act of heathen worship.—It need hardly be remarked, that this passage gives no ground for the opinion that the Lord's Supper is a sacrifice. This is not the point of comparison"].—In ver. 19 he draws the conclusion he has been aiming at in this whole exposition.—**What then am I saying?**—*i. e.*, 'what is the result to which I am coming?' He begins his answer by repudiating an inference which might be drawn in contradiction of his statement in viii. 4. Is it—**that what is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing?**—*i. e.*, possesses reality, is veritable flesh consecrated to a god?—**or that an idol is any thing?**—*i. e.*, has being as the very god which the heathen imagine (comp. viii. 4 ff.); or, changing the accent and reading *εἰδωλόθυτον—εἰδωλόν τι ἐστιν*, he would say: 'that there is any idol-offering, or any idol—namely, of the sort mentioned?' Both constructions amount to the same thing.—**But** [*i. e.*, 'nay, but;' this ellipsis of the negative taken up by *ἀλλά*, is found in classical Greek]. —And now comes his direct statement—**that what things they offer (it is) to devils and not to God, they offer (them).**—The text is quoted from the LXX. version of Deut. xxxii. 17, which seems to be adduced as authoritative proof of his position. See also Baruch iv. 7, *θύσαντες δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ*. His meaning is: 'This I say, that ye by partaking at heathenish festivals come into communion with devils; just as we through the bread which we break come into communion with the body of Christ, or as the Israelites through their sacrificial feasts come into communion with the altar, *i. e.*, of God's sanctuary.' Before explaining himself, however, on the point that the heathenish sacrifices with which those feasts were connected, were offered, in fact, to devils, and instead

of drawing his conclusion directly, he states it in the form of an injunction—**and I would not that ye should have communion with devils**—the very thing he would convict them of doing—and then he assigns a reason for this in the following, vv. 21, 22.—Such we conceive to be the logic of the Apostle (as Osiander and others). But Meyer understands it differently. He finds in vv. 16–18, a justification of the warning in ver. 14: "Flee from idolatry;" and in ver. 19f., a repudiation of an inference which might be drawn from the analogy of the Jewish sacrificial festival (ver. 18); since by this he seemed to acknowledge a veritable communion with the gods in the heathen altar-service, and with this also the actual divinity of the idols worshipped in it.*—Since the idea of communion runs through the whole passage to ver. 21, the first exposition of the order of thought merits the preference.—The *δαιμόνια, demons*, to whom the heathen sacrificed, are not imaginary gods—sub-deities, as it were; but, as is seen both from the connection and from the uniform usage of the LXX. and the New Testament, they are evil spirits, the chief of whom is *διάβολος, diabolus, the devil*. The expression in Acts xvii. 18: "he seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods," is adapted to the usage of the Greeks [for the word *δαιμόνιον* was employed by them in a comparatively good sense, to denote the objects of their worship]. "It is probable that in order to exhibit the abominableness of all participation in idol-worship, Paul designedly chose an expression, which indeed among the heathen was used to denote their deities, but which among the Jews always designated evil spirits." BENGEL. To regard heathendom as the devil's kingdom, was a mode of thought prevailing among the ancient Church, and well founded (comp. Osiander, p. 455 f.). We, therefore, must certainly distinguish, especially in the sphere of the Hellenic religion, between the opinion and intent of idol worshippers, and the objective powers actually operating in heathenism, which obtained Divine honor to themselves by darkening the human mind. But it would be wholly arbitrary, were we to ascribe to the Apostle the idea that the offerings of the heathen were presented to the devils in so far as these persuaded the heathen that there are gods to whom sacrifices must be offered, in order to receive to themselves under the name of gods, Divine worship and sacrifices (Rückert).—The "fellowship with devils" which he would not have them hold, was not merely a symbolic one, but an actual one, by means of which they would expose themselves to their corrupting influences (comp. Osiander, Bengel).—The wish just expressed he grounds upon the irreconcilableness of a participation in heathenish festivals, which involve communion with devils, with a participation in the Lord's Supper.—**Ye cannot.**—The inability here expressed is of a moral kind—a moral impossibility.—**drink the cup of the Lord,**—that is, the cup of the Lord's Supper, which belongs to the Lord, has been consecrated to Him, and is the communion of His blood; therefore, brings us into fellowship with Him.—**and the cup of devils,**—that is, the cup consecrated to demons, which brought a person into actual relations to them, and out of which wine was drunk at the sacrificial feasts, with pre-libations in honor of the gods.—**Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils.**—The table signifies the entire meal, including the consecrated food. ["From this passage probably, 'the table of the Lord' became an expression current in all ages of the Christian Church. See Suicer *in voc.*" ALFORD]. In this verse the Romish Church unwarrantably finds evidence for the doctrine that the Lord's Supper was not simply a sacrament, but also a sacrifice (Conc. Trid., 22, 1). "It is not the Church that offers Christ in communion; but Christ offered Himself up once for all (Heb. vii. 27; ix. 25, 26; x. 10; xii. 14, 18); and He brings to the Church the bread and wine, not for an offering, but to be eaten and drunk, in order that by this means He may give His own body and blood for their nourishment, according to His promise." W. F. BESSER.

VER. 22. **Or do we provoke the Lord to jealousy?**—This is not to be taken conjunctively,—neither by assuming irregularity of formation, nor yet in accordance with the sense, as if it were deliberate. The indicative is still more emphatic. His meaning is, 'ye cannot unite the two (ver. 21). Or, are we the persons who by such an attempt will venture to provoke the Lord to jealousy?' Such would certainly be the result, inasmuch as we would be practicing communion with evil spirits hostile to the Lord, while professing to hold communion with Him who insists on our keeping ourselves exclusively His. The expression, "*provoke* to jealousy," is taken from Deut. xxxii. 21, and is taken from the metaphor of a marriage between God and His people, which pervades large portions of the Old Testament, and in accordance with which the Church is represented as the bride of Christ (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 2). It denotes the strong displeasure which arises in consequence of adulterous love, ["and is the fiercest of all human passions. It is therefore employed as an illustration of the

*[We here give Stanley's ingenious and valuable note entire. "From this passage his meaning has often been taken to be that, although the particular divinities, as conceived under the names of Jupiter, Venus, *etc.*, were mere fictions, yet there were real evil spirits, who under those names, or in the general system of pagan polytheism, beguiled them away from the true God. (So Ps. xcvi. 5, *πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν δαιμόνια*). Such certainly was the general belief of the early Christians. But the strong declaration in viii. 4, reiterated here in verse 19, of the utter non-existence of the heathen divinities, renders it safer to understand him as saying that in the mind of the heathen sacrificers, whatever Christians might think, the sacrifices were really made to those whom the Old Testament called *δαιμόνια*. It is in fact a play on the word *δαιμόνιον*. The heathen Greeks (as in Acts xvii. 18, the only passage where it is so used in Biblical Greek) employed it as a general word for 'Divinity,' and more especially for those heroes and inferior divinities, to whom alone (according to the belief of this later age), and not to the supreme rulers of the universe, sacrifices as such were due. The writers of the New Testament and the LXX., on the other hand, always use it of 'evil demons,' although never, perhaps, strictly speaking, for the author of evil, who is called emphatically 'Satan,' or the 'Devil.' It is by a union of these two meanings that the sense of the passage is produced. 'The words of Deut. xxxii. 17, truly describe their state, for even according to their own confession, although in a different sense, they sacrifice to demons.' A similar play on the same word, although for a different object, occurs in the Apology of Socrates, where he defends himself against the charge of atheism, on the ground that he believed in a demon (*δαιμόνιον*); and that demons (*δαιμόνια*) being sons of gods (*θεῶν παῖδες*), he must therefore be acknowledged to believe in the gods themselves"].

hatred of God towards idolatry. It is as when a bride transfers her affections from her lawful husband in every way worthy of her love, to some degraded and offensive object." HODGE]. The jealousy is one which is sure to bring severe punishment; and this is what one seems to challenge upon himself who is not accustomed to fear the might of the Lord. Hence the concluding question—**Are we stronger than He?**—so that we can avert His retributive power?

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Communion with the Lord and in the Lord*—such is the fundamental generic idea of the Lord's Supper. He is in us, and we in Him; and therefore all united together—members of one body, composed of all those who have fellowship with Him. But this communion is not simply one of the Spirit, effected through the word received in faith, by means of which His Spirit bears witness with our spirits that we are the children of God; it is not a purely spiritual one in the sense that Jesus, by His Spirit alone, makes His dwelling in the hearts of all who believe. But it is one which is accomplished also through the body, and includes, likewise, the physical life. It is His atoning life offered up for us—His body broken in death for our sakes—His blood shed in our behalf, of which we partake by means of the bread and wine. And this life of Jesus is imparted to us in its totality, as fitted to nourish, strengthen and refresh our life—in short, as food and drink for our life in its totality; that is, for our new life, which is from God which, begun in Christ at the new birth, is perfected at last in the body also, at the resurrection; for He is the Redeemer of the body (comp. John vi. 54; Rom. viii. 11).

But how is this nourishment imparted? This is the point on which the various confessions of the Christian Church begin their strife. If we keep in mind Paul's expression, "the communion of the body and blood of Christ," it will be seen that we, by no means, do justice to it by holding the extravagant hypothesis (of the Romish Church) that in virtue of the priestly consecrating word the bread and wine are transformed into the veritable body and blood of Christ; for in that case we could not speak of holding communion [inasmuch as eating the material substance would be a mere physical act, which would be perfect without the concurrence of the Spirit].—Neither does it satisfy simply to assume that the elements are mere symbols—that the body and blood of Christ are exhibited and made present to the consciousness of faith through the bread and wine, and that so by means of these, a communion of the believing participant is effected;—whether it be, as Zwingle supposes, that the believer partook of the broken body and blood shed, by being more fully assured thereby of the forgiveness of sins, or, as Calvin supposes, that a mysterious union ensues for the believer with the glorified life of Christ in heaven. The Apostle's language, "the bread, the wine, is a communion of the body, of the blood of Christ," means yet more. If the bread and wine are the means of our communion with the body and blood of Christ, it is obvious that there is a participation in these very objects themselves, as, indeed, in the passage, John xi. 25 (cited by Meyer), Christ calls Himself the resurrection, and the life, *i. e.*, that very thing by which the life is again restored and imparted, in so far as He is in His own person the life, and the life of humanity again restored.—This brings us, then, to Luther's view, *viz.*, that of the mysterious union of the elements with the body and blood of Christ, effected through the power of Christ's Spirit in His Word—a union with His redeeming life, not only as it has been, but as it is now, everywhere present and glorified.

It will, indeed, be asked, "how does this hypothesis suit with the original institution of the Supper, when such a union could not have existed? and are we then to distinguish between the first celebration of the Supper and all others that have ensued?" We must, at all events, affirm, with Œtinger ("*Theology drawn from the idea of life*," translated by Hamburger, p. 244), that, as in the case of baptism, so also here, a gradual progression may be traced. "Before Christ died and rose again, the disciples received the flesh and blood of Christ, efficiently (*efficienter*), rather than substantially (*substantialiter*); but after the ascension, both substantially and efficiently."—Through this union the bread and wine become a spiritual meat and drink, *i. e.*, a nourishment of the new spiritual life, which, however, in the case of those not qualified to enjoy it, serves not to nourish, but to condemn—even as the Gospel is to some a savor of life unto life, and to others a savor of death unto death.—This is not the place to treat more particularly of manducatory participation, and of the participation of the unworthy.*

2. *Inconsistency of attempting to hold fellowship with the world and Christ at the same time.*—To sit down at the table of the Lord, and to commune with Him by partaking of His body and blood, and then to convert aught into an idol, or by idolatrous proceedings to devote one's self to the god of this world and to his spirits, and so to profess them, are intolerable contradictions. He who dares thus, exposes himself to the severest judgments. By such conduct he violates the holy claims of the Lord to his person, which having been redeemed and honored by Him, with all the blessings of His redemption, belongs to Him exclusively—wholly and solely, even as a bride to the bridegroom. And such conduct involves the greater folly from the fact that Christ is one to whom all power in heaven and earth is given, and before whose bar all must

* [We let our author's statement of sacramentarian theories, and his expressed preference, pass without debate. The main point of doctrine he has well brought out in the first paragraph; and some will think that the Calvinistic theory of the "Real Presence" will answer all its demands. In the words of the Westminster Catechism, the sacrament of the Supper may be said "to *represent*, *seal*, and *apply* Christ and the benefits of the new covenant to all believers." And this is done through the Spirit who takes of the things that are Christ's, and shows them unto us in His ordinances according to their intent. Those interested in the question here mooted, we would refer to the current works on Dogmatic Theology, also to HOOKER, *Ecc. Pol.*, B. V., c. 67; EDWARD IRVING, "*Homilies on the Lord's Supper.*" *Coll. Writings*, Vol. II., p. 439 ff. J. M. MASON, "*Letters on Frequent Communion.*" *Works*, Vol. I. p. 372 ff.—D. W. P.].

stand to receive the final decision affecting their eternal weal or woe.

[3. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper, a pledge of the resurrection of believers. As the consecrated bread and wine were the authentic symbols of Christ's body and blood, and were, in *construction* and certain *effect* (though not in substance), the same with what they stood for, to all worthy receivers; it is manifest that *bodies so incorporated* with the *body* of Christ, must of course be partners with it in a glorious resurrection. Thus was the Eucharist ever considered as a sure and certain pledge to all good men of the future resurrection of their bodies, symbolically fed with the body of Christ. This is the argument which the Christian fathers insisted upon, and with this they prevailed. See Waterland on "*The Doctrinal Use of the Sacraments*" (Vol. VIII., p. 132). (Wordsworth)].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Starke:—Ver. 14. A Christian must be very careful how he, in any way, participates in a false worship (2 Cor. vi. 14).—Ver. 15. A true minister, who is sure of his doctrine, will urge his hearers freely to test its truth, so that they shall feel that they have to do, not so much with him as with God, whose doctrine he preaches. So, too, a proper hearer will look not so much to the minister as to God in the matter of doctrine (2 Cor. i. 24; Acts xvii. 11).—Ver. 16 (Spener). The doctrine that the bread and wine are the communion of the body and blood of Christ, is to be taken in its plainest acceptation—they are the very means by which the participants take part in the body and blood of Christ. Accordingly, *faith* is not made the communion or the means of participation, in which case those who approach the table without faith could not be said, in any sense, to receive such blessings; but the bread and the wine are themselves the things. Hence, he who partakes of these comes also into connection with the blessings themselves.—Ver. 17. Where Christ's body is there is love, chap. xii. 13.—He who receives the sacrament testifies that he is in the communion of Christ and His Church.—Ver. 19. To the pure, all things are pure; yet many things may be rendered impure by circumstances. Hence great circumspection is needful to purity.—Ver. 20. All false worship is a worship of the devil, and those who participate in it shall receive the recompense destined for their lord (Rev. xviii. 4).—Ver. 21 (Œtinger). There is no profit in serving two masters, and just as little in trying to sponge on them both. If the world's baits delight, let Christ's feasts alone (Matt. vi. 24; Jer. xvi. 8).—Ver. 22. To be obstinate and imagine that we must keep up acquaintances and friendships, and that God will not be very exacting in the matter, is an abominable presumption, calculated to provoke God's righteous wrath.—How will God let such miserable sophists run their course till they are made aware of His power (Job ix. 4, 19; xxxvii. 23)?

Berlenb. Bible:—Ver. 14. If we are attempting to serve God in the spirit of truth, through the proffered grace of Christ, we shall abandon all idolatry, such as consists in serving God through ceremonial practices and works of the flesh. But then we must be careful to drink often and much of the spiritual drink, and eat the spiritual food. Christ Himself is both these. In Him is everything given to us spiritually and divinely; in Him there is everything to be had freely and without price—everything which cannot be found in this world's wilderness. He will surely care for soul and body. Therefore flee from Babel, the idolatrous land. When it pursues we must run: otherwise its idols will slip into our hearts.—Ver. 15. Who has the Spirit of Christ, has also the spirit of a sound judgment. No prudent man will be sure of anything, the ground of whose truth he does not find in himself.—Ver. 17. True Christians, as members of Christ, constitute one spiritual body, and are nourished by one meat—the body of Jesus. A sweet communion of sanctified spirits ought, in this way, to be established and fostered. Let us be one, even in this, that we have no fellowship with idols.—Ver. 20. Men often trust their fancies rather than God, and regard it as spiritual pride, as it were, to mount up to Him, and will disoblige none. So it goes, although one does not betake himself to the right source (Ps. xxxvi. 9; Jer. ii. 13; xvii. 13).—Ver. 21. What does it mean that a person presents himself occasionally at the Lord's Table, when throughout his whole life Belial is uppermost in his heart! What a pretence to think of satisfying God with the outward forms and postures of a lifeless worship, while we are sacrificing to our own pleasure, and are intent on gratifying our senses with vanity! All who live after the lusts of the flesh eat of the devil's table.—Those who tread under foot Christ's body and blood, drink rather of the wine of His wrath, and eat the bread of His anger. But priests who cause the people to sin by their evil example, or by failing to rebuke sin through shameful weakness, and who do not instruct the people sufficiently will be obliged to give an account, not only for themselves, but also for the people they have had in charge.

Heubner: — Ver. 16. God's demands are always endorsed by our own consciences.—Ver. 20. To the Christian all evil is an abomination, because it brings him in contact with the kingdom of evil. Do nothing, however indifferent in itself, if according to the intent anything unrighteous or ungodly is indicated by it.—Ver. 21. Participation in the Lord's Supper binds us to strict separation from everything unhallowed, because it implies the most intimate union with Christ. Hence, after communion, a true Christian can hardly divest himself of a certain degree of anxiety.—Ver. 22. Communion with the unholy is a challenge to Christ, because it is a contempt of His Majesty. Indeed, the thought of our weakness ought to awaken in us a salutary fear of our Almighty Lord.

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 13. God will indeed protect us; but we can cherish this consolation only when we flee from every occasion to sin, unensnared by the conceit of our steadfastness.—Ver. 21. Greek and Roman pagans were wont to consecrate a crowned beaker to Bacchus. Is it any less idolatrous when apostate Christians now celebrate the name of a man, some hero of the times, with gluttony and wine-bibbing, with im-

pure jests and buffoonery, and with the tacit denial or uttered blasphemy of God? Oh, how does the world laugh when partakers of Christ's Table run into the web which the devil spins at his banquets of pleasure. Every observance of the Lord's Supper ought to impress on us the words of Paul, "*Ye cannot* be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils." Woe to us if we undertake to do what Christians cannot! The Lord is a jealous bridegroom of His bridal Church, and to put contempt on Him, or to provoke Him to jealousy (Deut. xxxii. 21), is to imitate the sin of the children of Israel, who tempted Christ (ver. 9).

[Barnes:—Ver. 20. The custom of drinking *toasts* at feasts and celebrations arose from this practice of pouring out wine, or drinking in honor of the heathen gods; and is a practice that partakes still of the nature of heathenism. It was one of the abominations of heathenism to suppose that their gods would be pleased with the intoxicating draught. Such a pouring out of a libation was usually accompanied with a *prayer* to the idol god, that he would accept the offering; that he would be propitious; and that he would grant the desire of the worshipper. From that custom the habit of expressing a sentiment, or proposing a toast, uttered in drinking wine, has been derived. The toast or sentiment which now usually accompanies the drinking of a glass in this manner, if it means anything, is now also a *prayer:* but to whom? to the God of wine? to a heathen deity? Can it be supposed that it is a prayer offered to the true God; the God of purity? Has Jehovah directed that *prayer* should be offered to Him in such a manner? Can it be acceptable to Him? Either the sentiment is unmeaning, or it is a prayer offered to a heathen god, or it is a mockery of *Jehovah;* and in either case it is improper and wicked. And it may as truly be said now of Christians as in the time of Paul, 'Ye cannot consistently drink the cup of the Lord at the communion table, and the cup where a *prayer* is offered to a false god, or to the dead, or to the air; or when, if it means anything, it is a mockery of *Jehovah.*' Now can a Christian with any more consistency or propriety join in such celebrations, and in such unmeaning or profane libations than his could go into the temple of an idol, and partake of the idolatrous celebrations there? ·

Hodge:—Ver. 20. It was of great importance for the Corinthians to know that it did not depend on their intention whether they came into communion with devils. The heathen did not intend to worship devils, and yet they did it; what would it avail, therefore, to the reckless Corinthians, who attended the sacrificial feasts of the heathen, to say that they did not intend to worship idols? The question was not, what they meant to do, but what they did: not, what their intention was, but what was the import and effect of their conduct. A man need not intend to burn himself when he puts his hand into the fire; or to pollute his soul when he frequents the haunts of vice. The effect is altogether independent of his intention. This principle applies with all its force to compliance with the religious services of the heathen at the present day. Those who in pagan countries join in the religious rites of the heathen, are just as much guilty of idolatry, and are just as certainly brought into fellowship with devils, as the nominal Christians of Corinth, who, although they knew that an idol was nothing, and that there is but one God, yet frequented the heathen feasts. The same principle also applies to the compliance of Protestants in the religious observances of Papists. Whatever their intention may be, they worship the host if they bow down to it with the crowd who intend to adore it. By the force of the act we become one with those in whose worship we join. We constitute with them and with the objects of their worship one communion].

E. ***Concluding admonition to live in such matters so as to profit one another, and to glorify God.***

Chapters X. 23.—XI. 1.

23 All things are lawful for me [*om.* for me],[1] but all things are not expedient;
24 all things are lawful for me [*om.* for me],[1] but all things edify not. Let no man seek
[that which is] his own, but every man[2] [that which is] another's *wealth* [*om.*
25 wealth]. Whatsoever is sold in the shambles [meat-market], *that* eat, asking
26 no questions for conscience' sake: For the earth *is* the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.
27 If[3] any of them that believe not bid you *to a feast*, and ye be disposed to go; whatso-
28 ever is set before you, eat, asking no questions for conscience' sake. But if any man
say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols [*om.* unto idols],[4] eat not for his

sake that shewed it, and for conscience' sake: for the earth *is* the Lord's, and the ful-
29 ness thereof [*om.* for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof]:[5] Conscience, I,
say, not thine own, but of the other: for why is my liberty judged of another *man's*
30 conscience? For [*om.* for] if I by grace be a partaker [if I partake with thankfulness
εἰ ἐγὼ χάριτι μετέχω], why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks?
31 Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do [or do any thing, *εἴτε τι*
32 *ποιεῖτε*], do all to the glory of God. Give none offence, neither to the Jews,[7] nor to
33 the Gentiles [Greeks, *Ἕλλησιν*], nor to the church of God: Even as I please all *men*
in all *things*, not seeking mine own profit, but the *profit* of [the] many,[8] that they may
be saved.

XI.

1 Be ye followers [imitators, *μιμηταί*] of me, even as I also *am* of Christ.

[1] Ver. 23.—The Rec. has *μοι* after *πάντα* in each clause, but it is opposed by the best authorities, and was probably taken from ch. vi. 12. [As the Apostle was here unquestionably repeating the same expression as was used in chap. vi. 12, the internal evidence would seem to be in favor of *μοι* (Bloomfield, Rinck). But the documentary evidence in its favor (II. K. L. Sin. (3d hand), the Syr. both, one copy of the Vulg., Chrys., Theodt., Orig., August. and some inferior MSS., which omit *πάντα ἔξεστιν, ἀλλ' οὐ π. οἰκοδ.*) is too feeble, and that in opposition to it [A. B. C. (1st hand) D. Sin. (with Clem., Athan., Damasc., Iren., Tert. and many others), too strong to warrant its insertion.—C. P. W.].

[2] Ver. 24.—The Rec. also inserts *ἕκαστος* after *τοῦ ἑτέρου*, but it was perhaps borrowed from a similar passage in Phil. ii. 4. [It is not found in A. B. C. D. F. G. H., Sin., six cursives, the Ital., Vulg., Copt., Sahid. and Arm. versions, and some Greek and Latin Fathers. Even Bloomfield, who at first defended it, now brackets it.—C. P. W.].

[3] Ver. 27.—The *δὲ* is wanting after *εἰ* in some good manuscripts [A. B. D. (1st hand) F. G. Sin., and some cursives, the Ital., Copt. and Vulg. versions, and Antioch., Chrys., Theodt., Aug., Ambrst.], and was probably, inserted because it was supposed to be needed as a connecting particle. [It is retained by Tisch. with C. D. (3d hand) E. H. K. L., some Sahid., Syr., Goth. versions, Theodt., Theophyl. and Œcum., but it is cancelled by Lach., Alf., Mey., Stanl. and Wordsworth. D. E. F. G., the Ital., Vulg. and Copt. versions, and Ambrst., Pelag. and Bede (not the Aug.) insert *εἰς δεῖπνον* after *ἀπίστων*.—C. P. W.].

[4] Ver. 28.—The Rec. has *εἰδωλόθυτον*, but it is probably a gloss which has been substituted in the text for the more uncommon *ἱερόθυτον*. Neither word was common, but *ἱερόθ.* was of the classical, and *εἰδωλόθ.* of the Hellenistic Greek (Bloomfield). The former had a neutral, and the latter a contemptuous signification (Stanley), and hence some have thought that no one would be likely to use the latter at the table of an unbeliever, unless, as Bloomfield suggests, by a weak fellow-Christian in an under tone, or aside. The former word is not *too* respectful for the Apostle to use, and it would imply nothing false. It is adopted by Griesb., Lachm., Tisch., Meyer, Alford and Stanley, on the authority of A. B. H. Sin., two cursives adduced by Bloomf.; the Sahid. version and some indirect testimonies produced by Tischendorf. Julian quotes Paul as using this word in this connection, and his opponent Cyril admits the same (Tisch.). The Latin versions of D. and F. use the word *immolaticium*, to which some Vulg. MSS. add *idolis*, one (amiat.) has *immolatium* (2d cor. has *immolaticum*) *idolis*, and the Vulg. (ed.) has *immolatum idolis*. The Rec. is favored by C. D. E. F. G. K. L., Chrys. and Theodt., and it is defended by Scholz, Reiche, Bloomfield and Wordsworth.—C. P. W.].

[5] Ver. 28.—The Rec. after *συνειδ.* has *τοῦ γὰρ κυρίου ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς*, but these words are not found in the best MSS., and are a repetition of ver. 26. [They are left out in A. B. C. D. E. F. G. H. (1st hand), Sin., the Ital., Vulg., Copt., Syr., Sahid. and Arm. versions, and Damasc., August., Ambrst., Pelag. and Bede, and are retained in H. (2d hand) K. L., the Goth., Slav., some Syr. and Arm. versions, and Chrys., Theodt., Phot., Œcum. and Theophyl.—C. P. W.].

[6] Ver. 30.—The Rec. after *εἰ* inserts *δὲ*, but it is feebly sustained.

[7] Ver. 32.—The Rec. has *γίνεσθε καὶ Ἰουδ.*, but *καὶ Ἰουδ. γίνεσθε*, is better sustained by the MSS. [The latter has for it A. B. C. Sin., 17, 37, 73, Orig., Didym., Cyr., while D. E. K. L. Sin. (3d hand), some cursives, and Chrys., Theodt. and Damasc. are in favor of the Recep.—C. P. W.].

[8] Ver. 33.—The Rec. has *συμφερον*, but *σύμφορον* has better authority. [The former is more usual, and is sustained by D. E. F. G. K. L. Sin. (3d hand), while the latter is sustained by A. B. C. Sin. Comp. on the same variation of reading in chap. vii. 35.—C. P. W.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 23, 24. He here anticipates an objection that might be raised against his previous injunctions on the score of Christian liberty, by pointing out the ethical limitations which restrict that liberty.—**All things are in my power.**—[This is the old statement made in vi. 12, setting forth the broad privileges of the Christian freeman, and to which the Apostle in a measure assents.]—**But all things are not expedient.**—This is the first limitation of expediency. But expedient for whom? The word *συμφέρει* might, in view of the previous warning, seem to imply 'expedient for the subject himself.' It were better, however, to take the word in its broadest application, 'advantageous not only to the subject, but also to all others concerned.'—**But all things edify not.**—The second limitation; since it is the duty of every Christian to make edification a special object. In the verb 'edify' the reference to others is more fully brought out, and here it denotes the furtherance of the welfare of the Church.—In the next verse this limitation is more definitely expressed in the form of a maxim inculcating the exercise of an unselfish love. It is a general truth which he by no means intends to limit simply to the case in hand.—**Let no man seek his own (wealth), but (every man) that of another.**—Here the negation is to be taken absolutely, and not relatively, as though it meant, 'seek *not merely* his own wealth, *but also* that of another.' The 'seeking of one's own' denotes the selfish attempt to make one's own enjoyment, one's own liberty, one's own rights the sole paramount consideration, regardless of the good of others; and this falls under an absolute prohibition as being a violation of the great law of love. "The idea here is, that even what is indifferent in itself becomes sinful when done to the prejudice of a neighbor." Neander. From *μηδείς* we obtain for the nominative in the positive clause an *ἕκαστος*—a case of Zeugma. Like expressions occur in xiii. 5; Phil. ii. 4, Rom. xv. 2 f.

Vers. 25, 26. First he asserts that the eating of flesh exposed for sale in the market, and thus disconnected from idolatrous worship — even

though it may have been cut from sacrificial victims, was altogether innocent, since this meat as well as the whole earth and all things in it belonged unto God.—**Whatsoever is sold in the meat-market.**—*μακέλλῳ*, a word taken from the Latin and=*κρεωπωλίῳ*. [The sale of the portion of the sacrificial meat, which fell to the priests, formed a part of their revenue, and was not to be distinguished from ordinary meat, except perhaps by its excellence, as the animals offered at the altar were usually of a superior kind.] **that eat, without special inquiry.**—*μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες, carefully searching nothing, i. e.*, as to whether it had been offered in sacrifice or not.—**on account of conscience.**—*διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν.* [What is this to be joined with? Some say the previous participle, as setting forth the particular point as to which the inquiry is made, and meaning 'on the score of conscience;' others connect it with the whole participial clause, as assigning the ground for not inquiring, being equivalent either to: 'in order that your conscience may not be disturbed,' or: 'because your conscience being well informed as to the real nature of idols needs no inquiry']; it had best however be joined with the whole previous sentence, and the meaning would then be: 'eat without inquiry in order that the conscience be not burdened or troubled.' [Such is the view of Meyer and Alford. Hodge gives another interpretation which he considers the simplest and most natural: "buy what you want and eat, making no matter of conscience in the thing. You need have no conscientious scruples, and, therefore, ask no question as to whether the meat had been offered to idols or not."—By reason of what is said in ver. 28, one may be led to suppose that it was the conscience of an observer that was meant, which by that act might become disquieted or sullied, inasmuch as he too might be influenced through the example of one deemed stronger in the faith to eat likewise in spite of his scruples. [So De Wette, Bengel, Rückert]. And in justification of this, reference is made to ver. 29, where the conscience of another person is particularly specified. But the cases are not parallel; and in ver. 29, the reference to others is distinctly denoted through the preliminary clause in ver. 28, and there being no such reference here, it were far more natural to suppose the conscience of the inquirer to be intended.—The exhortation in our passage applies to all parties, especially to the weak, who would anxiously ask about their duty in the premises. Yet it was also suited for the strong whose freedom of opinion might suffer damage through the inquiry, since their conscience had been quickened by the Apostle's instruction in reference to this whole matter.—The act of eating he justifies, by a citation from Ps. xxiv. 1, ["which was the common form of Jewish thanksgiving before the meal, and hence probably was the early Eucharistic blessing, and thus alluded to in this place." STANLEY].—**for the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.**—The word *πλήρωμα* denotes that with which a thing is filled, being passive, as everywhere in the New Testament. That which belongs to God can never pollute, and His children need have no scruple about using and enjoying it freely. [And this meat which had been offered to idols, was in fact no less His than any other meat. An idol being nothing could not vitiate it for its original use]. (Comp. on chap. viii. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 4; also Osiander in *hoc loco*, and the citations from Calvin and Melancthon by him).—Vv. 27–30: The same maxim is here applied to their conduct at a banquet given at a private house by a heathen to which they might be invited.—**If any of the unbelievers invite you.**—The invitation here is not to a sacrificial feast, for in such a case the person would not need to be told whether the meat set before him had been offered to idols, [nor yet would it be allowable for a Christian to be present here].—**and ye desire to go.**—A slight hint that remaining away would be a little better; since heathenish customs were everywhere in vogue, and the temptation to deny their Master on the part of those not firmly established was very strong. He here has in view the more liberal-minded whose liberty he did not wish to retrench, and inasmuch as the case often involved the relations of family and friendship, by means of which the truth might be brought home to those who were still unbelievers.—**whatsoever is set before you eat, asking no question on account of conscience.**—See comments on ver. 25.—The case, however, is altered when the attention of the guest has been turned to the sacrificial character of the meat presented.—**But if any man say unto you,**—not the host, as is clear from the repetition of the *τις*, and from what is added further, which cannot in any case be referred to an unbeliever. For the same reason, we cannot explain it, of a heathen fellow-guest who might indicate the fact to the Christian, either from love of mischief, or from a wish to test him, or even out of good-will. Only a Christian can here be meant, and that too some weak brother who has discovered the fact pointed out, and now warns his fellow-believer of it. "Not a Jewish Christian, since such a one would not ordinarily accept the invitation of a heathen; but some converted Gentile, infected with Jewish prejudices, who regarded idols as demoniac powers, and in partaking of the sacrificial flesh, felt himself brought into contact with them." NEANDER. Even a weak brother might be supposed to partake of such a meal, being influenced by his particular relations, and yet with a determination to refrain from every thing polluting.—**This is offered in sacrifice.**—*ἱερόθυτον*, and not *εἰδωλόθυτον*, see critical notes. The former is a neutral word, and is used advisedly to represent what would be said at a heathen's table; but the latter is a contemptuous expression, which we could hardly suppose would be employed there.—**eat not for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience' sake.**—The latter expression is explanatory of the former, and the connecting *καί*, *and*, specifies only the particular point to which the more general statement that precedes applies. If the informant were a heathen, then this expression, "for conscience' sake," would be unsuitable, or we should have to regard it as a second reason derived from the weaker brother, whose conscience we must suppose to be meant. Or we must take it to mean that the person must refrain from eating

in order not to allow the heathen informer to suppose that the participant still had to do with idols, and in order not to violate the conscience of weak Christians—obviously, a forced interpretation. [Evidently then it is some weaker brother that is here meant, for whose sake it was duty to abstain. "The union of the most enlightened liberality with the humblest concession to the weakness of others here exhibited, may well excite the highest admiration. The most enlightened man of his whole generation was the most yielding and conciliatory in all matters of indifference." HODGE]. He next explains himself more fully, putting it beyond a doubt whose conscience is referred to.—**Conscience I say, not thine own,**—*τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, i. e.*, of any one who may come into such circumstances (not=*τὴν σεαυτοῦ*).—**for why is my liberty judged of another's conscience?**—This is not to be taken as expressing the defiant remonstrance of the liberal-minded to his weaker brother, who objected to be governed by his prejudices. Such an interpretation would be unsuitable both by reason of the "for," which in this case would be inapposite, and also because the following exposition gives no reply to it. Several other interpretations here offer themselves. Rückert and others think they find here a further reason for the command not to eat (ver. 28), taking the words to mean that the liberal-minded should not by eating give occasion for others to judge and blaspheme. But in this case they arbitrarily insert the thought, "to give occasion," and entirely pass over what precedes.*—To this there is joined another interpretation, which would find in this verse a vindication of the freedom of conscience, which the Apostle maintained in the name of the liberal-minded, *q. d.*, 'About one's own conscience I am not now speaking; for it is altogether improper for my liberty to be judged by another's conscience. If I am blamed for that which I for my part thankfully enjoy, so that by my thanksgiving such enjoyment is sanctified, this unfounded condemnation neither violates nor endangers my own conscience; so that in not eating, my concern is chiefly for the conscience of another—some weak brother which ought to be spared, and not mine own.' [This is Meyer's explanation, who finds here the reason asserted why Paul did not mean the person's own conscience, for the sake of sparing which he enjoined abstinence from eating in the case mentioned in ver. 28, but the conscience of another. The man's own conscience, he says, did not need such consideration, for it is not affected by another's judging and blaspheming, since both are groundless. The reason therefore for abstaining, could only be found in the conscience of another, and not in the danger done to one's own conscience; and this also is Bengel's view].—The *ἵνα τί=ἵνα τί γένηται, in order that what may happen?—why?* a form for introducing a question about something which has no object or ground, as here, and the verb 'judge' (*κρίνειν*) here denotes a disapproving, condemning judgment, as is seen in the parallel verb, *βλασφήμειν*, in the next clause.—**If I with grace do partake.**—Here *χάριτι* corresponds to *εὐχαριστῶ* in what follows, and is not to be understood of the goodness of God, which allows of such participation, or gives me the light which liberalizes my spirit, and hence is not to be translated 'through grace' [or 'by grace,' as the E. V. has it], but it means, with thanks, referring to the Eucharistic blessing which accompanied the social meal, as may be seen in the expression still common in many places—"to say grace." As the object of the verb 'partake,' we are to supply 'meat and drink.'—**why am I evil spoken of respecting that for which I give thanks?**—*βλασφήμειν*, lit., *to blaspheme*, a sharp word, denoting the bitter condemnation pronounced on the liberal-minded, as on one false to his principles. In the use of it there lies a sharp rebuke of the lack of love exhibited by the person judging (comp. Rom. xv. 3; xiv. 16).

VER. 31—Chap. xi. 1. His exhortation here turns to the Church in general, describing the end and aim which should control the entire conduct of every Christian. And this he connects directly with the last word in the previous verse, *εὐχαριστεῖν*, which denotes an ascription of honor to God.—**Therefore,**—*q. d.*, 'in like manner, as ye thank God for your nourishment, so in all your eating and drinking,' *etc.* Or if this mode of connection does not satisfy, we may take the 'therefore' to indicate the logical inference of a general truth from the special one,—**whether ye eat, whether ye drink, whether any thing ye do.**—The first *ποιεῖτε* may be taken either as generic, including under itself also the eating and drinking, or, it may be taken as expressing action, in contrast to enjoyment. In the first case, the emphasis would lie upon *τι*, as equivalent to *ὁτιοῦν, whatsoever;* in the second, it would lie upon the verb,—but this is hardly to be preferred, [though Alford does prefer it]. In like manner, Col. iii. 17. "From what has been said, Paul here deduces a general didactic inference; he exhorts them so to adjust and use every thing, however indifferent, that God's name may be hallowed." NEANDER.—**Do all to the glory of God.**—["This may mean either, 'Do all things with a view to the glory of God;' Let that be the object constantly aimed at; or, 'Do all things in such a way that God may be glorified.' There is little difference between these modes of explanation. God cannot be glorified by our conduct, unless it be our object to act for His glory. The latter interpretation is favored by a comparison with 1 Pet. iv. 11, "That God in all things may be glorified." See Col. iii. 17, all the special directions given in the preceding discussion are here summed up. 'Let self be forgotten. Let your eye be fixed on God. Let the promotion of

* [Kling here hardly does justice to the interpretation he so summarily sets aside, and which is advocated by Chrys. and the Greek commentators, Heyd., Billr., Olsh., Neand., Hodge, Stanley, and many others. This takes *κρίνεται* for *κατακρίνεται*, in the sense of *condemn*, and finds here a valid reason for enjoining the liberal-minded brother not to eat against the convictions and prejudices of the weaker one, who has pointed out to him the objectionable meat. The reason is that there is no propriety in doing that which seems censurable to another, and gives occasion for observers to blaspheme, even though it may be right in our own esteem, and accompanied with thanksgiving to God. "This," as Hodge well says, "brings the passage into harmony with the whole context, and connects it with the main idea of the previous verse, and not with an intermediate and subordinate clause"].

His glory be your object in all ye do. Strive in every thing to act in such a way that men may praise that God whom you profess to serve.' HODGE]. This thought is further expanded negatively.—**Give none offence, neither to Jews, nor to Greeks, nor to the church of God.**—He here specially addresses the liberal-minded, as in v. 31, who by the reckless use of their liberty were putting a stumbling-block as well in the way of the Jews to whom every approach to heathenism was an abomination, as in the way of the heathen who beheld in their lax conduct a want of fidelity to a religion which professed to separate itself so strictly from heathenism, and would become disgusted at the divisions thus created among Christians; and also in the way of the Church of God, both at Corinth and elsewhere, which would feel injured by conduct so ambiguous and so prejudicial to its unity. And while thus the recognition of the true God in Christ would be obstructed both among Jews and Gentiles, and the Church would be hindered in its happy success, the result would be, in its final bearings, dishonorable to the glory of God. The regard here paid to Jews and heathen, should not so surprise us, as to force us to the supposition that Jewish and heathen converts were meant; for in chap. ix. 20 also, we find the Apostle laying just as great a stress on the duty of taking pains to win both. —This exhortation he finally strengthens by a reference to his own example.—**Even as I please all, in all things.**—Comp. chap. ix. 19 ff.—πάντα, the accusative of more exact definition. The verb 'please,' as in Rom. xv. 2, means *to seek to please, try to prove acceptable to*, and is to be taken in a good sense, as the subsequent explanations show. It is otherwise in Gal. i. 10.—**Not seeking**,—[μὴ ζητῶν, the use of the subjunctive negative here, shows the implication of a particular affection, which he ascribes to himself, and brings into the supposition, *q. d.*, 'as one who, as far as I can, am seeking,' see WINER, p. III., § 55, 5, 13],—**mine own profit, but that of the many.**—Here he puts in contrast over against his own single self, the vast multitude (as in Rom. v. 15) whose interests were the object of his pure and affectionate endeavor. Their profit which he sought, was the highest conceivable,—**that they might be saved.**—Comp. ix. 22; i. 18.—Assured of this his purpose, he urges them to imitate his example (comp. iv. 16) even as he himself imitated the example of Christ, in the exercise of a love which renounced all selfish interests.—**Be ye imitators of me, as I also am of Christ.**—"Only in so far should they imitate him, as he set forth the image of Christ. Of course the whole picture of Christ's life stood before the eyes of the Apostle. But then Paul must have had a historical portrait of the acts and sufferings of Christ, just as it is exhibited in the traces sketched by the Evangelists, and in this we have an argument against the mythical view of the life of Christ." NEANDER.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The Christian's inheritance in this earth, and the duties consequent upon it.* "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof." In this one sentence there is opened to the Christian an inexhaustible wealth of joy and satisfaction, as well as a wide sphere of sacred obligations. If the earth, with all that fills and adorns it, belongs to the Lord, because it is His work, then in every earthly good which nourishes and quickens him, which strengthens and delights him, ought the Christian to taste the favor and the goodness of his God (Ps. cxxxvi. 1; xxxiv. 8), to perceive His power and glory, and to receive it all as the gift of His love. In all his observations and researches, he ought to mark the footsteps of the Divine wisdom and greatness; of the Divine faithfulness and care for His creatures, and above all, for His human creatures made in His own image. Wherever he turns, the thoughts of God which are expressed in the manifold productions of earth, will reveal themselves to his thought. The earth itself, with all its rich and varied life, will become to him a manifestation of the Divine glory and grace; and the more he searches, the more clearly will this open before him. Thus he acquires a large open heart, and becomes ever more capable of enjoyment. Every thing narrow and contracted about him will drop away by degrees. What once seemed strange and mysterious will become known and familiar; he will be able to rejoice in it, freed from all anxious thoughts.—Such results are, however, conditioned on the fact that he walks as in the presence of God, that the earth appears to him as a sanctuary, where he ventures to tread, only after he has taken off his shoes, *i. e.*, only after he has divested himself of the commonness of his earthly sense, of vain and proud thoughts, of selfish and interested projects and endeavors, and after he has become collected in spirit; so that out from the midst of all the manifold phenomena around him, the one Divine ground and aim had in them, the Divine idea in forming, and so richly unfolding itself therein, shall shine out upon his spirit. His God, who furnishes him all this fulness for his use and enjoyment, for his study and comprehension, has by this means put him under obligations also, *i. e.*, inwardly bound him to Himself, so that he shall be dependent on Him, as on the One who is the ground and goal of all things; so that all participation and all joy of discovery shall issue in thanksgiving and praise to His great and good name, and so that he, as the priest of God, shall conduct His creatures to Him in an intelligent, susceptible, and worshipful spirit, moulding and fashioning them out of his own spirit, in such a way as to awaken in them Divine thoughts and endeavors, and to cause the natural to wear the impress more and more of the spiritual. In this is included a tender, delicate, gracious treatment of all creatures, and also a temperance and modesty in their use, to the exclusion alike of all conduct that is crude, severe, arbitrary, reckless and excessive; and of all mismanagement as well through unmercifulness, as through foolish fondling and petting.—Cf. SCRIVER:—GOTTHOLD'S: "Four hundred occasional prayers;" PAUL GERHARD'S: "Go forth, my heart, and seek my joy," *etc.*; and much in J. Böhme, Oetinger, Herder, Schubert, *etc.*

2. The *success, perfection and development of the*

church of Christ is conditioned on the prevailing power of righteousness, which, on the one hand, takes account of the weakness of unconfirmed and scrupulous natures in considerate, tolerant self-denying love, honors the severity of earnest Christians even though oftentimes abrupt and inordinate, and presents an offering of self-denial to one another with perfect willingness; yet, on the other, injures in no respect the right of evangelical liberty, but avows it and maintains it, and, with all readiness to deny itself of this and that, in order to give no occasion of offence, also insists upon the fact that the conscience of a person living in faith is not dependent upon the scruples, and narrow thoughts and judgments of another, but, on the contrary, stands free and far above them, inviolable, in untroubled calmness and clearness. It is thus that a true advance can be made towards the sound expansion and softening of a narrow and stringent mode of thought, as well as towards the healthy restriction of that which is broad and free; and thus the glory of God be promoted and strengthened in His Church.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—Ver. 33 (Spener). A God-loving Christian willingly refrains from needlessly doing anything which may awaken doubts as to its propriety. It is not enough to have truth in view, and according to this our rights, and according to our rights our liberty; but the rules of Christian prudence and moderation, directed to general edification, require compliance with love, that true mistress, which, though it often yields its rights, never loses its good conscience. —Ver. 24. Since self-love has become so far corrupt as to lift us not only above our neighbor, but also above God, self-denial has come to be the first rule of Christianity, in order that our love may be properly balanced; since there is no danger of our ever absolutely forgetting self. Indeed, the equity of love demands that we, in many circumstances, prefer our neighbor to self, *i. e.*, the profit of his soul to our own bodily convenience.—(Hed.) "Let every one seek what is another's"—so, in fact, selfishness and avarice say, *i. e.*, "take, rob, get by fraud what is another's." But mark what is added: "Let no one seek his own."—Ver. 25. The Christian is free to eat everything, provided no offence is given to his neighbor. Useless inquiries and curious subtleties awaken many scruples. Against all such, simple-mindedness is a sure antidote.—Ver. 26 (Luther). Christ is Lord, and free, and so are Christians, in all things.—Oh, man, thou art not lord-proprietor, but only steward in God's domain! What a rich Father we have if we are God's children.—Ver. 29 (Luther). My conscience shall remain unbound, though I outwardly comply with my neighbor for his good. We may eat what we will, provided we have it righteously, take it as a gift from God, and receive it with thanksgiving.—Ver. 31. All acts, however small, are sanctified and ennobled by a single reference to the glory of God; and this is promoted, when we do that which accords with a well ordered love toward ourselves and our neighbor, and abstain from whatever desecrates God's name.—Ver. 32. Believers ought to walk unreprovably, not only among brethren, but also among unbelievers and hypocrites, in order that such may find no occasion for blaspheming Christian doctrine.—All have one common Father; we ought, therefore, to be serviceable to one as well as to another.—Ver. 33. Ministers should be an example to their hearers, in order that they may not retract with the left what they give with the right.—xi. 1. Christ is the perfect pattern of a holy life, who, for our sakes, renounced all comfort and personal convenience. To follow in His steps is the preëminent token of a true minister. Such imitation is possible through the privilege we have of drawing from His fulness (John i. 16).

BERLENB. BIBLE:—Ver. 23. A soul truly emancipated may, by reason of its innocence and simplicity, do much which is not only not displeasing, but even acceptable to God; nevertheless, it may not be always *advisable* to do it. Love must be the standard in all things.—Ver. 24. Let none say, 'why must I consult for another? Why must he be so weak?' Wherefore, then, didst thou wish to become a member of the Church if thou art unwilling to inquire after its members?—In this way thou severest thyself from the Head. —Ver. 25. We must deal very tenderly with the conscience on account of our corrupt state. Many are scrupulous where they might be unhesitating, and reckless where they ought to be careful.—Ver. 26. What the earth produces is good; the great point is, how is it used?—Ver. 27. The liberty which Christ has earned for us should be guarded as a priceless jewel, that Christ may have His own.—Ver. 28 ff. A person may possess something and yet refrain from its use, preserving his liberty intact.—Ver. 31. A Christian must order his entire life, so as to render it a perpetual God-service. Even our calling is a service of God; therefore refrain not from it. If with singleness of purpose thou dost consecrate all thy labor to God, then does it become a divine service. This rule put in exercise, sanctifies everything, even our natural work; and converts every meal into a sort of sacrament, so that it, in its own way, as if an acted prayer, shall receive its reward. By this means our most general works are hallowed, and without this our costliest works are punishable. Such searching method in the service of the Spirit many call legal. But it is the right method of faith, whereby the Son makes us free from the law of sin and death. The believer does, according to the spirit, nothing but good so far as he is a believer; he pleases God in all things by virtue of the divine life in him, which he has by faith. His doing, thinking, speaking, all transpires in God and before God.—Ver. 32. If a person desire to honor God, and yet set his neighbor aside, his eye would be playing the rogue. *Be void of offence!*—Chap. xi. 1. Christ's example is both a gift and an influence. If we put on His example, His Spirit, His compassion, He makes out everything which can happen in our outer and inner life. He is the original, according to which all must be fashioned. The Apostles, indeed, referred to themselves; but they had a good conscience.

RIEGER:—Chap. xi. 1. Christ is certainly the most perfect example; yet, since it is difficult for

us, in all our varied circumstances, always to track His footsteps, the types of Christ seen in the Old Testament, and the patterns after Him found in the New Testament, serve to present to us His mind in a form adapted to our every day conditions.

BENGEL:—Ver. 30. Giving thanks at meals sanctifies all food, denies the authority of idols, and acknowledges that of God.

HEUDNER:—Ver. 24. The Christian pays a tender regard to the conscience of others, without proudly asserting his own rights, and without loftiness of spirit.—Ver. 29. In doubtful cases, do not insist upon another's deciding according to your own conscience.—Ver. 30. Since a thankful spirit sanctifies every enjoyment, all that thou canst, with a clear conscience, give thanks for and ask a blessing on, is allowable.—Ver. 31. Also in the society of the unholy ought a Christian to keep in view his highest aim, *i. e.*, to glorify God by his life; hence he should join in nothing that dishonors God.—Ver. 32. By carefully avoiding offences, a Christian should preserve his own honor and that of his Church. The immoralities of professing converts may prove a cause of stumbling even to unbelievers. —Ver. 33. The Christian's pleasing is a holy pleasing. It aims not at his own enjoyment, but at the spiritual good of others; it proposes to win them, and the agreeable exterior is designed to open a way to the interior—the sanctuary within.—Chap. xi. 1. Christ has taken care to provide for us a multitude of examples, in order to show us that we likewise may follow Him.

W. F. BESSER:—Ver. 24. Liberty is given thee in all sorts of things, not to use them for thine own sake at pleasure, but rather to serve thy neighbor therewith, and to seek his prosperity.—Ver. 25. There is a hunting after conscientious scruples, in which many persons carry out their whole Christianity, ending, alas! oftentimes, in straining out gnats and swallowing camels.

[A. FULLER:—Ver. 33. Paul pleased men in all things, and yet he says, if I pleased men I should not be the servant of Christ, Gal. i. 10. From the context in the former case, it appears plain that the things in which the Apostle pleased all men require to be restricted to such things as tend to their "profit, that they may be saved." Whereas the things in which, according to the latter passage, he could *not* please men, and "yet be the servant of Christ," were of a contrary tendency. Such were the objects pursued by the false teachers whom he opposed, and who desired to make a fair show in the flesh, lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ, chap. vi. 12. The former is that sweet inoffensiveness of spirit which teaches us to lay aside all self-will and self-importance, that charity which "seeketh not her own," and "is not easily provoked;" it is that spirit, in short, which the same writer elsewhere recommends for the example of Christ Himself: "We, then, who are strong, ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves.—Let every one of us please his neighbor for his good to edification; for even Christ pleased not Himself; but as it is written, "The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me."—But the latter spirit referred to is that sordid compliance with the corruptions of human nature, of which flatterers and deceivers have always availed themselves, not for the glory of God or the good of men, but for the promotion of their own selfish designs].

[M. HENRY:—Ver. 23. They who allow themselves in everything not plainly sinful in itself, will often run into what is evil by accident, and do much mischief to others. Circumstances may make that a sin, which in itself is none.—Ver. 27. Christianity does by no means bind us up from the common offices of humanity, or allow us an uncourteous behaviour to any of our own kind, however they may differ from us in religious sentiments or practices.—Ver. 33. A preacher may press his advice home with boldness and authority, when he can enforce it with his own example. *He* is most likely to promote a public spirit in others, who can give evidence of it in himself. And it is highly commendable in a minister to neglect his own advantages, that he may promote the salvation of his hearers. This shows that he has a spirit suitable to his function. It is a station for public usefulness, and can never be faithfully discharged by a man of a narrow spirit and selfish principles].

[F. W. ROBERTSON:—Ver. 29. *The duty of attending to appearances.*—Now we may think this time-serving; but the motive made all the difference: "Conscience, I say, not thine own, but of the other." Study appearances, therefore, so far as they are likely to be injurious to others. Here, then, is the principle and the rule; we cannot live in this world indifferent to appearances. Year by year we are more and more taught this truth. It is irksome, no doubt, to be under restraint, to have to ask not only, "Does God permit this?" but, "Will it not be misconstrued by others?" and to a free, open, fiery spirit, such as the Apostle of the Gentiles, doubly irksome, and almost intolerable. Nevertheless, it was to him a most solemn consideration: Why should I make my goodness and my right the occasion of blasphemy? Truly, then, and boldly, and not carelessly, he determined to give no offence to Jews or Gentiles, or to the Church of God, but to please all men. And the measure or restraint of this resolution was, that in carrying it into practice he would seek not his own profit, but the profit of many, that they might be saved].

XV.

APOSTOLIC INSTRUCTIONS IN RELATION TO THE CONDUCT BECOMING CHURCH ASSEMBLIES.

CHAPTER XI. 2-34.

A. *In respect of apparel; in the covering of the head by the women, and the uncovering of it by the men* (Chap. xi. 2-16).

2 Now [But, δὲ] I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep
[firmly hold, κατέχετε] the ordinances [traditions, παραδόσεις], as I delivered *them* to
3 you. But I would have you [I wish you to, θέλω] know, that the head of every man
is Christ; and the head of the [*om.* the] woman *is* the man; and the head of Christ
4 *is* God. Every man praying or prophesying, having *his* head covered [anything
5 down, depending from his head, κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων], dishonoureth his head. But
every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with *her* head uncovered dishonoureth
6 her [own, ἑαυτῆς] head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven. For if the
woman be not covered, let her also be shorn [let her hair be cut off, κειράσθω]: but
7 if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered. For a man
indeed ought not to cover *his* head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God:
8 but the woman is the glory of the [*om.* the] man. For the [*om.* the] man is not
[out] of the [*om.* the] woman; but the [*om.* the] woman [out] of the [*om.* the] man.
9 Neither was the man [For man was not] created for the woman; but the [*om.* the]
10 woman for the man. For this cause ought the woman to have power on *her* head
11 because of the angels. Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither
the woman without the man [neither is woman without man, nor man without woman],
12 in the Lord. For as the woman *is* [out] of the man, even so *is* the man also by
13 [means of] the woman; but all things of [*are* from, ἐκ] God. Judge in yourselves
[among your own selves, ἐν ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς]: is it comely that a woman pray unto God un-
14 covered? Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a
15 shame unto him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for *her* hair
16 is given her for a covering [an envelopment, περιβολαίου]. But if any man seem to be
contentious, we have no such [established, συνήθειαν] custom, neither the churches of
God.

[1] Ver. 2.—In many good MSS, *etc.*, ἀδελφοί is found after ὑμᾶς, but it is doubtful; it is not in A. B C. [Sinait., 4 cur sives, the Copt., Sahid., Athan. (Romaned.), Arm., Athan., Cyr., Bas., Chrys.]. Its insertion would have been very natural. If this verse were the beginning of a new section, transcribers and commentators would have expected the word, and if it had been in the original, it would not have been easily omitted. It is found in D. E. F. G. K. L., *et al.*, the Ital., Vulg, Goth., Syr. (which, with some others, adds μου), Athan., Theodt., Damasc., Ambrst., Rel. *Lachm.*, *Alford*, *Stanley* and *Wordsw.* cancel it, while *Bloomf.* and *Tisch.* (after cancelling it in his 3d edit.) insert it.—C. P. W.].

[2] Ver. 3.—The article τοῦ before Χριστοῦ is not very certain. [*Lachm.*, *Tisch.* and *Alford* admit it on the authority of A. B. D. Sin. and some Fathers. *Bloomfield* suggests that in these MSS, "the word, written *abbreviatim*, may have arisen from the preceding δὲ." It *may*, however, have been *removed* to match the absence of the article before γυναικὸς.—C. P. W.].

[3] Ver. 5.—*Lachm.* has adopted αὐτῆς on very considerable authority [A. C. D. (1st cor.) F. G. L. Sinait., and about a dozen cursives, with Chrys., Theodt., *et al.*]. This form might have arisen from an attempt to make it conform to the αὐτοῦ of ver. 4. [*Bloomfield* thinks the true word may have been ἀυτῆς, which in Hellenistic Greek was often equivalent to ἑαυτῆς (*Fritzsche*). *Tischendorf*, in his early edit., had αυτῆς, but in his 3rd, and later, he has ἑαυτῆς. The latter word would have been needful, if the Apostle had wished to prevent his readers from confounding the κεφαλὴν with ὁ ἀνὴρ, as they would have been likely to do after what he had said in ver. 3.—C. P. W.].

[4] Ver. 7.—The Rec. omits ἡ before γυνή, but the authority for the article is very strong. It was removed so that the phrase might conform with similar preceding and following phrases. [A. B. D. (1st cor.) F. G. Sinait. (3d cor.) 73, 118, Dial., Isador., Theodt. insert it. So *Lachm.*, *Tisch.*, *Alford*, *Meyer* and *Stanley*. *Bloomfield* receives it, but expresses it in small print. It seems required in the same sense as in ver. 10, where it is certainly genuine.—C. P. W.].

[5] Ver. 11.—The Rec. has an inverted order for these words, but it is not well sustained. Meyer thinks that it was more natural to mention the man first, and that this occasioned the change. [*Lachm.*, *Tisch.*, *Bloomfield* and *Alford*, with A. B. C. D. (1st and 3d cor.) E. F. G. H. and Sinait., with several cursives, versions and Fathers, have γυνὴ χωρὶς ἀνδρὸς οὔτε ἀνὴρ. χωρὶς γυναικος.—C. P. W.].

[6] Ver. 14.—The Rec. has ἢ οὐδὲ αὐτὴ φύσις, but in opposition to decisive authorities. The ἢ was an addition to determine the connection with ver. 13. [It is wanting in A. B. C. D. (1st cor.) F. G. H. Sinait., *et al.* Ital., Vulg., Copt., Syr., Arm., Tert., Ambr., Ambrst., and has been suspected to be an attempt to *point* the interrogation. F. G. Arm., Tert., have ἡ φύσις without the αὐτὴ, but against better authorities; but many of the best MSS put αὐτὴ after φύσις.—C. P. W.].

[7] Ver. 15.—*Lachmann*, with the Rec., adds αὐτῇ after δέδοται, on some good but not sufficient manuscripts. It is easy to see how it may have been added. [A. B. Sinait., *et al.*, have δέδοται αὐτῇ; C. H., with some cursives, the Vulg. and Syr. versions, and Damasc. and Ambr. have αὐτῇ δέδοται· and D. E. F. G. K. L., and many others, with Chrys., Theodt., Œcum. and Tert. entirely omit αὐτῇ.—C. P. W.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

["Having corrected the more private abuses that prevailed among the Corinthians, the Apostle begins in this chapter to consider those which relate to the mode of conducting public worship. The first of these is the habit of women appearing in public without a veil. Dress is in a great degree conventional. A costume which would be proper in our country, would be indecorous in another. The principle insisted upon in this paragraph is, that women should conform in matters of dress to all those usages which the public sentiment of the community in which they live demands. The veil in all eastern countries was, and to a great extent still is, the symbol of modesty and subjection. For a woman, therefore, in Corinth to discard the veil, was to renounce her claim to modesty, and to refuse to recognize her subordination to her husband. It is on the assumption of this significancy in the use of the veil that the Apostle's whole argument in this paragraph is founded." HODGE.]

VER. 2. He begins the new lesson he was about to impart with a conciliatory introduction.—**Now I praise you.**—This might be attached directly to the previous injunction "be ye followers of me," just as what follows might be subsumed under the one in the 32d verse, "give none offence," although neither of these connections is by any means certain. At any rate the first clause is not to be taken in the way of a strong contrast with what precedes [taking the δέ in an adversative instead of transitional sense], *q. d.*, 'though I exhort you to imitate me, yet, nevertheless, I praise you.' [Hodge is inclined to adopt this method of interpreting the connection, and adds: 'the Corinthians, although backward in following the self-denying and conciliatory conduct of the Apostle, were, nevertheless, in general mindful of the ordinances or rules which he had delivered to them.']—**That ye remember me in all things.**—The μου is not dependent on πάντα, so that the latter becomes the direct object of μέμνησθε, making the rendering (that ye remember all things which proceed from me). Such construction were inadmissible, if for no other reason but this, that the verb μιμνήσκειν in the New Testament never takes the accusative.—This remembrance he designates as one that proved itself in worthy deeds.—**That ye keep the traditions even as I delivered (them) to you.**—The personal and the official characters are here inseparably united. The traditions (παραδόσεις) he here speaks of, were both of an oral and written kind (2 Thes. ii. 15), and embraced doctrinal, as well as ritual and practical matters. Here, indeed, he refers primarily to such instructions and ordinances as concerned the order of the church, and of divine worship. The dispute respecting Scripture and tradition obtains no hold here, inasmuch as the distinction between that which was fixed in writing, and that not so fixed did not as yet appear. ["The word translated 'traditions' is never used in the New Testament in reference to the rule of faith, except for the immediate instructions of inspired men. When used in the modern sense of the word *tradition*, it is always in reference to what is human and untrustworthy, Gal. i. 14; Col. ii. 8, and frequently in the gospels of the traditions of the elders." HODGE.] That the particular point alluded to cannot be that mentioned in ver. 3 ff. (Olsh.), is plain from the formula of introduction there used which hints at something new (comp. Osiander). κατεχέιν, *to hold fast*, so as to submit to it as authority, and to conduct one's self accordingly (Meyer: by faith and obedience; Osiander: *usu tenere*).

VER. 3. **But I wish you to know that the head of every man is Christ.**—He here assigns the doctrinal ground for the practical instruction which follows. "In the Corinthian Church there was a departure from the prevailing custom of the East (according to which women went veiled), especially on the part of heathen converts, who, even in other respects, rather overstretched the idea of Christian liberty. Since Paul is here discussing a question of merely outward custom, it is interesting to observe how characteristically he surveys the smallest matters in connection with the greatest, and understands how to penetrate to the remotest particulars from the fundamental principles of the Christian life. He begins, not with the custom itself, but with the leading idea that ought to govern it." NEANDER. By the opening words of the verse he indicates the importance of the instruction he is about to communicate. What he particularly inculcates, is the subordination of woman to the man; but this he directly connects with higher relations. Before he declares the relation which the wife sustains to the husband as her head, he points to that which the man sustains to Christ as his Head, and concludes with referring all back to God as the Head of Christ. By the term head he expresses the next immediate relation sustained. The man, that is the Christian man, has Christ for his Head to whom he is alone subordinate, while the woman who, as a member of the Church, has indeed Christ in like manner for her Head, is yet primarily subject to her husband, and in him has her support, her destiny, and her dignity.—To extend this relation to men generally, is opposed by the fact that the Apostle is here addressing the Christian Church. Nor yet is he indicating the relation of the two sexes in general, but only as it is definitely realized in marriage. But even here we are to distinguish between the inner life of faith, or in other words, the personal relation to Christ where all other distinctions are entirely swallowed up and lost (Gal. iii. 28), and the social position held in the family and in the church where the wife is dependent on the man, is represented by him, and put under his care. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that this power and dignity of the husband is founded on the position he holds toward Christ as his Head, and so the dependence of the wife on him appears as a mediated dependence on Christ.—**And the head of Christ is God.**—Compare the remarks on iii. 23; viii. 6. Although the economic relation is primarily meant, wherein Christ even in His exaltation is dependent on God (xv. 28; Col. i. 15; Eph. iii. 9); yet this dependence presupposes a sort of dependence also in the immanent relations of the Trinity, which, however,

is perfectly consistent with essential equality of being.—[Here, then, we have a view of the unity of the heavenly kingdom in its gradual subordination to the Supreme Authority—God—Christ—Man—Woman. The dependence and submission is one of love yielding to the divinely appointed guardianship and control; the authority is that of love exercised in wisdom, and directed towards the good of the lowest and the glory of the highest. These are the conditions of the divine order in which the relations sustained between the parties are typical of each other. And on this fact is the argument of the Apostle founded. As God is the head of Christ, and as Christ is the head of the Church, so is the man the head of the woman. For a fuller development of this analogy see Eph. v. 23–33. Let it be here understood that the subordination thus expressed involves no degradation. As the Church is not dishonored by being subject to Christ, so neither is woman dishonored by being subject to man].

VER. 4. From the doctrine established in ver. 3, he first draws an inference for the man in the matter of his apparel while at Church.—**Every man praying or prophesying,**—*i. e.*, speaking in public. And by the former is meant, not exactly the speaking with tongues which certainly occurred while in prayer, but the simple offering of supplication in general; by the latter, such a discourse as set forth the mysteries of the divine counsels or of the human life, under a divine inspiration. (Comp. xiii. 2; xiv. 24 ff.). These were the two main parts of primitive Christian worship. In the first the speaker is the organ of the congregation presenting itself before God in thanksgiving, petition, and intercession; in the second, the organ of the Divine Spirit communicating His lessons to the Church. **—Having his head covered.**—*κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων*, here *τι* is understood—lit. 'having aught upon his head.' According to the usage of the Greeks, men appeared in public religious service with face and head uncovered. The case was otherwise with the Romans, and from later times with the Jews. In the Old Testament period such covering was employed only as a token of deep mourning (2 Sam. xv. 30; Jer. xiv. 13).—**dishonoreth his head.**—Suitably with the context we must here understand, not man's own head literally, but Christ who is dishonored when the man denying his independence seems to subordinate himself in this way to the dependent wife, or even allows the tokens of human dependence to be seen upon him.* Although in ver. 5, we are to take the expression 'her head' literally, yet nothing can be deduced from this as to the meaning of ver. 4, because there the meaning is established by *ἑαυτῆς*, and the explanation which follows. On the contrary, the relation to ver. 3 is decisive as to its meaning here. Such was Meyer's view in ed. 2. On the contrary, in ed. 3 he understands it as in vv. 5, 6, and 14 of the natural head, on which the evidence must be seen that no human person but Christ, and through Christ God is the head of the man, and this evidence is its uncovered state. At any rate the chief stress lies upon the rebuke administered to woman's wish to become emancipated in this particular, and that said of the man might also serve for illustrating the opposite.

VERS. 5 and 6. **But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth.**—The propriety of women's praying or prophesying in the Church, is here passed over without comment since he is only treating of apparel; while it is rebuked and interdicted in xiv. 34 ff. Hence the arbitrary assumption that prophesying here means simply chiming in with inspired song is superfluous. ["In here disapproving of the one, says Calvin, he does not approve of the other. Paul attends to one thing at a time"].—**with her head unveiled.**—The unveiling of the head was an abuse originating in female vanity under the pretexts of Christian freedom and of equality with man; and it was so much the more disturbing to devotion as it was contrary to custom to see women unveiled out of the house.—**dishonoreth her own head.**—This referred to the man, would yield a good sense even in connection with what follows, inasmuch as the woman by appearing abroad so shamelessly and exposing herself to the gaze of other men might bring a blot upon her husband. But the use of the reflexive pronoun *ἑαυτῆς* shows clearly that it means the natural head; and this accords with what he says further, inasmuch as a shorn head was with women disgraceful—a symbol of female dishonor—a token of shamelessness,—and, indeed, was made the punishment of an adulteress—at least among the Germans (see TAC., *Germ.* 19; also see WETSTEIN in *hoc loco*), and, indeed, also among the Jews, Numb. v. 18. It was also a token of sorrow. Deut. xxi. 12. [Stanley again finds in the word 'head' a double allusion both to her own head and her husband's as represented by it. See Smith's Classical Dictionary, *Coma* and *Vestalis*].—**for that is one and the same thing;**—the neuter is here used because it treats not of personal, but generic identity.—**with her being shaven.**—That is, she assumes the characteristic mark of a disreputable woman.—This identity he goes on to explain.—**Let her be shorn.**—This is not said permissively, but it expresses a command setting forth the legitimate consequence of the unsuitableness of her being unveiled, *q. d.*, 'if she will do the one thing, let her also do the other.' If she will be so shameless as to appear with her head bare, let her act consistently, and give such a token of her shamelessness as will be seen in stripping her head entirely of its hair.—He then argues.—**But if it is a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven.**—*ξυρᾶσθαι, to be shaved*—a stronger expression than *κείρασ-*

*[Stanley says that both the literal and the metaphorical sense of the term head are here included. The man dishonors his head by an unseemly effeminate practice, and thereby Christ, who is his spiritual head. Here the head, as being the symbol of Christ, is treated with the same religious reverence as is the body in vi. 19, as being the temple of the Spirit! Hodge, on the contrary, prefers to take the word 'head' in its literal sense. "1. Because in the immediately preceding clause the word is used literally. 2. Because in ver. 5 the woman who goes unveiled is said to dishonor her own head, *i. e.*, as what follows shows *herself*, and not her husband. 3. It is more obviously true that a man who acts inconsistently with his station disgraces himself, than that he disgraces him who placed him in that station." The force of the last argument Stanley does not allow, as will be seen above. Stanley's view seems, all things considered, to merit the preference].

θαι, to be cropped short. αἰσχρόν, *shameful,* can hardly be taken here to denote the æsthetic view of the matter as if the meaning were 'if it displease her,' so that we should have here but a sarcastic thrust at woman's vanity, as Calvin thinks [who says that 'the conjecture has some appearance of probability that women who had beautiful hair, were accustomed to uncover their heads for the purpose of displaying their beauty, and that Paul here hints to them that so far from appearing the more beautiful by taking off their veils, they looked as badly as if they were all shaven and shorn.'] The Apostle is rather looking at the subject from a moral point of view throughout.

VER. 7–10. He here resumes the argument for the woman's veiling her head, presented in ver. 3. Only he drops the relation to Christ, and presents that of the man to the woman, illustrating his point antithetically.—**For a man indeed ought not to veil his head.**—The expression οὐκ ὀφείλει means more than 'he is not obliged,' it denotes 'he should not,' 'it is unbecoming for him.' The reason of this is, that—**he is the image and glory of God.**—By this he indicates the godlike rule and lordly majesty (comp. Gen. i. 26) which the position of the man as the head of the wife involves, or which is in a peculiar manner exhibited in it. By the expression 'the glory of God' he means that man carries in himself a likeness to the greatness and majesty of God in so far as he rules in his own sphere with Godlike power and freedom. ["He is created in the image of God, and therefore is the reflex of the divine glory, 'being crowned with glory and honor,' and having, therefore, dominion over the works of God. He, therefore, ought to have nothing on a head which represents so Divine a majesty, nothing on a countenance which reflects so Divine a glory." STANLEY].—Such is obviously the point brought out: not that he is set to show forth God's glory, a thing which does not appertain to man exclusively; not that He is the glory of God in so far that the woman has to veil herself before him, just as the seraphim do before the majesty of Jehovah; nor is δόξα = דְּמוּת for then Paul would have used the term ὁμοίωσις; nor least of all is it to be understood as Fritzsche does on Rom. iii. 23. *Ornamentum Dei quippe quo fingendo Deus, quantum posset, manifestaverit.*—**But the woman is the glory of man.**—This she is in so far as she could be fashioned entirely out of his rib—an evidence *quanti vir sit* [!] Now, the wife is the glory of the man inasmuch as in her, in her management as a housewife, the exalted position of the man is made manifest; or inasmuch as she develops an independent activity only in subordination to him, and by virtue of his plenary power, or only in connection with him attains to her proper dignity and worth. ["She always assumes his station; becomes a queen, if he is a king; and manifests to others the wealth and honor which belong to her husband." HODGE.] Paul does not add the word "image," since it would be unsuitable on account of the diversity of sex; others say because it would otherwise appear as if the Divine image in her were ignored. But Paul is not speaking here in a religious or ethical sense.—The higher position of the man and the dependence of the woman are still further proved from the history of their creation, (their genetic relation. MEYER.).—**For man is not from woman, but woman from man.**—[Here the emphasis rests on 'is' which is equivalent to 'takes his being.' The reference is to Gen. ii. 23.—ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς ἐλήφθη αὐτη.].—But this derivation rests again upon the fact that the object of the creation of the woman is in the man—not the reverse. In other words, the dependence of existence rests on the dependence of destination.—**For neither was man created on account of the woman, but woman on account of the man.**—That the "for" in this clause is to be taken as parallel with the previous one is improbable, because unnecessary. [Alford however disputes the subordination of the latter 'for' to the former, and makes the two parallel; but without reason. Certainly the view given above, which is Meyer's and Stanley's also, is in better accord with the Greek, καὶ γάρ, *q. d.*, 'and that for this reason, for,' etc.].—From this relation of woman to man thus proven, he now draws his inferences in regard to her true mode of apparel.—**For this cause ought the woman to have power upon her head.**—["There is scarcely a passage in the New Testament which has so much taxed the learning and ingenuity of commentators as this." HODGE. "In the difficulty of its several portions it stands alone in the New Testament, unless, perhaps, we except Rev. xiii. 18; or Gal. iii. 20. Each part has its own particular obscurity." STANLEY]. In the first place, the term "power" (ἐξουσία) is a very remarkable one. Interpreted by the context, this can only mean the veiling of the head, standing by metonymy for that, which was the token of power or authority. So NEANDER, who adds: "The wife should have upon her head a symbol of the power which the man has over her, *i. e.*, the veil."* The word itself, however, nowhere else occurs in this sense. As somewhat analogous to it, we have the word βασιλεία, which literally means *kingdom,* used evidently for *diadem* in *Diod. Sic.* I. 47 (ἔχουσιν τρεῖς βασιλείας ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς: 'they have three kingdoms on the head,' meaning 'three crowns'). A number of conjectural readings, and also varied attempts at explanation,—some strange, some arbitrary, may here be passed over. For an account of them, see Meyer, Osiander [and Stanley, whose note on this word is quite elaborate].—As an additional reason why the women should have the symbol of power on their heads, the Apostle subjoins.—**on account of the angels.**—Here, too, there has been a great elaboration of opinions, partly in the way of conjectural readings, and partly in attempts at explanation. The former deserve no mention [as the

[* Wordsworth says, rather "an emblem of authority which she derives through man from God; and by throwing off her covering she throws away her ἐξουσιάν, or the mark of her own authority, which consists in the essential derivation of her being through man from God. She forfeits her own claim to reverence by breaking that link of connection which binds her through man even to the throne of God." But in opposition to this statement we need but cite a quotation made by Barnes from Chardin. Speaking of the head-covering used by the ladies of Persia, this author says, "only married women wear it; and it is the mark by which it is known that they are *under subjection*"].

present reading is supported by all good authorities; although Neander can hardly help the persuasion that it was a gloss introduced anterior to all the existing manuscripts, and so perpetuated]. As far as the latter are concerned, owing to a disinclination to assume that supernatural existences were meant, it has been thought that the "angels" here spoken of were of a human kind—whether it be officers of the church,* which can hardly be the case, from the lack of all qualifying terms (comp. Rev. i. 20: "unto the angel of the church," *etc.;* Mal. ii. 7: "The priest—is the messenger (ἄγγελος) of the Lord of Hosts"); or prophets, of which the same remark holds good; or messengers from other churches, which by no means follows from Jas. ii. 25, where Rahab is spoken of as 'receiving the messengers:' or whether it be unconverted husbands, or others not Christians, who might come into the congregations to make report. If, however, supernatural beings are understood to be meant, then the question arises whether these are good or bad spirits. If we suppose the latter, then the reference here would be to the danger of temptation through such evil spirits, either through the women's being betrayed into unhallowed thoughts, or through their tempting men to indulge the same by showing themselves unveiled. But from the lack of any definite limitation of the meaning of the term, or of any hint of the kind in the context, we can hardly suppose this class of spirits to be intended. He must mean therefore *the good and holy angels.* Yet the phrase is not to be construed as expressing an oath which would be contrary to the usage of the language. Nor yet does it mean that women should veil their faces in presence of men, who are here declared to be the image and glory of God, because angels do this in the Divine presence (Isa. vi.). Nor yet does the phrase denote the purpose not to give offence to their guardian angels by an indecorous appearance; for then would he have added the pronoun 'their' to imply this. The most probable opinion is, that he means angels in general, who are regarded as being invisibly present with Christ in the assemblies of the church, and whose displeasure would be awakened by the violation of decency. The first trace of such an idea, which appears also to have been advocated by the early fathers, is to be found in Ps. cxxxviii. 1. "Also before the angels will I sing praise to Thee." Traces of the same belief may be found also among the Jews of a later period. (Comp. Grotius on this text). *Reverentia geniorum, qui formationis hominum testes et spectatores fuerunt.* The origin of the idea that angels were present at the creation of men, may be proved to have come from the rabbinical interpretations of Gen. i. 26. [The view just given Hodge declares to be "the common and only satisfactory interpretation of the passage which answers all the demands of the context]." And Alford expresses his belief in it, and adds that the reason of Paul's thus speaking of the angels was, that he "had before his mind the order of the universal church, and prefers, when speaking of the assemblies of Christians, to adduce those beings who, as not entering into the gradation which he has here described, are conceived [of] as spectators of the whole, delighted with the decency and order of the servants of God." Such also is Calvin's view, who says that "this was added by way of amplifying, *q. d.* 'If women uncover their heads, not only Christ, but all the angels, too, will be witnesses of the outrage.' And this interpretation suits with the Apostle's design, as he is here treating of different ranks." Stanley's note, which is full of interesting information, is too long to be quoted here, and the curious reader can only be referred to it.

[* In support of this opinion, see some interesting statements in THOMSON'S "*The Land and the Book*," Vol. I., pp. 34–37].

VERS. 11, 12. All proud depreciation of women on the part of men, as well as all disposition to retire on the part of women, Paul now opposes by qualifying his previous expressions and bringing to view the mutual connections of the sexes in the sphere of Christian life. And these he then refers back to their relations grounded in nature.—**Nevertheless neither is woman without man, nor man without woman in the Lord.**—To explain the word "Lord" of God, as if the phrase "in the Lord" meant on account of 'God's will and ordinance,' would be contrary to Paul's use of language, and is by no means required by the relation of the two verses [11, 12], by which the harmony of the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of nature is indicated, or that the order of life obligatory in the sphere of redemption is grounded on that which preceded it in the sphere of creation according to the Divinely ordained development of things therein.—But the question still arises whether the expression "in the Lord" is to be taken as a predicate with 'is' understood, as if he meant to say that the one is not without the other in communion with the Lord; or as an adverbial expression qualifying the two clauses so as to imply that in the sphere of Christ both are inseparable. The sense is essentially the same in both constructions, and both are logically admissible. But the former better expresses Paul's thought. He means that while the woman ought in the public assembly to show herself as one subordinated to the man in a dependence which is indicated both in her origin and in her destiny, nevertheless Christianity requires no separation of the sexes. Neither party stands for itself alone. Both belong essentially together, and point to one another. And even in relation to the Christian life there is a mutual dependence, so that the one serves to supplement the other. As BURGER says: "In their relation to Christ, in that communion where both alike have the ground and aim of their spiritual life, the distinction of the sexes is resolved into a mutual dependence of love."—In what follows, Paul points to the fact that this relation in Christ corresponds to the natural relation existing between the sexes, and is demanded by the essential harmony which prevails between the kingdom of nature and the kingdom of grace. "For were this not so, then would Christianity be opposed to the natural order of things." MEYER.—In contrast with what is said in ver. 8, and here re-stated, that—**the woman is from the man**—he says—**so also is the man through the woman.**—As the former declaration refers

o the origin of the woman, so does the latter refer o the progressive reproduction of the race, which ven in the case of the man is effected through he woman.—And lastly, he sets this natural re- ation under a religious point of view.—**but all hings of God**—*i. e.*, God is the first principle f all things, of the existence of woman from the nan, and of man through the woman. But the ogical relation of the two verses does not require hat we refer this to what was said in ver. 11 by he expression "in the Lord." From this brief ligression he returns to his immediate sub- ect.

VERS. 13–15. He here appeals once more to heir natural sense of propriety.—**Judge in ourselves.**—*i. e.*, without reference to any ex- ernal authorities by which their judgment might e biased. We are not to suppose that Paul is ere accommodating himself to the fondness for hilosophic proof prevalent among the Greeks, s Rückert imagines. He intends only to bring he matter closer home to their own conscious- ess, both softening and sharpening his reproof t the same time. ["The Apostle often recog- izes the intuitive judgments of the mind as uthoritative, Rom. i. 32; iii. 8. The constitu- ion of our nature being derived from God, the aws which He has impressed upon it, are as nuch a revelation from Him, as any other possi- le communications of His will. And to deny his, is to deny the possibility of all knowledge." HODGE].—**Is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?**—By praying unto God, he does not mean silent participation in ublic worship, but as in ver. 5, taking the lead in udible prayer.—If the women, while they were hus putting themselves upon an equality with nen, deemed themselves at liberty on this ac- ount to appear like the men unveiled, it is so nuch the more remarkable, that Paul should efer them simply to the uncomeliness of their ehavior while holding public intercourse with God, whose ordinance they were violating in so doing. Hence he here says nothing about pro- hesying.—That the sense of propriety required woman to be veiled, is shown from the sponta- eous teachings of nature.—**Doth not nature tself teach you that if a man have long air, it is a shame unto him, but that if a woman have long hair it is a glory to her?**—The *οὐδέ* had best be translated *not even*, which imparts to the whole question a greater mphasis. In regard to "nature," the question rises whether the word is to be taken in the ob- ective sense, as denoting the order and laws of ature, or in the subjective sense, as denoting the nstinctive feelings and sentiments, the native ense of propriety existing in every individual, nd which may have been more or less affected y custom and habit. The latter interpretation annot be altogether established from the mean- ng of the word. But the former yields good ense, as we understand by it here to denote the atural constitution of the sexes, and the richer rowth of hair in the woman. In observing these onstitutional tendencies, a significant hint is erived as to what is befitting in the premises. ccordingly, in contrast with the practices of a ruder heathenism of the earlier time, when long air prevailed, there has grown up among the most civilized nations, that good taste which de- clares itself in favor of short hair for men and long hair for women. Among men, the wearing of long hair is now reprobated as a mark of effe- minacy and dishonoring to them, inasmuch as it prevents the free exposure of the countenance. [The Nazarites, as a distinction, allowed their hair to grow]. The main stress of the Apostle's instruction, however, bears upon the duty of woman, and he assigns as one reason for her wearing her hair long, that—**her hair is given to her instead of a covering.**—From this it follows that the artificial veiling which he has spoken of above, is also an honor to the woman, while going unveiled disgraces her, since na- ture itself seems to have insisted upon the veil- ing of her head. [Chardin writes respecting the ladies of Persia: "The head-dress of the women is simple: their hair is drawn behind the head, and divided into several tresses: the beauty of this head-dress consists in the thickness and length of these tresses, which should fall even down to the heels, in default of which, they lengthen them with tresses of silk. The ends of these tresses they decorate with pearls and jewels, or ornaments of gold or silver." (Barnes). This method of wearing the hair is common among all Eastern nations, and it shows how woman's hair was regarded as "a covering." But the Apostle, it will be observed, makes no allusion to the *customs of nations* in the matter, nor is even the mention of them relevant. This, it will be important to observe, since many are inclined to construe his instructions as applicable only to those early times, being fashioned in accord- ance with customs then prevalent. So far is this, however, from being the case, that he ap- peals for support, solely to the Divine ordinances in nature, and therefore imparts a lesson which is applicable alike for all times].

VER. 16. He concludes by asserting his own custom and the custom of other Churches, as an answer to those contentious people who might refuse to concede the validity of his arguments. —**But if any man seem to be contentious.** —*δοκεῖ* does not mean *incline*, for this idea is ex- pressed by *τινι δοκεῖ*. It may be explained as denoting either 'thinks he is at liberty to be,' or as a delicate turn after the fashion of the Latin *videtur*: hence essentially the same as *ἐστίν*. In the apodosis the expression is elliptical, and we must supply some such phrase as 'let him un- derstand that,'—**we**,—that is, himself and his fellow-Apostles, and those of like sentiment.— **have no such custom.**—It is questionable whether he means here the custom of women's appearing unveiled, just animadverted upon, or the contentiousness he is anticipating. The lat- ter interpretation suits with the use of the word "we," which otherwise would suggest the thought of some Jewish custom had in mind, a thing that does not suit here; and also of the Churches of God, he could very properly say that conten- tious disputing was not allowed among them, and was not their custom. [Such is the view given by Chrysostom, Calvin, Meyer, de Wette, and many of the best modern commentators. But in regard to it Alford well says: "Surely it would be very unlikely that after so long a treatment of a particular subject, the Apostle

should wind up all by merely censuring a fault common to their behavior on this and on all the other matters of dispute. Such a rendering seems to me almost to stultify the conclusion. But for the weighty names on the other side, it would seem hardly to admit of a question, that the custom which he here disavows, was the practice of women praying uncovered. He thus cuts off all further disputation on the matter, by appealing to universal Christian usage." With this view agree Grot., Billroth, Olsh., Hodge, and others]. The allusion to the Churches of God carries great emphasis, as decisive of the point in question, and shutting up all strife. It might be said that here was a genuine Catholic element set in opposition to a self-opinionated particularism.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *The unity amid diversity in the Divine economy.* The Sovereign of the heavenly kingdom is the Son who is one with the Father, and yet has God for His Head. Yea, as the One who is of the Father, and derives all things from the Father, so as to be able to say, "All Thine are mine," is He dependent on the Father, and distinguishable from Him both in His unity and in His equality.—The same law reappears in the human sphere. Here man is the chief power, and woman is dependent on him. There is the same humanity in both, and the same Divine life in both. But as the woman originally derived her life from the man, and so is subordinate to him in all the relations of life, being created for him and designed to be his helper; so likewise in the spiritual sphere, in the domain of God's Church is woman subordinate to man. Here, too, is it the life of the man through which the Lord primarily acts. Men are the bearers of the Divine message; they proclaim the Divine truth, and by virtue of it beget a spiritual life in others; and they are the shepherds who foster the life thus begotten in its onward development. And as in his doings and management the majesty of God is reflected, so is the glory of man reflected in woman, and in her activities in so far as she acts by the authority and power of the man moulding, informing and training the life received from him, and ruling in the household set up by him, to order, counsel and educate within her own sphere. This is a genuine womanliness, which manifests itself in the constant consciousness of such a dependence which every where follows the man, which regards his mind and will as the ground and rule of her action, which is never obtrusive, arrogates no functions belonging to the man, and always wears the appearance of modesty and decorum whatever may be the prevailing fashion of the times.

But as in the natural sphere, man with all his freedom and independence, is in turn conditioned upon the woman, deriving his existence through her; and as the man with all his freedom cannot isolate himself from the woman, but is obliged to find in her the complement of his whole being and existence, so is it likewise in the sphere of his Christian life. As the woman ordinarily imparts a salutary and refining influence to man's moral and social life, tempering his strength with her mildness, and adding her plastic power to his, in the whole business of education; so is it likewise in the spiritual life. As an evidence of what she is and can do here, we can point to the lives of many distinguished men in the kingdom of God, who have owed their greatness to wise and pious mothers. If on the one hand woman, in fellowship with man, obtains through his influence energy and boldness, power and independence, freedom and breadth of character, by means of which she is raised above her natural state without injury to her feminine qualities, and is brought to share in his being without altering, but rather ennobling her womanliness; so on the other hand, through the influence of woman, the angularity and sharpness, the harshness and strength of the masculine nature become softened, and acquire a gentleness and grace, which without injuring his true manliness, adorns and ennobles his whole life. And both these effects are seen in their purest and highest forms within the sphere of Christianity. And in this sphere alone is man able to assert and realize in a truly moral way his proper position and influence, for here he has Christ as his Head. By this means, also, are the relations of the divine and the human spheres properly mediated. In a certain sense, Christ, the Son of God, the First-born of all creatures, in and through whom all things were made, the original image of God after which man was fashioned, the primeval glory of God of which human glory is but a ray, must be considered as the Head of the man, in all the spheres of earthly life, from the beginning to the end; and all true manliness, with its elevating influence upon the character of woman, must be referred back to Him:—just as in like manner the receptivity and formative activity of the woman, and the identity of the two-fold life in marriage, is grounded upon the divine act that made them partakers of one common nature. And both these are truly realized in their mutual influences in Christianity in that sphere of redemption which has been wrought out and perfected by the incarnate Son of God. Here the man depends on Christ by faith, and derives from His fulness power, wisdom and love, which enable him to prove a true support for the woman who has been redeemed by the same Christ, is united with him in faith, and is taken into personal communion with him, imparting to her what he has received from Christ, and in the love of Christ, who gave Himself for them, devotes his strength and all his qualities, and so leads her on under his influence that she is daily strengthened through the divine grace derived through him, and so becomes, in turn for him, just what she, according to her own way and destiny, can be, and ought to be by virtue of this same divine life—a true Christian wife, a veritable help—meet for him in God.

[2. *Dress* is not only an article of comfort and convenience, but also, in its original design and use, is a symbol: 1, Of our fallen state—betokening sin and shame. 2, Of sex—distinguishing between man and woman. 3, Of rank and station—designating by its specific differences the positions which persons hold in life. 4, Of character and sentiment—expressing in its style the

peculiarities, good or bad, of the wearer. In consequence of this, its symbolic character, it becomes every Christian to be particular as to the manner of his dress, and see to it that it properly expresses the position which he occupies in society, and in the Church of God, and that it indicates those qualities of character which it becomes him always to cherish and manifest. This rule applies alike to both sexes, and ought to be fully considered by Christians at this day, when the propensity is so strong for complying with the fashions of a world, which, in forgetting God, is too apt also to ignore and violate the just relations held by men and women in society. Above all things ought "women professing godliness to adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shame-facedness and sobriety," resisting firmly every fashion that may prove either a dishonor to themselves or a temptation to man].

[3. *Nature and Christianity.* Both originating in the same God, appear in perfect harmony. The laws of nature confirm the dictates of Christianity, and Christianity accepts, authenticates and sanctifies the teachings of nature. In this mutual support we find one evidence of the truth of revelation].

[4. The New Testament confirms the truth of the Old Testament, even in those particulars which it has been too much the fashion to discredit as a mere myth or allegory. In referring for proof to the facts of the history of the creation, Paul here establishes the credibility of the Mosaic narrative in all its literalness. It is impossible, therefore, for any Christian who believes in the inspiration of the Apostles, to doubt the divine authority of the Pentateuch, or to confine the inspiration of the ancient writers to their doctrinal and preceptive statements].

[5. The authority of the Apostles is the end of controversy. To argue against what they have established is, therefore, to show a contentious and rebellious spirit, that, instead of being reasoned with, had best be let alone].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—Ver. 2. As a father toward his child, so does a faithful minister toward his Church use all means—praise and censure—for urging his hearers to goodness and piety (iv. 14; 1 Thess. ii. 11 ff.).—As faithful ministers remember their people, to pray for, love and serve them, so should the people remember their ministers, to pray for, assist and give heed to their lessons.—Ver. 3. For a happy marriage, it is essential, 1, that the husband acknowledge Christ as his head, and rule in his spirit; 2, that he prove the head of the wife in fact, yet not in such a way as to destroy her courage and confidence; 3, that the wife acknowledge her husband as her head—not undertaking to act as master. —Ver. 4. In public worship, as also everywhere else, Christians ought to preserve decorum according to established usages (Ex. xix. 10, 11). —SPENER: It is incumbent on Christians in all their religious services to indicate by their appearance and demeanor a reverence for the presence of God—man and woman conducting themselves according to the divine intent in their creation.—HEDINGER: As God and nature have distinguished offices and sexes, so have they also appointed distinctions in apparel and demeanor, which should be observed according to public custom, and so as to avoid offence (Deut. xxii. 5).—Ver. 6. None should allow themselves to be forced to do that which is good. Willing obedience is what pleases God.—Ver. 8. Behold the wisdom of God in fitting man and woman to the position designed for them severally in marriage.—Ver. 9. It is a perversion of God's ordinance, when a woman usurps authority over her husband, or when a man, from fond affection, becomes the slave of his wife.—HED.: As the lord of the household, man must keep his place, and he commits a great mistake when from any side considerations he forms a marriage contract that requires him to yield his position. Yet "dwell with your wives according to knowledge" (1 Pet. iii. 7), and tenderness as "fellow heirs of the grace of life," on whom God has enjoined obedience as a praiseworthy duty—which has, however, since the fall proved a cross to the weak and a vexation to the unregenerate.—Ver. 10. A dress designed for the ball-room is unsuited to the house of God, where it becometh women to assume a modest attire, if not for the sake of man, yet at least for the sake of the angels present there, and for the sake of God, who has promised there to come and bless His people (Ex. xx. 24).—Ver. 11. Man and woman have an equal right to the kingdom of God; they have been redeemed at an equal cost, and may obtain like blessedness; therefore let not man plume himself on his supremacy, nor woman feel disgraced on account of her subjection.—Ver. 12. Christ Himself was born of woman; hence men should honor and love their wives, and wives not begrudge their husbands their lordship. All things are of God—man and woman and the ordinances regulating their relations; hence, to Him belongs the honor due, in all humility and obedience. What is comely should be cultivated, because well pleasing to God no less than to man (Phil. iv. 8).—Ver. 15. Long hair is an honor to a woman; but she should not proudly parade it; rather it should be to her a sign of subjection, and serve for a covering.—Ver. 16. True church members will never *compel* others to adopt their own opinions, however well grounded, nor wrangle about them; but will quietly let wranglers pass and leave them to their own responsibility.

BERLENB. BIBLE:—Ver. 2. He who will maintain the spirit of Christianity in its integrity, will show it even in little things.—Ver. 3. All true order has its foundations above.—The distinctions which God has made between the sexes cannot be arbitrarily overridden.—Man must conduct himself according to the type set by Christ. If he prides himself on his authority, and is not at the same time obedient to his Lord, nor abides in His Spirit, he is guilty of flagrant folly. His example encourages the wife to be disobedient too. As Christ is submissive to God, and is intimately united to Him, so must man be related to Christ. He must be as a Christian, and act consistently with his profession.—Vv. 7–9. These first principles sound like old tales; but let us keep them fresh by constant application. The order of nature must be held close

with the order of creation and Providence, and with the history of Moses.—Ver. 10. Christianity consists in a life of subjection; but it is by this means that Satan is overcome.—Vv. 11, 12. Man and wife are united as head and body—the one cannot exist without the other; therefore, each should consent to unite with the other in one understanding, purpose and head. In the kingdom of grace there must be no infraction upon the kingdom of nature. They concur, and have their lesson from the Lord, and their blessing through "the seed of the woman."—The man, however, cannot abide in the Lord unless he be condescending to his wife. It is a valuable exercise in Christianity to be referring all matters, even the least, to the Lord, whence all things come. God is the source of all things, and if we do not go back to the origin of things as revealed we shall not discover their true law and order. —Ver. 13. God has given woman certain signatures, which shall indicate to her how she is to conduct herself outwardly. Prayer begets reverence and docility.—Vv. 14, 15. Nature must not be abandoned in common life, much less in holy services.

Rieger:—Ver. 2 ff. There is something very delicate about our good standing in the kingdom of God, far more than about the most refined court-fashion in the world. If we hesitate to offend against the latter in the slightest particular of dress or deportment, how much more should we hesitate in the case of the former.—The man finds his Head in Christ, from whom he derives grace and gifts not only for himself, but also for his house; but woman is to find her head in man, even aside from the marriage relation, because in the constitution and management of the Church all depends on men. And this should not appear hard, since in the work of redemption there exists just such a mutual relation between Christ and God. He derives everything from the fulness of the Father, and refers back to Him what He, as the Mediator, brings to us.

Heudner:—Ver. 3. Every regulation should be so referred back to our religious instincts and to fundamental principles, as to be made the standard of decorum for every age.—Ver. 7. Man is the Lord of the house—the image and representative of God—the one from whom the majesty of God should be reflected. The wife represents at home the absent man, and should exhibit his image in herself; she has authority only from him [even as she bears his name]. Hence both should so carry themselves in deportment and attire, that the supremacy of the man and the subordination of the woman shall be recognized.—Ver. 9. It is a sad perversion of God's ordinance, when women regard men simply as the means of their convenience, honor, or comfort.—A wife who fails to further the just interests of her husband, contravenes the appointment of God.—Christianity is innocent of that silly worship of ladies which has often been observed in Christian nations. Yet woman is not on this account to be regarded as the mere instrument of the man.—Ver. 11. Christianity balances the inequality through the equality, secured in Christ, in whom both ought to be regarded as one. Before God all stand on one footing.—Ver. 13. Our moral sentiments often decide a question more correctly than the understanding. Most of all, in our devotions should modesty rule and protect the heart. Can the bold, the shameless, the restless pray?

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 11. The Greeks excluded woman from certain solemnities of their idol-worship; on the contrary, in Christianity married couples walk together to the house of God, sit side by side at the table of the Lord, unite at the morning and evening blessing, and are together in all the observances where life in the Lord is fostered. In Thee, O Lord! the man is not without the woman, and woman is not without the man; but in order that both may remain in Thee, keep Thou them steadfast in obedience to Thy will, that the woman may serve Thee in subjection to the man, and the man may be the head of the house in Thee!—Ver. 16. A praiseworthy ordinance which has in it a sound Christian sense, should not be mutilated, deranged, and perverted, through mere love of change or selfish cunning, if for no other reason than this, that unedifying and useless strife is thereby evoked, in which each one deems his own was the best.

[Wordsworth:—4–15. St. Paul here teaches the Christian women, who more than any women in the world, needed such instruction, that by obtrusive boldness and wanton effrontery, and by presumptuous shamelessness and flaunting immodesty in public, in the House of God, they *gained nothing*, but *forfeited* that dignity, power, and grace, which God had given to women, especially under the Gospel.—Thus the Divine Apostle has left a lesson to women in every age, a lesson which in the present age deserves special attention, when the attire of some among them seems to expose them to that reproof which was spoken through him by the Holy Spirit to the women of Corinth.—Let them learn from him, that the true power of woman is in gentle submission; her most attractive grace and genuine beauty are in modest retirement and delicate reserve; her best ornament, "that of a meek and quiet spirit, which, in the sight of God, is of great price" (1 Pet. iii. 4)].

B. *On the contrast between the rich and poor at church-feasts, as inconsistent with the idea of the Lord's Supper, and provocative of the Divine judgments.*

CHAPTER XI. 17–34.

17 Now in this that I declare *unto you* I praise *you* not [But this I command you,
not praising you, *παραγγέλλω οὐκ ἐπαινῶν*],[1] that ye come together not for the
18 better, but for the worse. For first of all, when ye come together in the church [a
public assembly, *ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ*],[2] I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly
19 [in some degree, *μέρος τι*] believe it. For there must be also heresies [sects, *αἱρέ-
σεις*] among you, that they[3] which are approved may be made manifest among you.
20 When ye come together therefore into one place, *this* [*it*] is not to eat the Lord's sup-
21 per. For in eating every one taketh before *other*[4] his own [private, *τὸ ἴδιον*] supper:
22 and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What! [For, *γὰρ*] have ye not houses to
eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and shame them that have
23 not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise[5] you in this?[6] I praise *you* not. For I
have [*om.* have, *παρέλαβον*] received of the Lord that which also I [have, *παρέδωκα*]
delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the *same* night in which he was betrayed,
24 took bread: And when he had given thanks, he brake *it*, and said, Take, eat[7] [*om.*
Take eat]; this is my body, which is broken[8] [*om.* broken] for you: this do in remem-
25 brance of me. After the same manner also *he took* the cup, when he had supped,
saying, This cup is the new testament [covenant, *διαθήκη*] in my blood: this do ye, as
26 oft as ye drink *it*, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and
drink this [the][9] cup, ye do shew [proclaim, *καταγγέλλετε*] the Lord's death till he
27 come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread,[10] and [or, *ἤ*] drink *this* cup of the
28 Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and [the][11] blood of the Lord. But let
a man examine [make trial of, *δοκιμαζέτω*] himself, and so let him eat of *that* [the
29 *τοῦ*] bread, and drink of *that* [the, *τοῦ*] cup. For he that eateth and drinketh un-
worthily, [*om.* unworthily][12] eateth and drinketh damnation [judgment, *κρῖμα*] to him-
30 self, not discerning the Lord's [if he does not discern the, *μὴ διακρίνων*] body. For
31 this cause many *are* weak and sickly among you, and many sleep. For [But, *δέ*] if
we would judge [had judged, *διεκρίνομεν*] ourselves, we should not be [have been
32 judged, *οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα*] judged. But when we are judged [now that we are judged,
κρινόμενοι], we are chastened of the Lord,[14] that we should not be condemned with the
33 world. Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for
another. And [*om.* And][15] if any man hunger, let him eat at home; that ye come not
34 together unto condemnation [judgment, *κρῖμα*]. And the rest will I set in order when
I come.

[1] Ver. 17.—The Rec. has *παραγγέλλων οὐκ ἐπαινῶ*. The authorities are about equally balanced, but the internal probabilities are in favor of *παραγγέλλω ο. ἐπαινῶν*, the more difficult reading. [Lachmann, Tischendorf and Alford adopt this reading, from A. C. F. G., 10 cursives, the Syr. (both), Arm., Ital., Æth., Vulg., Ambrst., Aug., Pelag., Bede. The Rec. has in its favor, D. (3d hand) E. K. L. Sinait., several cursives, the Copt., Slav., Chrys., Theodt., and is defended by Reiche and Bloomfield. D. (1st hand), 137, and Sahid., have *παραγγέλλω οὐκ ἐπαινῶ*, and B. with a Lambeth cursive has *παραγγέλλων οὐκ ἐπαινῶν*. The Rec. was probably a correction to suit vv. 2 and 22.—C. P. W.].

[2] Ver. 18.—The Rec., which has *τῇ* before *ἐκκλησίᾳ*, is feebly sustained: [with Œcum., Theophyl. and a few unimportant cursives, from an idea that by *ἐκκλ.* was meant the church proper. Theodoret has instead of *ἐν ἐκκλ.* the words: *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ*, from ver. 20.—C. P. W.].

[3] Ver. 19.—The *καὶ* after *ἵνα* is rather doubtful. Many very good MSS. are without it. [They are: A. C. D. (2d and 3d hand) E. F. G. K. L., Sinait., Syr. (later) Copt., Orig., Epiph., Chrys., Theodt., Damasc., Cypr.—C. P. W.].

[4] Ver. 21.—For *προλαμβάνει*, a considerable number of cursives and Zonaras (Tisch.) have *προσλαμβ.*, probably from an attempt to explain and make less difficult the fact here stated.—C. P. W.].

[5] Ver. 22.—Lachmann has *ἐπαινῶ* for *ἐπαινέσω*, but not with sufficient authorities. It was probably a conformation to the preceding and following presents. [It is sustained only by B. F. G., the Italic, Vulg. and the Latin fathers.—C. P. W.].

[6] [Ver. 22.—Stephens (the Elz.), Griesb., Scholz, and Tisch., Sinait. and D. (1st cor.), the Vulg., Goth. and Syr. (later) punctuate so that *ἐν τούτῳ* is taken not with *ἐπαινέσω*, but with the following *οὐκ ἐπαινῶ*.—C. P. W.].

[7] Ver. 24.—After *εἶπεν* the Rec. has *λάβετε, φάγετε*: but the words are not genuine in this place, and are taken from Matth. xxvi. 26, *etc.* [The reading of the Rec. is sustained only by C. (3d hand) K. L., a few cursives, one copy of the Syr. (both), Chrys., Theodt., Damasc., Œcum., Theophyl. The Vulg., Arm., Slav. and Ambrst. also add *καὶ* after *λάβετε*. But A. B. C. D. E. F. G., Sinait., omit both words as well as *καὶ*.—C. P. W.].

[8] Ver. 24.—The additions *κλώμενον* (Rec.), *θρυπτόμενον*, and *διδόμενον*, are attempts which have been made to complete our Lord's expression. The best MSS. have simply *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*. [*Κλώμενον* is omitted in A. B. C., Sinait., 17, 67 (2d hand).

Athan., Cyr. and Vulg., but it is given by the second hands of C. D. and Sinait., and in F. K. L., the Syr. (both), Goth., Theodt., Damasc., Œcum., Theophyl. In D. (first hand) is θρυπτ., and in the Copt. and Arm. is διδόμ. The Vulgate has: *quod pro vobis tradetur.* Very properly the three words are thrown out by Lachm., Tisch., Bloomfield and Alford.—C. P. W.].

[9] Ver. 26.—After ποτηριον the Rec. has τουτο, but in opposition to the best authorities. The same may be said of the ἄν instead of ἐὰν after γάρ.

[10] Ver. 27.—After ἄρτον the Rec. inserts τουτον, but it is feebly sustained. [The Eng. A. V. has *and* instead of *or* in this verse. Alford, in his work on "How to use the Epistles" (Sund. Mag., April, 1867), severely censures this misrendering. It is not impossible that our Translators were influenced by their hostility to the Romish construction. And yet their rendering is sustained by A., 4 cursives, one MS. of the Vulgate, the Syr. (both), Copt., Sahid., Clem., Pseudo-Athan., Orig., and some Latin writers. Some of these authorities, however, were not known to them. The ἤ is found in B. C. D. F. K. L., Sinait., Ital., Syr. (Philox.), Chrys., Theodt., Damasc., Cypr.—C. P. W.].

[11] Ver. 27.—The Rec. omits του before αἵματος The best MSS. insert it.

[12] Ver. 29.—The words ἀναξίως after πίνων, and του κυρίου after σῶμα, are not to be found in the best MSS. See the Exegetical notes. [The former word is wanting in A. B. C. Sinait., 17, Sahid. and Æth., and the latter in the same MSS. with 67, and some copies of the Vulgate. They are thrown out by Lachm., Tisch., Meyer, Alford and Stanley, but they are defended by Osiander, Bloomfield, Wordsworth and Hodge. They seem to be a gloss from ver. 27, to complete what is certainly a difficult sense without them.—C. P. W.].

[13] Ver. 31.—The Rec. has γάρ but δέ is sustained by better authorities.

[14] Ver. 32.—Before κυρίου, Tischendorf (7th ed.) and Wordsworth insert a του after B. C. Sinait. *et al.*; Alford brackets it; but Lachm., Bloomfield and Stanley cancel it, as "more likely to be added than removed."—C. P. W.].

[15] Ver. 34.—The Rec. after εἰ has δέ, but in opposition to decisive authorities. [It is omitted in A. B. C. D. E. F. G. Sin. the Lat., Vulg. and Copt. versions, Chrys. (in comm.) and the Lat. Fathers.—C. P. W.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

[In order to the right understanding of this section it must be premised: 1. That it was the primitive custom to celebrate the Lord's Supper in private houses (Acts ii. 46); although there is reason to believe, as will soon be seen, that the Corinthians had already a specific place for public worship. Yet, supposing this to have been the case, it would be natural to infer that the habits and sentiments attaching to the observance at the private house, would be transferred to what might be called "the church." 2. That the Lord's Supper was held "daily" (Acts ii. 46), and was usually connected with an ordinary meal; although even in this respect the language of the text seems to imply a change to a less frequent observance; perhaps the first day of the week, as was afterwards the custom (Acts xx. 7). 3. That this meal was often made up of contributions brought by the communicants, to be enjoyed in common, and which came to be called an Agape (ἀγάπη) or love-feast, where the fellowship of the Christian community was exhibited and cultivated in a social festival. 4. That the custom of enjoying such social repasts existed also among the Greeks. With them these repasts were termed ἔρανοι, *club feasts*, which were associated with plans of mutual relief or charity toward the poor, where the practice was for each guest to eat that which he brought with him in his own basket. And what an influence this heathen observance, so often attended with disorder and rioting, would have upon the minds of recent converts present at a similar Christian festival, can be readily imagined. Bearing these four facts in mind, we shall be able the more readily to appreciate the nature of the difficulties which had arisen in the church, and the occasion of the Apostolic rebuke and injunction. And in all this we shall see an illustration of the old proverb, that "evil customs give rise to good laws." See these facts more fully brought out in STANLEY's valuable note, and also in articles under "Lord's Supper," in KITTO's *Biblical Cyclopædia, Alexander's Ed.;* and SMITH's *Dictionary of the Bible;* RIDDLE's *Christian Antiquities*, p. 500; NEANDER, *Plant. and Train. of the Christian Church*, pp. 23, 163; SCHAFF, *Hist. of the Apostolic Church*, p. 185 ff.].

VER. 17. **Now this I command.**—He here refers to the foregoing precept; and through a participial clause expressing a contrast with what he says in ver. 2, he connects with it a rebuke of further evils in their church assemblies—**Not praising (you).**—We should have expected to see the sentence here differently constructed, having the main verb in the form of a participle, and the participle in the form of the main verb; since it is on the latter that the emphasis evidently lies. Hence the ordinary reading, which for this very reason is not to be maintained. If, however, with Lachmann [and Stanley], we include ver. 16 in this paragraph, then the words τουτο παραγγέλλω would point to what follows, and be rendered: 'Now this I declare unto you' [as the E. V.], which rendering would be contrary to the New Testament usage. And to this we may add that the previous paragraph requires just such a conclusion as is found in ver. 16. There is no need whatever of supposing that the strifes and schisms alluded to in ver. 18 refer to the contentiousness spoken of in ver. 16. Besides, the reference of τοῦτο, *this*, to what follows is inadmissible, since no directions do follow immediately; and in order to find any, we must look onward to ver. 33 ff., which would be too remote. Still further, there is *no need* of looking for them here, since the close connection with the precepts immediately preceding by means of the participial clause, is sufficiently motived by that which is common to the two paragraphs, *viz.*, disorders in the church assembly; and to this we may add the contrast between the "not praising" and the "I praise" of ver. 22, *q. d.* 'But this precept I give not praising you, as in the former instance, in that,' *etc.**—**that** [ὅτι, not, *because*, as Alf., Words.] **ye come together.**—"Hitherto he has been speaking only of the ambitious few; but now he feels obliged to rebuke the whole church for a prevailing evil." NEANDER.—**Not for the better, but for the worse.**—These phrases do not indicate *the way*

[* The unnaturalness of the construction here advocated by Kling furnishes a strong argument in favor of the interpretation given by Chrys., Grot., Bengel, Lachmann and others, which makes τοῦτο refer to what follows according to the well-known classic usage (JELF, *Grammar*, § 657. 2), and takes παραγγέλλω in its original meaning, *announce.*—or, as translated by Tindal, Cranmer, in the Geneva Bible, *warn you of;* we should then have a fitting introduction to his new theme: "This moreover I declare unto you, or warn you of, not praising you," 'as in the former case, where in many particulars you did merit approval'].

and manner of their assembling, but rather its *result* or *fruit*, implying that by means of it they were injured rather than improved; and so the issue was not edification, which it was incumbent on all to aim at, but the opposite; instead of furthering, it hindered their communion with their Lord and with each other.*

VERS. 18, 19. **For first of all.**—πρῶτον μέν is followed by no ἔπειτα δέ, just as is the case in Rom. i. 8; iii. 2. Accordingly the second matter of rebuke many think they find in ver. 20, introduced by οὖν, *therefore*, because this is to be regarded as a result of the "schism" spoken of in the next clause. What, then, does he mean by these "schisms?" Is it what he more fully discussed in chapter i. 11 ff.? Were this so, could he have alluded to them here in so incidental a manner? This is hardly possible; for he must then have had in mind certain reports of their schismatic ways in their church assemblies different from that particularly specified in ver. 20, and which ought to have been more fully detailed. The correct view, therefore, undoubtedly is that the second disorder which he rebukes is not to be found in ver. 20 ff., and that in the word "schisms" he only indicates generally what he there more fully defines, and to which the words "when ye come together" and the "therefore" which resumes the argument, refer; and that there, for the first time, the proper rebuke follows (ver. 22). The "schisms," then, denote ruptures, disorders in fellowship of love as they appeared in the church feasts, and which he speaks of more fully in ver. 21. The second matter, then, which he has to rebuke, we are to look for in chap. 12, *viz.*, the disorders arising in their church assemblies from an unbecoming use of "gifts." But the connection is loosely indicated, and is to be understood along the more extended exposition which intervenes.—**When ye come together in the Church.**—ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ shows the form of their coming together, *i. e.*, in a church assembly. To suppose a pregnant construction for εἰς ἐκκλησίαν is unnecessary; still less is the word ἐκκλησια, *church*, to be regarded as denoting the place of assembling; which use of the term did not spring up until later times. Yet perhaps we might say, with Meyer and de Wette, that the congregation is here regarded in the light of a locality.—**I hear.**—He thus vividly presentiates the whole circumstance, as though what had been communicated to him were still sounding in his ears.—**that there are schisms among you.**—[These, as intimated above, are specifically those occurring at the love-feasts; but on the mention of them he breaks off to show that such divisions were to be no matters of surprise, but were ordained to test them. The original term is σχίσματα, whence our *schisms;* but here it designates simply *cliques*, separated from each other by social distinctions and petty alienations of feeling. Those who were thus divided were outwardly still one body].—**and I partly believe it.**—The word "partly" has a softening effect, *q. d.*, 'I think too well of you to believe *all* that has been reported to me.'

He next proceeds to assign a higher reason for the partial belief which he was constrained to give to what he heard, *viz.*, a Divinely ordained necessity in the circumstances alluded to, as instrumental to a Divine result, "according to that law of Divine administration by which evil, so far from hindering, is made tributary to good." BURGER (Matth. xviii. 7; xxvi. 54).—**For there must be also heresies among you.** In explaining this passage the chief question is, what did Paul mean by αἱρέσεις, lit., *heresies?* The word occurs elsewhere with Paul only in Gal. v. 20, specifying one of the works of the flesh, and is one of the expressions denoting hostility and division. It occurs besides in Acts v. 17; xv. 5; xxiv. 5, 14; xxviii. 22, of religious parties or sects; and in Titus iii. 10, αἱρέτικος denotes one who occasions divisions in the church by turning aside from sound doctrine (comp. αἱρέσεις, 2 Peter ii. 1). "Originally in classic usage αἱρέσεις signifies nothing bad. It implies *choice*, hence an *opinion*, then a *party*, which arises through choice, especially in the schools. It came to possess a bad significance, first in Christian usage; and this is in consequence of our Christian modes of thinking and viewing things. On the stand-point of worldly wisdom, diversity of views and tendencies in regard to religious things is allowable; but on the Christian stand-point it is required that every thing within us be subjected to one Divine principle of life, and be brought into one fellowship of faith and love." * NEANDER. In our text the current exposition wavers between the identification of the word with σχίσματα so as to make it imply only the divisions alluded to in the following context, and the later ecclesiastical signification of the word, *viz.*, 'heresy'—a departure from the fundamental truth of the Gospel, and the divisions arising in consequence; thus distinguishing it from 'schism,' which implies a division simply in the matter of discipline. Between these extremes we give the explanation, *ecclesiastical divisions*, in the broader sense of the word [that is, divisions without any formal separation]. And this explanation is the only correct one, and suited to the character of the clause wherein the word occurs, which is only a digression by way of confirmation (Meyer). In this case the καί before αἱρέσεις will mean not *even*, but *also*, *i. e.*, among other evils it is necessary that there should be *also* 'heresies.' The main emphasis lies upon "must" (δεῖ), rather than upon "heresies," as required by the logical relation of this to the preceding verse.†—The

[* May there not be also an allusion here to the punitive consequences more fully set forth in vers. 29, 30, that in coming together "and eating unworthily they ate and drank condemnation to themselves," and exposed themselves to bodily disorders and death? So understanding this clause, do we not here find a reason for his using the word παραγγέλω, which conveys the idea of a solemn announcement or proclamation, rather than the ordinary λέγω, *I say or declare?* For in thus interpreting to them the tokens of the Divine displeasure, Paul was in fact acting the part of a Divine herald (ἄγγελος)].

[* Illustrations of the early use of this word may be seen in GIESELER'S *Ch. Hist.*, Vol. I., p. 149 ff., and note 3].

†[But one would suppose from the καί that there was also a stress to be laid upon αἱρέσεις, as indicating something worse than σχίσματα, and pointing to what would continue to happen in the future, *q. d.*, 'for it is necessary that there must arise *even heresies* among you, as an ordeal to test and exhibit those who are approved'—a truth which the whole history of the Church has signally illustrated, as may be seen in the instances of such men as Athanasius and Augustine, and Luther, and Calvin, and Edwards, and a host of others, who have made themselves illustrious in their conflicts with heresy (M. Stuart)].

objective clause, "**in order that those who are approved may be made manifest among you,**" involves the idea of a sifting process performed on the Church. "The approved" (*δόκιμοι*) are the rightly disposed, who devote themselves without reserve to the whole body of Christian truth, and hence to the Spirit of the Lord; and it was necessary that such should be "made manifest," inasmuch as the impurity and weakness of the Christian life, the yet remaining power of a carnal and selfish nature, often unfolds itself in such a way that many cleave one-sidedly to particular individuals, and to peculiar kinds of talents, and to certain specific tendencies and opinions, without, however, becoming distinctly heretical; although in the Judaistic and anti-judaistic modes of thought, and in the denial of the resurrection of the dead (chap. xv.), significant germs and leanings toward heresy might have been formed. The sifting accordingly leads, and was intended to lead, to a higher development of the life of faith and love in the Church, which had been thus obstructed and disturbed. "The Apostle's view of history thus brought out stands opposed as much to a pantheistic conception of necessity as to an atomistic view of freedom. It recognizes in history room for the play of freedom, yet at the same time asserts the guidance of a higher law." NEANDER. ["The Church has been constrained by the rise of heresies to search Scripture more carefully; and thus heresies have served as occasions for bringing forth more fully the articles of faith in her creeds." WORDSWORTH. "But the advantage here spoken of we ought not to ascribe to *heresies*, which, being evil, can produce nothing but what is evil, but to God, who, by His infinite goodness, changes the nature of things, so that those things are salutary to the elect, which Satan had contrived for their ruin. The cause here implied is the secret counsel of God, by which things that are evil are overruled in such a manner as to have a good issue." CALVIN].—Vv. 20, 21. In these verses Paul intimates that what transpired in their Church assemblies rendered the celebration of the Lord's Supper *impossible;* and then he states more definitely wherein the inconsistency was to be found; so that this appears as explaining and confirming what is before asserted.—**When then ye come together.**—["Verse 19 being an interruption, the connection with ver. 18 is resumed by the particle *οὖν, then.*"]—**into one place.**—*ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ* is to be construed locally (Acts vii. 15; ii. 1), and denotes the place where the Church assembled. [From this some have inferred that the Corinthians had already come to have a room or building particularly set apart for religious services].—(**it**) **is not.**—Some translate *οὐκ ἔστιν, this* is not; [referring to what they did on coming together, and which he goes on to specify]; but then *τοῦτο* should have been expressly given as the subject. Lit.: 'there is no such thing as your eating,' *i. e.*, 'it is impracticable,' 'impossible;' not, however, from lack of bread and wine (Bengel), but because there was a lack of the requisite disposition. An accusative before the infinitive is here not necessary. [Bloomfield detects a sarcastic point in this sentence, *q. d.* 'To eat the Lord's Supper surely *is* not, *cannot* be the purpose of your meeting (since *that* you do *not* eat): for your meal is not common, but separate; every one eats his own Supper'].—**to eat the Lord's supper.**—*κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*, 'a feast appertaining to the Lord,' or as Osiander says, "one consecrated to the Lord and instituted by Him." (Comp. *κυριακὴ ἡμέρα*, Rev. i. 10). By this the Apostle designates neither the agapae (Jude 12), the so called church feasts, [as Romanists interpret who would thus elude the argument furnished by this passage against their sacrificial theory of the Eucharist]; nor yet, the Holy Supper (ver. 23) *by itself;* but the combination of the two* as it was to be found in Christian Churches, according to the original Apostolic custom, and in accordance with the first institution of the Supper, which, as we know, followed upon a regular meal. The "Supper" spoken of in the text was a festival, to which each one contributed a portion, and which concluded with the Lord's Supper proper. That, however, which was brought by individuals, was to have been enjoyed in common, so that the fellowship of love, unbroken by social distinctions, might be the more clearly exhibited. Thus was the agape, or love-feast, a suitable preparation for the Lord's Supper, in its more restricted sense, where all ate of one bread, and drank of one cup. But in Corinth such a meal as this, where all appeared as one family living on a common property, could not take place; since by reason of the cooling of their love, each one kept and enjoyed for himself the portion which he had brought [according to the heathen custom of the *ἔρανοι*—see above]; so that the distinction between the rich and the poor, which ought to have melted away in Church communion, re-appeared—and this to such a degree that while one class suffered from a sense of want, others were satiated to a degree which, in some cases, amounted even to drunkenness.—**For in eating**—*ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν* is not to be taken as defining more fully the preceding verb, *προλαμβάνει*; but it is simply a note of time, *q. d.*, 'while eating.'—**every one**—*viz.*, who has brought something with him.—**takes before other**—*προλαμβάνει*, a suitable expression for the selfish and hasty appropriation of what had been brought without waiting to put all together and divide it for the common good.—**his own supper.** [In contrast with the Lord's Supper, and this in the Lord's House, and not in his own private house. The abuse seems to have grown out of the primitive practice of sometimes annexing the love-feast to the Holy Communion. And here, in this case the former seems to have crowded the latter almost entirely aside, and the natural want was gratified to the overlooking of the spiritual need].—**and one hungers and another is drunken.**—*μεθύει.* [The use of this word

*[Such an extension of the meaning of the term is altogether unwarranted and wholly needless. The Lord's Supper properly can only mean that particular ordinance which was instituted by our Lord, *viz.*, the solemn participation of the bread and the wine, as the memorials of His death. This was ever kept distinct from the agape, although connected with it, until at a later period they were entirely separated. Wordsworth says, that "the non-insertion of the definite article τὸ before *κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, Lord's Supper*, shows that by habitual use in the Church this term had now attained the force of a proper name"].

in John ii. 10 shows that it need not be always taken to denote intoxication; but this is its natural meaning in most passages, and there is no need of softening it here.* As Meyer says, "Paul draws the picture in strong colors and who can say that the reality was less strong?" "It is wonderful and well nigh portentous that Satan could have accomplished so much in so short a time." CALVIN].

VER. 22. The blame just indicated is here sustained.—**For, have ye not houses to eat and to drink in?**—*q. d.*, 'if this is what you have to do, *viz.*, to hold your private meals, why, you have your own houses for this object. To use the assembly of the Church for such a purpose is needless.'—**Or despise ye the church of God and shame those who have not?**—A second reason for the blameworthiness of their conduct—the disparaging of the Church of God, whose meetings were abused to festivities derogatory to its holy character by the introduction of secular distinctions there, and by the contemptuous treatment of the poorer members of the Church—a course of conduct which involved a disparagement of the Church in its members; inasmuch as these were shamefully thrust into the back-ground by reason of a difference which ought to have led only to an equalizing distribution of the good things in the fellowship of a holy love. These two reasons are closely connected.—The term "Church" is not to be interpreted locally,† as is plain from the adjunct "of God." It stands first, because of the emphasis ("the Church of God," IIis sanctuary, His temple); on the contrary, in the second clause the stress lies on the verb, "despise ye." [*τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας—those not having.* There is a question as to what is the real object of the participle here which must be supplied. Alford, and others, say, "houses to eat and to drink in," and suppose that in this fact we have the reason 'for their coming to the love-feast to be fed. But Meyer, Stanley, Hodge, and others, construe the phrase more generally.' Those "not having" are those who have nothing, and are the poor in contrast with the rich. This is both consistent with Greek usage and gives a better sense].—**What am I to say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not.**—The rebuke here is couched in mild expressions, and its interrogatory form is calculated to awaken reflection. There is, however, a sharp rap in the concluding words, which is, in fact, very severe. In saying "I praise you not," he refers back to ver. 17 (comp. Osiander).

VER. 23. The concluding question of the previous verse implies an answer in the negative, and this is now confirmed by a reference to the original institution of the Supper, wherein its character and worth are clearly set forth, even as he himself had received it by reliable tradition, coming directly from the Lord, and had so transmitted it to them.—**For I received from the Lord.**—*παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου.* The sense in which these words are to be taken, is very questionable. Are we to understand them as implying a direct, special revelation to Paul of the circumstances of the institution (for the text says nothing of a mere confirmation of testimony otherwise received, or of any special illumination respecting the significance of the circumstances)? if so, was it by means of a vision (as Tholuck, Olshausen, Osiander suppose)? or, as a tradition starting from the Lord, and transmitted to the Apostles? The first supposition is supported, not indeed by the force of the verb *παρέλαβον, I received*, but by the force of the prep. *ἀπό, from*, which implies [a remote source,] an indirect derivation; [instead of which *παρά* would have been more likely to be used, had he intended a direct communication (Winer, P. III., § 47)]; as well as by the internal probabilities of the case, since he could have resorted to an accurate tradition of the whole circumstance. The second supposition is opposed by the force of the pronoun *ἐγώ, I*, standing out prominently; since indeed, according to this supposition, Paul would only have placed himself on an equality with all others who had, in like manner, received the Apostolic tradition; [whereas he here brings himself specially into view, as one who had derived his knowledge from original sources, and had the right to speak authoritatively in the premises]. We might suppose with Meyer, Ed. 2, that this important circumstance had been accurately communicated to him through Ananias, or some other person, in obedience to a special commission of the Lord, and that this communication was made to him with the understanding that the Lord had given a special commission for him in this particular by means of a vision. This might have been connected in some way with his baptism, or with those special disclosures which he had received in relation to his future calling. Or we may suppose (according to Meyer, Ed. 3), that since, in consequence of its essential connection with the Gospel, and indeed with the fundamental doctrine of Paul concerning the work of atonement, the whole subject excluded human intervention according to Gal. i. 12, 16, the communication was made in some indefinable manner, either through the inspiration of the Spirit, or through the manifestation of angels, or in ecstatic vision. [Hodge argues with great force in favor of a direct derivation, and shows conclusively that this is invalidated neither by the use of *ἀπό*, nor by the supposition that no special revelation was necessary, on the ground that the facts connected with the institution were generally known; nor yet by the assumption that not historical facts, but only ideas and truths, may be communicated by visions and inward influences; but that, on the contrary, it is required by the context, and is in harmony with what Paul elsewhere claims for himself. He concludes: "It was not only of importance for the Corinthians, but for the whole Church, to be assured that this account of the Lord's Supper was communicated immediately by Christ to the

* [Is not this a valid argument in proof of the fact that the wine used at the Lord's Supper in the primitive church, was such as could intoxicate? See Bib. Sac. for 1843, p. 507 f].

† [Wordsworth, however, takes this text as "a proof of the setting apart of places for God's worship in primitive times, and of the reverence due to them as such." And he refers to Joseph Meade's Essay on this text, for evidence collected on this matter, and also to Hooker V. 12, 5. And certainly the contrast here drawn between the private house and the place of church meeting, seems naturally to suggest the local interpretation of the word church].

Apostle. It shows the importance which our Lord attributes to this ordinance"].—**what I also delivered unto you,**—[*i. e.*, during his ministry among them; so that he is here only reminding them of precious instructions.—On the following words Stanley well remarks: "They form probably the earliest record of the institution of the Eucharist, and they contain also the earliest recorded speech of our Lord. To explain them at any length, or to adjust their relation to the other three verses in St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Luke, would be to encroach upon questions belonging only to the Gospel narrative; yet those who are familiar with those questions, will observe: 1. That their almost exact coincidence with the account in St. Luke, is important, as confirming the tradition of the author of that Gospel being the same as the companion of St. Paul. 2. That in this, the most ancient record, of certainly one of the most important speeches of our Lord, it is possible to discern elements of the discourses in St. John's Gospel, *viz.*, vi. 35–58; xv. 1–6. 3. That even in the four extant versions of this short passage, there are yet verbal variations of such an extent as to show that it was the substance, rather than the exact words, which the Apostle and the Evangelists aimed at producing. 4. That there is all the appearance of a familiar and fixed formula, especially in the opening words. 5. That it implies on the part of his hearers a full acquaintance with the history of the Betrayal and Passion."].—What he had received by means of such a revelation, and had also imparted to them, is—**that the Lord Jesus**—(a solemn expression intimating His supreme dignity, and His character as Saviour)—**in the same night in which He was being betrayed.**—παρεδίδοτο, Imp., indicating that the scheme of betrayal was still in progress, and not yet fulfilled when He performed this act. By this circumstance the touching and affecting nature of the transaction is more prominently brought to view in contrast with the trifling character exhibited by the Corinthians at their love-feasts. It was the last transaction of our Lord just before encountering death, by means of which He intended to set forth what immediately awaited Him, and also establish a solemn memorial of the sacrifice which He was about to make. ["There is," says Stanley, "an appearance of fixed order, especially in these opening words, which indicates that this had already become a familiar formula"].—**Took bread**—*ἄρτον a loaf*—the last of the passover meal yet remaining. ["It was the thin passover bread of the Jews. But as no part of the significancy of the rite depends on the kind of bread used, as there is no precept on the subject, and as the apostles subsequently in the celebration of the ordinance used ordinary bread, it is evidently a matter of indifference what kind of bread is used. It was, however, for a long time a subject of bitter controversy." Hodge].—**And having given thanks.**—That this included praise for divine grace manifested in the work of redemption, is to be assumed from the nature of the transaction; and it was naturally suggested by the preceding Passover meal which commemorated the deliverance of Israel. [In Matt. and Mark the expression is, "having blessed it;" but in Luke the same word is used as here. Both expressions mean the same thing, and declare the act of consecration by a grateful acknowledgment of God's mercy, and invocation of His blessing—as the two are united in the "grace said" before meals]. **He brake it.**—["This circumstance is included in all the accounts; in those of Matt., Mark, and Luke, as well as in Paul's. This is one of the significant parts of the service, and ought not to be omitted as is done by Romanists, by the Greek Church, and by Lutherans." Hodge].—**And said**—["The words uttered by our blessed Lord are differently reported. The proper inference from this diversity is, that the words were uttered; but as the ideas which they express were sufficiently indicated by the gesture of reaching the bread to His disciples, they were omitted by some of the narrators as unnecessary. The idea, however expressed, is of importance. The bread was to be taken and eaten; there must be a distribution of the elements to those participating in the service. Otherwise it is not a communion, as it is not in the Romish Mass where the priest alone eats the consecrated wafer."—Hodge].—**This is my body that for you.**—With these words he signifies the act of breaking that had just taken place. "This," which has just been broken, "is my body;" and the object of this He at once defines—*τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* sc. *ὄν.*, "which is or suffices for your salvation," namely, by reason of this, that in it is fulfilled what the breaking of the bread indicates, *to wit:* violent dissolution and breaking up. This thought is expressed in the apparently well-attested, yet undoubtedly interpolated expression 'broken,' instead of which some authorities have 'given,' borrowed from Luke. Meyer in 3d Edition speaks of it, 'as the calm utterance of deep earnest feeling excited by the occasion.' The symbolic character of the words is almost unmistakable, although we are not at liberty to translate *ἐστιν signifies*, or yet *μου τὸ σῶμα the token of my body.* He means to say 'this bread is my body, intended for your salvation, inasmuch as the breaking of it exhibits the slaying of my body which redounds to your salvation.' That it is not, however, a mere memorial, but a token which offers, imparts, and therefore carries the fact in itself, and so is a means of communicating, and a conveyance of the same cannot be proven from the words of the institution itself. This thought is first obtained through the authentic apostolic exposition in chap. x. 16. We recognize in this the interpretation given by the spirit of Christ, which perpetually works in the unfolding thoughts of Christendom, and which has obtained in the substance of the Lutheran article of doctrine an essentially correct expression—while the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation carries the appearance of fancy: and the exposition of the Reformed Church in its various modifications, in part, presses a dry exegesis too far, and, in part, stops with a rationalizing separation of the matters involved, and does not attain to a truly Christianlike intuitive union of them, inasmuch as it produces nothing more than the conception of an ideal or symbolic means of communication, *to wit:* that the bread presentiates the body of

Christ to the believers, and is the pledge of a redemption achieved for them, and so mediates the operation of the Holy Spirit which contemporaneously with their physical participation effects a union with the heavenly life of Christ.*—**Do this in remembrance of me.**—This injunction, on the one hand, exhibits to us the subjective side of the ordinance, *to wit*, that believers should do this which He was now doing, *i. e.*, should break the bread with thanksgiving and divide it, *in order to realize more* vividly the sacrifice which He in His own person was about to make for them; on the other hand, it gives us to understand that our Lord wished to have this ordinance *continually observed* to all future time. That this is the import of the injunction is shown more clearly in ver. 25, where, in presenting the cup, He says, "this do, *as oft* as ye drink of it, *i. e.*, as often as ye hold communion with one another through the cup" (Meyer), [showing plainly the perpetuity of the rite]. Others, however, make the words "do this" mean the simple receiving of the elements at the time; which, indeed, both in itself and in relation to what follows, would be suitable enough, but here, where the words "take, eat," are not to be retained, it is hardly to be supposed. [The import of the command, then, is nothing less than the imposing of a solemn duty upon the church, to be performed until it should meet to drink anew with our Lord in His Father's kingdom; and the prime object of the observance is *remembrance*—a remembrance, however, which implies the real representation to their minds and hearts of their risen yet omnipresent Lord. "The bread is His body because it assuredly testifies, that the body which it represents is held forth to us, or because the Lord, by holding out to us that symbol, gives us at the same time His own body; for He is not a deceiver, to mock us with empty presentations." Calvin.]. Less simple are the words employed in the distribution of the cup which was passed around after the Passover had been concluded. **In like manner the cup after He had supped.**—[An intimation that the cup ought to be separated from the common meal. (Bengel.)]. **Saying, this cup is the new Covenant in my blood.**—He does not say merely "this is my blood." That which in Matthew and Mark is added to the words "my blood" by way of further qualification, *viz:* "of the new Covenant," is here joined directly with "this cup" as a predicate—"this cup is the new Covenant;" and as a further qualification there is added "in my blood," in accordance with Luke's narrative which almost literally agrees with that of Paul, and was no doubt derived from it. The words "in my blood" are related either to "the new Covenant," so that the clause shall mean "the Covenant which is established in my blood"—a construction which conflicts with the absence of the article which is here indispensable, especially since ἐστί intervenes: or it may be connected with the whole clause, *q. d.*, "this cup is the New Covenant in virtue of my blood." In other words, His blood is that whereby the New Covenant was established, in so far as this Covenant, in distinction from the Old Covenant of the law (the institution of which is described in Ex. xxiv. 8 in the very same terms), is the Covenant of grace, *i. e.*, of sin-forgiving love. And this forgiveness was mediated through the shedding of His blood, through His holy self-sacrifice which is at once the sacrifice of the Covenant and of expiation (comp. Osiander, and in reference to the New Covenant Matt. xxvi. 28; Heb. viii. 8; Jer. xxxi. 31 ff.).—"Διαθήκη properly denotes an *ordinance* or *institution* in general, then *an agreement, a covenant*, an institution which establishes a mutual relation between God and men."* Neander.—The cup then, with the wine it contains, symbolizes the New Covenant, and this Covenant is established in the blood of Christ, which the wine, poured into the cup and poured out of it for their participation, sets forth as shed for the expiation of sinful men and to be appropriated by those who drink of the cup. "According to a very common metonymy the cup here stands for the wine—the thing containing for the thing contained." Steudel. "The wine, as the symbol of the blood of Christ, is the symbol of the New Covenant, and of our participation in it. But this is the more significant as it is a *real* symbol, *i. e.*, the 'wine of blessing (x. 16) is the communion of the blood of Christ,' as the channel or means by which it is communicated." Kurtz.—The thing treated of here is a covenant—a relation between God and man resting upon promise, and not simply a fellowship among guests at a table united as brethren in Christ,

*["The flesh profiteth nothing; it is the Spirit that quickeneth," saith our blessed Lord. And herein we have a key to the interpretation of the sacrament before us. Whatever benefit we derive from the bread and wine, must then be by virtue of the Spirit, who being then present, does, in and through the symbols that set forth to our senses the great sacrifice of our redemption, take of the things of Christ, and so show them to our spirits that we, through those faculties and powers of the soul, which alone can deal with the spirit, do feed on Christ—do come into veritable communion with our risen Lord—do have our whole being—body, soul, and spirit—quickened and sanctified, and eventually glorified by that Eternal Life which in Him clothed itself in our nature for the sake of effecting this very object—so that we are grafted into His mystical body, "become partakers of His Divine nature" in its entireness, and are prepared to unite with Him in glory at the resurrection. We are joined to Christ's body and assimilated to it, not by the mere *process of eating and drinking* the elements, which are either transubstantiated into, or consubstantiated with, His flesh and blood; but by the *faith* which receives through the Spirit the life-giving power of that sacrifice which is represented and sealed to us through them. As Calvin says: "Christ's body is not received as dead or even inactive, disjoined from the grace and power of His Spirit." A great mistake is made when *body* is confounded with "flesh and blood,"—elements which Christ no longer possesses, and of which it is said that they "shall never inherit the kingdom of God." We partake of the bread and wine, first, as the symbols of a sacrifice made once for all, and which is not to be repeated continually (as the Romish theory would have it); and then, as the condition of uniting with and becoming conformed to Christ's glorified body, which is now in Heaven, where He is, the Head and Representative of the whole Church, transforming, sustaining and gathering unto Himself all who truly believe on His name, and receive His Spirit.—On this whole subject consult Hooker, *B* 5, *Chap.* 67: Edw. Irving, *Coll. Writt., Vol.* 2; Calvin's *Institutes, B.* 3, *Chap.* 17, 18; Kitto's *Exerc. Art. Lord's Supper*; Smith's *Dict. of the Bible, ditto*; Herzog, *Real. Enc. Art. Abend-Mahl.*; *Bib. Sac.* for 1843, p. 584 f.; also for 1844, pp. 111, 225].

*[It is to be regretted that the translators of the English version have followed the vulgate in uniformly translating διαθήκη by *testament* (*testamentum*), a meaning it nowhere has, save in Heb. ix. 15 ff. (and *that* it acquires by a subtle turn of the thought, without, however, altogether surrendering its original signification), and which greatly obscures the sense of the passages when it occurs. On "the import and use" of this word see Fairbairn's *Hermeneutical Manual*, pp. 338–351.]

whose union is symbolized by the wine contained in one cup (Schultheiss); although such a fellowship does indeed *result* from the Covenant.—The Covenant is called "new," not merely to indicate a relation of time, but of character also, it being different in kind from the "old" (Jer. xxxi. 31 ff.).—The various accounts given by the Evangelists and Paul agree essentially, and supplement each other. It is also conceivable that during the presentation of the bread and distribution of the cup, the Lord in various ways expressed the significance of the act, or the fundamental ideas embodied in the institution.

VER. 26.—Here follow the words not of Jesus, but of Paul, explanatory of the injunction: "do this in remembrance of me," by a reference to the actual practice of the church which confirmed it.—**For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do proclaim the Lord's death.**—In place of the word "remembrance" we have here the word "proclaim" (καταγγέλλετε) representing the Supper as a solemn liturgical exhibition of the fact that the Lord suffered *a sacrificial death* in behalf of His church, and thereby achieved their redemption—just as there was a proclamation or "showing forth" of the deliverance of Israel at the Passover. ["These words are emphatically introduced in order to introduce the continuance and identity of the original meal through its subsequent celebrations." STANLEY.].—We have here, however, no injunction; hence the verb καταγγέλλετε is not Imperative but Indicative. The "proclamation" is that confession with thanksgiving which is connected with the rite itself, and being made in its very terms and forms, whether it proceed, in individual cases, from a heart penetrated by the love of God or not. The repetition of the words "as often as ye drink"—thus echoing the language of our Lord (ver. 25)—is quite in Paul's manner. (Ἐάν in vv. 25, 26, which is the reading best sustained, is an incidental form of ἀν used by the later inspired writers).—**Until He come,** ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ.—The omission of the ἄν here shows the time to be definitely fixed; and this time is the second advent of the Lord, until when this Supper shall continue to be observed as the compensation for His absence and the pledge of His return. ["This remembrance is of the closest and most vivid kind, like the remembrance by children of parents, by a wife of her husband, by a brother of brother, united with faith, love, desire, hope, joy, obedience, and summing up the Christian condition. This relation is in force from the close of the last feast with His disciples till His coming (Matt. xxvi. 29). Thus *this mystery unites the extremes of the two periods or dispensations.*" BENGEL.]

VER. 27–29.—From the fact that the Supper was a proclamation of Christ's death, He at once deduces an inference (v. 27), followed by an exhortation (v. 29) which is enforced by means of a threat in case of unsuitable deportment.—**Wherefore,**—since at every celebration of the Supper ye proclaim the death of our Lord.—**whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup.**—The particle ἤ, *or*, here connecting the two verbs (which is critically well supported, since καί, *and*, has only few authorities in its favor), has been the theme of no little controversy. The Romanists use it as a sanction for the separation of the elements, and for withholding the cup from the laity; as though the propriety of using the *cup* alone might not just as well be deduced from it. In order to rebut their inference, however, there is no need of taking the "or" as equivalent to "and." The two things are thus disjoined for the purpose of setting forth the guilt involved by unworthy conduct, whether it be in eating *or* drinking; and from this it would seem that in the primitive celebration of the Supper the distribution of the elements did not follow immediately upon each other (comp. Meyer and Osiander).—**Unworthily.**—ἀναξίως admits of various interpretations—*impenitently, unbelievingly, unlovingly.* "He partakes unworthily," says Neander, "who does not keep in view the holy purport and aim of the solemnity; but treats it as an ordinary meal which, in its observance, does not show forth the death of the Lord." At all events, the unworthiness lies in a lack of living active faith in the atonement which has been achieved by the death of Christ; and this is the *source* of the various moral disqualifications by which the celebration of the Supper may be dishonored (Meyer Ed. 3). Among these we may mention a selfish, unloving conduct as one of the chief—such conduct as the rich at Corinth manifested towards the poor, and which exhibited a striking contrast with the love of Christ shown in the sacrifice of Himself for all, and set forth in the Holy Supper wherein the benefits of it are extended to every one.*—**Shall be guilty,**—especially in the judicial sense. Elsewhere ἔνοχος is connected with the dative of the words expressing punishment prescribed by the law, and the complaint made, and also the crime committed. But the latter stand at times also in the genitive, and this construction is in the New Testament the prevailing one. Here as in Jas. ii. 10, the object against which sin is committed is put in the genitive. *Crimini et pœnæ corporis et sanguinis Christi violati obnoxius erit:* "shall be liable to the crime and punishment of having violated the body and blood of Christ." But the idea is not that the unworthy participant is as guilty as if he had taken part in the death of Christ, and is to be regarded as one of His crucifiers. The connection points only to the body and blood of Christ as exhibited in the elements of the Supper, "towards these he will stand in guilty relation from the very moment he partakes unworthily." MEYER.—This declaration holds good whether we suppose a symbolical or a real presence of

[*But here it may be asked, "If Christ is really present in the sacrament, of what does the unworthy communicant partake? Does he actually partake of Christ himself?" Certainly not. He shares only in that which he is capable of sharing in. As Calvin says: "receives nothing but the sign." Or as Augustine: "he eats the bread of the Lord, but not the true bread who is the Lord." Since Christ's presence in the Supper is through His Spirit, only the spiritually-minded can there hold real communion with Him. But the unworthiness of the communicant does not destroy the supernatural character of the institution itself. It remains the same whether the communicant believes or not. So far as the administration is concerned "Christ's body," as Calvin says, "is present to the wicked no less than to the good: for God does not there represent in a delusive manner, to the wicked, the body of His Son, but He presents it in reality. As to their rejection of it, that does not impair or alter any thing as to the nature of the sacrament." On the contrary, their guilt is enhanced by the sacred character of what they offend against.]

the body and blood of the Lord. Irreverent or contemptuous conduct towards the symbol is in fact a desecration of the object symbolized. The guilt, however, appears in a stronger light when that which is unworthily partaken of is regarded as the very vehicle of the body and blood of Christ. The same remark is true of ver. 29. [" All that is necessary here to observe is, that the warning is directly against the careless and profane, and not against the timid and the doubting. It is not the *consciousness* of unworthiness that makes a person unworthy, nor yet is it any *misgiving* in regard to a suitable preparation; for although this may be an evidence of *weak faith* it certainly *indicates a better state of mind than indifference or false security.*" HODGE].—In ver. 28 Paul indicates a way in which this sin and danger are to be guarded against.—**But**—δέ, shows the advance in discourse, and turns it into a contrast, *q. d.*, 'but in order not to incur this guilt'—**let a man examine himself,**—ἄνθρωπος as in iv. 1, [a general term suited for both sexes]. The expression δοκιμάζειν ἑαυτόν cannot mean *to make one's self fit;* for it nowhere occurs in this sense not even in 2 Cor. xiii. 5; Gal. vi. 4; 1 Thess. ii. 4; but it means *to examine one's self*, and here, as to whether he is morally and religiously qualified for the ordinance. Where such examination is not sincerely made, and is not accompanied with an earnest desire to be in a suitable frame of mind, there a proper self-knowledge will not be likely to exist, nor will a person be likely to avoid that selfish, haughty, unloving temper which is so disturbing to a worthy communion.—**and so,**—*i. e.*, after having examined himself and discovered some reason humbly to hope that he may partake worthily.—**let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup.**—[" The case in which the self-examination ends in an unfavorable verdict does not come under consideration, because it is assumed that such a verdict will lead to repentance and amendment." ALFORD].—The above exhortation he enforces by referring to the penalty incurred by unworthy communion.—**For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself,**—That participation which ought to be to the communicant the means for appropriating salvation, he converts into the opposite, he makes it a means of destruction, and draws down condemnation therewith upon himself. The word κρίμα does not denote an absolute damnation, but points primarily to those impending Divine judgments which are spoken of in ver. 36 f.—According to the ordinary text [which inserts the word "unworthily"] he asserts this of *unworthy* communicants; and then adds as a yet further reason explaining the unworthiness predicated,—**not discerning the body.**—The verb διακρίνειν is translated either, *to distinguish* —in this case from ordinary food and drink, or, in order to escape the necessity of adopting a different signification from that in ver. 31, *to judge*, *i. e.*, in regard to the body of Christ, whose symbol he receives:—in other words, to make a careful estimate of its sanctity and importance (Meyer). But it may be asked whether the legitimate signification of the word is not here transcended; and whether both the judging of the body of Christ and the judging of one's self, is not to be explained analogously. In the most important MSS. (A. B. C. [Cod. Sin.)], we find neither ἀναξίως, *unworthily*, nor τοῦ κυρίου, *the Lord's*. But the latter words are at all events implied, and to be derived from the connection; the former, however, cannot be so readily understood. If we do not choose to suppose (with Meyer) that any abuse is intended in the clause, "he that eateth and drinketh," and regard the expression as merely designating one who partook of the sacrament simply as an act of eating and drinking (comp. vv. 22, 34), then must we translate the participle μὴ διακρίνων, *if he does not discern* (de Wette), which is better and more expressive than that emphasis put upon the clause, "he that eateth and drinketh," and it does not suffer from meaningless expansion; rather it is made as terse as possible, since we understand by it eating of the bread and drinking of the cup. "Not to discern the body," is to fail of the very thing which should be aimed at in examining ourselves, *viz.*, that we possess that frame of mind which belongs to him who has qualified himself, not to partake of ordinary bread, but of that which is the body of the Lord. In this case also we are not compelled to connect, as Osiander does, the words "condemnation to himself," with the clause, "he that eateth and drinketh," as if it read, 'he that eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself;' in which case we should have to translate μὴ διακρίνων, *without discerning*, *i. e.*, he that eats and drinks judgment to himself, eats and drinks without discerning the body. Such a rendering would not only be harsh, but also incorrect, for the sense requires that "condemnation" be joined with the predicate.

VERS. 30, 31. He here applies what has just been said directly to the Corinthians.—**Therefore,**—*i. e.*, on account of such unworthy communion, or in consequence of the judgments superinduced by it.—**many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.**—To suppose that the natural results of intemperance are here alluded to, is both absurd and contrary to the immediate context. Neither can we understand him to mean by the word "sleep," the decay and extinction of the spiritual life, since this word every where denotes natural death; and still less can we suppose him to mean a union of the spiritual and temporal death (as Olsh.). Rather, the Apostle here alludes to some extraordinary wide-spread weakness and disease prevailing at that time in the Church, and often proving fatal, which he regarded as a divinely inflicted punishment on their desecration of the Lord's Supper (so Calvin, Neander and many others). The word κοιμῶνται. may be rendered, *they sleep*, *i. e.*, dying as a continual process. But whether this intended a euphonism to denote their entrance into rest with a hope of resurrection to life (Osiander), is at least very doubtful; although from what is said in ver. 32, we are not obliged to suppose the cutting off of all hope. [Wordsworth says: "He does not say κεκοίμηνται, the term which is used to describe the peace of the saints who *have fallen asleep* in Jesus (see xv. 20; 1 Thess. iv. 13) but κοιμῶνται, a tense which is less expressive of a permanent condition of rest than the other]. The words ἀσθένεις καὶ

ἀῤῥωστοι, *weak and sickly*, may be distinguished either by taking the former to denote mere indisposition, and the latter severe disease; or the former a chronic, and the latter an acute disease; or, which is indeed more correct, the former denotes those whose very powers fail, *i. e.*, confirmed invalids; and the latter those in whom they are only weakened. Something analogous to these judgments is presented to us in v. 5; Jas. v. 15; and also in the O. T. examples mentioned in x. 6 ff.—In what follows he next gives them to understand how such judgments might be avoided.—**But if we would judge ourselves.**—The γάρ, *for*, of the received text implies another view of the connection, *q. d.*, 'therefore, in consequence of the Divine judgment, there are many sickly among you; for if we only judged ourselves, then would such judgment not befall us.' The διακρίνειν, *judge*, refers back to δοκιμάζειν, *prove*. It denotes the thorough-going self-condemnation which springs from earnest self-examination—a self-condemnation which involves self-punishment, and a thorough severance of the carnal from the spiritual within us (comp. Osiander). Self-judgment is in fact a diagnosis of one's own moral state according to the Divine standard of what it should be (Burger).—The transition to the first person serves to soften the exhortation, and is not to be explained (Grotius) on the supposition that the Apostle had church discipline in mind, of which the context gives no hint.—**But when we are judged, we are chastened by the Lord.**—The judgment spoken of in ver. 30 he here represents in the light of *chastisement*, *i. e.*, the infliction of pains for the benefit of the individual, so that it shall appear as an exercise of paternal love, and not of exscinding wrath (comp. Heb. xii. 6–11). The words "by the Lord" are not to be interpreted of God, but of Christ, the Lord and Educator of the church, and they are better connected with "chastened" than with "judged," which, as in ver. 31, is used without further qualification as being self-evident. The cheering and encouraging tendency of this view of the matter appears yet more definitely in the final clause,—**that we should not be condemned with the world.**—Through such discipline, aiming at improvement, we are said to be guarded from relapsing into a worldly state whereby we, together with the world, *i. e.*, the mass of humanity, remaining outside of the fellowship of salvation, and abiding in hostility to Christ and God, would incur damnation, *i. e.*, utter exclusion from the kingdom of God. The words διακρίνειν, κρίνειν, κατακρίνειν, present a significant paranomasia (Osiander. Meyer says "an Oxymoron" *). In a friendly, winning manner he next follows up his rebuke with a positive exhortation.

Vers. 33, 34. **Wherefore.**—ὥστε draws an inference from what precedes.—**my brethren, when ye come together.**—He here goes back to the point he started from in ver. 20, "to eat," *i. e.*, at the church-feast—the agape,—**tarry one for another.**—ἐκδέχεσθε as the opposite of the reprehended προλαμβάνειν (ver. 21) means, *wait*, suitably to the N. T. usage elsewhere. [Wordsworth translates it *receive, entertain one another*, a rendering which is forbidden by the contrast which it forms with προλαμβάνειν, and is not found in any of the versions].—Finally he points to the fact that this Supper was not intended for the satisfaction of bodily wants, and that these ought to be attended to at home. This would serve to guard them against that greedy haste which destroyed the fellowship of the Supper and counteracted its sacred intent.—**And if any man hunger, let him eat at home.**—This exhortation he strengthens by referring once more to the judgment to which they would expose themselves by an unseemly gathering.—**that ye come not together unto condemnation.**—Having thus given the necessary directions in reference to the matter most urgent, he postpones all further instructions concerning Divine worship and church usage, to his personal arrival. **And the rest will I set in order when I come.**—From this passage the Romish theology has sought to find a support for its tradition. "All permanent instructions which are destined to have the character of Divine appointments are always referred back even by the Apostles themselves to the Lord and His Word (chap. vii. 10; ix. 14); and hence we justify the rule that nothing can stand as a Divine ordinance in the church which is in opposition to the recognized and definite expressions of the Lord and His Apostles." Burger.

* A figure in which an epithet of a quite contrary signification is added to a word.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

[1. The Lord's Supper. 1. *Its authenticity.* In Paul we have a separate and an independent witness to the genuineness of this institution. It was revealed to him as a part of that Gospel of which he certified that he neither "received it of man, neither was taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." And the essential harmony of his account with the narratives found in the synoptical gospels, while it is prior to either of them in the order of composition, puts both the fact and all its particulars beyond reasonable doubt. The mythical theory here finds most effectual refutation. 2. *Its distinctive character.* It is the *Lord's* Supper, and is therefore to be separated from ordinary meals as designed not for the nourishment of the body, but for the soul. It is, therefore, a suitable observance for the Lord's house, and should there be celebrated with all the solemnity which the great event it commemorates ought to inspire in devout minds. 3. *Its import. a.* It is a memorial of our Lord's death. This it exhibits to us as a sacrifice for our sins. The bread betokens the body that was broken in our behalf; the wine calls to mind the blood that was shed for the forgiveness of our sins, and by which the covenant, ensuring to us eternal life, was sealed. These elements are a significant witness, therefore, of the atoning character of our Lord's sufferings and death, and they can be rightly received only by those who so interpret that wonderful transaction. *b.* But while it is a memorial, the Lord's Supper is at the same time a *feast* to the soul. Our Lord therein presents Himself to the church as the true bread from heaven which giveth life unto the world, and by means of which we are to eat

His flesh and drink His blood, so that He shall dwell in us and we in Him. It is, therefore, no empty form, but one filled with richest substance —a substance which is nothing less than the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which it becometh the believer to discern and appropriate by a living faith to the strengthening of his own spiritual life, and that he may be raised up at the last day. *c.* Besides, it is a *festival of social union and communion* where, in fellowship with their Head, believers knit the bonds of their common membership. *d.* It is, moreover, a *proclamation* of our Lord's death, a significant exhibition to the world of what He has done and is still ready to do in behalf of all perishing sinners. In celebrating it the church sends forth its invitation to the world bidding every one that hungers and thirsts to come and eat without money and without price. *e.* It is a *pledge* of the Lord's return. As it points backward to His death, so does it also point forward to that Marriage Supper where He, the returning Bridegroom, will entertain His Bride clothed in white array without spot or blemish or any such thing, and destined to go no more out from His presence forever and ever].

2. The Lord's Supper. *The proper method of its observance.* The words "given for you,"—"shed for the remission of sins,"—are associated with the act of eating and drinking the elements as expressing the chief thing in this sacrament; and he who truly believes in these words is a right-worthy and well-qualified communicant. But he who does not accept their truth or doubts them is unworthy and disqualified; for all that the words "for you" require is a sincere believing heart.—Again, where this faith is fervent there the new command of our Lord, John xiii. 34, is observed by all the members of the New Covenant. The fire of this love, which in Christ devoted itself even unto death in behalf of all mankind, melts down human pride and selfishness. If this love of Christ truly possesses our hearts so that we can appropriate to ourselves the sacrifice it has made as offered for us, then will our natural self and all we have of this world's advantages and goods become as nothing. Christ and his love will be our all, and in Him will the entire worth of life be included for us. We shall seem to possess worth so far as we are in Him; and everything will possess worth for us so far as it belongs to Him, proceeds from Him, is His work, partakes of His nature, bears His impress, and has Him for its end.—Still further, in my associates I behold One who is in them, even as He is in me, who imparts Himself to them as He does to me, who loves them as He does me, and who is beloved by them as He is beloved by me. Thus, all sense of estrangedness is removed, and a feeling of true brotherhood is awakened, and a communion established wherein we freely share with each other what we have received from Christ. When believers celebrate the Lord's Supper in such a state of mind, then may they be said to partake worthily; then are they in condition to receive through the bread and wine the all-atoning grace of Christ, and together with this, the might of a pure love which gladly forgives; which shrinks at no self-mortification; which embraces all who are in Christ with a pure benevolence and sinks all distinctions of weak and strong, of poor and rich, of little and great, in the one life of Christ which is freely imparted to all, and alone has and gives absolute worth; which accepts with pleasure the little from the little, and rejoices also to give without stint and without selfish intent, in perfect simplicity of heart, so that we receive from our brethren what they have in Christ and what is precious and costly, however small it may appear, and give to them in turn, what we too have derived from Christ, both great and small, counting it a favor if we may but be made the instruments of His love.—When on the contrary the heart is closed against the brotherhood in selfishness and disgust, and cleaves to earthly things of whatever kind, and exalts itself by reason of their possession and looks contemptuously on the rest keeping aloof from them, then faith in the declarations, "given for you"—"shed for you" is utterly impossible; there the person is disqualified for a living union with the Lord in His Supper; then does he eat and drink in an unworthy manner. Here then is the point which every one must carefully look at who wishes to commune at the Supper; and he must examine himself honestly in presence of the great Heart-Searcher in reference to it.—And only after thorough self-examination under the instruction and guidance of Christ's Spirit must he approach the Holy Supper where the Lord imparts His own offered life to Him being vitally present through the visible symbols.—Holding communion thus he will be greatly strengthened in the participation of Christ's salvation and be merged more completely in the river of eternal life flowing from Jesus, and his whole nature will be quickened, refreshed and nourished for the more complete development of its spiritual powers.—But when these conditions are wanting and when persons approach the Supper in an unhallowed frame of mind, faithless and loveless, then will the life so freely offered to them, instead of proving a blessing and a nourishment work out for them a greater condemnation. The Holy Sacrament being violated and desecrated by an unworthy handling proves a stumbling-block to the communicant; his life pines away and perishes—an effect which not only took place in the apostolic churches, but which stretches on through all time to come extending even to the body itself, (comp. Calvin in loco).—Such judgment, however, is to be regarded primarily as a chastisement of the Lord by which He intends to bring back the unworthy communicants to suitable reflection and to guard them against sinking back into the world and incurring a greater damnation. From all this it will seem that an unworthy communication can only take place where through the operation of the Divine Spirit a worthy communication has been rendered possible, where a believing disposition has already existed so that the unworthiness proceeds from unfaithfulness to the divine influences and from a mind perversely resisting the grace of Christ. But the oftener such unworthy communication is repeated, the more closed does a man become against rebukes of the Spirit and the more disqualified from proper self-reflection and personal

examination and purifying self-judgment, the nearer also does he approach that state of complete apostasy which brings with it damnation.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

LUTHER.—Vers. 20, 21. No sin is so contrary and hostile to this sacrament as disunion and discord. STARKE:—Ver. 17. The minister's commands ought to be God's commands. Woe to the minister who commands otherwise, and woe to the hearers who do not obey! HED.:—Ver. 19. God turns all things for good: the juice must *ferment* if wine is to be produced; so must the church be agitated by false opinions and abuses in order that what is evil may foam up and pass off. By this means we learn ourselves, and the hypocrite is separated from the true Christian (1 Jno. ii. 18 f.).—Ver. 20. Oh, what multitudes approach the table of the Lord, not as they should, but as they would; by so doing they celebrate, not the feast of the Lord, but the feast of their own condemnation.—Ver. 21 (HED.). The Lord's Supper, not an ordinary meal, but a true Supper, where not the stomach, but the soul, is to be satisfied. Dost thou hunger and thirst after Jesus? Then it will be easy to fast while preparing to approach the table of the Lord for the sake of better devotion. But if thou art weak, and must needs partake of food, still this will not hinder the worthy reception of the Holy Supper.—Ver. 22. In the Church of Christ, and in the distribution of the Supper, one is of as much consequence as another; and the rich and the noble must not take umbrage if the poor and the lowly partake first.—Ver. 23. Abuses can best be remedied by going back to the primitive institution of a thing (Matth. xix. 4).—If our Lord has instituted an ordinance, it is not allowed us, or the whole Church even, to change aught therein; for He is the Lord of the whole Church.—Ver. 24. He says not: 'offer it, honor it, guard it, carry it about, worship it.' SPENER: If the veritable body of the Lord has been offered for us, then must the same also be received and enjoyed by us in the Holy Supper. In the inward remembrance of the Saviour there is an actual seeking, desiring and apprehending of all His grace; and such recollection transpires in the inmost depths of the soul. The more thou thinkest upon Jesus the happier art thou: the oftener, the better! (Spener)—Ver. 25. It is real blood that Christ has shed for us, and indeed the sacrificial blood which he has offered up in our behalf, the blood of atonement whereby we are reconciled, and hence the very thing whereby he has sealed the New Testament. Where the cup is wanting, there the supper is mutilated; for Christ did not bequeath his blood with the bread, but with the cup. As after having been born, we need food, not only once, but daily for the strengthening of our nature, so must this sacrament, which is designed to strengthen our new nature, be frequently repeated. And to this we should be urged not only by the command of the Lord, but also by a sense of our own need—because we crave the forgiveness of sins and spiritual invigoration. Besides we should be moved to it by the pre-eminent worth of the good things presented to us.—Ver. 27. Judged according to our merits we are all too unworthy of food and drink, such as no angel has been honored with. Yet the super-abounding grace of our Lord Jesus Christ renders the lowest of us worthy of it. Those who approach the table of the Lord without repentance and faith, without reverence and holy resolves, without love and reconciliation, in short, without the perfect renunciation of all deliberate and presumptuous sins, offend as grievously against the body and blood of the Lord as did the godless Jews and heathen, who crucified the one and shed the other. (Heb. vi. 6).—Ver. 28. LUTHER: To examine oneself means to consider whether we are fit: hence, it requires that we should not trust at once to our own thoughts, nor to the opinions of others, but keep these in abeyance until the matter has been well investigated before God and in the light of his word. And for this a person should be duly qualified. Hence, no unconverted man can properly examine himself, unless he first begins to yield to the prevenient and convicting grace of God, and thus a spark of divine light is kindled in him.—Examine thyself according to the *law*, as to whether thou dost realize thine own sin, and the well-merited wrath of God; also, according to the *gospel*, as to whether thou dost in faith comfort thyself solely with the all-availing merits of Jesus and whether this faith in thee is strengthened through a hearty love of God and of thy neighbor—through a profound hatred of all sin and evil—through a holy zeal for true godliness, through a high minded contempt of that which is seen and temporal and through a burning desire for that which is unseen and eternal. If this examination be sustained, be assured that this Holy Supper presents you that which heaven and earth cannot give. (ARNDT): Prove thyself according to the language of the institution wherein the great mystery contained is set forth to be, that it exhibits to us the true body and blood of Jesus—that He, as an offered body and as atoning blood, yea as a testament with all well earned treasures and gifts is truly presented, to some for a blessing, to others for a condemnation. And remember also, that to be a worthy guest thou must be prepared by repentance and faith to be capable of spiritual communion with Christ and his spiritual body. Such are the blessed intents, fruits, operations of this mysterious testamentary feast of love and reconciliation.—Ver. 29. It happens sometimes, that the children of God approach the table of the Lord without suitable reflection and proper preparation. These invite upon themselves severe temporal chastisements; while the utterly godless, provoke a greater damnation.—Ver. 30. HED.: Why are many sick? Why do many die? Why do many fall? Some reply; "it was a raging pestilence"—'the physician failed'—'we cannot avoid ill luck'.—I reply, 'it is because they partake unworthily of the Lord's Supper.' God's judgments yet endure. But who sees them? who suspects them?—Ver. 31. If thou wilt judge thyself salutarily, keep from dissipating vanities; refrain from treacherous self-love; and think not to magnify the good and diminish the evil that is in thee. Pray God to enlighten thee; and take God's word to counsel and re-

form thee in all particulars wherein thou canst and ought to be reformed. He who does not daily stand in judgment upon himself, cannot stand well in a state of grace. Amid many kinds of wordly avocations this may not be readily done; yet the spiritual and eternal welfare of our souls is of sufficient importance to demand and obtain some time for this purpose from every one; and time may be easily found for it if we will.—Ver. 32. Behold the compassion of God towards the unworthy communicants at Christ's table. He does not send them at once to hell; but searches them by means of temporal punishments, with paternal intent of leading them to repentance, and keeping them from being condemned with an impenitent world.—Ver. 33. O happy fellowship, where in holy communion, one deems himself no higher than another, but rather each one thinks other better than himself! (Phil. ii. 3).

Berlenb. Bibel: Ver. 16. It is always the duty of Christians to meet together, but it should be for edification. The tendency is ever to backslide. Steadfastness in the truth already known costs effort. By the grace of God only can we grow.—Vss. 18. 19. Were we to look into man's condition and also to comprehend ourselves better, it would not astonish us to find so little perfect union among pious people. And were our hearts more simple and thoroughly freed from falsehood, how would we learn to look with others' eyes at everything which now awakens, at first sight doubt, disgust and jealousy! We readily acquiesce in the most singular ways of Providence when we have learned how to bring good out of evil, and under all things to recognize God's wisdom, truth, and blamelessness. Of many a church-communion at the present day Paul might well say, "How can ye, being unholy, have a holy table of the Lord? The world is full of hypocrites and mouth-Christians.—Ver. 23. We must first *receive* the mystery of faith from the Lord, if we would so *transmit* it to others as to awaken their reverence. Those who profess to be the servants of Christ ought first to have tasted of the goodness of the Lord, and have derived strength from His love, in order that they may be the holy instruments of God in bearing witness of His gospel to others, and nourishing them with spiritual food. What is to be imparted to souls ought not to be taken at second-hand, or delivered without being first experienced in the soul.—Ver. 24 ff. Through the apostasy, mankind have been betrayed into a frightful hatred of God, and into a slavish fear and distrust of Him. Hence they very reluctantly come to commemorate Him whom they regard only as their Judge, and not also as their Saviour and Helper.—In order to furnish weak and wretched souls with the guidance like that of a hand, Christ establishes the outward observance of the Holy Scriptures as His memorial—not as though He Himself were ever absent, since He has promised to be with us always, yea, to dwell in His own,—but because our ever forgetful disposition requires such constant reminding. Yet at the same time He aims to make such a powerful impression by means of it as shall deeply stamp on the heart His whole character and work—both what He has done and what He has suffered in our behalf.—And this memorial is intended also to effect an actual reunion and communion with the Lord; for when a poor, weary soul, in its great need, seeks anxiously for Christ, then does He knock at the heart, not only inwardly, by His attracting Spirit, but externally also, through the means of grace. And if the person opens to Him his whole heart, then does He at once become one with him forevermore; and if he is of one mind with Christ, then is he also a partaker of Him.—Through the envy and wrath of Satan, have mankind fallen into a condition of mutual hostility and passionate strife.—The hellish abyss of bitterness and falsehood lies deeply concealed in every one, and the fire of self-love and self-will burns by nature in us all. Thence arises wrath, strife, hatred, envying, and all the other hellish attributes and works of Satan, by which God's wrath is kindled in the human heart. In this hellish torment would man be doomed to burn evermore, had not Mercy found a perfect means of deliverance in its great wisdom.—The Son of God, as the manifestation of God's heart and love, has incorporated Himself with humanity, and thus have Divine love and grace been again revealed and brought near to man. Those now who unite with Christ through faith become partakers of God's life and love.—The new covenant is at the same time a Testament of the Divine promises which the Son of God has sealed for us with His death and blood. With him, who has enjoyed this blood in its purifying power, is this covenant ratified. If thou wilt then have a share in this covenant with God, thou must open thine heart to Him in order to receive His perfect will, together with all His grace and strength. For this is the power of the new covenant that God proposes to give to His saints His Spirit, whose work it is to draw us to Christ, glorify him in our eyes, and make us strong to obtain all things in Him.—He who has an earnest longing to know Christ, and to partake of Him, will find but little pleasure in transitory things, and be little disposed to think of and cleave to them. For the one must give place to the other, even in thought.—Ver. 26. The first observance of the Supper is apt to be attended with the most earnest devotion. With time, devotion lessens. Constant reflection will, however, guard us against this evil. Our devotion ought to be ever increasing, and this will be the case if we so eat of the bread as not to forget the Lord, and devote ourselves entirely to each other, as the Lord has done for us, and thus allow the blood of Christ to kindle in us a holy zeal to be true to Him even unto death, and to stand by each other even unto blood, in the actual and active communion of the heart, and life and goods, as becometh members of one body. As we eat and drink with the mouth, so with the mouth do we also confess the Crucified, and incite each other to the fervent imitation of Him. This proclamation of His death involves our living as those who have been crucified, and are dead to the world with Christ; so that we can show that we have a perfect Saviour actually in us, who, as our High Priest has atoned for us, as our Prophet, has instructed us, and as our Ruler, has strongly controlled us. —His death slays our death. His life quickens

our life. And this we ought also to impress on each other: that as Christ died for us out of sheer love, so also ought we, out of the love which He has given as food for our souls, to die gladly unto iniquity, and to live no more unto ourselves, but unto God through Christ, who has suffered Himself to be slain in our behalf.—As the sacraments derive their power and active operation from the death of Christ, so is their most important end conformity to the death of Christ. (Phil. iii. 10). Just in proportion as a person brings to mind the death of our Lord, holds Him in constant recollection, and thinks merely of His future glory, will he become dead to all evil lusts and desires from day to day. Then, when Christ comes, will He take the sovereignty, and liberate the creature from the curse, and from every evil which it has incurred in consequence of the fall. Until then we must hold fast to the memorials of His death.—He who abuses the creature in lust and vanity, and thus excites and nourishes lust and strengthens sin, poorly prepares himself for the coming of the Lord.—Ver. 27. He who eats and drinks without true penitence and spiritual hunger, or renders himself unworthy by sorry pursuits, so far from being absolved from guilt, only doubles it.—Ver. 28. Self-examination should be carried on by a sharp introspection and constant observance of what transpires within us—of our thoughts, aims and desires; by watching what proceeds from us in word and deed; and by reflecting on what the issue of all these things will be before God. At the same time there must shine in us the light of the Holy Spirit, who shall discover to us our secret faults, and disclose the evil we might otherwise overlook. New strength must also be invoked from Him for the overcoming of our selfishness. If we could only suffer ourselves to be examined by Him, then would questions such as these arise: 'How is it with thee in respect to the love of God? Art not thou loving and serving the creature more than the Creator? Whereupon rests thy confidence—upon the living God, or upon thyself? Art not thou still constantly abusing the holy Name and will of God for hypocritical ends? Is there nothing false in thine act and on thy tongue? Dost thou not indeed represent thyself as more pious than thou art, and still performest in secret thine own will? Dost thou let God rest in thy heart, or art thou hindering Him with thine evil desires? How art thou dealing with God's Word? Art thou employing the best of thy time for the true inward service of God? How does thy heart stand related to thy neighbor? Hast thou not injured or oppressed any one, so as to cause him to sigh because of thee? Is thy heart free from hatred, and envy, and wrath, even in the nicest particulars? Art thou disciplining and chastening thyself? Art thou practising nothing, even under cover of marriage, which stains thee before God? How art thou dealing with others' goods? Art thou acting in all things honestly and truly before God?'—Under such searching inquiry, what a depth of impurity is opened up within? The discovery of it cannot but bow the heart mightily before God. This self-examination, accordingly, includes in itself the whole work of repentance which is demanded before the communion.—Ver. 29. A person eats unworthily—1, when he fails to recognize his own need, and proves not himself; 2, when he hungers not after Christ, nor discerns His most holy and glorified Body. Such base contempt of Christ justly incurs upon itself the severest punishments. Plagues of every kind then ensue—the cause of which is not often seen—and we wonder why this or that person is so severely chastised.—Ver. 30. The first inflictions are somewhat temporary, and they can be ameliorated by earnest repentance, so that the man shall not fall a prey to death. Under the prostration of the body, many a soul may be rescued. That there are, even among well meaning persons, so many sick and dead in faith, happens for this reason: were persons always helped, so as to go on successfully in their appointed conflicts, and to remain looking to Jesus, and to receive from Him grace and victory, they would at once give scope to their fancy, pride themselves on the gifts which they have received, and which were given to them for the purpose of being industriously improved, towards making their calling sure, and advancing in humility. But instead of this, they gradually abandon their humility, and exalt themselves. In this way their field is sown with thorns by the enemy; yet they deem it all good fruit, eat thereof, and fill full their pride and self-love.—Much evil arises when those who are weak separate themselves from such as are able to furnish them good guidance.—Ver. 31. He who comes squarely up to the righteousness of God, and freely acknowledges himself as guilty before it, and subjects himself to its avenging sword by condemning himself, acts discreetly, and according to the mind and counsel of the Holy Spirit. For it is far more tolerable to manage our owe case with God secretly, and to take to shame ourselves, and bow before him here, than to be exposed to shame yonder in presence of the angels and of all the elect, and there incur His condemnation. A converted Christian judge himself alone, and trusts none less than himself. Such self-judgment also works in us the death of Christ, in that we judge ourselves as those who have deserved like death, yet for whom the Lord has died, in order that we, through His death, may die unto sin and live unto righteousness. How many a one would lie already in hell, if God, out of sheer mercy, had not taught him through great tribulations!

RIEGER: VER. 17 ff. In a church of Christ there ought to be manifest advance from year to year. In the present constitution of Christ's kingdom, in which power is still left to the arch enemy to betray, and in which carnal security, levity and temerity are still peculiar to men, factions and class distinctions, those fruits of self-formed opinions, are unavoidable. Where the distinction between rich and poor is still maintained in the church, there it appears no more as it did in the upper chamber of the first Lord's Supper.—Ver. 23 ff. The observance of the Lord's Supper falls in between two termini—on the one side, the night when our Lord's ordinary intercourse with the world was broken off, and on the other His second

coming, when we shall begin to eat and drink anew with him in his kingdom. It is therefore a special provision for those who, not having seen him yet believe.—Ver. 31. To judge oneself, to be judged by the Lord, to be condemned with the world constitute three stages, just as in Mark ix—to be salted with the salt of heavenly discipline, or to be salted with fire, or to be cast into the fire which shall not be quenched.

HEUBNER: Ver. 17. Out from our worshiping congregations there ever depart those persons who are worse than when they came—persons who have been hardened and embittered against the word of God.—Ver 19. God's government in this world aims at disclosing evil in its true form, but this is ever connected with the glorification of that which is good—Ver. 21. The holiest things are precisely those which are most exposed to desecration—Ver. 22. The presence of God and the sanctity of His temple ought to impress every one with a sense of his own nothingness and of the vanity of earthly things—Ver. 23. In that place where the friendship of Jesus was so bitterly requited He set up the memorial of His love; in that place where He suffered His fearful passion did He establish that ordinance through which He imparted Himself most intimately to others.—Ver. 26. The Lord's Supper should also refresh the sure expectation of His future coming, and be a foretaste of the heavenly Supper.—Ver. 28. This Supper demands the most earnest preparation of mind, wherefore it becometh every Christian to experience some anxiety respecting himself as to whether he is honoring his Lord as he ought. Ver. 29. A deterioration of the heart is one result of unworthy communication.—Ver. 30. the physical weakness which often gets the upper hand of us, is in various ways a sad token of moral degeneracy.—Ver. 31. The more severe a man is upon himself, the more sparing is God toward him. To be sparing of self is to incur harm.

W. F. BESSER: VER. 17. Where the fountains of grace and of life are flowing, and where the guests of the Lord are to be nourished and strengthened with His body and blood, in order that they may grow in love toward each other even as Christ has loved them, these people can never assemble only to remain as they were before; they are either better or worse after it.—Ver. 26. How can the death of our Lord move the hearts of those who habituate themselves only to carnal contentions and fleshly enjoyments?—Ver. 29. He eats and drinks judgment to himself, who does not eat and drink blessing to himself. Therefore let every one see to it, that he does not eat and drink the judgment of the impenitent and the unbelieving.

[CALVIN. VER. 30. If in Paul's times an ordinary abuse of the Supper could kindle God's wrath against the Corinthians, so that He punished them thus severely, what ought we to think of the state of things now? We see throughout the whole extent of Popery, not merely horrid profanations of the Supper, but even sacrilegious abominations set up in its room. 1. It is prostituted to *filthy lucre* (1 Tim. iii. 8) and merchandise. 2. It is maimed by taking away the cup. 3. It is changed into another aspect by the custom of partaking separately, communion being thus done away. 4. No explanation is given of the meaning of the sacrament, but a mumbling that would accord better with a magical incantation, or the detestable sacrifices of the Gentiles than with the Lord's Supper. 5. It is associated with an endless number of ceremonies, partly trivial, and partly superstitious—therefore polluting. 6. There is the diabolical invention of sacrifice, which contains an impious blasphemy on the death of Christ. 7. It is fitted to intoxicate miserable men with carnal confidence, while they present it to God as if it were an expiation, and think to drive off every thing hurtful by this charm, and that too without faith and repentance. 8. An idol is there adored in place of Christ. In short, it is filled with all kinds of abominations].

C. The church in general, and the possessor of spiritual gifts in their right estimate and application.

CHAP. XII—XIV.

I. These gifts — their ground and aim and hence their unity in manifoldness, suitably to the organic character of the Church.

CHAP. XII.

Now concerning spiritual *gifts*, brethren, I would not have you ignorant. Ye know
2 that [when, ὅτε][1] ye were Gentiles, [ye were] carried away unto these dumb idols,
3 even as ye were led. Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed [says, 'Cursed is Jesus:' *Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς*],[2] and *that* no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, [say 'Lord Jesus,' *Κύριος*

4 Ἰησοῦς] but by the Holy Ghost. Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same
5 Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but [ministries and, διακονιῶν
6 καὶ] the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is [*om.* but it is,
7 *ins.* and] the same God[3] which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit
8 is given to every man to profit withal [for some profit, πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον]. For to
one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge
9 by [according to, κατὰ] the same spirit; [But, δὲ][4] To another faith by the same
Spirit; to another the gifts of healing [healings, ἰαμάτων] by the same[5] [in the one ἐν
10 τῷ ἑνὶ] Spirit; [But, δὲ][6] To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy;
to another discerning of spirits; to another *divers* kinds of tongues; [but, δὲ] to another
11 the interpretation[7] of tongues: But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit,
12 dividing to every man severally as he will. For as the body is one, and [yet] hath many
members, and [but, δὲ] all the members of that one[8] [*om.* that one, *ins.* the][8] body,
13 being [although] many, are one body: so also *is* Christ. For by [in, ἐν] one Spirit are [also
were, καὶ-ἐβαπτίσθημεν] we all baptized into[9] one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles
[Greeks, Ἕλληνες] whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into
14 [*om.* into][9] one spirit. For the body [also, καὶ] is not one member, but many.
15 If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it there-
16 fore not of the body? [it is not therefore not of the body]. And if the ear shall say,
Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? [it
17 is not therefore not of the body]. If the whole body *were* an eye, where *were* the hear-
18 ing? If the whole *were* hearing, where *were* the smelling? But now hath God set
19 the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him. And [But, δὲ]
20 if they were all one member, where *were* the body? But now *are they* [indeed, μὲν][10]
21 many members, yet [*om.* yet] but one body. And [But, δὲ][11] the eye cannot say
unto the hand, I have no need of thee: nor again the head to the feet, I have no
22 need of you. Nay, much more those members of the body, which seem to be more
23 feeble, are necessary: And those *members* of the body, which we think to be less
honourable, upon [around περιτίθεμεν] these we bestow more abundant honour; and
24 our uncomely *parts* have more abundant comeliness. For our comely *parts* have no
need: but God hath tempered [combined, συνεκέρασεν] the body together, having
25 given more abundant honour to that *part* which lacked:[12] That there should be no
schism[13] in the body; but *that* the members should have the same care one for
26 another. And whether[14] one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one
27 member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of
28 Christ, and members in particular [severally, ἐκ μέρους].[15] And God hath set some
in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles,
then[16] [after that, ἐπειτα] gifts of healings, helps [helpings, ἀντιλήψεις] governments
29 [governings, κυβερνήσεις] diversities of tongues. *Are* all apostles? *are* all prophets?
30 *are* all teachers? *are* all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? do all
31 speak with tongues? do all interpret? But covet earnestly [be zealous for, ζηλοῦτε]
the best [superior, κρείττονα][17] gifts: and yet [moreover, ἔτι] shew I unto you a more
excellent way [way according to excellence, καθ' ὑπερβολήν].

[1] Ver. 2.—The Rec. has ὅτι ἔθνη &c. But the omission both of ὅτε and of ὅτι [K.] may be explained by the attempt which was made to remove the anacoluthon in the original. [*Griesbach, Lachmann* (who however brackets ὅτε) *Scholz, Tischendorf* and *Alford* edit ὅτι, ὅτε before ἔθνη with A. B. C. D. E. L. Sinait. about 50 cursives, the Vulg. Syr. (later), Sahid. Aeth. (both), Arm. Slav. and very many Greek and Latin Fathers. The Rec. (Elz.), which gives ὅτι alone after οἴδατε and before ἔθνη, is sustained by F. G., a number of cursives, the Syr. (Pesch.) Copt. Arab. (Erp.), Oecum. Ambrst. In addition to K. ὅτι (alone) has in its favor two copies of the Slav. Theodt. (comm.) Damasc. Oecum. (comm.) and Augustine C. P. W.] The authorities in support of ὅτι ὅτε are decisive.

[2] Ver. 3.—The Rec. has κυριον Ἰησουν, and also ἀνάθημα Ἰησοῦν. The best MSS. have these nouns in the nominative. [*Lachmann, Tisch.* and *Alford* favor the nominative form, not only because the external authorities (A. B. C. Sinait. 4 cursives, and a number of versions and Fathers) are on their side, but because the accusative form seems an evident attempt to avoid the *oratio directa*. A few MSS. including the Vulgate have Ἰησ. in the Genitive, and Κυρ. Ἰησ. in the accusative.—C. P. W.]

[3] Ver. 6.—*Tischendorf*, after B. L. *et. al.* has καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς θεὸς ὁ, but the Rec. has ὁ δὲ αὐτός ἐστι θεός. But not only is there a disparity between the two phrases ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ and ὁ δὲ αὐτός, but the most decisive authorities are against ἐστι. [The author would imply that it is hardly possible that καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς should have been an alteration from ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς, so as to conform to the previous phrases, especially when the first of those phrases (τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ) remained unchanged; and that ἐστι, being manifestly spurious, throws additional doubt over the whole reading. Without the ἔστι however, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς has the support of A. K. L. Sinait., the Ital. Vulg. Syr. (both), Sahid. and several of the Greek Fathers.—C. P. W.]

[4] Ver. 9.—The first δὲ is omitted by B. D. E. F. G. Sinait. the Ital. Vulg. Syr. (Pesch.) Clem. Orig. Eus. and the Lat. Fathers, but it is inserted by A. C. D. (2d and 3d hand) K. L. Sinait. (3d hand) many cursives, the Copt. Sahid. Syr. (later) Arab. (Par.) Slav. and nearly all the Greek Fathers.—C. P. W.]

[5] Ver. 9.—The Rec. has αὐτῷ instead of ἑνὶ following A. B. [5 cursives, the Vulg. Didym. and a considerable number of the Latin Fathers.] But the αὐτῷ was substituted so as to conform to the preceding clauses. [It has however for it D. E. F. G. K. Sinait. the Syr. (both), Copt. Clem. Chrys. Theodt.—C. P. W.]

[6] Ver. 10.—In each case in which δὲ occurs in ver. 10, some good MSS. are found to omit it, but the weight of authority is decidedly in its favor.—C. P. W.]

[7] Ver. 10.—*Lachmann* has διερμηνεία, but it is not sufficiently sustained. [*Alford* thinks it a mistake occasioned by the preceding δὲ. The substantive ἑρμηνεία occurs once again in this epistle (xiv. 26), but the verb usually takes the form of διερμηνεύω (xii. 30; xiv. 5, 13, 27, 28). Hence perhaps the change. A. D. (1st hand, which also has confusedly διερμηνεία γένη γλωσσῶν) have διερμενια; B. 109 omit ἄλλῳ δὲ ἑρμ. γλωσσῶν; and C. D. (3rd hand) E. F. G. K. L. Sin. and the Greek fathers have ἑρμηνεία.—C. P. W.]

[8] Ver. 12.—Rec. has τοῦ ἑνὸς after σώματος, but against the most decisive authorities.

[9] Ver. 13.—Rec. has εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα, but εἰς is not sufficiently sustained. It was evidently occasioned by the first member of the sentence. The reading πόμα ἐποτίσθημεν originated in an attempt to make the meaning more evident, [Meyer says: According as the sense of the words was made to refer to the Lord's Supper or not, sprung up the reading πόμα (with or without εἰς) instead of πνεῦμα, and ἐφωτίσθημεν (spoken according to the usage of the Greeks of baptism) instead of ἐποτίσθημεν. The reading ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσ. is sustained by B. C. D. F. Sinait. some copies of the Vulgate, by the Syr. (Pesch.) Copt. Goth. Aeth. and most of the Greek writers. Instead of ἐποτίσ. A. has simply ἐσμεν.—C. P. W.]

[10] Ver. 20.—A. C. D. (2d and 3d hand) E. F. G. K. L. Sinait. have μὲν, and it is adopted by *Tischendorf* and *Alford*; but it is omitted by B. D. (1st hand), two cursives, the Gothic and Augustine.—C. P. W.]

[11] Ver. 21.—*Tischendorf* and *Alford* insert δὲ, following B. D. K. L. Sinait. the Syr. (Philox.) Goth. and most of the Fathers.—C. P. W.]

[12] Ver. 24.—*Lachmann* has ὑστερουμένῳ with A. B. C. [Sinait. 17, 57, 67, Melet. (in Epiph.) Damasc.] Nearly all the remaining MSS. have ὑστεροῦντι. [B. has τι περισσοτέρον δοὺς instead of περ. δ. τιμήν.—C. P. W.]

[13] Ver. 25.—D. F. G. L. Sinait. and a number of versions and Fathers have σχίσματα, but the preponderance of authority is in favor of σχίσμα.—C. P. W.]

[14] Ver. 26.—*Lachmann* has εἴ τι, but his authorities are not sufficient. [The first ἓν is omitted by A. and Orig., and the second by A. B. Sinait. The evidence for them is abundant.—C. P. W.]

[15] Ver. 27.—Some MSS. have μέλους; *Meyer*. It was an error of some transcriber or from not understanding ἐκ μέρους.

[16] Ver. 28.—Rec. has ἔιτα. The weight of authority is in favor of ἔπειτα. [*Alford* thinks the Rec. a correction to a more usual form, and the entire omission of the word which some respectable MSS. show, an attempt to throw all into one catalogue.—C. P. W.]

[17] Ver. 31.—*Tischendorf*, and others edit μείζονα with A. D. C. [Sinait., eleven cursives, the ancient Syr. (Pesch.) and perhaps the later Syr. Aeth. and some Greek Fathers]; but the Rec. has κρείττονα which Meyer prefers. Very probably a change was made because κρείττονα seemed unpleasant, and on account of Chap. xiii. 13 and xiv. 5. [*Bloomfield*, *Lachmann*, and *Alford* however agree with Tischendorf that the weight of evidence is in favor of μείζονα.—C. P. W.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

["The ancient prophets had clearly predicted that the Messianic period should be attended by a remarkable effusion of the Holy Spirit (Joel ii. 28). Our Lord, before His crucifixion, promised to send the Comforter, who is the Holy Ghost, to instruct and guide His Church (John xiv.). And after His resurrection He said to His disciples, "These signs shall follow them that believe. In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover" (Mark xvi. 17, 18). And immediately before His ascension He said to the disciples, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence" (Acts i. 5). Accordingly, on the day of Pentecost, these promises and prophecies were literally fulfilled. The peculiarity of the new dispensation consisted, in the first place, in the general diffusion of these gifts. They were not confined to any one class of the people, but extended to all classes—male and female, young and old; and secondly, in the wonderful diversity of these supernatural endowments. Under circumstances so extraordinary, it was unavoidable that many disorders should arise. Some men would claim to be the organs of the Spirit, who were deluded or impostors; some would be dissatisfied with the gifts which they had received, and envy those whom they regarded as more highly favored; others would be inflated, and make an ostentatious display of their extraordinary powers; and in the public assemblies it might be expected that the greatest confusion would arise from so many persons being desirous to exercise their gifts at the same time. To the correction of these evils, all of which had manifested themselves in the church of Corinth, the Apostle devotes this and the two following chapters." HODGE].

VER. 1–3. **His instructions in regard to spiritual gifts, especially in regard to such discourses as proceeded from the special influence of the Spirit, Paul introduces by a statement of the chief token by which any genuine spiritual utterance may be known, *viz.*, 'the acknowledgment of Jesus as Lord.' Whether he had been particularly questioned on this point, as in the instances mentioned vii. 1 and viii. 1, [and which are by some supposed to be continued here; or whether this is the second of the points alluded to in xi. 16, concerning which he had heard,] is uncertain. At any rate, what he is laboring for is the removal of abuses which had crept into the didactical and lyrical portions of Divine worship, occasioned by these extraordinary phenomena (comp. xiv.). "The Corinthians having turned aside from a plain, practical Christianity, were employing the gifts of the Spirit without regard to church edification, putting the greatest value on their most striking features, and prizing most such as were best calculated to impress the senses. Hence Paul felt constrained to instruct them in the 'true end and right use of these gifts, and to warn them against confounding a genuine inspiration with fanatical excitement.'" NEANDER. These abuses have, without good reason, been put in connection with the party divisions at Corinth, mentioned in chap. i. Baur and Rübiger reckon those who prophesied among the followers of Paul, and those speaking with tongues among the followers of Peter; while Dähne regards the latter as Alexandrine fanatics of the Christ-party.—Now concerning spiritual things.** —τῶν πνευματικῶν is to be construed as neuter, according to the analogy of xiv. 1; and is not to be interpreted solely of the gift of tongues [as Billr., de Wette, Stanley], concerning which he is not now speaking exclusively; but of spiritual things generally, *i. e.*, of such effects as were wrought by the Holy Ghost, whether ordinary graces and virtues, or supernatural phenomena proceeding from Him and belonging within His sphere. What is said in xiv. 37 [to which Grot., Ham., Locke, allude], might seem to sustain the masculine construction here, making the word apply to inspired persons in

general (*πνεῦμα ἔχοντες*), or those speaking with tongues (*γλώσσαις λαλοῦντες*), provided the Corinthians had been wont to designate them especially by this term. But the predominant reference is, on the whole, to the phenomenon itself (comp. ver. 31; xiv. 1, 39); and to restrict it to one class of persons is demanded neither by the allusion to dumb idols in ver. 2, nor by the drift of the whole paragraph, which aims to correct the excessive estimation of that gift.—**brethren, I would not have you ignorant.**—Comp. on x. 1. He here gives them to understand both the subject of his instructions, and also that they needed enlightenment respecting the nature, origin, worth and use of these operations of the Spirit. To this necessity he points in the following verse, where he reminds the Corinthian converts (who formed the main body of the Church) of their former heathen state—a state of inexperience in regard to the revelation of the living God and the Spirit's influences, and of a blind passivity in religious things—a state which disqualified them for an accurate judgment respecting these new experiences, unless carefully instructed. Burger states the connection thus: 'the power which once influenced you as heathen is now broken; another influence has now poured itself forth upon you, of which you are made aware by these gifts of the Spirit. And now, be it understood, that this Spirit has fixed and uniform purposes and signs, and does not scatter itself in a variety of discordant relations and services such as you were involved in amid the distractions of heathenism. The one abiding centre of all spiritual operations is Jesus.—**Ye know that when.**—In the best authorities the reading is *ὅτι ὅτε*, *that when*. If we adopt this, we must either suppose an anacoluthon here, on the assumption that after writing *ὅτε*, *when*, Paul lost sight of the *ὅτι*, *that*, and proceeded directly with the following words in connection with *ὅτε*, *when;* so that the construction would be—**ye know that when ye were Gentiles, carried away to dumb idols as ye were led**—(*ὡς ἂν ἤγεσθε*, where the *ἂν* indicates what ordinarily happens; comp. *Passow* I., p. 156). Or, with Bengel, we may construe the *ὡς ἂν*, as in 2 Corinthians x. 9, by *tanquam, quasi, as it were*, thus softening the strong expression *ἤγεσθε*, *were led*, which would then be taken in connection with *ὅτι*, *that*, as the predicate of the main clause; while *ἀπαγόμενοι* would come in as a side qualification, indicating that they suffered themselves to be thus led. In this case the sentence would read—'that ye, when ye were Gentiles, were in a manner led away to dumb idols.'—[Alford supposes an ellipsis of *τόν χρόνον, the time*, while *ὅτι* virtually drops away as a part of the formula, *οἶδατε ὅτι, q. d.*, 'ye remember the time when ye were']. At all events, the word *ἤγεσθε* [which here expresses the main point to which he would call attention] indicates a power foreign to one's own conscious self-determination, whether it be that of a blind enthusiasm, or of some impulse of nature not as yet overruled by what is truly Divine, or even of demoniac influence. The last agrees well with viii. 5; x. 20; Eph. ii. 2, and can be assumed to co-exist with blind enthusiasm and natural impulse. To imagine any reference to the blinding influence of priestcraft would hardly do, since there was very little of this apparent in the religion of the Greeks. In the expression, *ἀπαγόμενοι, being carried away*, we are not to suppose any figurative allusion, either as to a criminal led to execution, or to a victim reluctantly dragged to the slaughter, thereby showing the worthlessness or the unluckiness of the sacrifice. It is not to this that the context points, but rather to the readiness with which they allowed themselves to be led aside from the right into the wrong way—a matter which needed not to be directly stated in the context, but which lies in the very nature of the case, as the Apostle regards it, and as he teaches those whom he instructed to regard it. So the term is used also in classic writers (comp. *Passow* I., p. 292). The idols to whose altars and temples they were led, whether to sacrifice, or to pray, or to consult, are termed *ἄφωνα, voiceless, dumb* (comp. Hab. ii. 18 f.; Ps. cxv. 5; cxxxv. 16) in contrast with the living God who reveals Himself by word, and through His Spirit imparts the gift of speaking in prophecy.—**Wherefore**—*i. e.*, suitably to their necessities. In order that they may form a correct judgment in relation to the Spirit's operations, especially in relation to utterances proceeding from this source, he gives them the chief token of speaking by the Holy Ghost; and first, negatively,—**no man speaking by the Spirit of God saith, 'cursed is Jesus,'**—*i. e.*, speaking in the Spirit excludes all cursing of Jesus; hence, where this takes place, there can be no speaking in the Spirit; next positively,—**no man is able to say 'Lord Jesus,' save in the Holy Spirit.** — The confession of Jesus as Lord is to be attributed to the Holy Spirit as its source, since only in Him is such a thing possible (comp. 1 John iv. 2 ff.). The distinction between the text here and that in John, according to Bengel, is that Paul furnishes a token of the true inspiration as against the heathen; but John, as against false prophets. The expression "in the Spirit," *ἐν πνεύματι* (comp. Matth. xxii. 43; Mark xii. 36) indicates the conscious exercise of our faculties in the element of the Spirit—a thorough pervading of the soul by the Spirit in the act of speaking. "'Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦν, *anathema Jesus*, is an expression of the fanatical rejection of Christ, such as might occur in moments of devilish excitement in Jews or heathen.' *Ἀνάθεμα*, in its original signification, is the same as *ἀνάθημα, any thing devoted;* but it is especially used in a bad sense, denoting that which is devoted to destruction by God, just like חֵרֶם in the O. T., and *sacer* among the Romans. In the synagogue it designated that which was doomed to utter excommunication; hence its meaning is accursed." NEANDER. ["He says, not *Christ*, which term designates the office, and is in some measure the object of faith, but *Jesus*, the personal name designating the historical person whose life was matter of fact. The curse and the confession are in this way far deeper"]. The idea that in the latter clause it was Paul's intention to avert contempt from those speaking with tongues, is a groundless assumption, since no trace of such contempt appears; and it belongs with the arbitrary suppo-

sition that he here had especially in mind the gift of tongues. In 3 Ed. Meyer says: "It is possible that amid the various forms and even distortions of spiritual discourse at Corinth, public opinion may have varied as to who could be properly regarded as the speaker of the Spirit, and who not. Over against all arbitrary, ambitious and exclusive judgments on this point the Apostle expresses himself the more forcibly the broader he makes the specific sphere of spiritual discourse to appear, and the more simply and definitely he lays down its specific characteristic." The expression "anathema Jesus" may be taken either as a wish, 'let him be anathema,' or as a declaration: 'he is anathema,' thus referring to the fact that He suffered death upon the cross as one accursed (comp. Gal. iii. 13). Then it would essentially agree with the term "blaspheme" in Acts xxvi. 11. The contrast with this extreme of unbelief is given in the key-word of faith "Jesus is Lord," wherein the Messiahship of Jesus is acknowledged, and that too as a dignity divine (comp. Rom. x. 9). ["The confession includes the acknowledgment that He is truly God and truly man. What the Apostle says is, that no man can make this acknowledgment, but by the Holy Ghost. This of course does not mean that no one can utter these words unless under special Divine influence; but it means that no one can truly believe and openly confess that Jesus is God manifest in the flesh, unless he is enlightened by the Spirit of God. This is precisely what our Lord Himself said when Peter confessed Him to be the Son of God. "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven," Matth. xvi. 17. HODGE].

VER. 4–7. He here enters upon the more definite exposition of his subject. After having presented a true test of a genuine utterance by the spirit, he points to the diversity of the spirit's operations, which yet converge to one end, even as they all have but one actuating principle. The advance in his argument, or perhaps, also, the contrast between the diversity he is about to speak of with the one fundamental characteristic mentioned in ver. 3, is denoted by a δέ.—**But there are distributions.**—By διαιρέσεις is meant either *distributions* (comp. διαιροῦν ver. 11) which would make this clause imply that one gift was imparted to one person, and another to another; or *distinctions, diversities* (comp. Rom. xii. 6, χαρίσματα διάφορα). Both renderings amount to about the same thing. The former, however, which ought to be preferred on account of ver. 11, involves the latter. [This expression is repeated three times in connection with three different classes of objects—χαρίσματα, διακονίαι, ἐνεργήματα, severally rendered *gifts, ministries, operations*]. But what are we to understand by these terms? Much the same thing? as though the Christian virtues, of which he speaks afterwards, were contemplated from three different points of view; first, as gifts of divine grace, as elements of the new life which, with all its varied capacities, is mediated by the indwelling Spirit of God; secondly, as ministries,—means or instruments by which one member contributes to the good of another; or, as Meyer says, wherewith Christ is served—"that same Lord to whom service is thus rendered,"—contrary to the analogy of the other clauses; thirdly, as effects in which the gifts manifest their efficiency? Or thus, that the second and third classes are subordinated to the first—"services" and "operations" being the two characteristic forms in which the "gifts" are exercised, and in which these exhibit themselves, *viz.*, as *services* in their relation to Christ, and as *operations* in relation to their effects, whether miraculous or not? (Meyer).—Or does the Apostle allude to various sorts of the Spirit's operations, such are afterwards particularly specified in ver. 8 ff.—so that by "gifts" we are to understand "the word of wisdom and of knowledge, prophecy, divers kinds of tongues," and the capabilities belonging thereto, and intended for instruction; and by "services," "the helps and governments," &c., appertaining to the management and polity of the church (ver. 28); and by "operations," the miraculous powers mentioned in ver. 10, and the faith of ver. 9, among which we find the gifts of healing reckoned, but which are expressly referred back to the first class of "gifts," showing by this very circumstance the arbitrariness of the interpretation? Since the first of these methods of construction has also its difficulties, and "ministries" cannot be included under the head of "gifts," another mode of interpretation and arrangement is required. The χαρίσματα, *gifts*, are qualifications or capabilities peculiar to Christianity (comp. on i. 7)—["Eminent endowments of individuals in and by which the Spirit dwelling in them manifested Himself:—and these either *directly bestowed* by the Holy Ghost Himself, as in the case of healing, miracles, tongues, and prophesying, or *previously granted* them by God in their unconverted state, and now *inspired, hallowed,* and *potentiated* for the work of building up the church, as in the case of teaching, exhortation, knowledge. Of all these gifts *faith working by love* was the necessary substratum or condition." ALFORD].—"And here we must distinguish between such gifts as are repeated throughout all time, and such as involved the supernatural also in form according to the peculiarity of the first century. Hence we see the erroneousness of Irving's stand-point by whom the restoration of all the gifts collectively was desired for the regeneration of the church, just as they existed in the apostolic period. But we, at any rate, will recognize in those gifts the types of such as shall exist always in the Christian church, only, indeed, in another form." NEANDER. The διακονίαι, **ministries**, are the manifold offices or functions in the church, (understood in their widest sense) in which these "gifts" were employed, and which indicate a division in the spheres of labor corresponding with these "gifts." ["These must not be narrowed to the *ecclesiastical orders*, but kept commensurate in extent with the gifts which are to find scope by these means, see vv. 7–10." ALFORD]. Finally the ἐνεργήματα, **operations** are the various effects resulting from the exercise of the "gifts" in these particular "ministries." ["These are not to be limited to *miraculous* effects, but understood commensurately with the gifts of whose working they are the results." ALFORD]. Very instructive is the reference of the first of these classes—the gifts—to the Spirit as the principle which reforms the inward man, and qualifies and disposes our na-

tural endowments for carrying forward the objects of God's kingdom, awakening, developing, and sanctifying them for their several uses—**but the same Spirit,**—sc., *ὁ διαιρῶν* comp. v. 11, *who distributes them as He will*;—and so also the reference of the various ministries or offices to Christ as the Head of the Church from whom its organization and regulation proceed (comp. Eph. iv. 11),—**but the same Lord,**—sc., *ὁ διαιρῶν, who appoints and assigns individuals to them as He will;* and not less that of the operations to the all-working God,—**but the same God.**—And He in consistency with the term "operations" (*ἐνεργήματα*) is represented as the **one who worketh** (*ὁ ἐνεργῶν*) **all things in all.**—This clause may be taken in its widest sense, as referring to God's activity in the universe; or it may be interpreted more restrictedly, in relation to the gifts and ministries above specified; or, which might be more correct, in relation solely to the operations spoken of in this clause; since God is the efficient cause of all the effects which are produced by those who, by virtue of the gifts of the Spirit, work in the various offices of the church. What is here affirmed of God is not in conflict with that asserted in ver. 24, where God is said to be the one who tempers the body together; since it is God who ordains and fixes all things, even what the Spirit inwardly works, and what Christ ordains in the church. Nor, in like manner does that which is said of Christ in Eph. iv. 7., that "grace is given to every one according to the measure of the gift of Christ," derogate from what is here ascribed to the Spirit. Christ is the one who commissions the Spirit (John xv. 26) and all the effects of the Spirit refer back to Him. ["Thus we have *God the Father*, the First Source and Operator of all spiritual influence in all; *God the Son*, the Ordainer in His Church, of all ministries by which this influence may be legitimately brought out for edification; *God the Holy Ghost*, dwelling and working in the Church, and effectuating in each man such measure of His gifts as He sees fit." Alford. "Once are these Three known thus solemnly to have met, at the creating of the world. Once again, at the Baptism of Christ, the new creating it. And here now the third time, at the Baptism of the Church with the Holy Ghost. Where, as the manner is at all baptisms, each bestoweth a several gift or largess on the party baptized, that is, on the church; for whom and for whose good all this dividing and all this manifesting is. Nay, for whom and for whose good the world itself was created, Christ Himself baptized, and the Holy Ghost visibly sent down." Wordsworth]. Having thus set forth the diversities and the one fixed ground of these gifts, he proceeds to point out the one chief end of the manifold operations of the Spirit.—**But to each one,**—*i. e.*, who is endowed. This stands first by way of emphasis. With this, again, the idea of diversified allotments is again taken up, but only as related to the unity of *purpose*. That which is given to each one He calls—**the manifestation of the Spirit,**—by which the unity of the actuating principle is again specified. But it is doubtful whether the Spirit is to be regarded as manifesting Himself, or as being manifested. The latter accords with the use of the word in 2 Cor. iv. 2, the only place where *φανέρωσις* elsewhere occurs in the New Testament. That in this way too much would be conceded to human self-activity, is a groundless objection, which is already set aside by the use of the verb "*is given*," with which also the other construction better suits. What is meant is, that each one manifests the Spirit dwelling and working in him through the exercise of gifts. [Wordsworth unites both ideas. "These spiritual gifts are the *manifestations* of the Spirit actively, because by these the Spirit manifesteth the will of God unto the church, these being the instruments and means of conveying the knowledge of salvation unto the people of God. And they are the manifestations of the Spirit passively too; because where any of these gifts, especially in any eminent sort, appeared in any person, it was a manifest evidence that the Spirit of God wrought in him. As we read in Acts x. 45, 46, *They of the circumcision were astonished when they saw that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost.* If it be demanded. But how did that appear? It followeth in the next verse, *For they heard them speak with tongues, etc.* The spiritual gift, then, is a *manifestation* of the Spirit, as every other sensible effect is a manifestation of its proper cause"].—**for the common profit.**—*συμφέρον* denotes: the good of the Church, its edification. ["This is the common object of all these gifts. They are not designed exclusively or mainly for the benefit, much less for the gratification of their recipients; but for the good of the Church. Just as the power of vision is not for the benefit of the eye, but for the man. When, therefore, the gifts of God, natural or supernatural, are perverted as means of self-exaltation or aggrandizement, it is a sin against their giver, as well as against those for whose benefit they were intended."—Hodge]. *πρός* as in vii. 35.

Ver. 8–11. He here proceeds to unfold in detail what is said in ver. 7, appealing to facts as they existed in the Church. Hence the *γάρ*, which is explanatory.—**For to one indeed.**—In *ᾧ μέν* = *τῷ μέν* the old demonstrative use of *ὅς* appears (comp. *Passow.* II., p. 1545). In what follows the expressions denoting the various parties to whom the distribution has been made, occur interchangeably. We have *ἑτέρῳ δέ* and *ἀλλῳ δὲ*. Since the former indicates a stronger difference than the latter, there is a disposition to mark out the chief divisions according to these, so as to make three classes of gifts in the enumeration (see Meyer). [I. Gifts having reference to intellectual power: 1, the "word of wisdom;" 2, "the word of knowledge." II. Gifts conditioned on an exalted faith: 1, *faith* itself; 2, *practical* workings of faith—*viz.*: *a.* healings; *b.* powers; 3, *oral* working of the same—*viz.*: prophecy; 4, *critical* working of the same—*viz.*: the discernment of Spirits. III. Gifts having reference to tongues: 1, speaking with tongues; 2, interpretation of tongues*]. But shall we

[* The following classification following the distinction implied in *ἑτέρῳ* and *ἄλλῳ* is suggested by Dr. Henderson as tending to show the "beautiful symmetry" of the passage:
I. To one, the word of wisdom.
2. to another, the word of knowledge.
II. To another, faith.
1. to another, gifts of healing.
2. to another, working of miracles

assign prophecy and the discernment of spirits to that class of gifts which are conditioned on a heroic faith? This will hardly do. We will here state in advance our ideas of whether and how the classification can be made. First, we have two gifts evidently belonging together, or nearly related, *viz.*: "the word of wisdom" and "the word of knowledge."—Λόγος thus rendered "word" means lit. *discourse;* according to the sense here, *a capacity* for discoursing; and the words in connection denote the subject matter of discourse. But there is a difficulty in distinguishing between wisdom and knowledge. Certainly we cannot admit the view which takes λόγος σοφίας, the *discourse of wisdom*, as= to σοφία λόγου, *the wisdom of discourse*, i. 17, and which interprets λόγος γνώσεως as meaning knowledge communicated in the simplest style. Rather, we might take the distinction between these two to be that of theoretical and practical knowledge. But then it would be doubtful by which term the one and the other was denoted. Paul's usage declares for our taking γνώσις, *knowledge*, theoretically (in opposition to which the practical import is plainly to be assumed in 1 Peter iii. 7; 2 Pet. i. 5 f.); but σοφία, *wisdom*, can by no means be understood in a practical sense; in support of which only Col. iv. 5 may possibly be adduced, and also the adjective "wise" (σόφος) in Rom. xvi. 19; 1 Cor. iii. 10; Eph. v. 15. According to Meyer, σοφία denotes the higher Christian wisdom in and for itself, which is not to cease, even at the coming of our Lord; while γνώσις (xiii. 8), *knowledge*, denotes a speculative insight into truths, their philosophical exposition through the processes of the intellect. According to Osiander, "wisdom" is the apprehension of Divine truth in its totality—of the aims and purposes of God, of the plans and operations of salvation, of the entire scheme of redemption in its inward connection as a well organized Divine system; but "knowledge" is the clear apprehension of particular things Divinely imparted through an inward appropriation and experimental acquaintance (comp. John vi. 69; xvii. 3; Phil. iii. 8)—the former being rather the objective, extensive, all-comprehensive form of knowledge, the latter the subjective, intensive, and special form. Adhering now essentially to both these interpretations, we take "wisdom" to denote the direct intuition into Divine mysteries, and "knowledge" as that kind of apprehension which is gained by reflection, and which therefore belongs only to the present dispensation. [So substantially Hodge and Alford. "According to Neander, 'wisdom' is the *skill* which is able to reduce the whole *practical* Christian life into its due order, in accordance with its foundation principles (see *Plant. and Train.*, p. 444, 445); 'knowledge,' the *theoretical insight* into Divine things; and similarly Olsh. and Billroth. But Bengel, *et al.*, take them conversely—'knowledge' for the practical, 'wisdom' for the theoretical. Both, as de Wette remarks, have their grounds in usage. 'Wisdom' is practical, Col. i. 9, as is 'knowledge' in Rom. xv. 14, but they are *theoretical* respectively in ch. i. 17 ff. and viii. 1 Estius explains 'the discourse of wisdom,' *gratiam de iis quæ ad doctrinam religionis ac pietatis spectant disserendi ex causis supremis*,—as ch. ii. 6 f.;—and 'the word of knowledge,' he says, '*gratia est disserendi de rebus Christianæ religionis, ex iis quæ sunt humanæ scientiæ vel experientiæ.*" ALFORD].—**To another**—ἑτέρῳ δέ—**faith.**—Not that faith which receives salvation in Christ, *i. e.*, justifying faith, but a strong confidence in the Divine omnipotence, or in the power of Christ, as able to make itself manifest in extraordinary deeds, or to afford and insure help of a supernatural kind; or, in other words, a confidence which shall enable a man to perform these deeds or to afford this help (comp. xiii. 2; Matth. xvii. 20; xxi. 21). Osiander says, "the *fides miraculosa*, which could display itself in fervent, effectual prayer, also in extraordinary joyfulness and confidence amid dangers and sufferings, or in readiness to undergo the same. Bengel defines it as "a very earnest and most present apprehension of God, chiefly in His will as to the effects particularly conspicuous either in the kingdom of nature or of grace." [Alford says, "a faith enabling a man to place himself beyond the region of mere moral certainty, in the actual realization of things believed, in a high and unusual manner." HODGE: "A higher measure of the ordinary grace of faith. Such a faith as enabled men to become confessors and martyrs, and which is so fully illustrated in Heb. xi. 33–40. This is something as truly wonderful as the gift of miracles"].—**To another**—ἄλλῳ δέ—**the gifts of healings**,—*i. e.*, for healing divers diseases, hence the plural ἰαμάτων, *of healings*. In one a capacity for healing one class of diseases, and in another for healing another class, by word and prayer, and the laying on of hands (comp. Mark xvi. 18; Acts iv. 18, ἐν).—**and to another**—ἄλλῳ δέ—**the workings of miracles.**—[ἐνεργήματα, a passive noun, which, if construed strictly, would denote the things wrought by miraculous power; Hodge translates the clause, *effects which are miraculous*, and here the effect is put for the cause, *viz.*, the ability to work miracles]. The miracles here are of a still different kind from those of healing, such as the expulsion of devils, raising the dead, and, according to Calvin and others, judicial inflictions also, as in Acts v. 5, 9; according to Olshausen, operations as in Mark xvi. 18: Acts xxviii. 5 [the safe handling of serpents and deadly things]. Meyer understands it of miraculous effects of all kinds (comp. Acts iv. 30), and not simply healings. How a speculative rationalism interprets these charisms or gifts, may be seen from Dr. Baur's *Paulus*, p. 559 f. "Faith," he explains as a peculiarly strong trust in Providence; "*gifts of healing*" mean no more than the ability to pray with peculiar power and earnestness in behalf of the sick, with more or less assurance of their recovery, if they please God;

3. to another, prophecy.
4. to another, discerning of spirits.

III. To another, divers kinds of tongues.
2. to another, interpretation of tongues.

Thus the first class includes "the word of wisdom" and "the word of knowledge." Under the head of *faith*—that is, the faith of miracles—four kinds of gifts are enumerated: "gifts of healing," "working of miracles," "prophecy," and "discerning of spirits;" while the *third* class includes "divers kinds of tongues," and "the interpretation of tongues." See HENDERSON on *Inspiration*, pp. 185–187].

and the "operations of miracles," are the proofs of extraordinary strength of soul and vital power in respect to the deeper things of Christianity. The relation of these three charisms to the Spirit is expressed by three different prepositions: διά, *through*; κατά, *according to*; ἐν, *in*. The phrase — *through the Spirit* — then designates the Spirit as the power which mediates the Divine bestowments,—**according to the same spirit**—as the power which disposes and regulates them,—**in the same spirit**—as the power in which the charism is founded.—Distinct from these three charisms are the two following,—**and to another prophecy, and to another discerning of spirits**,—the latter corresponding with the former. These cannot in any case be referred, as by Meyer, to a heroic faith; for the prophecy alluded to in Rom. xii. 6, "whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the analogy of faith," is of a different sort. Prophecy here (comp. xi. 3) means the announcement of things hidden by means of a Divine revelation or inspiration—in other words, the ability obtained by the illumination of the Spirit, or through the opening of the spiritual vision by Him, to unfold the onward progress of the kingdom of God,—especially its future developments, or even to open up the mysteries of the inner and outer life. The inspiration in this case is not a blind rhapsodic excitement, but one united with a clear self-consciousness and the free exercise of the faculties (comp. xiv. 32 f.); and the discourse is carried on in an exalted and earnest, yet perfectly intelligible strain. By the side of this enlightening (xiv. 24), awakening, invigorating, inspiring operation of the Spirit, there stands a judicial and critical power, "discerning of Spirits," *i. e.*, an ability to distinguish true prophecy from the false, in the same or in different subjects,—to discern between the pure inspiration of the divine Spirit and the impure excitements either of the natural man or of demoniac agencies—an ability which includes in itself a susceptibility for prophecy and an ability to enter into prophetic ecstasy. The demand for such discrimination is indicated in 1 Thess. v. 21; 1 John iv. 1. "[It appears, especially from the epistles of the Apostle John that pretenders to inspiration were numerous in the apostolic age. He therefore exhorts his readers, "to try the Spirits, whether they be of God; for many false prophets are gone out into the world." It was therefore of importance to have a class of men with the gift of discernment, who could determine whether a man was really inspired, or spoke only either from the impulse of his own mind or from the dictation of some evil Spirit." Hodge]. The plural "spirits" is to be referred either to different agencies at work in prophecy, *viz.*, the divine, the human, the demonic; or to the manifold operations of the Spirit and by metonymy, to those inspired by the Spirit. The correct interpretation is problematical. The enumeration concludes,—**and to another, divers kinds of tongues and to another the interpretation of tongues.**—By γένη, *kinds*, he indicates the diversity there was in the tongues—a diversity of race, family, species and modes. But what is meant by the word "tongues" (γλῶσσαι) is much disputed. I. The older exposition proceeds from the definition *language*, and appeals for support to the promise of Christ, Mark xvi. 17 "they shall speak with new tongues" and to the miracle of Pentecost recorded in Acts ii. It understands this gift to be an ability to speak in various unacquired foreign languages under the influence of the Spirit which for the moment dissolved all bounds of language, and transported the subjects of it into a state of ecstasy, thereby symbolizing the universality of the Gospel. This view later commentators have modified; some explaining the circumstance to be a speaking or worshipping in acquired languages, falsely regarded as a charism (Fritzsche); and others asserting that by the power of the Spirit these Christians had been qualified to speak in the original language—a language which contained the elements or rudiments of the various historical languages, and was the type of the broad general character of Christianity (Bilroth).—Others, who reject the older interpretation as not well sustained, partly because of the impossibility of the thing itself, or at least because it was wholly uncalled for by the circumstances of the Corinthians, and partly because irreconcilable with the various expressions and statements of our paragraph (comp. on chap. xiv.), have abandoned the meaning *language*, on the assumption either that the phenomenon at Pentecost was different in kind from that here spoken of [that being evidently a speaking in foreign languages, intelligible to the hearers, while this needed interpretation], or that the account in Acts [being much later than our epistle] was a perverted tradition of the original facts. But these interpreters themselves start from different significations of the word in question. II. Some take it to mean *glosses*, *i. e.*, highly poetic words and forms that are obsolete or provincial, [(a sense in which the term is used by the Greek grammarians; see Arist. *Rhet.* iii. 2. § 14)] (Bleek); or, uncommon and striking expressions, differing from common usage and partly taken from foreign languages, employed to assist the utterance of the Spirit which was struggling for expression under the stress of overflowing feelings (Baur) — an interpretation which is certainly foreign to the New Testament, and which in particular passages is fraught with great difficulties. III. Others, hold fast to the other fundamental meaning of the term, *viz.*, *tongue as the organ of speech*. In their view the gift implied the special use of this organ for expression, 1. either in its cruder form, as the babbling of inarticulate tones [where the tongue moved and not the lips] (Eichhorn and others); or 2. as an ecstatic speaking in low, scarcely audible, inarticulate words, tones, sounds, whereby the inspired Spirit gave vent to itself (Wieseler)—a view which is decisively opposed by chap. xiv. 16; or 3. as an act of worship by means of ecstatic exclamations, and snatches of hymns of praise and other outbursts of prayer, where the tongue no longer served as an organ of conscious intelligence, but moved independently and involuntarily under the impulse of the Spirit (Dr. Schultz, de Wette, Meyer and others); or 4. as an inspired utterance in which the conscious intellect was held in abeyance and the spirit of the worshipper overpowered and ravished by the

might of the Spirit, gushed forth in words and sentences involuntarily forced upon him, which were unintelligible to those of his hearers who were not possessed of the same inspiration. We shall revert to this point hereafter, [see chap. xiv.]. Since this speaking with tongues was unintelligible to the congregation, it was necessarily supplemented by another gift, *viz.*, "the interpretation of tongues." This was the ability to translate this unintelligible utterance into a language known to all, and so to explain its meaning—an ability which implied the power of bringing the understanding (*νοῦς*) to bear upon the meaning of the things wrought by the Spirit, and thus to consciously apprehend them. This charism belonged either to the person himself who spoke with tongues (comp. xiv. 5, 13), or, as one passage intimates, to a distinct class.

Having thus enumerated the several gifts, he once more refers in ver. 11 to the one original principle from which they proceeded, the oneness of which is brought out emphatically in the expression "the one and the same."—**All these things works one and the same Spirit.**—What he asserted of God in ver. 6, he here ascribes to the Spirit,—*ἐνεργεῖ, he works*, so that the Spirit here appears as a creative power—as the Spirit of God working divinely. As in this verb we have the import of the prepositions "in" and "through" (vv. 9 and 8) again brought out, so that of the other preposition "according to," ver. 8, is again resumed in the participial clause,—**distributing**, *etc.*—The Spirit is here represented as a voluntary regulating power, in terms which show Him to be not a blind energy, but a self-conscious, intelligent agent.—**As he wills**—not arbitrarily, but, in perfect consistency with classic usage, according to a rational and discriminating self-determination which decides its action upon the grounds and purposes of a divine wisdom and love.—**to each one severally**,—in so far as He imparts to each one something special, so that each one has a charism of his own by which he is distinguished from others with their endowments. This is in accordance with that principle of individualization which pervades the whole economy of creation. The divine idea pours itself forth in a rich variety of forms which again combine to supplement each other in the exercise of that same divine love which ruled in their creation. This is what the apostle further sets forth in an instructive analogy, whereby it would seem he aimed to counteract alike the disparagement as well as the overestimate of particular gifts—shall we add also, the misapprehension of the divine principle therein? At any rate there is no argument here against referring the gifts to a variety of originating causes or principles (Mosheim).

VER. 12, 13. He here proceeds to explain or confirm what is stated in ver. 11. The unity of the in-working Spirit in the variety of His gifts to the Church corresponds to the unity of the Church itself in the variety of its members as typified in our physical organization.* [This thought is again further developed in ver. 14, so as to exhibit the organic character of the spiritual gifts, and their supplementary connection with each other. First, the organic unity of the church is likened to that of the body, showing that the unity is one which does not exclude diversity, and, on the other hand, diversity as not conflicting with unity.—**For as the body is one, and yet.**—By reason of the contrast between the one and the many the *καί* should be rendered, *and yet*,—**has many members, and all members of the body.**—The word "body" is here repeated by way of emphasis, in order to indicate in advance the unity of the members amid the plurality,—**(although) being many**—*πολλὰ ὄντα*—is to be translated concessively,—**are one body.**—Short and pregnant is the concluding clause,—**so also is Christ**,—not Christ in His distinctive personality, but as including the church in Himself as His living organism. As Augustine says, *totus Christus caput et corpus est.* "The whole Christ includes both head and body." "What the state is in its own sphere as a moral person possessed of corporate rights, that the church is in its sphere; and the name of its collective personality is Christ." W. F. BESSER. "In the view of the Apostle, Christ is the archetype of a new and glorified humanity as it is developed in the church. Hence the development of the Christian Church is nothing less than the progressive development of the image of Christ." NEANDER. (Comp. Eph. i. 23; v. 30). That here the plurality constitutes a unity is exhibited by a reference to the facts by which a church-life is constituted. The first and foremost of these is baptism (comp. Eph. iv. 5)—a transaction which involves also the dispensation of the Spirit. (Comp. John i. 33; iii. 5; Tit. iii. 5).—**for also.**—The *καί* belongs either to the whole clause, or to the words immediately

[* The proper definition of an organism is, a whole consisting of parts which exist and work each for all and all for each; in other words which are reciprocally related as means and end. But such a constitution can only be effected by the creative power of some vital principle working from within in accordance with its own specific law or norm. This it is which assimilates the material of which the organism is composed into one substance, preserves its identity amid all changes of form, and its unity through all diversity, and establishes and maintains the reciprocal action of the parts combining them in a sympathetic relation, and making them tributary both to the well-being of each other severally, and of the whole. In this respect an organism is essentially differenced from mechanism, which is something fashioned and put together by a power operating from without.

Now, since it is of the nature of all life to organize, there exists a striking analogy between all true organizations; and one serves well to illustrate another. The figure, therefore, which runs throughout this chapter, rests on an essential analogy. The life of nature as operating in that most perfect of organisms, the human form very properly typifies the working of the Spirit of life in constituting the body of Christ, which is His Church. As might be expected, however, the latter organization, in proportion as it is higher, is more complex and far richer in its combinations and results. It is not for this reason any the less a real body, and all that may be asserted of the former holds literally good of the latter. The main difference lies in the nature of the vital principle which assimilates, shapes, and joins together the Church of God The Spirit of life here is a Spirit of love, yea, is love itself, and the law which regulates its operations is the divine Word. He who *lives* in the Spirit *loves*;—The two words are no less identical in their root, than are the things which they describe. And love is from its very nature organic. It binds persons together in one vital communion; and being an intelligent principle, it binds them together according to their distinctive qualities and gifts for the same holy end. Thus does it constitute the body of Christ,—one complex and glorious whole, countlessly diversified in its membership, yet fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, and growing up into Him in all things which is the Head, even Christ].

following, *q. d.*, 'the union is not simply by external bonds, but also through the Spirit.' (Meyer).—**in one Spirit have we all been baptized.**—The Spirit is here represented as the element into which the baptized have been transferred, and in which as the result of their baptism they ever after live and move (Acts ii. 38; xix. 5, 6).—A further consequence of this is the formation of one body;—**into one body**—*i. e.*, 'so as to become one body;' or, 'in order to become one body;' thus stating the object for which the Spirit wrought in it. The latter is to be preferred as the simpler form.—**whether Jews or Greeks, bond or free.**—Here the strongest contrasts of national, religious, and social life are specially mentioned as illustrating the mighty unific power of the Spirit in abolishing them.—"The higher unity designated is an all comprehensive one. It does not destroy the distinctions of race and condition, but it assigns to them a suitable order, and overcomes them in their sharp and selfish antagonisms. Jews and Greeks are to remain Jews and Greeks, yet they are to subordinate their national peculiarities to a higher Christian unity." NEANDER.—**and we all were made to drink one Spirit.**—[ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν, for the construction of the acc., with a passive verb, see JELF. § 545, 3, or WINER, P. III., § 32, 3; for the omission of the *εἰς into*, see critical notes]. This statement is parallel to the former. Accordingly some think they discover here a reference to the mystery of the Holy Supper as associated with baptism, [and helping to blend believers into one body], (comp. x. 4; xi. 2). This reference is to be recognized in the reading εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα and ἓν πόμα. The objections to this are: 1, the preterite ἐποτίσθημεν *were made to drink*, [which denotes a past event],—and cannot be regarded as the aorist of custom, since it must be taken analogously with ἐβαπτίσθημεν, *were baptized;* (so Billroth, Olsh. [Hodge]). 2, the contents of the clause itself; since nowhere else do we read of the Lord's Supper, and still less of the drinking of the cup, as a means of partaking of one Spirit:—But if a union with Christ is effected in the Supper, and if the communion of His bodily life offered up for us cannot be separated from the communion of His divine life, then must there be in it also an imparting of the Spirit as in baptism; and, moreover, since the Spirit is exhibited to us under the figure of a flowing stream, *e. g.*, 'the outpouring of the Spirit,' Acts ii.; 'the living water which Christ gives,' John vii. 37, ff. (comp. iv. 14) it was natural that Paul should select this part of the supper, and not the eating of the bread as specially indicating our participation in the Spirit. If this explanation holds, we must then suppose the aorist ἐποτίσθημεν to have been used in conformity with the parallel ἐβαπτίσθημεν, and because he was speaking of the participation in the Spirit not as a continuous act, but as something which, together with baptism, had already served to found the collective life of the church. Both are completed facts, by means of which the union of the church has been constituted in the Spirit. And here we may also distinguish between the operation of the Spirit laying the foundation of the work in baptism, and the intimate appropriation of the Spirit through the supper (comp. Osiander). If we reject the idea of an allusion to the supper, then we either lose the parallelism with the verb "were baptized," or we must surrender also the idea of any allusion to the rite of baptism even here, and explain it simply of the copious effusion of the Spirit.* But, at any rate, it is strange that after he had spoken of the one Spirit as that on which our being baptized into one body is founded he should again so emphatically speak of participating in the same (as Meyer: "The reception of the one Spirit in baptism is once more emphatically expressed"). "It is clear from this passage that Paul considers the unity of the church not as something formed from without, but as fashioned from within." NEANDER.

VER. 14–26. The proposition that the unity of organization includes, rather than excludes, a plurality of membership, is next carried out in relation to the human body, and that too in a way to suggest practical instructions in respect to the organization of spiritual gifts in the church. The first lesson is a dissuasive against discontent on account of the smallness of the gift, and against a consequent disposition to withdraw from the church either in jealousy or in self-disparagement, as though persons so feebly endowed could do nothing towards integrating the body. The several members are here introduced as holding colloquy to this effect in a highly dramatic style. Something like this is to be found in the apology of MENENIUS AGRIPPA; *Livy*, II., § p. 32.—**For the body is not one member, but many.**—["The word 'member' means a constituent part, having a function of its own. It is not merely a multiplicity of parts that is necessary to the body; nor a multiplicity of persons that is necessary to the church; but, in both cases, what is required is a multiplicity of members in the sense just stated. No one of these is complete in itself. Each represents something that is not so well represented in the others. Each has its own function to exercise, and work to perform, which could not so well be accomplished without it. It is only when the hand undertakes to turn the foot out of the body that the foot is bound in self-defence, and for the good of the whole, to defend its rights." Hodge].—**If the foot shall say, Because I am not a hand, I am not of the body; it is not therefore not of the body.** The final clause οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐστιν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος, may be either taken as a question [Alford, Hodge]; in which case the double negative would be equivalent to a single one, [WINER §

[* So Hodge, who argues strenuously against supposing any allusion in this passage to either of the sacraments. And it must be confessed that the thought of such an allusion does not readily occur to the mind of a common reader. Scripture abounds in such figures as are here used without any possible reference either to the rite of baptism, or, of the Lord's supper (comp., Matth. iii. 2; John i. 33; John vii. 37). Yet the fact must be noted that the great body of ancient and early modern commentators, *e. g.*, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Henry, Scott, interpret as Kling does, and all later ones of Sacramentarian proclivities like Wordsworth. Alford maintains an allusion to baptism only, in both the expressions in accordance with Chrys. Theoph. Bengel, Rückert, de Wette, Meyer, and others; while Barnes denies this, or maintains only the allusion to the supper in the second. The case hardly admits of being decided by argument, and will continue to be determined in accordance with the feelings and original preferences of different individuals. See SCHLEUSNER'S *Lex.* II., p. 671].

59, 8 b.], and this would indeed be a more lively way of constructing the sentence; but whether grammatically allowable is doubtful. Or it may be taken as an affirmative clause, in which case, then, the *οὐκ ἐστιν* would form a distinct idea: 'it is not on that account not of the body.' [So Stanley, Lachm., Billr., Rück.].—*παρὰ τοῦτο* [instead of the more common *διὰ τοῦτο*] *on this account*, or more literally, 'alongside of this.' [Jelf. *Greek Gr.*, § 637, III. 3, *d.*]—**If the ear shall say because I am not the eye, I am not of the body, it is not therefore not of the body.**—As in comparison with the foot the hand is the nobler member, so is the eye in comparison with the ear. It is the hegemonical (*ἡγεμόνικον*) or directing part of the body. The hand and foot denote the higher and lower gifts of service; the eye and the ear, the intellectual gifts. Particular explanations here are in any case questionable. ["The obvious duty here inculcated is that of contentment. It is just as unreasonable and absurd for the foot to complain that it is not the hand, as for one member of the church to complain that he is not another; that is, for a teacher to complain that he is not an apostle; or for a deaconess to complain that she is not a presbyter; or for one who had the gift of healing to complain that he had not the gift of tongues. This, as the Apostle shows, would destroy the very idea of the church." Hodge]. That this undervaluation of the lesser gifts, and this excessive or exclusive estimate of the more notable gifts was altogether improper, is next shown from the fact that were the latter to exist alone, the body of Christ would lack some of its most essential functions.—**If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling?** A gradation is here observed from the higher to the lower. In the terms "hearing" and "smelling" the organs are designated according to their functions; [or perhaps we might better say the functions are specified in order to set forth the importance of the organ through which they are performed. "The application of this idea to the church is plain. It also requires for its existence a diversity of gifts and offices. If all were apostles, where would be the Church?" or where the diaconate, or where the eldership?] In contrast with the condition of things arising from this one-sided estimate of particular gifts he next exhibits the nature of a true organization as ordained by God.—**But now,**—*i. e.*, as the case actually stands,—**God set**—*ἔθετο*, not 'made,' but *set, i. e.*, gave them a position, and a destination in accordance with it. The divine purpose here presents a silent contrast to the proud and selfish views and wishes of men as being one of perfect love and wisdom.—**the members each one of them,**—the latter expression is added in order to cut off all thought of exception in any particular.—**in the body, as it hath pleased him.**—[*i. e.*, it is not man's fancy that here rules, but the will of Him whose wisdom and right are unquestionable. In rebelling therefore against our place and appointment we are virtually rebelling against the Creator and rightful Disposer of all things].—**And if they were all one member, where were the body?**—The exclusive maintenance of one organ virtually destroys the whole organism; [and this naturally reacts to the prejudice of the organ itself: for where is the use or even the dignity of the organ without the body to which it is attached?]—**But now are they indeed many members, but one body.**—This is the character of all proper organization—plurality in unity.—He next in ver. 21 rebukes the pride of the more highly gifted, and refutes their vain conceit of the dispensableness of the lesser gifts to them.—**and the eye cannot.**—*οὐ δύναται*, not "may not," but absolutely *cannot*, because the hand is really indispensable to the eye,—**say to the hand, I have no need of thee: nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you.**—[He here exhibits "the mutual dependence of the members of the Church. The most gifted are as much dependent on those less favored as the latter are on the former. Pride, therefore, is as much out of place in the Church as discontent." Hodge]. In contrast with the negative he next sets forth the positive side of the fact.—**Nay, much more, those members of the body, which seem to be weaker, are necessary**:—The adverbial phrase "much more" does not belong to the adjective "necessary," *q. d.*, 'much more necessary,' as this would involve an unsuitable thought; but to the whole clause, and carries the logical sense of *far rather*. The specific class of members here alluded to it is neither possible nor necessary to decide upon. ["They are best left undefined, as the Apostle has left them." Stanley]. He certainly cannot mean the eye or the head, because of what is said in ver. 21; neither could he intend to term the hands and the feet as seemingly weaker than the eye or the head. Other suppositions, such as that the brain and vitals were here alluded to [Hodge], are wholly uncertain; [at least, they are not naturally suggested]. To translate *ἀσθενέστερα* by *smaller*, is unwarrantable. [Alford understands by the phrase in question, "those members which in each man's case appear to be the *inheritors of disease*, or to have incurred weakness. By *this very fact* their *necessity to Him* is brought out much more than that of the others." But whatever may have been the specific thing had in view by the Apostle, the lesson is plain. The very weakliest in the Church—whether it be in body, mind, or estate—have their use, and are not to be despised or overlooked. The sick, if they cannot work, can pray. The poor are needful to the eliciting of charity. And the children, however helpless, cannot be spared from the fold, for they are the hope of the future].—**and those members which we think to be more dishonorable.**—It would be natural here to think of the arms, feet, and ears which people are wont to adorn with all kinds of ornaments. [But is there not an emphasis laid on the expression 'we think,' and a force in the term *ἀτιμότερα*, which point to other parts of the body which sin only has associated with a sense of shame, and which we are therefore more careful to honor by concealment?]—**on them we bestow the more abundant honor,**—*i. e.*, by means of clothing or adornment. ["It is observed by Raphelius that *τιμὴν περιτιθέναι*

signifies in general *to give honor;* but in this passage by a metonymy, *to cover over with a garment* that which, if seen, would have a disagreeable and unseemly appearance, and this is a kind of honor put upon them"]. The word *περιτιθέναι* often denotes dress (Matt. xxvii. 28; Gen. xxvii. 16ff. ["by which passage *τίμην* may possibly have been suggested since it is here used by the LXX. for a covering of eyes." STANLEY]). — **and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness.**—What are here meant cannot be doubted. [If the second explanation given above be the true one, we have here simply an expansion of the statement just preceding]. Our uncomely parts receive a more decorous regard than the other members, inasmuch as they are more carefully clothed as a matter of propriety. With all this he gives us to understand that the lesser gifts in the Church are not to be lightly esteemed and neglected; but should be treated with the greater consideration and care, because they are indispensable to the whole body, and the honor of the Church depends no less on the proper care of these than does the honor of the body upon the adorning of the less honorable, or the veiling of the uncomely members. ["It is an instinct of grace to honor most those members of the Church who least attract admiration." HODGE]. By way of completeness he adds,—**For our comely parts have no need**:—*i. e.*, to have such care bestowed on them. [They are in fact in a measure neglected. The face goes uncovered, the hands and often the feet are left bare, because their exposure involves no disgrace].—**But God hath tempered the body together,**—There are two constructions here: 1. That of Lachmann and Meyer, who take this clause as directly antithetic to what precedes, and put only a comma after *ἐχει*. In this case *ἡμῶν* would be dependent on *οὐ χρείαν ἐχει*, and stand in contrast with *ὁ θέος*, so as to read: 'our uncomely parts have no need of us; but God hath,' *etc.* Such a construction, however, would not conform to the analogy of *τὰ ἀσχήμονα ἡμῶν* [and it is rejected by Alford, Stanley, and Wordsworth.] Or 2., which is preferable, a period may be put after *ἐχει*, and the clause may be regarded as a more comprehensive statement of the relation of the members to each other in their higher destination and composition, in contrast with the view previously taken of them separately, and presenting the whole from a teleological stand-point. Ἀλλὰ, *but*, would then have a strongly adversative meaning.—[In his reference to the work of "God" he takes us back to the original creation of man, and points to the primitive constitution of things]. Συνεκέρασεν indicates such a mutual adjustment of the parts in the body as shall counterbalance differences, so that one part shall qualify another. So *κεράννυμι* is used to denote a tempering of parts by mixture; then, a pleasant harmonizing of contrasts bringing out from them an agreeable manifoldness and interchange, (compare Passow I. 2, p. 1707).—By way of more exact definition he adds, — **having given more abundant honor to that which lacked.**—*i. e.*, by making the uncomely parts essential to the well-being of the rest, and by diffusing a common life to all the members, so as to bring them into close sympathy one with another, and awaken in each an interest for all according to their several characters and conditions.—The object of this is next stated.—**in order that there may be no schism in the body;**—*i. e.*, through the neglect of the inferior members on the part of the superior ones; or by the separation of the subordinate ones from the ruling members, because of their not receiving that consideration and care which is due to them as members of one body. There is an allusion here to the schisms in the Corinthian Church, whose influence was felt also in the matter of the gifts in so far as they served to undermine or weaken the common fellowship.—**but that the members should care one for another.**—The use of the plural *μεριμνῶσιν* after a neut. plural nominative, is owing to the fact of his having personified the members.—*The same,* *τὸ αὐτό*, *i. e.*, in a harmony that is opposed to all schism by virtue of which each member has the same interest in charge, *viz.*, the well being of all the rest. This thought is expressed still further by setting forth the mutual participation of all in the good or bad condition of the others severally, (comp. Rom. xii. 15).—**And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it;**—The verbs here fall away from their dependence on *ἵνα*, so as to indicate that the divine purpose before spoken of has already been realized. The conjunction "and" joins this lightly and yet closely to the final clauses, and to the main verb preceding, as a consequence resulting of itself, or establishing the truth of the case. The sympathy here spoken of implies not merely a common sense of the injury inflicted upon any one, but also an active effort to abate the pain and remove the cause. In this way the care, which one should take for the other, is properly carried out. — **or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it.**—The honor here may be that which is conferred by apparel and ornament, and the like, as well as by the recognition of the beauty, strength, or utility thus obtained, on the part of the others (Meyer).—The 'rejoicing' is that satisfaction and sense of common well-being which arises by virtue of the organic connection between the members. But from this it does not follow that *δοξάζεσθαι* is=*bene et feliciter haberi*, "to be in prosperity and happiness" [CALVIN]. Rather we might here suppose him to mean that fine development which ensues as the result of human care and divine providence (Osiander). On the whole, however, we had better abide by the common interpretation which well suits the personification employed, and the more so, because he is just passing over to the practical application. The Romish expositors with great impropriety deduce from the expression 'rejoice with' the doctrine of an overflow of merit from the saints upon the rest of the Church.—It is obvious from what has been said that Paul here meant to mortify the pride of the Corinthians who boasted of their more noted gifts, and did not take to heart the welfare or the suffering of the Church and its members.

VERS. 27, 28. He goes on to apply what has been said concerning the human body to his

readers as a church of Christ, composed of individual members.—**Now ye are the body of Christ**—σῶμα χριστοῦ, not *a* body of Christ, as though the churches were severally regarded as distinct bodies of Christ; rather each church is taken to represent the body of Christ, *i. e.*, the whole of Christendom. Analogous to νάος θεοῦ, iii. 6 [see WINER, § XIX., 2 *b.*]. The figure of the church as Christ's body frequently occurs, Eph. i. 23; ii. 16; iv. 4, 12, 16; v. 23, 30; comp. Col. i. 18, 24; ii. 19; iii. 15. Of this body Christ is the ruling and quickening Head.—**and members in particular.**—This he adds to distinguish the individuals from the whole church collectively; since they, in their several capacities only, could be regarded as members. The expression ἐκ μέρους may be rendered either *individually in particular*, as elsewhere κατὰ μέρος and ἐπὶ μέρους; or, as a more exact qualification, *proportionately*, according to the share which each one has in the body of Christ, according to his place and function in the collective organism (Meyer and Osiander). The former rendering is obviously the more correct. To explain this clause of local churches as parts of the whole church, or of those more spiritually endowed, as if they exclusively were members of the church, is altogether untenable. This general application is now unfolded in detail. Passing from the simple division expressed by οὓς μὲν to a statement of orders in their several gradations; hence no οὓς δέ follows (as in Eph. iv. 11).—**And some God set in the church**—*i. e.*, the church as a whole, because of the mention of Apostles who were preëminent over the whole body.—**first apostles**—being possessed of the fulness of all gifts. These occupy the highest rank (comp. on i. 1). They include not merely the original twelve, but Paul also, who, in consequence of the direct calling of Christ, occupied the same position towards the churches converted from heathenism, which the others did towards the churches converted from the Jews. But whether Barnabas and the like are to be included also, is less certain. [These have no successors, not even in the bishops, who are supposed to be their spiritual lineage. "They were the immediate messengers of Christ, rendered infallible as teachers and rulers by the gift of plenary inspiration." HODGE]. Next follow those who are limited to particular gifts, and are only indirectly called—**secondly prophets, thirdly teachers.**—These are distinguished just as the gift of inspired utterance through a direct revelation (comp. on ver. 9) affording deeper glances into the spirit world, is distinguished from the acquired ability for calmly unfolding Christian truth and furthering its comprehension. While, as a general rule, the *prophets* (as well as the evangelists, Eph. iv. 11) occupy a more extended sphere of labor, standing in this respect more nearly to the Apostles (comp. Acts xv. 32), the teachers usually discharged their functions in particular churches (Eph. iv. 11). We find the two classes also associated in Acts xiii. 1; but here those are included under the term teachers, who were called to a more comprehensive range of duty. Out of the above mentioned gifts the teacher possessed preëminently "the word of knowledge."—From the concrete he next passes over into the abstract, designating not persons, but offices (reversing Rom. xii. 6 ff.); not because there was a lack of concrete terms, but for the sake of change. NEANDER says, however: "because the gifts he proceeds to enumerate were not so definitely and continuously connected with certain persons," ["but were granted promiscuously to all orders in the church." ALFORD].—**after that miracles,**—sc. ἔθετο in the sense of ἔδωκεν, *gave.*—**after that gifts of healings,**—See on ver. 9.—**helps, governments,**—The mention of these supplements and fills out the catalogue of ver. 8 ff. The things themselves belong to the more practical departments of church life. The former (comp. 2 Macc. viii. 19; Sir. xi. 12, and the verb Luke i. 54; Acts xx. 35) denotes such assistance as is rendered by the diaconate for the relief of the poor and sick, *etc.;* and the second, the functions of church administration and polity as discharged by elders, bishops, pastors, rulers, presidents, or moderators. To refer the former to the higher department of government, because it stands first [as Stanley does, who says: "ἀντιλήψις, as used in the LXX., is not (like διακονία) help ministered by an inferior to a superior, but by a superior to an inferior (see Ps. lxxxix. 18; Eccles. xi. 12; li. 7)"], comports neither with the meaning of the word, nor with the circumstances of the primitive church; besides, the order of rank was given up, when the employment of abstract terms began.—**lastly divers kinds of tongues.**—This is mentioned last, not for the purpose of assigning the overestimated gift to the lowest place; for, as just said, the order of rank is not strictly followed in the enumeration; but rather because of its singularity (Meyer), or because he has to deal with this especially in his subsequent exposition (Osiander).—He passes over the gifts of 'interpretation of tongues' and 'discernment of spirits,' but mentions them again in ver. 30, where, however, 'helps and governments' are omitted. Were it desirable now to classify the gifts and offices specified in this chapter, we might arrange them thus: 1. The gifts of knowledge, of word and of doctrine, *viz.*, "the word of wisdom," "the word of knowledge," "teachers," "prophets," and "the discerning of spirits;" 2. Gifts of power and deed, *viz.*, "miracles" and "healings," with their root, "faith;" 3. Gifts of practical life, *viz.*, "helps" and "governments;" 4. Gifts of ecstatic inspiration and utterance, *viz.*, "divers kinds of tongues" supplemented by "the interpretation of tongues." We might perhaps put under the same head "prophecy" and "speaking with tongues," together with the gifts belonging to these, *viz.*, gifts of direct inspiration manifesting itself, partly with a clear self-consciousness, as in prophecy, supplemented with the power of discernment for its eclaircissement and the maintenance of its purity; and partly, in ecstasy with unintelligible utterance, *i. e.*, speaking with tongues, supplemented with interpretation for the purpose of church edification, and so for the attainment of the great end for which all gifts were given—the general profit. To reckon the Apostles among the first class (Meyer), is hardly fit, since, in accordance with their high comprehensive position in

the church, they embraced all the gifts in their possession. It must be affirmed, however, that more or less uncertainty must always attend this matter of classification, since there must have been a combination of different gifts oftentimes in the same person, *e. g.*, the word of wisdom and prophecy.*

VERS. 29–31. He continues his application, pronouncing still further against all exclusive regard for particular gifts; since it was impossible for all to have one alone, but diversity or distribution were necessary.—**Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all miracles?**—It is debated whether the last (*δυνάμεις*) is in the nominative or objective governed by *have* (*ἔχουσιν*) in the next clause, which, were this so, would occupy a remarkable place in the series of questions. If, however, it be nominative, it is the abstract term for the concrete—'workers of miracles' (comp. Acts viii. 10; Col. i. 16; Rom. viii. 38), just as we call men of great power, powers.—**do all speak with tongues? do all prophesy?** ["As in the body all is not eye, or all ear, so in the church all have not the same gifts and offices. These God distributes as He pleases; all are necessary and the recipients of them are mutually dependent. None must be discontented, none must boast." HODGE]. Next follows an exhortation.—**But**—*i. e.*, though all gifts have their value and are conferred by God, yet some are more valuable than others,—**be zealous for**—such can only be the meaning of the verb *ζηλοῦτε*, as in xiv. 1, 39.—**the better gifts,**—or according to another reading (see critical notes)—**the greater gifts.**—By these he means those best suited to the attainment of the object of all gifts (ver. 7). This is a remarkable injunction when viewed in the light of ver. 11, where the Spirit is said to "distribute unto each man severally as He will." To reconcile the seeming inconsistency some interpret the 'gifts' here to mean moral Christian virtues, such as faith and love, which ought to be sought by all; but this is contrary to the use of the word in this epistle, and also to the context and the exposition which follows. Others interpret *ζηλοῦτε* as denoting zeal in improvement of the gifts bestowed, contrary to xiv. 1, 39 (Joel ii. 18; Zach. 1, 14; viii. 2; 2 Sam. xxi. 2, do not belong here). Others, again, translate this verb as in the indicative, *q. d.*, 'ye in your opinion are seeking;' others, as a question continuous of that in ver. 29, and regarding both as implying rebuke. But this does not suit; since in what follows nothing is set over against the thing rebuked; for the conjunction which follows is *καί* not *δέ*. Nor yet is there any need of such a construction. Neither can we construe the verb as implying merely a wish, desire or prayer; for this is contrary to the meaning of the word.—Paul is here speaking of the duty of cultivating in ourselves those powers and qualities which may be sanctified and exalted into charisms by the power of the Spirit, ["and we may notice that the greater gifts, those of prophecy and teaching, consisted in the inspired exercise of *conscious faculties*, in which culture and diligence would be useful accessories." ALFORD]. This of course is far different from the effort which the Pantheists make to turn the exercises of their own spirits into a sort of divine revelation. What is inculcated is simply the preparation of the mind which fits it for the divine blessing, just as tillage prepares the soil for the genial influences of the sky. "Paul everywhere presupposes that the divine operation can never take place in man without a coöperating receptivity on his part." NEANDER. That this endeavor should not be directed out of vanity to gifts less valuable because less subservient to the one great end of edification, but rather to those which are preëminent in this respect, does not conflict with that unenvying contentment which he had inculcated above; and it is in any case more in conformity with the meaning of the word *ζηλοῦτε* than if we said with Osiander, that it referred more to the exercise of the gifts already had, than to the seeking for them, whether we regard the exhortation as directed to the church as a whole which regulated the employment of the gifts, or to the individuals, endowed with them.—In this endeavor for the best gifts a vigorous spiritual life and a pious zeal for furthering the common welfare are apt to show themselves. This is indicated in what follows, when we are told that this zeal is displayed in the way of love which is the true guide of all these endeavors. As NEANDER says: "Paul shows us that the best way for discovering the better gifts is through love. In his estimation love is the standard by which the worth of the gifts is to be determined."—**And yet**—besides exhorting you to be thus zealous—**I show unto you a very excellent way.**—*καθ' ὑπερβολὴν* belongs to *ὁδόν, way*, in the sense of *ὑπερέχουσαν, superior, very excellent*, as explained by Chrys. and Theoph., entirely in accordance with Greek usage. Bengel says: *viam maxime vialem.* If we connect it with the verb as in some versions, it yields no fitting sense, whether we translate it 'abundantly,' or 'in a remarkable manner;' it would be a rare compliment to his own modo of instruction;—nor yet can we take the phrase comparatively 'more *excellent*,' as exalting love above the charisms (Rückert [and the E. V.]), or as implying something superior to being zealous for the best gifts. For this the context affords no warrant. ["The idea is not that he intends to show them a way that is better than seeking gifts, but a way *par excellence* to obtain those gifts." HODGE. So also Alford.]

[* SCHAFF proposes "a psychological classification, on the basis of the three *primary faculties of the soul*—they all being capable and in need of sanctification, and the Holy Ghost in fact leaving none of them untouched, but turning them all to the edification of the church. With this corresponds also the classification according to the different *branches of the church life*, in which the activity of one or the other of these faculties thus supernaturally elevated predominated. This would give us three classes of charisms: (1) those which relate especially to *feeling* and *worship*; (2) those which relate to *knowledge* and *theology*; (3) those which relate to *will* and *church government*. To the gifts of feeling belong speaking with tongues, interpretation of tongues, and inspired prophetic discourse; to the theoretical class, or gifts of intellect, belong the charisms of wisdom and of knowledge, of teaching and of discerning spirits; to the practical class, or gifts of will, the charisms of ministration, of government and of miracles. *Faith* lies back of all, as the motive power, taking up the whole man and bringing all his faculties into contact with the Divine Spirit, and under His influence and control"].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Christianity superior to heathenism in the matter of truth and its tests.* In heathenism there rules a dark and soul-darkening power by which its devotees are blindly impelled. There they have no revelation—no Spirit diffusing life and light, but only beguiling error and the treachery of priestcraft and soothsaying, of oracles and magic. There everything tends to keep down the people in a state of childish ignorance and benighted dependence. Precisely the opposite of this is seen in Christianity—the truth and radiance, the light and life of the Divine Spirit; hence also an elevation to maturity and independence; hence the free offer of tokens by which to test the truth. For a Christian is one who is said to *know* why and in whom he believes; who does *not suffer himself to accept* the fair show of higher powers without ascertaining the real character of what thus challenges his confidence and seeks to influence him—what it aims at, and whence and with what authority it comes. He is one furnished with a sure token of truth in the relation which anything sustains to Christ—that Being from whom all spiritual light and life descend. Whatever tends to disparage Christ, or His words, or His merits, or His exclusive availability for our religious well being—whatever tends to set aside His person as He was originally exhibited to us, and as He insists on being regarded both by His own declaration and that of His accredited heralds—whatever tends to the denial of His absolute worth for us, and of His unrivalled dignity in Himself, can never proceed from the Spirit of God. On the contrary, whatever tends directly to glorify Christ and to confirm His truth, and to maintain His saving power—whatever exalts Him as the all-sufficient Savior and the absolute trust-worthy Lord—whatever conducts to Him and ascribes to Him the honor in all things—this is of the Spirit. By such tokens are the operations of the Spirit of God ascertained; to these can we confidently hold fast and thus be furthered in knowledge and in all true piety.

[Herein we see the perfect concurrence between Christ and the Holy Ghost, and how they bear witness to each other. The Holy Ghost testifies of Christ, and the genuineness of His testimony is ascertained by its relation to what we already know of Christ in His Word].

2. *Nature and grace essentially harmonious and analogous.* If by nature we understand human life as withdrawn from the controlling power of the Divine Spirit, and hence as godless and sinful (as the word is sometimes used), then is there between this and grace the strongest antagonism. But they stand together in most perfect correspondence when we consider nature as creaturely life, disposed and ordered by the Creator's will. This, so far as it is organized and develops itself in the power of that will, furnishes a fit substratum for all renewing and sanctifying influences that are to fashion it in harmony with the Divine idea. Of these influences the chief is that which we denominate *grace, i. e.*, Divine love in its redeeming and healing power; and this in its relation to nature is a salutary and not a destructive or disturbing force. This truth is clearly manifested in the gifts of the Holy Ghost. In these we discover a spiritual organization which has its proper analogon in our physical organization. Here there is one whole—a totality consisting of various parts, mutually supplementing and serving each other, all harmoniously articulated by one common principle, and working for one and the same end—the preservation of our natural life. And so, too, is that spiritual organization one perfect whole, consisting of manifold powers which, with their functions and operations, have all the same vital principle, *viz.*, the one Spirit, the one Lord, the one God; and they operate for the same end, *viz.*, the increase of the body of Christ. For this reason they are joined together in mutual supplementation and subserviency, as are likewise those who exercise them—persons endowed with manifold capacities of soul and body. These, by virtue of that one Spirit actuating them from within, are all members of the church,—each one indeed constituting with his own specialty one self-included whole; yet by the energy of the Divine love, which is shed abroad through them all, each is united with the rest, so that each specialty with its own peculiar qualities quickened by the Spirit, serves and helps the others, forming together with them one higher complex life. This specialty consists in the peculiar activity or spontaneous movement of one particular kind of natural talents, while the rest remain in a passive or recipient state; so that in respect to the former there is a direct proffer of good, a furnishing of aid, while in respect to the latter there is a need of help, and a condition to partake of the good which the others have to bestow through their particular advantages. In this way a rich manifold spiritual life is produced. The advantage which each one possesses belongs in like manner to all the rest.

In this communion the apparently insignificant member is raised by a fellowship with the higher, since it partakes of the gifts which the higher enjoys, according to its own capacity; and it in turn comes to their aid, and is by them acknowledged and esteemed as indispensable. Thus a beautiful *temperamentum*—a balancing of parts—ensues which gives to the whole a harmonious character. The high looks not down scornfully upon the low; nor does the low look up enviously at the high, or fling itself away in self-contempt. But each rejoices in the society of members whom it can in some way assist with its own gift.

In this spiritual organization, however, that mutual concurrence which in the natural body goes on instinctively and unconsciously, is maintained with a clear, intelligent self-determination, and in the exercise of a conscious love, and through a sense of church union, that goes on unfolding itself in wishes and efforts for the common good, all having their common principle in that faith which recognizes and honors God's gifts wherever seen, and seeks to improve them according to the Divine intent.

3. *Spiritual gifts—their distinctive character.* In these gifts our natural dispositions and talents are so possessed by the Spirit as to recover their original condition and use, as formed in accord

ance with the Divine image. This possession by the Spirit results, partly, in giving to any talent already cultivated only a new direction towards the highest end, *viz.*, the kingdom of God, so that its capacities are exercised within this sphere; thus the matter on which it acts is changed, and its form also somewhat modified; and, partly, in arousing a slumbering talent to action, so that it appears as something new which the Spirit of Christ has for the first time summoned forth. In thus awakening and sanctifying our natural talents, the Spirit acts as a voluntary agent, according to His own free will, directed with reference to the necessities of the church or of the individual, so that no one deemed worthy of so gracious a gift, can pride himself by reason of it, and no one on whom a lesser gift has been bestowed, has occasion to complain of himself.

The various endowments, however, stand related to the manifold forms and powers of our natural life. In one person an intuitive knowledge is awakened and fashioned into an ability to apprehend profoundly and comprehensively the plans and purposes of God's providence. In another, a capacity for investigation and scientific statement is awakened and directed towards the highest problems of human thought. In another, the shaping power of imagination—an ability to speak in a vivid and glowing style, is employed and sanctified to set forth the mysteries of the kingdom of God and its future developments, or the hidden experiences of the inward life. In another, the critical, analytic power is so enlightened that it is enabled to separate between the true and the false in religious things, discerning between genuine spiritual influences, and spurious excitements. In another, the energies of the will are roused, so that by taking hold believingly on the Divine omnipotence as proffered in the promises, it can, through prayers and strong consolations, work out superhuman results, heal diseases, relieve infirmities, and create or remove whatever needs to be established or put away for the glory of God and the interests of His kingdom. To these we may add a talent for all sorts of charitable service in rendering timely and suitable aid to the poor, the sick, and the distressed. And finally, a talent for governing within a greater or lesser sphere with all circumspection, and power, and energy, and patience, according to the requirements of times and persons. In all this there exists a wealth of spiritual operations and a copiousness of moral tasks, through the performance of which the highest ethical work of art is brought to its completion. There is here a Divine operation running through every thing and determining our natural life in its manifold capacities, which, however, as the operation of a personal God in beings destined to a personal life, is one which develops a free individual action, and is glorified by it.

[4. One peculiarity of the Gospel, as contrasted with the law, is, that *church offices presuppose spiritual endowments;* the office falling not, as of old, to the next casual successor, but to those qualified for it; and the qualifications springing directly from Christ, present by His Spirit in the midst of His people. The warrant for exercising the office is, in the first instance, and before it is any thing else, the possession of the gifts of the Spirit, who, in this matter, refuses to be tied to any external prescription, and divideth to every man severally as He will. See LITTON, *Church of Christ*, p. 372 ff.].

[5. *Gifts and offices not commensurate either in number or kind.* The gifts were numerous, bestowed in accordance with the necessities of particular times and circumstances. Some were transient and some permanent, but the offices, with the exception of that of the Apostles, are permanent; and what they are is to be ascertained from other portions of Scripture. Hence it must be supposed that several gifts were conferred upon the same individual, and that they were exercised often by private persons, without any official authority, but under the simple warrant of possessing the gift].

[6. *The gifts with which the early believers were endowed were all earnests* of the promised Redemption,—pledges presented to the church at its very start, of the final victory which it will achieve over the whole realm of nature, when its true idea as the kingdom of God shall be fully realized, and all things shall be made subject to it in Christ. They were at the same time designed to be *signs* unto the world of the presence of a Divine power in the church, demanding of it faith and homage; and must ever be had in the church according to the exigencies of her position—some permanent, some transient. See EDWARD IRVING'S Discourse on *The Church with its endowment of Holiness and Power.* Collected writings, Vol. V. p. 450 ff.].

[7. *The doctrine of the Trinity.* In this chapter, especially in vv. 3, 4, 6, 12, 13, 27, 28, we have the three factors of the Christian Godhead plainly brought to view: I. in their *diversity*, under separate names and functions; II. in their *personality* as acting with conscious intelligence; III. in their *unity*, as testifying of each other, performing parts of the same great work, and all carrying the attributes of divinity, yet in such a way that there are not three Gods, but one God. Thus we have God the Father, the first Source and Operator of all spiritual influences, and in relation to Him these influences are called "operations;" God the Son, the Lord of the Church, and the Ordainer of all the ministries therein by which these influences are brought into exercise; and in relation to Him they are termed "ministrations;" God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father through the Son, dwelling in and animating and sanctifying and binding together the whole church into one body—one living organism, and imparting to each member such measure of power and grace as pleases Him; and so in relation to Him these influences are termed "gifts." Thus we have the Trinity in unity shown to underlie the whole work of Redemption in its original plan and continued execution].

OBS.:—The subject of speaking with tongues is reserved for further inquiry, and has not therefore been taken under consideration in these comments.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—VER. 1. Gifts of miracles, and gifts for sanctification are to be distinguished; with

the former not only apostles, but also many believers have been endowed for the sake of winning unbelievers; but the latter are necessary for all, in order to faith, love, and the worthy exercise of all Christian virtues.—Ver. 2. Well is it for him who knows what he has been, what he is, and what he shall be.—To think of our origin, and our former state, incites to humility, and keeps us from becoming elated with the gifts we have received (Chap. iv. 7; Gen. xxxii. 10).

HED:—Ver. 3. He who honors and confesses Christ, and shuns no danger for His sake, gives strong evidence of his sincerity. Nevertheless we must distinguish between saying and doing, boasting and performing. Many have only the show and speech of Christians; it is all nothing, their aim and action betray them. Rub the coin, and you will see the copper.—Ver. 4. If there is one Spirit, why enviest thou? It is a shame for those who work on the same building to take it ill, because one builds above and another below. Let each one pass for what he is worth. Be thou nothing in thine own eyes, but faithful in thy work, according to the extent of thine ability. O, that the members might once agree! What an amount of good would then ensue! But no, the devil sunders all through envy, and avarice, and ambition.—Ver. 5. Divine grace is the true cornucopia out of which we can obtain all blessings, yea, a superabundance of gifts, and powers, and goods.—Ver. 7. All gifts and aptitudes are conferred for the benefit of the church. He who perverts them to his own honor and use, perpetrates a sort of church-robbery, and is deserving of punishment (Eph. iv. 15).—Ver. 8. The glory of the Lord shines forth out of the gifts wherewith He has endowed one in preference to another. Hast thou great gifts, boast not; through small gifts God can accomplish great things. Hast thou small gifts, be not impatient and envious; God knows how much oil suits thy little cruse. The faith of miracles helps nothing towards salvation. Art thou blest with a sanctifying faith, thank God for this glorious gift (2 Thess. i. 3).—Ver. 10. Watchful men, who have understanding to prove all things, are to be highly regarded as a gift of God; and they must withstand the introduction of false prophets into the church of God for true ones.—Ver. 11. He who is not content with his gift, finds fault with the all-wise God, and vexes himself about it in vain.—Ver. 12. As the head is united with the body, so is Christ united with his faithful ones (Col. i. 18).—Ver. 13. Baptism and the Lord's Supper should remind us of our brotherly union. Through the former we become Christ's members; through the latter we are ever more closely united with His body; and the longer it is observed, the more do we partake of the Spirit of God.—Ver. 14. Let the number of thy bodily members awaken in thee much holy astonishment, much gratitude, and much care not to offend thy Creator with any one of them.—Ver. 15–20. As in the human body each member has a special function for the good of the whole, so has every Christian a special gift from the Holy Spirit for the use and edification of Christendom. As one member has a larger and higher capacity than another, so also among Christians, one has more and richer gifts than another.—Ver. 21. Those who have a keen insight into divine things (eyes) cannot dispense with those who hold practical offices (hands); the rulers (the head) cannot dispense with those who above all others bear the burdens of the church (feet).—The number, variety, and needs of the members and servants of the church, are in their inter-dependence necessary to it.—The highest of all needs the lowest of all, and so *vice versa* (Phil. ii. 25).—Ver. 22 f. Those members in the spiritual body which are the weakest, and from which the church derives the least honor, should for this reason be maintained with the greatest care and patience.—Ver. 24. God has wisely ordained that each one should abide in his own order; but men disturb the order, and dishonor the members which might and ought to be held in the highest honor, and adhere to others with a foolish pride, even when they have but little need of them (chap. vi. 15, 18; Is. iii. 18 f).—Ver. 25. The humblest Christian has as much in Christ, and is as truly a member of His body as the most distinguished. For this reason also there ought to be no divisions among Christian believers, but rather a loving union (Eph. iv. 3, 15).—Ver. 26. This is the true communion of the spiritual body of Christ, when we feel and experience its weal and its ill, the one to our joy, and the other to our sorrow (Rom. xii. 15 f).—Ver. 27. Believers are all members of Christ, have one Head, and stand together in the unity of the faith and of the Spirit, so that they serve themselves of each other, and take part in each other's joys and sufferings. But each one is a distinct member who has his own peculiar gifts and qualifications, and with these he should serve the others.—Ver. 28. The office of teacher is the most universal, and the most lasting, and embraces in itself, in part, professorships of the the higher and lower schools, wherein the teachers themselves are trained, and, partly, the office of pastor in the churches. Their position ought even at this day to give evidence of its divine character, in the true spiritual qualification and fidelity they exhibit, and in their simple obedience to the divine call, not running unless sent.—Ver. 29 ff. Because no one has everything, but each has need of another, it becomes all to use their own gifts for the service of others in humility, self-discipline, order, and love.—Ver. 31. A church-minister, indeed every Christian, may well bestir himself to excel others in gifts, provided he only use such gifts well and piously for the good of the church.

SPENER:—This "excellent way" is a simple, true-hearted love, which in the eyes of many lofty spirits is a contemptible thing; yet it leads to the highest gifts, winding up a height so gradually that it takes a man at last to the loftiest summits without the slightest danger; while, on the contrary, those who are resolved on mounting straight up the rocks, fall headlong for the most part, or at last, cease from climbing, and find themselves obliged to choose the more gradual path.

BERLENB. BIBEL:—Ver. 1. Such spiritual gifts afterwards became altogether unknown; yet this same God is still Lord over all, and just as gladly distributes His spiritual gifts, *provided* only faithful recipients can be found, who would use them in love and fidelity, and put them to

interest for the general good. Man readily pounces on that which strikes the eye, and hence is very apt to leave out of account those gifts which belong to the very essence of Christianity.—Ver. 2. What is leading you now? Whither are ye bound? Take care lest under the name of Christianity you be betrayed into devious paths.—Man precipitates himself into idolatry, and even makes an idol out of himself.—Ver. 3. If the Spirit of the crucified Saviour does not speak out of thee, then is all thy speech a disgrace to Him. The true knowledge of Jesus Christ in Spirit is the chief gift which will serve you as a proper sign. Other gifts without this even the devil may use for his own kingdom; but the Holy Spirit does not lead to the achievement of great things of which a man can boast, but to the humility of Jesus, who walked in the midst of sufferings. An infinite blessing is it, if the soul first recognizes Jesus as its Lord through the Holy Spirit; for as it is the Spirit Himself in us that confesses Christ to be a Lord, so does He fill us with faith, and love to Him. This is the blessed commencement of salvation.—Vv. 4–6. God gives Himself to the church in manifold ways; but Satan seeks to pervert everything which God does.—If God confers extraordinary gifts, take them and learn to use them in subordination,—just as the Apostles did who abode in the Spirit of God, walked in His presence, meant well with the people, and so were in condition to oppose all abuses.—The various officers of the church should conspire to one result, for it is the same Lord on whom they all depend.—There may be never so many matters in hand, and never so many instrumentalities, yet all issue from the same God from whom the Spirit proceeds, and by whom the Son is begotten. The power of the Spirit works by the command of God in the name of Christ.—The more we allow our working to yield to His working, the greater will be our successes. It is idle to suppose that we can mark the presence of the Spirit in a little religious knowledge and in a few efforts though good in themselves; there must be in us a new spiritual life to give assurance of this. We must yield entirely to the influence of the Spirit, if we would have our work found perfect toward God.—Our growth is conditioned on holding fast to God by His Spirit. Those who have received Him, already understand this mystery, and see how it is that the Spirit always asks and receives in believers.—Ver. 7. Let us, first of all, take care that we be found pure and well qualified before God, so that He may trust us with what is right. Above all things, let us remain humble and in the exercise of the best gifts; for it is not the gifts which make us blessed, but faith which works by love. Therefore let every one see that he is made properly a partaker of Christ himself, the highest gift. The incidental gifts will then come to us as supplemental. That which God finds ready in the soul, He can purify and elevate and make useful for His service. He works what and how He wills with our own peculiar endowments, so as to evoke our praise in view of His own wonderful doings.—Something good lies with every one by which he may serve God and his neighbor, and also earn to himself a good degree in the future. But it requires industry and constant self-watchfulness to be able to observe and trace out the object to which the dear God calls and draws us, and discover what His motive, His gift is, which works in us.—Ver. 8. As *wisdom* is the gift of insight that enables us to look profoundly into things; *knowledge* on the contrary goes to the right appropriation of all the various divine doctrines, disciplines and testimonies.—As in God there is a depth of riches, both of wisdom and of knowledge, so there will also flow such power into the sucklings of his wisdom as to make them luminous within.—Ver. 9. That saving faith, which seeks for mercy and purification through the blood of Jesus in the Holy Spirit, we all must have. But with this we can enter courageously upon everything, since the power of the Spirit waxes so strong in the soul through the new birth, that it is able to do all things in Christ, yea, even bind and constrain God Himself in faith, that He may show the wonders of his Omnipotence, Holiness, Wisdom, Goodness, in any particular matter, and in all circumstances in which His honor is involved. To this it may be added that by means of earnest prayer, many "a spirit of infirmity" may be driven out in faith.—Ver. 10. In as much as there is such a diversity of spirits and powers, and the evil one gets up so many strange shows, and practises such trickery both before and in men, especially where something good exists, or is just coming to light, it is very needful to have the gift of testing and distinguishing between them. And this gift is imparted to many friends of God. Yet it becomes every Christian also to pray for something at least of this gift, in order to guard himself from treacherous men, who even transform themselves into angels of light.—By the *gift of tongues* the Spirit snatches again from Satan's hand the plurality of tongues. Indeed, it is favor enough to be able to express the mind of the Spirit, and the divine mysteries, ways and purposes according to their proper grounds.—Ver. 11. The chariot of God has several wheels; but it is one Spirit which drives the wheels and works all in all.—The Spirit leaves none empty save those whom it finds incapable and closed against His influences. In this matter He deals "as He will;" but He wills no otherwise than as He finds good and needful for each one.—If we would enjoy the true source and compendious summary of all divine gifts and powers, we ought continually to beseech God for His holy love, which is the inexhaustible treasure of all good. He who seeks this, hits the thing most surely, and continues guarded against the temptations which accompany all the higher gifts.—Ver. 12. The members together with the Head form one Christ (Gal. iii. 28). Christ stands for all. On this account His personality is preserved and the singular number maintained.—Ver. 13. The two sacraments, *i. e.*, the objects themselves which they represent, should so unite Christians that they will never suffer themselves to be separated from one another in regard to particular powers.—Vv. 14–27. Do not be envious because thou canst not be as active as others. The question does not turn upon the magnitude of the work done, or upon thy sharp-sightedness or keenness of wit, but upon the state of thy

heart and the quality of thy faith. Attend to thy business and be satisfied with thy lot. God will reward according to His will.—Since the church is a Lazaretto, we have most to do with the weakest. Nevertheless no man there exists in vain. The more humble and lowly a man is, the more does he deserve our esteem. Many a man whom the world despises, does greater works in secret than some great saints who parade themselves before the eyes of men. The wretched should be looked after. Those members which are the most needy, should be most cared for.—Members of one body should hold together in joy and sorrow. Insensibility is the mark of a putrefied or dead member. A true heart is not satisfied at having things go well with itself alone; hence it is wont to intrude unsolicited upon the wretchedness and sorrows of others. Those who maintain the appellation "Christ's body and members" in truth, are of one heart and mind with the Head, follow Him wherever He goes and do what He wills.—Ver. 28 ff. All must have the will to be helpers; but, in actual practice, some are better equipped for help than others.—Ver. 31. All proper gifts come to us through the cross, or must be preserved by means of it.—Knowledge is not the best gift. God is love, and this is the first and most distinguished among the gifts of the Spirit. (Gal. v. 22).

RIEGER:—Vv. 1–3. The spirit of the world has sometimes observed that it can never crowd Christ, and His kingdom, and the truth of His gospel entirely from the earth; for this reason it endeavors to introduce its spirit and work into Christianity. Hence the necessity, at all times, for proving false spirits and separating from them. The world of to-day has become so impatient and incredulous in respect to any great advantage arising from spiritual knowledge, gifts, operations, and experiences, that it is disposed to deride and bring into contempt everything which cannot be included under the law of nature and reason. The labor of proving much, and the danger of being betrayed strip it of everything. But on this very account does it plunge into the greatest self-deception. O Lord Jesus! whether I live or die, my communion with Thee is my boasting and my hope. This have I learned from Thy Holy Spirit, and in this truth do I ever desire to be led onward.—Vv. 4–11. From the one fountain of the Spirit, opened through Jesus, ought we to learn to draw manifold streams, preserving the unity in the variety of the distribution. By means of gifts, offices, and powers, the Spirit commits Himself to the church for the common endowment of the saints, for the edifying of the body of Christ, and these things stand related to each other, and help towards the attainment of a common end. This mutual coöperation of powers, offices, and gifts, it is the more necessary to observe, the more secretly grace works, and imparts its blessings through the employment of our natural powers. Grace and its gifts certainly improve and elevate nature, but do not altogether change or absorb it. People of great natural powers often remain without grace, and hence without the gifts of the Spirit. With others the natural powers are comparatively small; but grace, and the gifts of the Spirit abundantly compensate for the defects. By *wisdom* we learn to recognize and experience the truth in its broader scope, and in its emancipating power. *Knowledge* occupies itself more with the truth in faith and act, and with instruction unto salvation, and draws more from the word of God than from all the works of God, and the wisdom manifest therein. As it regards the gifts of the Spirit, nothing can be merited, nothing affected, nothing forced. The Spirit gives and works as He will.—Vv. 12–31. *Men of the world* love to overshadow the gifts of others by their own. *Christians* love to serve each other with the gifts which God has given them. The manifold necessities of our condition require a diversity of gifts. For the poor and the suffering, there is needed pity, and the ability to sympathize; for the sick, the old and weak, hands to give, and feet to carry; for the young, the ignorant, the erring, teachers who are furnished with eyes, and who are furnished with tongues, to speak at the right time; for those who are still afar off, but whom God will nevertheless call, those who are ready to proclaim the gospel; for those who are desirous of wisdom, help is furnished by still other gifts.—No one should undervalue himself, and still less should any one contemn another's practice; all the members should care for each other, should rejoice and suffer in common. Away with that self-loving, self-pleasing creature, who thinks to make himself independent of his brethren! Away with all exultation in another's fall, with whispering and slandering, with everything which leads to provocation, and jealousy, and separation, and confusion.—We strive after the best and most useful gifts when we approach the dear God with humility, faith, and prayer, beseeching Him that He will never suffer either His church, or ourselves to be wanting in good spiritual gifts, or in obedience, or in aptness to devote self to the common good; and when, to this end, we put out of the way everything which tends to produce contempt, and envy, and offence. There is more utility in the most perfect love than in all the highest gifts without it. Ah, Lord Jesus, show Thy living power in me, so that I may be found a steadfast, friendly, and useful member in Thy body!

HEUBNER:—Vv. 1–11. The unity of all spiritual gifts.—Ver. 1. Spiritual gifts may further much, and also do much damage. There is need of warning to prevent our being misled by gifted ones.—Ver. 2. The living God only speaks and reveals Himself by His Spirit. He who does not know the true God and Christ is, nevertheless, betrayed, bewitched, or blinded by some idol. Satan leads men blindfold; they are compelled to go, with eyes bound, whithersoever sin leads them.—Ver. 3. He who is truly inspired, can never doubt the truthfulness, the Word, or the divine mission of Jesus; he must entirely agree with the Word of Jesus. Where the church is in general repute, there men do not openly curse and anathematize it; but the secret hostility in the depths of the heart remains the same. Where Jesus is evil-spoken of, there a good spirit is wanting. The more sympathy exists with Christ, and the more harmony with the gospel, the more there is of the Spirit of God. In order to believe

on Jesus with the whole soul, there is needed a heart enlightened and purified by the Holy Ghost.—Ver. 4. In the various spiritual gifts vouchsafed by Divine grace, or pervaded by the Holy Spirit, and destined for the service of the church, God glorifies Himself just as wonderfully as in the manifold works of nature.—Ver. 5. In the call to any office there is this holiest and most constraining thought, the Lord chooses thee for His servant. This alone makes the office great; not external honor, and glory, and influence. A faithful school-master has just as high an office as the highest spiritual bishop.—Ver. 6. In the office everything is wrought by means of the gifts. Of these God is the primal source. Thou canst not stir a finger except God wills.—Ver. 8. Even the gift for inquiry and speculation must proceed from the Holy Spirit, otherwise it leads away from the truth.—Ver. 9. It is not every believing Christian that has faith's courage. Melanchthon believed as much as Luther did in the atonement through Christ, but Luther's heroic spirit he had not.

Besser:—Vv. 4-6. As the sevenfoldness of the Spirit of God (Rev. i. 4; iv. 5; v. 6; Zech. iv. 10) does not break up its unity, but is only an image of the manifold fulness which lies included in that unity, and which works itself out in a series of revealing acts, so the distinction or division in the gifts of grace does not destroy the unity of their origin and end; rather the personal unity of the Giver as well as the united membership of those endowed with the gifts, are thereby made known, so that the various gifts are parts of one whole, the one pointing to the other, and each completing each. The triune control of the three Divine persons runs through the church in the matter of its edification (although sanctification is in particular the work of the Holy Spirit); the Spirit kindles the fire of the gifts of edification, the Son orders the rays of the offices for edification, and the Father creates the warmth of the powers for edification. Inseparable in being, the triune God rules His church; what a crime then is it to produce schism therein.—Ver. 7. Woe to the selfish and the carnal (Chap. iii. 3), who employ for schismatic ends that which was given them to subserve the general good of the whole body! And woe to that idle servant who buries his talent!—Ver. 12. Christendom is not a collection of individual Christian persons who walk beside each other, each one for himself in his own way; neither is it a union of Christian friends, who have arbitrarily or voluntarily associated themselves after that they had separately become possessed of Christianity. But they are in a spiritual way, what the body is in a natural way; —one whole consisting of many parts that exist for each other, and subsist through each other.

[Scott:—Vv. 15-25. "Our kind Creator hath effectually provided that there should be no schism in our natural body, but He has for wise reasons seen good to make trial of the members of the mystical body of Christ in this respect and through the remainder of error and sin in real Christians, through the intrusion of hypocrites and the artifices of the enemy; many disgraceful and lamentable divisions still prevail, which we should pray against and endeavor to heal to the utmost of our power and with persevering earnestness"].

Vers. 1–11. Pericope for the seventh Sunday after Trinity. *The Holy Spirit is the highest of all God's gifts:* 1. In Himself, because the fountain of all true life; a. for without Him, man is far from God, a slave of the evil spirit (ver. 2); b. through Him, man first learns to believe in Christ and to worship Him (ver. 3). 2. Through His particular operations; a. He is the cause that everything serves for one end, *viz.*, the glory of God and the salvation of men (vv. 4–7); b. He awakens the gifts and powers residing in each individual, and sanctifies them (ver. 11). *The manifestations of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men:* 1. In general, by regeneration and renewal; a. turning from sin and idolatry; b. turning to Christ. 2. In particular, by imparting various powers for the use of the Christian church; a. He arouses spiritual activity; b. He designates each one to his office; c. He makes each one an instrument of God; d. renders him a blessing to the congregation.—Vv. 12–31. *The perfect unity of Christians is grounded in Christ, and is preserved through Him.* The church is a spiritual body: 1. One whole like the body; 2. Pervaded by the Spirit of its Head, as the body is by one living power; 3. Diversity of powers and functions, as of members; 4. All serving one as all members work toward one object; 5. Mutual imparting of the powers of life,—edification, (health),—contamination, (disease); the more sound blood in the rest, the more ready healing of the sick; 6. Combination, even for particular objects, societies, brotherhoods, which may not, however, sever themselves from each other, but must remain united in one whole,—*Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, the means of union, their efficient principle, the Spirit.—Neither lowliness nor exaltedness of station releases from obligation to the church. Every legitimate and necessary calling forms a member of the same; a sorry notion is it to think of withdrawing oneself under certain pretexts from taking part in laboring for its welfare.—All love is service, living for others. This pre-supposes manifoldness; without manifoldness there is no society, the very essence of which is the union of the manifold for one end. What each one should be and do, that God has ordained; to each one has He appointed his position and calling and activity and worth. No one prescribes to Him aught. Let each one only learn what God wills of him. He who is dissatisfied with this arrangement, quarrels with God. The glory of each one consists in being that for which God has called, endowed, and created him.—Without a variety of members, the body would be one formless lump.—No member should think that he stands in no need of an other.—The mutual influence of the members is grounded upon the most intimate sympathy. The life of a Christian church should be a constant spiritual intercourse, a circulation of spiritual blood. The more intimate this mutual participation is, the more perfect the life and soundness of the whole. Should stagnation occur, the whole suffers. Each person can be only one thing, and should therefore not desire to have another office.—The office, not even thou

it be the highest, gives no claim to salvation. Only the absolute gift, that of love, of the pure heart ensures this. The most excellent way is not that which leads to eternal preferment, but that which gives the highest value to the heart.

[HARLESS, *Serm.*:—Vv. 1–11. *The blessings accruing from the communion in Christ.* I. It delivers us from the dumb idols which we serve. II. This it accomplishes through the unity of the Spirit—which, III., teaches us to serve in the manifoldness of our gifts, offices and powers—IV., the one Lord Jesus Christ.

SOUTH:—Ver. 4. *The Christian Pentecost, or the solemn effusion of the Holy Ghost in the several miraculous gifts conferred upon the Apostles and first Christians.* I. What those gifts were. II. What is imported and to be understood by their diversity. 1. It includes variety. 2. It excludes contrariety. III. What are the consequences of this emanation of so many and different gifts from one and the same Spirit. 1. We infer the deity of the Holy Ghost. 2. We infer the duty of humility in some, and contentment in others. 3. We have here a touchstone for the trial of spirits.

ROBERTSON:—*The dispensation of the Spirit.* I. Spiritual gifts conferred on individuals. 1. Natural—*i. e.*, those capacities originally found in human nature elevated and enlarged by the gift of the Spirit. 2. Supernatural—*e. g.*, gift of tongues and of prophecy. *Obs.* 1. The highest of these not accompanied with spiritual faultlessness. 2. Those higher in one sense were lower in another. II. The spiritual unity of the church—"the same spirit." 1. All real unity is manifold. 2. All *living* unity is spiritual, not formal — not sameness, but complexity. 3. None but a spiritual unity can preserve the rights both of the individual and the church. 4. The sanctity of the individual character respected.

OWEN:—Ver. 11. *Ministerial endowments the work of the Holy Spirit.* I. Our Lord hath promised to be present with His church unto the end of the world. II. He is thus present principally and fundamentally by His Spirit. III. This presence of the Spirit is promised and given by an everlasting covenant. IV. Hence the ministry of the Gospel is "the ministry of the Spirit." V. The general end why the Spirit is thus promised. VI. Particular proof of the proposition that the Holy Ghost thus promised, sent, and given, doth furnish ministers with spiritual abilities in the discharge of their work. VII. Spiritual gifts as bestowed unto this end are necessary for it. VIII. That there is a communication of spiritual gifts in gospel ordinances supported by experience. *Prac. Obs.* 1. The ministry of the gospel most *difficult* ministration, and great as difficult. 2. A *glorious* work. 3. The only *effectual* ministry.

BAXTER:—Ver. 12. *The true Catholic and Catholic Church described.* Doct. The universal church being the body of Christ, is but one, and all true Christians are members of which it doth consist. I. Diversity of membership as to, 1. Age, or standing in Christ. 2. Strength. 3. Gifts. 4. Mental complexion. 5. Spiritual health. 6. Usefulness. 7. Office. 8. Employment. 9. Title to be loved and honored. 10. Glory. II. The unity of the membership. 1. All have one God the Father. 2. And one Head and Saviour Jesus Christ. 3. One Holy Ghost dwelling in, illuminating and sanctifying them. 4. One principal, ultimate end. 5. One gospel. 6. One kind of faith. 7. One new holy nature. 8. The same objects of affection, and the same affections. 9. One rule or law. 10. One and the same covenant. 11. The same instrumental founders of his faith under Christ. 12. Membership in the body. 13. Habitual love to every other member. 14. Special love to the whole body of the Church. 15. Special love towards the nobler sort of members. 16. An inward inclination to hold communion with fellow-members, so far as they are discerned to be members indeed. 17. An inward inclination for the means of grace. 18. The same holy employment. 19. An inward enmity to what is destructive to itself or to the body. *a.* to sin in general; *b.* to all known sin in particular; *c.* specially to divisions, distractions, and diminutions of the church. 20. The same crown of glory, the same blessed God, the same celestial Jerusalem, the same services of joy and praise. Application: 1. To those who deny the very being of the Catholic Church. 2. To those who are perplexed to know which is the church. 3. To the several sects that would appropriate the church to themselves only. 4. To the papists that ask for a proof of the continued visibility of our church, and where it was before Luther.

MELVILLE:—Ver. 21. *The least of service to the greatest*].

---

2. [The measure of the worth and the rule of the use of the gifts; love, its worth (ver. 1ff.), nature (ver. 4ff.), and eternal duration, in contrast with the transient gifts (ver. 8 ff.).

CHAPTER XIII. 1–13.

Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity [love,
2 ἀγάπην], I am become [have become, γέγονα] *as* sounding brass, or a tinkling [clat-

2 tering, *ἀλαλάζον*] cymbal. And though I have *the gift of* prophecy, and understand
all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove
3 mountains, and have not charity [love, *ἀγάπην*], I am nothing. And though I bestow
all my goods to feed *the poor* [have fed out (in morsels) all my goods, *ψωμίσω πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντά*],[1] and though I give [have delivered up, *παραδῶ*] my body to be burned,[2]
4 and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing. Charity suffereth long, *and* is kind;
charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself [sheweth not itself off, *περπερεύεται*],
5 is not puffed up, Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily
provoked [whetted up to anger, *παροξύνεται*], thinketh no evil [makes no account of
6 the evil, *λογίζεται τὸ κακόν*]; Rejoiceth not in [at the, *ἐπὶ τῇ*] iniquity, but rejoiceth in
7 [along with, *συγχαίρει*] the truth; Beareth [puts up with, *στέγει*] all things, believeth
8 all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Charity never faileth [falls away, *ἐκπίπτει*][3] but whether *there be* prophecies, they shall fail [come to nought, *καταργηθήσονται*]; whether *there be* tongues, they shall cease; whether *there be* knowledge,
9 it shall vanish away [come to nought, *καταργηθήσεται*]. For[4] we know in part, and we
10 prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then [*om.* then] that which
11 is in part shall be done away [come to nought, *καταργηθήσεται*]. When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood [perceived, *ἐφρόνουν*] as a child, I thought [reasoned, *ἐλογιζόμην*] as a child: but [*om.* but] when I became a man, I put away [brought to
12 nought, *κατήργηκα*] childish things. For now we see through a glass [as by a mirror, *δι' ἐσόπτρου*], darkly [in an enigma, *ἐν αἰνίγματι*]; but then face to face: now I know
in part; but then shall I know [fully know, *ἐπιγνώσομαι*] even as also I am known
13 [was fully known, *ἐπεγνώσθην*]. And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three;
but the greatest of [greater among, *μείζων τούτων*] these *is* charity.

[1] Ver. 3.—The Rec. has *ψωμίζω*, but in opposition to the most decisive authorities. [The Elzevir form of *ψωμίζω* is sustained only by B. (Mai), K., some cursives, and Damasc. (Par.). The colloquial use of the Ind. Present for the Subj. Aor. prevailed in the later Greek, as is common in a similar form in English, but it could hardly have been allowed by Paul. It may have come into the text from the similar pronunciation in dictation.—C. P. W.].

[2] Ver. 3.—Some old MSS. (and with them agrees *Lachmann*) have *καυχήσωμαι*. The evidence in its favor is not, however, quite satisfactory. See Exeg. notes. [For the reading *καυθήσωμαι*, which is given in the Rec. and adopted by *Bloomf.*, *Meyer*, *Alford*, *Stanley*, and *Wordsworth*, we have C. K., a number of versions, Chrys., Theodt., several Lat. Fathers, and Jacob (Nisib.). For *καυχήσωμαι* (which *Meyer* says that even *Lachmann* has now given up) we have A. D. (though Mai has *καυχήσομαι*), Sinait., Aeth., Copt., (MS.), Ephr., Jerome (who remarks that among the Greeks the copies differ, and that among the Latins an error had crept in on account of the resemblance between *καυθήσωμαι* and *καυχήσωμαι*. On *internal* grounds, *καυχήσ.* seems like an addition to make prominent the possibility that such sacrifices might be performed without love, and to avoid the objection that martyrdoms by fire were almost unknown in the Apostle's time. The Subj. Future was, however, a barbarism which could not be expected in writers as early as those of the N. T., and as pure as the Apostle Paul. *Tischendorf*, *Griesbach*, and *Stanley* (in his note) have preferred the Ind. Fut. (*καυθήσομαι*), which might be easily changed by a careless copyist into the Subjunctive. This reading is supported by D. E. F. G. L., some cursives, Macar., Max., and Clemens Alex.—C. P. W.]

[3] Ver. 8.—*Lachmann* has *πίπτει* after A. B. C. [Sinait. 17] and some Fathers. *Meyer* regards *ἐκπίπτει* (Rec.) as a gloss to define more particularly what the Apostle meant. [*Tischendorf* prefers *ἐκπίπτει*, as it has in its favor C. (3d hand), D. E. F. G. K. L., almost all the cursives, many versions (Vulg. has *excidit*, and different copies have *excidat*, *excedit* and *cadit*) and most of the Greek and some Latin Fathers. Comp. Rom. ix. 6.—C. P. W.].

[4] Ver. 9.—*Tischendorf* has *δέ*, but the best MSS. are in favor of *γάρ*.

[5] Ver. 10.—The Rec. inserts *τότε* before *τὸ ἐκ μέρους*, but against the largest number, and to some extent the best, of the MSS. It appears to have been an addition from ver. 12. [It is found in D. (2d and 3d hand) E. (*τότε και*) K. L. Syr. (both), Orig., Melet. (in Epiph.), Theodt.; but it is omitted in A. B. D. (1st hand) F. G. and eight others, the Ital., Vulg., Goth., Copt., Aeth. (both), and a number of the Greek Fathers.—C. P. W.].

[6] Ver. 11.—In the Rec. *ὡς νήπιος* is put before the verb in each of the three clauses. *Tischendorf*, in each case, sets these words after the verb. The MSS. are not decisive in behalf of either arrangement. [These words are before the verb in D. E. F. G. K. L. *et al.*; the Ital., Vulg. (Fuld.), Syr. (both), and a number of the Greek and Latin Fathers. A. B., Sinait., the Vulg., Copt., Aeth., and a similar number of the Greek Fathers, with Jerome and August., place them after.—C. P. W.].

[7] Ver. 11.—The Rec. inserts a *δέ* after the second *ὅτε*, but in opposition to the best authorities.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

[The "supremely excellent way," by which to ascertain the best gifts and to regulate their use, is the subject which occupies the whole of this chapter. This way is in the original termed *ἀγάπη*, unhappily translated in our version in accordance with the Vulg. by the word *charity*, which is by no means its English equivalent. The substantive *ἀγάπη* from the verb *ἀγαπάω* is, as Trench remarks, "a purely Christian word, no example of its use occurring in any heathen writer whatever," and it was employed by the inspired writers, to denote *love* in its highest and purest sense—a love which embraced as its proper objects both God and man. And this is the rendering adopted by the translators Tindal and Cranmer as well as in the Geneva version; and it is to be regretted that the precedent here set has not been followed in the version of King James, inasmuch as the word "charity," adopted in this connection, has given rise to many errors of thought and practice. Many have in consequence been led to think that alms-giving and kindness to the sick and the poor is the sum total of all religion, because of the superior worth here ascribed to charity, exalting it above both faith and hope. But what the Apostle here speaks of, is not any one particular virtue or,

grace, but that which is the root and spring of all virtues and graces, and which to possess is to be both like God and in God. In describing and recommending this fundamental grace, therefore the Apostle might well be expected to enlarge most eloquently. Accordingly, we have here presented to us a chapter which, as HODGE well remarks, "for moral elevation, for richness and comprehensiveness, for beauty and felicity of expression, has been the admiration of the Church in all ages." Paul here exhibits to us love after the manner of a jeweller handling the most precious gem of his cabinet, turning it on every side, shewing it in varied lights, and holding it up to view in a way best fitted to awaken desire for its possession. As TERTULLIAN says, "his description of love is uttered *totis Spiritus viribus*, with all the strength of the Spirit"].

VER. 1. The worth of love is first set forth negatively, by the assertion of the utter worthlessness even of the highest endowments and of the greatest self-sacrifices, when not associated with it. ["In this passage there is a climax throughout. He begins with mentioning the gift of tongues, as it was against the exaggerated estimate of this, that he had chiefly to contend." STANLEY.].—**Though,**—Ἐὰν, *supposing that;* he here imagines a case which might possibly occur—"a case in the future," as MEYER says, "the realization of which must be known by the event."—**I speak with the tongues,** *ταῖς γλώσσαις*; the article indicates the thing in general—'with all possible tongues.' And these he exhibits in their highest conceivable development,—**of men and of angels.**—If we adopt the rendering *languages*, we shall have to insist on the idea that there were various classes of angels, and then assume either various modes of spiritual communication among them, or a diversity in the forms of expression used, according to their various orders and ranks without involving, however, any such rupture or disharmony as appears in human languages and dialects. But if we adopt the rendering *tongues* as meaning organs of speech, then we must suppose a reference here to some mighty jubilation, rung out in all the fullness of tone of which angels and men were capable. BESSER says, "with angel tongues whereby the glory of God's face, as beheld by them, is set forth." EWALD says, "with tongues far more wonderful and enchanting than those employed on earth by the ordinary speakers with tongues who could not like the angels adopt a purely heavenly strain." We are at any rate to reject the interpretation of Heydenreich, who takes the expression to denote all sorts of tongues in general, and that of Calvin, who regards this as "a hyperbolical expression Nę denote what is singular or distinguished;* of that of others, who take it simply as implying infine eloquence higher than human. [ALFORD jects, "it is hardly possible to understand *γλώσ*——here of anything but articulate forms of speech," and so also Hodge].—**and have not love.**—*ἀγάπη* in this connection means that brotherly affection which excludes all self-seeking in the possession and use of gifts, and is directed exclusively to the furtherance of the welfare of the brotherhood. It implies a perfect acceptance of the divine life as the principle of all action—a pervading of the entire disposition by the fundamental moral nature of God, while in the particular gifts the several sides of human life are laid hold of and fashioned by the operations of the divine power; or, in other words, special forms of life and action are combined with divine powers which all necessarily presuppose a perfect union of the human will with the divine will, and that perfection of the divine life which is implied in love. (Comp. also Matt. vii. 22). Osiander states the matter somewhat differently, p. 580. NEANDER well asks here: "how shall we conceive of that which can only proceed from the power of a Christian life as existing, where the very principle of that life, even love, is wanted?" To this he replies: "it may indeed happen that the Christian life actually existed in a man, though in a troubled state, love having departed, while yet the power it gave, continues a while longer, just as a chord continues to vibrate after it has once been smitten. It is possible also that the particular gift itself may lead to the fall, through the selfishness which fastens upon it and perverts it to its own ends."—**I have become,** *γέγονα, i. e.*, by the reception of such gifts as that mentioned; [or as HODGE better says, "through the mere want of love which notwithstanding the gift in question would reduce me to a level with—**sounding brass.**"]—This denotes, not exactly a brazen musical instrument, but any resonant piece of brass. The instrument is first specified in the following—**or a clanging cymbal,**—an instrument like a hollow basin which struck by another of the same sort emits a shrill, clanging sound (comp. 2 Sam. vi. 5). [For a description of the cymbal in its several varieties see SMITH's *Dic. of the Bib.*]. The verb *ἀλαλάζειν* is onomatopoetic and was formed to express the loud yell with which an army rushed into battle; and then from this it came to mean the making of any loud noise. The epithet here is certainly suggestive rather of loud and confused exclamation on the part of the speakers with tongues [so Hodge, referring to xiv. 23], than of any such muttering in low and scarcely audible tones as some have ascribed to them. But to suppose an intimation intended of the repulsiveness and annoyance of the din occasioned by them, as Chrysostom does, is hardly warranted.* The point of the comparison is, as MEYER states it, that 'the man who speaks with never so many tongues, and is at the same time devoid of love, becomes but the organ of a foreign impulse, without independent worth,' and, as BESSER adds, "having neither emotion nor consciousness."—**and though I have prophecy,**—

*[T
Chrys., is is also Stanley's view, and it certainly commends
older Eng person's common sense; and is moreover sustained
ner, Suidrder of the words, "though with the tongues of
sense: 'deak, or even of angels." The latter seems thus to
siderately as an after-thought, added simply for the sake of
loves both the statement as strong as possible, and not with
ments." ict idea that angels used either tongues or lan-
pretation.
decision].

*[Why not? If there are any who deserve to be "counted as giving impertinent trouble, as an annoying and wearisome sort of persons," to use Chrysostom's language, they are those loud-mouthed talkers and exhorters who sometimes appear in the church as possessed of a marvellous gift of tongues, but utterly devoid of the wisdom and modesty of love; "sounding brass and clanging cymbal" are not more intolerable than they].

i. e., the gift of prophecy. This in Paul's view was something higher than the former, because it contributed more to the edification of the Church, and furthermore, because it was combined with a clear self-consciousness which was wanting in the other case. Yet, excellent as this gift was, we see in the instance of Balaam (2 Pet. ii. 15; Num. xxii.) [also of Caiaphas, Jno. xi. 49 ff.] how worthless it is when not united with love. But how are we to connect this with that next mentioned?—**and know all the mysteries and all knowledge.**—Are these particulars only designations of the degrees in which the gift of prophecy was had? or are they special gifts? The former is apparently sustained by the fact that the particles "and though" are not repeated until we come to the next gift, and so the three seem included under one head (so Meyer). But although 'the knowledge of mysteries,' as implying a supernatural revelation like that in prophecy, may suit with this construction, yet the other expression "all knowledge" is just as far the other way (see on xii. 8). [Besides, Paul elsewhere distinguishes between prophecy and knowledge (ver. 8 and xii. 8–10); and to this it may be added that the words 'mysteries' and 'knowledge' depend not on "I have," but 'I know']. Hence it were better to understand him as speaking of separate gifts proceeding from the divine illumination and serving to enlighten others. The first of these, 'the knowledge of mysteries' (which possibly may be the same as "wisdom," xii. 8), implies a direct insight into the secret counsels of God as brought out in the great plan of redemption. This, indeed, could not be had without revelation, such as that which forms the basis also of prophecy, from which it is distinguished also by the nature of the objects involved; while it itself forms the basis rather of instruction. But inasmuch as the prophet may be at the same time an earnest inquirer, and through the help of the Spirit, may become a profound explorer into the truth of God's revelation, there is nothing in the nature of the case to prevent our accepting Meyer's view as expressed above. The extent of these gifts is represented as the greatest conceivable by the repeated use of the term "all."—The union of the words "and all knowledge" directly with the verb "I know," gives rise to the *constructio conjugati* (Osiander), or a zeugma* (Meyer), so that instead of "I know" you must supply some such verb as 'I have.'—**And though I have all faith,**—*i. e.*, faith in its whole extent and fullest measure. The word here means a power of will energized by faith (Neander).—**so that I could remove mountains,**—*i. e.*, so as to be able to accomplish that which transcends our natural powers, and appears impossible. (Comp. Matt. xvii. 20; xxi. 21). The expression can hardly be derived from a supposed tradition of Christ's speeches, but must rather be taken as a current proverb. [Inasmuch as the term *faith* is used in a variety of senses, we must be careful to observe the special signification in which it is here employed. Chrysostom calls it "the faith of miracles," that which apprehends Christ simply in His wonder-working power, and may sometimes exist in an unsanctified person, like Judas. Nothing can be inferred therefore from Paul's statement here to the disparagement of faith as the fundamental grace of the Christian life (Calvin)].—**I am nothing.**—A short and expressive statement of the result. Without love, though endowed with these most remarkable gifts which are so highly esteemed and capable of such use, and which seem to indicate a special divine favor, a person is in fact a mere nullity. ["They do not elevate his character, or render him worthy of respect or confidence. Satan may have, and doubtless has, more of intelligence and power than any man ever possessed, and yet he is Satan still. Those, therefore, who seek to exalt men by the mere cultivation of the intellect, are striving to make Satans of them." HODGE].—He advances in the climax by next mentioning acts which are regarded as the exercises of a love of the most ardent and self-sacrificing kind, but which are, nevertheless, affirmed to avail nothing when devoid of their proper actuating spirit. Such acts are but the outward forms of love, which may be performed under the promptings of a refined selfishness and vanity; or, as BESSER says, "are the forth-puttings of a self-will, which, being devoid of love, expends itself in empty, fruitless blossoms." Since he is here speaking of transient acts, he employs the aorist forms ψωμίσω and παραδῶ.—**And though I dole out all my goods.**—The verb ψωμίζειν, when used primarily with a personal object (Rom. xii. 20), means *to feed* as a mother does her babe, by putting into its mouth little morsels previously chewed; then, *to feed in general, to nourish.* When used with the accusative of the thing, it means *to feed out, to distribute to the poor.**—**And though I give my body that I may be burned.**—The reading ἵνα καυθήσομαι is strongly supported--but καυθήσωμαι is a barbarism, though found in several editions. [See Winer II., § 13, I. c]. The burning here may be either a burning to death, or simple torture by fire. Perhaps Paul had in mind such events as are recorded in Dan. iii. 19 ff.; 2 Macc. vii. The history of his time had not yet furnished any instances of martyrdom at the stake; but in accordance with the precedents just alluded to, and through the outlook which he cast into the future, he might here have anticipated something of the sort in spirit.—It is entirely erroneous to suppose that the reference here is to branding, as that of slaves; the usual words for this are στίζειν and στιγματίζειν. And still less can he allude to the casting of one's self into the fire in presumptuous expectation of Divine deliverance. The parallelism with the first clause naturally suggests the idea of a self-sacrifice for the good of others. [This is the thought which Hodge considers to be presented here]. But this text

*[A figure of speech by which an adjective or verb which agrees with a nearer word, is, by way of supplement, referred to another more remote and perhaps less suited to it].

*[Coleridge in a MS. note on this passage, given by Bunsen, says: The true and most significant sense is, 'and I dole away in mouthfulls all my property, or Who that has witnessed the alms-giving in a Catholic nastery, or the court of a Spanish or Sicilian bp. or archbishop's palace, where immense revenues are dole away in farthings to herds of beggars, but must lose the force of the Apostle's half satirical ψωμίσω]!"

text

not exclude the idea of a martyr-death, inasmuch as such a death may serve to manifest both an unwavering confidence in God, and also a readiness to devote one's self, body and life, for the benefit of others. But if such self-devotion did not spring from love, it is obvious that the martyrdom thus suffered would be only of a kind that often occurred later in the history of the church—[a mere parade of heroic endurance or defiance]. Thus the gloss early arose, *ἵνα καυχήσωμαι, in order that I may boast;* which then would have so much the more easily come into the place of the more difficult, and grammatically singular *καυθήσωμαι* since it would have involved the change of only one letter. This gloss would also, in such a connection, be both flat and disturbing to the sense.—**I am profited nothing.**—Thus he takes down all conceit about the meritoriousness of such works. The divine reward, *i. e.*, the crown of righteousness (1 Tim. iv. 8), can only be given to a humble disinterested love.

VERS. 4–7. In this paragraph we have a eulogy of love in a description of its qualities, setting forth its superior excellence both positively and negatively. The beauty of the description is heightened by a personification of love, to which those things are ascribed that are found in such as truly love. Throughout the whole there are occasional side-glances at the faults in the Corinthian Church, which stood in contrast with the excellences set forth. —**Love suffereth long, and is kind**;—Here we have opposite aspects of the same quality. The former expression denotes the withholding of anger, or displeasure at the offences or failings of others, and thus implies the overcoming of a natural indignation; the latter denotes the exhibition of a mild, gracious, tender disposition. The word *χρηστεύεται* [from *χρήστος, useful*] occurs only here in all the New Testament; and elsewhere we find it only in the Church Fathers. It primarily means *disposed to be useful.* Calvin exhibits the contrast thus—*in tolerandis malis—in conferendis bonis.* Next follows a series of statements in which several bad features are denied to love.—**love envieth not**;—The word *ζηλοῖ*, as here used, denotes the exhibition of wrong or unpleasant feelings in view of advantages possessed by others, giving rise to strife and schism; so *ζῆλος* in Rom. xiii. 13, and elsewhere.—**love vaunteth not itself,**—*περπερεύεται* is onomatopoetic ["and comes from the old Latin word *perperus, a braggart.*—See Polybius xxxii. 6, 5; xl. 6, 2;" STANLEY]. It means *to show off one's self—to cut a swell, make a display*, especially with false pretences, *to talk big, to swagger.** Next we have an allusion to the inward ground of all such conduct.—**is not puffed up,**—*i. e.*, inflated with vanity. As this expresses the subjective state of conceit and self-exaltation, so does the former express the natural manifestation of this in boasts over advantages possessed, and in attempts to get honor for them. [Of course there is a contrast here implied. Through these negatives he would give them to understand that "love is modest and humble; modest because humble." Or as CHRYSOSTOM beautifully says: "He adorns love not only from what she hath, but also from what she hath not. For he saith that she both brings in virtue, and extirpates vice, nay, rather she suffers it not to spring up at all".]—**does not behave itself unseemly,**—The word *ἀσχημονεῖν* does not allude precisely to such conduct as is rebuked in xi. 5, but rather to an unseemly obtrusiveness in the use of gifts (comp. xiv. 27 ff.; 39). [MEYER and HODGE interpret the word of unseemly conduct in general, *i. e.*, "love does nothing of which one ought to be ashamed; its whole deportment is decorous and becoming."]—**seeketh not her own,**—Here we have the exact opposite of the real nature of love, a selfish seeking after one's own advantage, honor, and influence as the great thing to be obtained (comp. x. 24, 33).—"Love seeks not its own pleasure, its own enjoyment, its own reputation, its own advantage, its own freedom—yea, not its own blessedness, for, as a general thing, it seeks nothing which it would have alone for itself." BESSER.—**is not provoked to anger,**—[*παροξύνεται*; "the expression is a strong one, and denotes all those feelings of violent irritation, and bitter exacerbation, which are so easily excited in an irritable man." BLOOMFIELD].—It points back to the long-suffering spoken of in ver. 4. Osiander distinguishes it from the former (which he explains as shewing meekness under wrong in general) by the explanation 'love does not allow itself to be aroused even into a transient passion, such as arises from the supposed infringement of one's own claims and interest.' Hence this declaration is closely connected with the one immediately preceding; and as much so with what follows.—**imputeth not the evil**;—*οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν*; this does not refer to the evil which proceeds from one's-self, as though *λογίζεσθαι* meant *to think upon, to meditate*, as in Jer. xxvi. 3; Nahum i. 9; and as Luther renders it: "*Sie trachtet nicht nach Schaden;*" but it refers only to the evil done to it, *q. d.*, 'love does not charge the evil inflicted,' 'does not carry it ever in mind, but forgives it.' (Comp. the word as used in Rom. iv. 8; 2 Cor. v. 19, and elsewhere). The rendering 'suspect' [given by Grot., Heyden., and adopted by Jon. Edwards in his celebrated discourses on this chapter] is, to say the least, doubtful. It is opposed by the article before *κακόν*, '*the* evil,' [which evidently implies the actual existence of some particular evil that was to be dealt with; so Alford, Hodge].—**rejoiceth not at the iniquity,**—Here, too, the thing spoken of is found outside of the subject, as may be seen from the positive antithetic clause which follows. [Jon. Edwards takes the opposite view, and understands the passage as affirming that love, so far from delighting in the practice of iniquity, tends towards holiness in the life. This is to overlook the general drift of the passage, which is rather to represent love in its relations to others]. But

*[This, however, is contrary to the meaning given by Chrys., and most of the Greek commentators, by all the older English versions, except the Genevan, and by Schleusner, Suidas, Bloomfield, and others, who all agree in the sense: 'doth not act precipitately, frowardly, rashly, inconsiderately.' Chrys. comments: "Love renders him who loves both considerate, and grave, and steady in his movements." The balance of authority is in favor of this interpretation. Amid such disagreement it is difficult to form a decision].

the iniquity to which he alludes is not iniquity in general—iniquity as it triumphs and spreads, and because it is in the ascendancy [Stanley, Wordsworth]; but, more suitably with the context, iniquity as perpetrated by particular individuals, and rebounding to their own hurt [Alford]. The trait here brought out, is that disposition to rejoice in the downfall or injury of others (*Schadenfreude*), which springs out of ill-will or jealousy, and which is gladdened when those who are envied for their advantages are compelled through some mis-step to come down from their high position and incur disgrace. This explanation is more natural than to suppose such a love intended as blindly or falsely approves even the errors of others, *applaudit male agentibus* (Grot.); comp. Rom. i. 32; xii. 9.—As a contrast with this, he says,—**but rejoiceth with the truth**;—*συγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ*, not "*at* the truth," thus making the *συν* in composition only intensive [as do most of the commentators and the E. V., altogether overlooking the force of the verb and the altered construction]; nor as though the persons concerned were also taken into the account as Bengel: *gratulatur* [*justis*] *justitiam;* but, "*with* the truth," truth being here personified. It is taken either to denote the absolute truth contained in the Gospel (Col. i. 5; 4 Thess. ii. 12, *etc.*) the aim of which is to make morality prevalent and which rejoices in the attainment of this end (Meyer); or in an ethical sense, as the good. Burger says: "the truth in the fullest sense (John iii. 21; viii. 32–44) as the ground of true morality;" and Neander: "Paul here traces back the idea of the good to that of the divine truth." Or it is interpreted subjectively, moral good in the concrete, *i. e.*, men who have been rescued to morality (Rückert); or the heart filled and sanctified by the truth and by obedience to it (Osiander). The ethical interpretation suits best with the antithesis; to that immorality, which is a violation of the divine righteousness and the divine will, there is here contrasted the harmony of human life in will and act with God and His will, *i. e.*, truth in a moral sense. *With* this, wherever it appears, love rejoices; it holds fellowship with it, and shares in the joy of its success. [So Hodge, who says: "the sympathy of love with the Gospel, therefore, does not seem to be appropriate in this connection, for it is of love as a virtue of which Paul is speaking"].—The conclusion of this description is made up of four positive statements. The first *πάντα στέγει* is variously rendered. The verb may be construed either as in ix. 12, "it suffereth all things," and so be referred to the pains and privations endured for the benefit of others (Burger), in distinction from the *ὑπομένει*, *endureth*, that follows, which is referred to the trials and persecutions inflicted by others. Or it may be rendered "covers up all things," *i. e.*, conceals and is silent about those faults of others which a malignant selfishness would gladly expose; as Bengel very finely says: "hides to itself and to others." So rendered it would stand in easy connection with the "rejoicing not in iniquity" of ver. 6, and also would suit well with what follows. [Jon. Edwards interprets the clause as denoting a disposition which makes us willing for Christ's sake to undergo all sufferings to which we may be exposed in the way of duty! But this, however, truly it may be asserted of love, is hardly consistent with the drift of the passage. It is better to adhere to the strict meaning of the verb *στέγειν*, *to cover*, which, as used by Paul, carries with it the idea of covering over and bearing in silence whatever may be put upon one. So Stanley and Wordsworth]. — **believeth all things**,—*i. e.*, shows a trustful disposition which instead of suspiciously and malignantly surmising and exposing faults, is ever inclined to suppose the existence of a good not seen, and in failures to presume the existence of a right intention. — To this then is added,—**hopeth all things**.—This denotes the disposition to hope for all good by looking unto God (comp. Phil. i. 7); confidently to expect the future victory of good in others, whatever may be the faults and imperfections which for the present bar such hope. [Many commentators are disposed to widen the acceptation of these two last qualities, and to give them a religious significance. So Jon. Edwards who regards the Apostle as here connecting love with faith and hope, thus showing how all the graces of Christianity are connected together in mutual dependence; and De Wette says: "the religious ideas, faith, hope, patience, are too well known not to be supposed to come into play here. A proper confidence in our neighbor passes over in many respects into the faith we have in the wisdom and goodness of God; the hope, by virtue of which we anticipate good in relation to our fellow-men, mounts up into the hope we have in the final victory of the kingdom of God; and the patience with which we endure opposition for our neighbors' sake, partakes of our steadfastness in doing battle for the kingdom of God. The true way therefore will be to interpret these statements both morally in relation to our neighbor, and religiously in relation to God." But, however true in itself, this expansion of thought may be, it is questionable whether the Apostle intended to give his language this scope].—From this there follows the ability for that which is expressed in the next clause,—**endureth all things**,—whether it be taken in the sense of expecting in patience, or of calmly enduring everything painful and trying that appears in the object of our hope. ["The verb *ὑπομένειν*, as Hodge says, is properly a military word, and means *to sustain* the assault of an enemy. Hence it is used in the New Testament to express the idea of sustaining the assaults of suffering or persecution, in the sense of bearing up under them, and enduring them patiently (2 Tim. i. 10; Heb. x. 32; xii. 2). This clause, therefore, differs from that at the beginning of the verse; as that had reference to annoyances and troubles [or, still better, to faults and offences], this to suffering and persecutions." Edwards, however, in consistency with his previous exposition interprets this clause as expressing the final perseverance of love, enduring to the end; this likewise must be considered as transcending the Apostle's line of thought. The union of faith and patience appears also in 2 Thess. i. 3, comp. 2 Tim. ii. 25. The expression "all things" is of course to be taken with a degree of allowance. In the first instance it im-

plies 'all things' which may be endured or concealed so far as duty and conscience do not require their exposure; in the two following it means 'all things' so far as truth allows, so that a person does not impose on himself, nor yield to groundless fancies; and in the last it is to be understood so as not to exclude that earnest reproof which circumstances may demand, [or, taking the second explanation given above, so as not to exclude such a resistance to injury and wrong as the public good or the interests of righteousness may require]. In this way the whole description becomes beautifully consistent. Besides, in this way the first explanation of *στέγειν*, which has in its favor Pauline usage, is not set aside. To suppose a close connection here with ver. 6, is by no means necessary; the voluntary enduring of all possible labors and hardships for the good of others, in striving for their salvation, expressed in the first clause of this verse, is naturally joined with the acts expressed in what follows. Besides, we need not understand by the last clause [as Hodge does] the endurance of persecutions and the like, and can hold fast to the second of the explanations given above. Mark the climax of expressions in this beautiful verse. "Whatever love may encounter from others that is calculated to make it impatient, all this it bears; whatever can make it distrustful, all this it trusts for; whatever might serve to destroy hope in a neighbor, all this it hopes for; whatever might cause it to sink in weakness, beneath all this it holds its ground in firmness and endurance." MEYER.—After having exhibited the excellence of love by portraying those fundamental features of it which are found also in its divine Archetype (Rom. ii. 4; 1 Tim. i. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 20; Titus iii. 4; Eph. ii. 7) he proceeds to display its excellence still further by showing the permanence of those things in respect to which it stands preëminent.

VERS. 8–13. The main proposition in the following exposition here stands first. As to the original text, critics are not yet agreed as to whether, with the Rec., it is to be read *ἐκπίπτει* (Tisch. Ed. 7. [Words.]), or with A. B. C. [Alf., Stan.] *πίπτει*; the sense is the same,—*οὐ καταργεῖται, οὐ παύεται* (comp. Luke xvi. 17). It states negatively what is positively asserted in ver. 13.—**Love never faileth**;—The compound *ἐκπίπτειν* is applied to denote the fading of flowers, the falling of trees, the dislocation of the limbs and the like; also displacement from one's position, becoming void, in Rom. ix. 6, spoken of the Word of God, corresponding to the Old Testament נָפַל, (Job xxi. 43; xxiii. 14). "There failed not aught of any good thing which the Lord had spoken;" and similarly xxiii. 14. The simple form *πίπτειν* means *to fall*, as houses, stars and the like fall. Mere continuance in use is not the thing meant; nor yet simply, that love never fails of its object; but, actual existence. As NEANDER expresses it, "All manifestations of the higher life are transient, save love. It endures for ever."—Instead of continuing in regular sequence, as might be expected, 'but the gifts of various kinds will all cease,' he introduces the mention of particular gifts by *εἴτε—εἴτε, whether—whether*. By this the general idea of gifts is split into its species, followed by distinct assertions respecting each,—**but whether (there be) prophecies**,—*i. e.*, the gift of prophecy, in all its varied forms.—**they shall come to nought**;—*i. e.*, when their contents are all fulfilled, when all that was once hidden is clearly revealed, and "every one is taught of the Lord. (Jer. xxxi. 34).—**whether (there be) tongues, they shall cease**;—Not human languages as such, but the special gift of speaking with tongues, whatever it be.—**whether (there be) knowledge**,—the reading *γνώσεις, knowledges*, is not sufficiently accredited, and the plural was used perhaps in comformity with the previous word.—**it shall come to nought.**—On *καταργεῖν* see chap. i. 28. All these gifts belong to the present state of imperfect spiritual operations and will cease when the period of perfection has come. This he fully asserts in relation to those of knowledge and prophecy in ver. 9, 10 ff. For the cessation of the gift of tongues such assurance was unnecessary, since it was evident of itself that this partial ecstatic and unintelligible manifestation of the Spirit was not to be regarded as anything perpetual and destined to continue in a state of perfection. [Chrys. and others, however, understand these futures, of the time when, faith having spread abroad, these special gifts will be no longer needed; hence, as belonging to the present age. And this has been the practical construction put upon them by a large portion of the Protestant church. Whatever may be the exegesis given this passage, the prevailing belief is that these gifts, especially those of a miraculous nature, were destined only for the apostolic period, and have already ceased. But this, certainly, it was not the intention of the Apostle to assert here. The time alluded to is undoubtedly that of 'the age to come,' ushered in by the second advent of the Lord]. Since the assertion that these gifts were to terminate, would seem most strange when applied to knowledge, he proceeds to enlarge on this first.—**For we know in part and we prophesy in part.**—[Here we have the reason why knowledge and prophecy were to cease. As here exercised, they were partial and imperfect, and therefore in their present form must necessarily pass away when the state of perfection arrived. The most that the most enlightened and inspired seers of the present revelation could boast of, were but momentary glimpses, whether they were into the mysteries of the spiritual world around them, or into the future beyond them].—**But when the perfect has come, that in part shall come to nought.**—By "the perfect" (*τὸ τέλειον*) he means the consummation of the kingdom of God which is to take place at the appearance of Christ, and not the state of believers after death. See Hab. ii. 14, "For *the earth* shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." [At that time all partial illumination will be quenched by the superior effulgence of the divine revelation then made, just as the light of lamps and stars is all quenched by the shining of the sun].—The relation of our present defective condition to what it will be in this future state, is next set forth by an illustration furnished by comparing the several stages of human development — that of

ignorant and inexperienced childhood with that of ripe manhood, which is elsewhere described by the epithet "perfect." (comp. ii. 6; iii. 1; xiv. 20; Eph. iv. 13 ff.).—**When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child**;—["He here once more returns to himself, as the representative of man in general;" and the verbs employed to express the infant condition may be thus defined and distinguished. Λαλεῖν means *to use the voice*, without any necessary reference to the word spoken, and is as applicable to the prattle of children as to the speech of men; φρονεῖν denotes the internal state of the mind, heart or will, which expresses itself through the former, and means not only *to think*, but also *to feel* or *to be inclined* in any particular direction; and λογίζεσθαι implies a continual process of thought, a course of reasoning, and means *to judge*, also *to purpose*; and it may also denote behavior, so far as the result is established and reckoned on]. To refer these three acts of childhood to the three charisms mentioned in ver. 8, *viz.*, of speaking with tongues of prophecy and of knowledge [Beng., Olsh., Stan., and others], is to say the least very problematical; for although the first may allow of this, it is hardly allowable of the other two, even though with Osiander we give to φρονεῖν a merely intellectual significance, *sentire, sapere*.—We might also be tempted to apply the condition of infancy, in its contentedness with its own prattle and acts and thoughts, to illustrate the self-sufficiency of the Corinthians in the possession and use of their gifts; so that then the Apostle would give us to understand in what follows, how everything of this sort, likewise which belongs to a period of immaturity, must be done away in riper manhood when the state of perfection has come. But the course of thought here forbids such an application of the analogy, and allows only that appertaining to the point in view. He means to say, that as one who has become a man has put away the childish character in every respect, so, in the future age, those forms of thinking, feeling and speaking which belong to the present age, will give place to something far better. [The comparison here, it must be observed, is not as between the false and the true, but between the more and the less in regard to what is true. The thoughts and feelings of a child may be correct as far as they go, sufficient for it at its stage, but utterly inadequate when compared with the objects with which it is concerned: all error, if error exists, will be that arising from the limitation of its powers; and this will be gradually removed as its powers expand. Just so our views of divine things at present are not to be suspected and disowned as though they were false because imperfect; but if formed under the guidance of the word and of the Spirit, they are to be relied on as practically sufficient for us in our present condition, even though destined to be greatly modified in the future].—The inadequateness of the present state of knowledge is more fully illustrated in ver. 12, in two contrasts—one as to the directness of knowledge, and the other as to its completeness.—**For now we see through a mirror in an enigma**;—Here knowledge is spoken of under the form of vision (βλέπειν); but it is not human knowledge in general that is intended, but Christian knowledge as a gift. Whether this "seeing" refers to prophetic vision in distinction from simple knowing, is, to say at least, doubtful. Ἔσοπτρον some interpret to mean *a window-pane*, whether of isinglass or some other translucent substance. But the word for this is διόπτρον, never ἔσοπτρον. The latter denotes a mirror which, according to the fashion of the time, consisted of a bright metallic plate, which, however, reflected dimly at the best. The prep. διά, 'through' [by which some support the interpretation of *a window-pane*], is used in accordance with that optical illusion which makes the object reflected seem as if *behind* the mirror, and so, as if seen *through* it.* The expression ἐν αἰνίγματι is not to be construed adverbially [as in the E. V. and by Heyden, Billr. and others] '*enigmatically*,' '*darkly*' (ἀμαυρῶς); but here the Apostle passes out of the sphere of seeing into that of hearing, and shows us the nature of that in which the objects alluded to are seen. This he calls an 'enigma'—a word denoting obscure phraseology, some mode of statement that only hints obscurely what is meant, or propounds a riddle to be solved. And by this term he characterizes the objective medium of Christian knowledge, *viz.*, the revealed word in which divine things are seen reflected as in a mirror. The appropriateness of the designation is seen in the fact that the divine word does not convey to us these things in perfect clearness, but only suggests them, leaving much still problematical. As Melanchthon says: "The word, as it were, veils a wonderful fact which in the heavenly state we shall contemplate fully disclosed to our sight." And Burger: "The revealed word is called an enigma, because it necessarily sets forth divine truth in modes of expression borrowed from human conditions and natural phenomena—consequently in a sort of figurative language, the import of which our minds but partially apprehend. [And Hodge: "We do not see the things themselves, but those things as set forth in symbols and words which but imperfectly express them."] Delitzsch, also, interprets the phrase in question of the revealed word. Perhaps there was floating before the mind of the Apostle that passage in Num. xii. 8, where the Lord says of Moses: "With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches (δι αἰνιγμάτων, lxx.), and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold." Compare with this Gen. xxxii. 30: "I have seen God face to face"—where, indeed, we have the expression in the antithetic clause of our text, which designates the immediateness of vision.—**but, then face to face**:—On this point see 1 Jno. iii. 2: "We know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is." Essentially the same contrast is expressed in 2 Cor. v. 7.—**now I know in part**;—[As before, the point of comparison was as to the *directness* of knowledge, so here it is as to its *extent*. The imperfectness of knowledge is owing, however, to its indirectness].—**but then shall I know**—ἐπιγνώσομαι;

*[But is not this an unnecessary refinement on the meaning? Instead of the *local* why not give διά the *causal* sense *by means of*? See Jelf. *Gr. Gram.* § 627, 3. d.]

the ἐπι in composition is intensive, *shall I thoroughly know, pernoscam.*—**even as I also was known.**—Here, too, the same verb is employed, ἐπεγνώσθην, *was thoroughly known.* Supply 'by God.' The perfection of human knowledge is compared with that of the Divine knowledge which apprehends its object not from one side or the other, but is central and total. "We should not hesitate to assert the entire fulness of the promise which the Holy Scripture gives to the soul that is related to God. The New Testament occupies the proper mean between deism and pantheism; it never allows us to divest ourselves of the character peculiar to personality, with its limitations; but, at the same time, it points us away to the highest exaltation of the human spirit by virtue of the fellowship it acquires with God. This statement of Paul corresponds with the beatitude of our Lord in Matth. v. 8: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." NEANDER. As the object of the verbs "see" and "know," some supply 'God' or 'Divine things,' or 'God in Christ,' but there is no necessity for such specification. The objects of vision and knowledge are obviously the things contained in the revealed word. The transition from the plural to the singular number is occasioned by the change in the mode of exposition. The aorist ἐπεγνώσθην, *I was known,* does no prejudice to the eternity of the Divine knowledge. It is employed simply to express the priority of that knowledge in respect to that of man in the future state, as a thing then past (Meyer, Ed. 3). It points back to the time of his conversion, when he became the object of the divine knowledge that then was turned directly on him (chap. viii. 3). Respecting the relation of this passage to others, where the cicarness and perfection of the Divine revelation, and of the Christian's knowledge of God are prominently brought out, comp. Osiander, p. 601.—But what is the meaning of the concluding verse, and in what connection does it stand with the preceding?—**And now**—νυνὶ δὲ. Is this to be taken in its temporal acceptation as equivalent to the "now" (ἀρτι) of the preceding verse, and in contrast with the "then?" * If so, to what extent does he emphasize the continuance of the things specified in the present dispensation of the world? Does he intend to put them in contrast with the other gifts which were soon to cease? This can hardly be, for in the Apostle's view the advent of Christ was ever at hand—so imminent, indeed, that he regards the gifts as continuing until then. And apart from this, in what goes before, he has proved that they would cease then from the fact that they have no place in a state of perfection. We are therefore compelled to take the words "and now" in a logical sense (BURGER says, "as an inference from what precedes")='under these circumstances,' *i. e.,* since these gifts are appropriate only for this dispensation, and must cease with the incoming of the period of perfection.—**there (therefore) remains permanently faith, hope, love.**—Thus what he has said of love in ver. 8, he extends now to the other fundamental graces of Christianity that are also elsewhere associated with love (Col. i. 4ff.; 1 Thess. i. 3; v. 8). The chief objection to this construction arises from the fact that Paul elsewhere exhibits to us faith and hope as belonging to the present life in contrast with the future. So in 2 Cor. v. 7, where 'walking by faith' is opposed to 'walking by sight;' and Rom. viii. 24, where we are said to be "saved by hope," which was hereafter to be merged in sight. Shall we then put the Apostle in contradiction with himself? Various attempts have been made to obviate this. Some would abstract from faith and hope their results or effects, and take these simply into view as the things which were to remain; but this will not do since they must be construed in the same way that love is, which is here taken in a subjective sense. Others would construe the verb "abide" in other than a temporal sense, *q. d.,* 'so there is left to us these three fundamental virtues; these three alone have an abiding significance (Burger), are the essential and sufficing elements of the Christian life. But all such interpretations are in this connection arbitrary (comp. on ver. 8 ff). Others still maintain, indeed, the temporal sense of the verb, but, so far as faith and hope are concerned, only relatively. They abide only until the advent. But here again the old difficulty arising from the gifts occurs. Others still interpret the verb to denote perpetual duration, in contrast with the practical and spasmodic character of the gifts; which is somewhat arbitrary. Others suppose a distinction between the glorified kingdom of Christ upon earth and the absolute perfection of heaven, and refer the verb to the former state; but this cannot be, since the previous verses plainly point to a state of absolute perfection. In our exposition we must settle upon this, that the Apostle ascribes to faith and hope the same permanent character which he ascribes to love. But the faith he speaks of is not opposed to sight, (as in 2 Cor. v. 7); still less is it the faith mentioned in verse 2; neither is hope to be taken in contrast with actual possession and enjoyment (as in Rom. viii. 24). But faith here is the everlasting foundation of the state of blessedness—faith as the devout apprehension, and fast-holding of Christ's attributes sole ground of salvation for each and every one; and hope is the perpetual expectation of [illegible] delightful manifestations of God's [illegible] unexpectation must also exist in the [illegible] a thing impossible only under [illegible] that God's glory was at once [illegible] and admitted of no further [illegible] stage of perfection no more [illegible] be cho[illegible]

* [So Poole, Bloomfield, and others (contrary to its use just after in xiv. 6), who interpret this verse as asserting the permanent character of the three *graces* in contrast with the transientness of the *gifts*, and that for this dispensation, while the eternal duration of love is set forth by implication in the last clause: "the greatest of these is love." "The difficulty," as BLOOMFIELD says, "hinges on this: the Apostle has omitted to mention the *cause* of the superiority; yet he hints it in the words 'now abideth,' *viz.*, since faith and hope only remain in use *now*, in this world only, love will *also* be exercised in *another world*, and to all eternity. The sense, then, may be thus expressed: 'Faith, Hope, and Love, these three together exist in the present scene *only;* but in the future world Faith and Hope will be done away, and therefore the greatest of these is Love.'" This interpretation certainly obviates some difficulties attending the other, and sustains the theory of the temporary nature of the gifts in question; but is it not adding to the letter and import of Scripture something not found there? And is it not opposed by the change of particles, νυνὶ δὲ being used instead of ἀρτι in order to avoid such construction]!

developments in sight and knowledge, than does the maturity of manhood in the natural life. Such mainly is Meyer's view. He interprets faith as an abiding trust in the atonement effected by Christ, which preserves the glorified in the perpetual enjoyment of salvation, and forms the living bond of an eternal fellowship with their Saviour; and hope he explains of the eternal duration, and progressive unfolding of the glory conferred upon them; and also from chap. xv. 24 he seems to find such developments in the future state indicated. And NEANDER says, "precisely because faith anticipates a higher stage of development in life, is it certain that that which it now has only as an object of faith is not to be had as a perfect possession of knowledge." Somewhat different is Menken's view; he assumes the eternal duration of both faith and hope in relation to ever fresh revelations of God, and to ever new degrees of blessedness also in the higher state. Accordingly we need not, with Osiander, refer back simply to the general state of mind underlying both: *viz.*, that of a true and blessed attachment to God in Christ, which is to go on unfolding itself even in yonder world.—**these three; but the greater of these.**—*μείζων τούτων*; *τουτων*, *of these*, is commonly referred to faith and hope, so that it is translated 'greater than these.' But the nearer reference is to the words "these three," and the proper rendering is as above. Of them all the greater, the one possessing higher worth—is love.—From the fact that love has nothing to do with the justification of the sinner, and that here faith alone comes into the account, no inference can be drawn in respect to the relative worth of faith; hence also the inquiry which Calvin institutes in respect to how far, also, on the other hand, faith is greater than love, is here superfluous. The superior worth of love, which is the sum and substance of all virtues, and is the bond of perfectness (ver. 4 ff.; Col. iii. 14), does not rest on the fact that it includes in itself faith and hope, as one would infer from ver. 7 [as DE WETTE, who beautifully remarks, "we have faith only in one whom we love, we hope only for that which we love"]; but rather on this, that in it the image of God, who is love itself, is most perfectly exhibited, in so far as, unlike the other two, it does not relate to the *receiving* of our salvation with all its blessings, but is essentially *imparting* and *self-bestowment*. It is to this that BENGEL finely points: "Love is of more advantage to our neighbor, than mere faith and hope w in themselves (comp. "*greater*," xiv. 5);—and pow God is not called faith or hope absolutely, but its pOe is called 'love;'" and MEYER in Ed. 3 says: things since, in relation to *faith*, the love by which it disowneas conditions its moral worth as well as the perfect; b. fruitfulness of the Christian life, *faith* word and ot it would be mere show; and *hope* can as practicallyv from a faith that is active and loving condition, eventh. xxv. 35)." And BURGER: "Love modified in the fu because it is the fundamental form the present state oife itself, which, in us, should be lustrated in ver. 12, ways of faith, and of hope." the directness of knoThroughout this chapter the its completeness.—**For**ce of one gift to others is **a mirror in an enigm**a superior usefulness. This spoken of under the forad judged by this rule, love is greater than either faith or hope. Faith saves ourselves, but love benefits others"].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Love the essential principle of all moral excellence.* The personal worth and eternal welfare of an individual consists not in any thing which he may have or be capable of, whether it be called talent, or endowment, or aptitude, or capacity, which may enable him to accomplish any thing of greater or less importance in any sphere of life, in the way either of thought or knowledge, of willing or working. In this matter it makes no difference even though the person may act as an organ of the Spirit of God, who for the time being may take possession of his natural powers and employ them upon Divine things. Let him do, or say, or think, what he will under such circumstances, from this alone no personal worth, no true salvation ensues. This rests solely and alone in an actual likeness to God as evinced in the whole tendency of a person's life. And this likeness is found in *love*, by means of which a man patterns after God in his whole inner and outward conduct, becomes fundamentally united with God, thinks and acts like God, and purposes to have and to hold nothing good for himself alone, but to impart it to others also, gives up all exclusiveness, and devotes himself with his utmost energies to works of benevolence, seeking therein not his own advantage, nor honor, nor influence, but his neighbor's good, and so also the fulfilment of the Divine ends, even the glory of God. So long, then, as Christ, who is the revelation of the Father's love, is formed in a man, does he possess a worth which nothing else can confer; and in company with Christ is he admitted into the very fulness of the Divine blessings, to share in Christ's salvation and enter on a life of everlasting blessedness. Has he any particular qualifications, with these he serves the body of Christ, and devotes himself and all he has to promote the welfare of that heavenly communion into which he is incorporated. Thus does he become a veritable member of this holy and blessed society, and participates in the Divine fulness which fills it.

But he that is devoid of love, however great his gifts, however superior his knowledge or his performances, is in consequence void of worth. The Spirit of Christ is not the life of his life—not the vital bond of his union with God—not the power which possesses his heart and draws it out from its selfish isolation and sheds abroad in him that love by means of which he in the very image and frame of his mind shall be conformed to the Divine image. In acting upon him the Spirit of God operates from without, and employs his particular powers only as the instruments for the accomplishment of specific objects, and only so long as it may please Him. Remaining fast in his own selfishness, and becoming an end to himself apart from God, he for this reason forfeits all claim to regard, and deserves to be used only as a means by that Being whose honor he has thus violated. All the reward he has is in the pleasure and reputation he may have acquired by his gifts; and shut up in

himself he lives and moves untouched by that stream of Divine blessing which flows in upon and fills the body of Christ, and makes every member rich to his profoundest contentment through the interchange of benefits which goes on between the members. The same holds true also in relation to such actions as are supposed to betoken a stronger love, *viz.*, extraordinary sacrifices, both of property and of life itself, and that too amid martyr sufferings. Should these be made in a loveless temper, and in a selfish spirit, though never so refined, they secure no advantage. The person forfeits his crown, because instead of honoring God he sought only to glorify himself.

2. *The excellent quality of love.* That which thus conditions our personal worth and salvation must in itself be supremely excellent. Accordingly we see that love displays itself in a nobler array of glorious attributes which are but the outgoings of its inmost nature. Indeed, its beauty is seen not only in what it has, but also in what it is devoid of. If with disinterested affection I devote myself to my brother's highest welfare, then will there be no room in my heart for *spite* or *ill-will*, and no relaxation in my labors and prayers in his behalf. Even though his progress be slower than I anticipated, though he exhibits all manner of weakness and imperfection, though he fails and backslides again and again, though he evinces an unteachable or ungrateful disposition, though he causes me weariness and disgust, though he grieves and provokes me, though he betrays my confidence and disappoints my hope often, yet for all this will I not turn from him in indignation. Love teaches me to endure, and to restrain my impatience, and to cherish and manifest my benevolence still, according to the example of my God. It prompts me to go on and bear all things, and endure labors and crosses in His behalf, on the ready supposition that where God's work has begun, however concealed from me, some good must exist which calls for my persevering effort even when the danger of failure seems most imminent. Again, if in cordial love I have given myself up to the communion of saints in Christ, then I shall feel neither *envy* nor *jealousy* in view of the preëminent gifts, or greater influence, or higher honor of others.—So, too, I shall be exempt from *pride* and *boasting* on account of my own superior advantages; nor will I unbecomingly obtrude myself on others' notice; but every where maintain a modest and decorous deportment; neither shall I be seeking mine own honor, or power, or enjoyment, nor give place to bitterness and evil passion when disappointed in such attempts or baffled by rivals. Moving continually in the sphere of that grace which freely and abundantly pardons all sin, I too shall not be ready to impute the injustice I suffer from, but rather shall seek to aid and bless in return, and requite good for evil. Moreover, having been made free by the truth myself, I shall sympathize with truth in every victory it gains, and take no pleasure in unrighteousness, nor feel a malignant satisfaction when others fall, as though their fall redounded in some way to my credit. Thus is love supremely beautiful, both from what it lacks and from what it possesses, shining forth in contrast with the sins and imperfections of the world, like a visitant from heaven.

3. *Faith, Hope and Love alone permanent.* Particular gifts which afford us only transient glimpses into the depths of the Divine plans and purposes, serve well for the wants of the present life, and satisfy certain needs of the church during its earthly career; but for this reason they are not suited to that state of perfection where the partial gives place to the complete, and where, instead of a knowledge mediated by inadequate words and signs, we enjoy the direct vision of God and of all things in Him. That only can endure which may be regarded as a conclusive union of our renewed nature with the life of God—with eternal grace, and truth, and glory. And such is *faith* which firmly and trustfully clings to God's redeeming grace in Christ as the sole foundation of safety both for time and eternity; such is *hope*, which reaches out joyfully after ever fresh manifestations of the Divine glory; such, too, is *love*, the union of the regenerate soul with the Triune God, in which the very life of God gushes forth in inexhaustible streams, and which must have the preëminence, even as the Divine principle of distribution and self-bestowment must have the superiority over the earthly principle of receiving and enjoying, because "it is more blessed to give than to receive."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

CHRYS.:—Ver. 5. As a spark which falls into the sea hurts not the sea, but is itself extinguished, so let any thing evil befall the loving soul, and it will soon be extinguished without disquietude.

LUTHER: — Ver. 3. Giving is indeed a *fruit* of love, but it is not love itself: love is a spiritual gift which involves the heart and not the hand alone; love denotes not that which the hand does, but which the heart feels.—Ver. 5. 'Not to seek its own;' behold, this is the nature of love where it is sincere; but it is sincere only where faith is sincere. A Christian lives not in himself alone, but in Christ and in his neighbor—in Christ, through faith; in his neighbor through love. Through faith he passes beyond himself into God, and out of God he passes again below himself through love, and ever abides in God and in Divine love.

STARKE:—Ver. 1. Glorious gifts make no man a Christian, but it is love that makes and proves him such (Gal. v. 6; John xiii. 35).—What is the knowledge contained in that speech which is not used through love and unto love, but the confusion of Babel. Oftentimes there is great sounding in the ear when there is no profit before God. Many a man speaks to his neighbor [illegible] in pure angelic words, while his heart is devoid of love; and to God he daily draws near with [illegible] his heart is far from him.—Ver. 2. The knowledge of divine mysteries is a remarkable [illegible] but take away love and it loses its [illegible] wonder-working faith is not the [illegible] makes blessed. Though possessing [illegible] yet be plunged into the prison-horrors [illegible] lieving souls (Matt. vii. 22 ff.). [illegible]

HED.:—Ver. 3. Let no one be [illegible] rejoicing against

ing and suffering. Inquire after the disposition—the ground and the aim. Love gives weight to all.—Though I do all the good a man can, and suffer all a man may; without love it is no good work for which I can hope a gracious reward.—To hazard life rather than the truth is indeed in itself something commendable; but he who might on this account endure the severest martyrdom without love, would nevertheless derive therefrom no profit.—There are true and false martyrs—God's and the devil's.—Vv. 4–7. As in a crown there are many precious stones, so in the single virtue of love there are imbedded many virtues. But to no wickedness must love be so hostile as to wrath and revenge, which it encounters in the beginning ("long suffering"), middle ("is not easily provoked"), and end ("endures").—Whom we love, we highly esteem; how then can we exalt ourselves above him?—O, how sadly is the sweet name of love abused in that it is made to serve as a veil for all unchastity and wantonness (ἀσχημονεῖν)!—Love is so far from making unrighteous demands that it rather yields its rights and imparts itself, with all it has and can, unto others. That which is called love and friendship is oftentimes nothing but a trade—with one hand it gives, but with both hands it is ready to take again. Behold how rare true love has become (x. 24).—Love does not 'laugh in the sleeve' when it sees a neighbor fall into sin; rather, it rejoices when men act uprightly and it goes well with them.—Void of love are they, who for the sake of peace in the church would readily sell the truth of the gospel. This is far too precious a jewel to be thus bartered.—Because love wishes all good to every one, it can surmise evil of none, but ever hopes well of a neighbor. Although often deceived in its good opinion, yet does it fill out the measure of its goodness by enduring everything, and labors still to set him right with all mildness and meekness. It does not readily despair of any sinner, however bad, and keeps hoping that God will still preserve him, and that he will yet acknowledge and reform from his unrighteousness.—Love has a broad mantle which it spreads over a multitude of sins and guards itself from the curse of Ham with all diligence.—Ver. 8 ff.: Love produces its fruits here without intermission and is a foretaste of eternal life; yonder it will become perfect; and in this our blessedness will consist. Although we possess everything in faith, and do now perceive something of what God is, and what He gives us, yet is this knowledge scant when compared with the clear vision of the future. Here we have only a few drops out of an ocean of divine knowledge; and who does not often find in these very drops an abyss which he
n cannot fathom (Rom. xi. 33)?—The imperfect
iso knowledge is as far surpassed by the perfect as
erfec wax light is by the sunshine (Hed.).—If thy
ord a wledge is but patchwork, why dost thou boast
s practi of? Heaven is the school where we shall
ondition, ecome masters.—Even prophecy, although
odified in perfection of an enlightened mind, is yet
ie present s inasmuch as it does not behold the
istrated in ve blessing as present, but only contem-
he directness o om afar. This will cease when we
s completeness. he chief object of all prophecy ful-
mirror in an redemption.—By reason of our
poken of under t

childish apprehension even the otherwise clear word of God comes to us as a veiled speech in which we ever look with industrious contemplation and only gradually discover the import; but in that perfect state we shall have God and all heavenly things present to our view and behold them as they are.—Ver. 13: Faith *receives* good, love *does* good. Faith and hope profit *me* only, but love *serves many*. It alone of the three is an attribute of God, and in men it is the most distinguished feature of the divine image.—Faith is the ground of a holy life and of good works; hope builds the edifice of the same; and love perfects and crowns it.

Berlenb. Bibel:—Ver. 1. It is better to appear foolish and weak before men, than to speak without the spirit of Christ; better to lack speech, than to lack love.—Ver. 2. In comparison with love everything is small, even the miracles of a wonder-working faith. Wherefore? Because our nature arrogates to itself all these works. But love ever bows low before the object loved, both God and man, and so is secured against all temptations to this.—As even the most plausible words are dead without love, so without love the best knowledge is also unfruitful; yea, it serves to enhance man's condemnation. Without it the glorious gift of prophecy especially is nothing, since God designs to be praised only in the Son of His love; and without love no words, however excellent, do Him service. The love of God, as it is His very nature and life, we may well call the mystery of mysteries. For who can rightly compute its power, attributes, and operations? Hence the knowledge of all mysteries and all other science, otherwise never so good, is cheap in comparison with it.—With all your spiritual gifts, always consider how far the one divine power of love may yet be wanting in thee for softening all your wild natural enthusiasm. Love makes the heart true and obedient. The greatest works may be performed from false motives, or even may be perverted to our own self-seeking.—Ver. 3. Love surpasses all sacrifice. A person can still love himself in the highest degree, be seeking his own honor, and the praise of men, even when dividing all his property among the poor, or complying with other religious requirements only for the purpose of being praised as a zealous Christian. So out of self-love may a person fling away his life, and suffer martyrdom, only that he may gain an immortal name. Such, indeed, have their reward.—But what boots it for them to cast away all their goods, if they do not also cast away their self-will? All formal sacrifice profits nothing, because it is without the true love of God, which indeed admits of no such self-love; and by it one becomes worse instead of better. Love is the disposition of God; as common the word, so uncommon is the thing itself. Set over against it the most extraordinary things are overtopped, and seem undesirable. From this we may infer the greatness of love, and how much it is to be preferred against all else. But, O Love, man knoweth thee not,-because thou art hid behind thine own simplicity. Only by thy workings canst thou be recognized.—Ver. 4 ff. Love is invincible. By impatience the strongest and the wisest, when devoid of love, may be overcome

of evil; but love is able to endure the keenest sufferings, and it is this that makes it strong. It shows itself, therefore, in those who have Jesus dwelling in them, partly by the manifestation of good, and partly by the endurance of evil, and in both meekness and long-suffering as exhibited in the heart and life of Jesus.—Ver. 4. By virtue of its soft, gentle nature, which shuns all rashness and haste, love is in itself *long-suffering*, even as God Himself is (Rom. ix. 22), especially in its dealing with difficult cases in the church; not that we are to let all evil pass, but only not to overdrive reform. Love *is kind* (Gal. viii. 22); this is its nature. The love of God, infused at the new birth, makes the soul kind, so that it gladly affords others the means of enjoyment also. It says not: "I am not bound to do this and this;" but where there is no law it makes one, in order to do as much good as it can, and to pour itself freely upon all men.—With love envy, revenge, wickedness, and pride can find no room. Love feels no jealousy in seeing another achieving great things.—Its whole action is modest. Its tender spirit allows of no arrogance. It boasts not of its divine nature, since its disposition is only to serve. It makes itself small and child-like; it bows its temper to a low estimate of itself, and a high estimate of others. It aims not at the praise of men, nor at self-pleasing; but strives, in every way, to please God, and all who are loved of God.—Ver. 5. According to a common proverb, the final end of love, in which it rests and is content, is the satisfaction and pleasure of the object beloved. True love has no separate interest of its own, but it gives itself entirely, with all its being and means, to its object. His good is its good, his joy its joy; it lives solely and alone in him and for him. If it knows that it has occasioned him any displeasure, then is its all embittered; and it cannot rest until it is assured that he has become reconciled again. Love allows itself in no violence, nor any inordinate desires after anything, nor in any ill humor even against evil.—It can forget; has no memory for evil; strikes it out of mind.—Ver. 6. Love takes no delight in seeing a person stumbling, so that it can raise a hue and cry after him. Antichristian spirits rejoice when anything goes wrong with those who do not coöperate with them in all things. Love is righteous, and rejoices when the spirit obtains a conquest over wickedness.—The love which does not rejoice in the truth, is no love.—Ver. 7. Love is not credulous, but believes all good of another sooner than allow itself easily to believe, or to imagine anything wicked, because love ever inclines to the side of the good. Love trusts God for final victory in all things. What it does not see, it awaits in patience; it exercises itself in prayer, and does not soon become weary of fidelity and patience towards others, but quietly endures the sufferings meted out unto it.—As in good, so in evil, is it invincible. It would rather bear, believe, hope, suffer all things than allow evil to triumph. Away, therefore, with your passionate, false, wrathful natures!—O Thou eternal Life, in the midst of Thine enemies rule Thou in us, through Thy lamb-like loving Spirit, in the patience and faith of Thy saints, in mildness and meekness, and tranquility!—Ver. 8. Love is unending and ceaseless as God's own eternal life, even so far as He imparts it to His believing creatures. It continues in eternity as an eternal essence and life in God, and in all blessed spirits. Other spiritual gifts are indeed from God, but they are not God's essence and life as love is, and they retire before it in eternity.—All other gifts are only preparations for perfect love; in it all those things terminate which have not in themselves the *entire* divine life. — Vv. 9, 10. One knows this, another that, none everything. The Church of God anticipates a summer which shall never pass away. At last the tree produces ripe fruits, the child loses himself in the youth, and the youth in the man. When the veils which now curtain us are all taken away, then will the perfect come. To abide in that which is fragmentary when age is matured, is childishness. When we hold to special gifts for their own sake alone, then are we liable to become extinguished with them.—Ver. 11 f. Mature manhood in Christ exchanges the patchwork of the outward exercises in speech and knowledge for the perfect essence of love. This makes us Christ godly-minded, and glorifies in us Christ, in the Father. —Ver. 13. Faith, hope, and charity, all three, are the simple cleaving of the loftiest disposition to God, as that Being who alone can and will help us through Himself. In *love* we have joy in Him as the highest good which can satisfy all our longings, and we strive to please Him supremely. In *faith* we commit ourselves wholly to Him on the ground that He loves us, and consequently will help us. In *hope* we patiently expect that He will love us in eternity, will impart Himself to us, and be our help forever.

RIEGER:—Vv. 1–3. That a person may have gifts without communion with God is a witness of the general disposition on the part of God to do good and simply to give. If a man endowed with many gifts is nothing without love, what must that man be who is utterly estranged from the life of love, and has nothing at all wherewith to clothe his nakedness. As *long suffering*, love can consume much time over the failings of others; as *kind*, it considers how it can make itself acceptable to them for their improvement. It desires not to be and to do everything itself; but it looks gladly on when its defects are supplied by the assistance and gifts of others. Together with this, it avoids all that petulance which characterizes those who love to please themselves. It is not puffed up with the breath of human applause, and in all it does, has reference rather to the Father who seeth in secret. Hence, it never behaves itself rudely, neither by making too common of high things, or by being too free with equals or by looking contemptuously on what is low; but it keeps in the place where God has put it as a member. It neither seeks its own in selfishness, nor fails to prefer the general good to its own. It imputes not evil, holding others aloof in suspicion or in revenge. It helps the truth, and it suffers much that is unjust towards it to pass as though unobserved. As far as it can, without prejudice to others and without injury to the public peace, it believes all things and hopes all things; and until this hope has become a joy, it endures all things and holds fast;—mercy rejoicing against

judgment.—Vv. 8–12. All knowledge and prophecy is patchwork; these can represent the truth only in partial aspects without giving a complete survey, because God has determined to draw men to Himself through His word, and the gradual revelation of Himself therein, and to operate upon their hearts under these external presentations, according as men allow themselves to be brought thereby to the obedience of faith and to heed the partial revelations given. After the light that was quenched in the fall, God purposed to restore man not through a direct illumination that would have rendered faith and conviction, obedience and love unnecessary. As he sinned through hearing and through disobedience, so was he to be saved also by hearing and faith and obedience. Therefore God showed to him so much as was necessary to awaken faith and obedience, left it so far obscure as to allow room for the excuses of unbelief in case he ceased to have pleasure in the truth.—All of us are too ready to engross to ourselves everything with the desire of becoming perfect ourselves; but the Scriptures admonish us to hold everything as a common good which has been conferred on us and others. The perfect descends upon me—even the kingdom of God, into which I enter, and which brings with itself something far beyond that which I could hitherto attain unto with my partial knowledge in prophesying. Ver. 13. Among the perfected righteous, love will remain as the bond of perfection. He who abides in love abides in God, and God in him.

Heubner:—Ver. 1. Love alone has unconditioned worth, it carries in itself its own contents; everything else, even the highest spiritual advantages obtain their worth through it. All speech without it is lifeless. The most beautiful orator devoid of heart is but a beautiful instrument unconscious of what is played on it. The simplest words spoken in love are of more worth than the most charming speeches void of heart. Those who are eminent for insight should not forget to love. And to whom this insight is denied, let him not trouble himself if he has love.—Indeed, there is a service which offers up all things and endures all sufferings and yet obtains not the grace of God nor any eternal reward, because love is wanting—because the thing was done for love of fame.—Ver. 4 ff. As the worth of love shines forth by a comparison with other excellencies, so is it seen also from its blessed fruits. Its chief attributes are a sparing tenderness, a gentleness which never injures, a simple self-forgetfulness, holy sympathy, invincible courage,—Division: I. according to the subject: benevolent (ver. 4), true (ver. 5), holy (ver. 6), invincible (ver. 7); II. according to its objects: the failures, infirmities, follies of others (ver. 4), injuries (ver. 5), needs (ver. 6).—Ver. 4. Love is not a transient ebullition, but a benevolence which does not allow itself to slumber, or kindle into wrath on account of the failings or indocility of others. It so associates with others that they can observe and feel the inner affection in its friendly ways.—It does not deal petulantly with the weaknesses and follies of others, nor make them the subject of ridicule.—It is free from conceit and self-consciousness, and is willing to let others feel its own weakness.—Ver. 5. Amid injuries it does not break out into wrath and contemptuous expressions, nor does it allow itself in anything by which another's sensitiveness or feeling of shame can be wounded, nor is it unseemingly obtrusive. It asks not, "what is that to me?" nor disavows the natural relationship among men, nor measures the iniquities of others according to the damage suffered. — It does not allow its benevolence to be disturbed by the pains which others inflict upon it. It hunts not after evil to insist on an atonement, but cherishes thoughts of peace.—Ver. 6. Observe its holy interest in the spiritual welfare of others: while the evil-minded rejoice over other's sins and punishments and disgrace, and narrate them with laughing lips, love delights in beholding the sincere piety of others clearly displayed.—Ver. 7. Love does not secretly impose severe labors upon others, but performs them itself, and bears their brunt.—It gives the best credit possible to others for their doings and hopes always for their improvement, and undertakes to promote it in all possible ways.—Ver. 8 ff. The worth of love is seen thirdly, from its eternal duration. It alone avails in Heaven where all that is here learned is useless.—In Heaven there is no preaching, since only one spiritual tongue is there spoken. We shall read each other's thoughts in our souls. The highest human knowledge is in its extent and depth and connections but mere patchwork.—Now God has given us a problem to solve; we are to find its solution in nature, in History, in His word where His holy love exhibits itself to us in the image of Christ. Then shall we behold that which is now unseen, face to face.

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 1. As the life blood of the body is poured from the heart into all the members, and as every heart-beat pulsates in all the veins, so is love the heart of the body of Christ. God has love without measure. His essence is love. The Christian has only drops from this divine sea of love, some small portion of the divine fulness. And Paul is strenuous that the love of the Spirit which renews the human soul in Christ, shall move the tongue of him who prays and sings praises; that love to the Lord Jesus, love to the church, love to all mankind shall give to the sounding instrument its living tune.—Ver. 3. O, how many works of undying fame perish before God and follow not their authors, because they are not quickened by that love which is alone imperishable!—Vv. 4–7. The twice-seven graces of love here shine like the seven colors of the rainbow. The rainbow is the token of the triumph of the sun over the rain; so love shows itself triumphant over all hostile obstructions in manifold ways. The heavenly daughter of the Spirit triumphs over that which is carnal and earthly.—The varnish of a worldly polish is nothing in comparison with the culture of the heart in the Christian, however humble his condition may be; love ennobles the whole conduct of him who has it.—O, Thou true Savior, in our poverty we cry to Thee! Turn Thyself to us! From being wrathful, unfriendly, envious, haughty, conceited, rude, selfish, implacable, revengeful, cold tempered, unmerciful, suspicious, mean, impatient

do Thou make us loving in heart.—Vv. 9-10. The edifice of evangelical doctrine has many openings which will remain unclosed, for they are the windows out of which we look toward Heaven and for the coming of that which is perfect.—Ver. 13. The Christian life is subject to the triumvirate of the three here lauded (comp. 1 Thess. i. 3; Col. i. 4, 5; Heb. x. 22-24).—*Faith* lays hold of the promise of eternal life; *hope* waits for the appearing of the object of faith; but *love* is eternal life itself in its power as manifested toward God and man. It is greater in duration; its being has no end.

Ewald:—Vv. 4-7. *The worth of love.* There is not a Christian virtue which is not strengthened by its power, not an evil which it cannot keep aloof, not a condition in life to which it cannot impart a Christian character.

Vv. 1-13. Pericope for Esto Mihi Sunday, Oetinger, *Sermons on the Epistles* p. 161 ff.—I. True love distinguished from attachment and partiality; II. overcometh all wrath and judgment.

Heubner.—I. Love is the highest gift of grace, on account of: 1. its inward worth; 2. its blessing, and 3. its influence upon eternal life. II. Love is the consummation of Christianity: 1. it puts the crown upon all excellencies; 2. it exhibits preeminently the power of Christian faith; 3. it sets us in connection with eternity and God. III. The comparison between the excellencies of the mind and of the heart: 1. the former have in themselves no unconditioned worth; without love they may inflict injury; the latter alone impart worth, and united with it the former become truly renowned; 2. the former do not make a person beneficial to the public; love only makes one ready to serve and generally useful; 3. the former confer no claim for salvation; love alone makes us worthy of heaven. IV. The Christian road to true fame (comp. chap. xii. 31): 1. It is a holy road, different from the ordinary one; 2. it is a truly difficult road, requiring much labor (comp. vv. 4-7), often not remunerative, often losing itself in the dark; but yet 3. it is safe, and certain of leading to heaven. V. The worth of true love: 1. often eclipsed by glittering gifts and showy acts; 2. its peculiar spirit, being often occupied in unseen labors, is not visible; 3. its eternal reward still hidden.—Vv. 1-8. *Sermons* by J. G. Krafft. Vol. 1, p. 165 ff. Love: I. Its peculiar character: 1. as to its ground (humility); 2. as to attributes. II. Its higher worth: it sanctifies knowledge; is the soul of faith; is the consecration of every good deed. III. How we shall partake of the same: 1. by the contemplation of its archetype in Jesus Christ; 2. by receiving love from Him who is the fountain of grace and love.

Ver. 7. Schleiermacher's *Collected works.* Vol. I. p. 40. The limits of forbearance: I. in our judgment respecting men; II. in our behavior toward them. "It is only justice toward the good and the pious, when you look upon them with the eyes of love, all glowing with faith and hope; it is only love to the evil, when you show strict justice towards the evil which is in them."

[Jon. Edwards. *Charity and its fruits.* Vv. 1-3. *All the virtue that is saving and distinguishes true Christians from others, is summed up in Christian Love.* I. The nature of this love: 1. in all true Christians is one and the same in principle; a. from the same spirit; b. wrought by the same work; c. has the same motives. II. Proof that all true virtue is summed up in it: 1. from what reason teaches of its nature: a. that it disposes to all proper acts of respect towards God and men; b. that whatever seeming virtues there are without love are unsound and hypocritical; 2. from what Scripture teaches: a. of the law and word of God in general, b. and of each table of the law in particular; 3. from what the apostle asserts of faith that "it works by love:" a. love is the most essential and distinguishing ingredient in a true and living faith; b. all Christian exercises of the heart and works of love are from love. Application: 1. by way of self-examination; 2. by way of instruction. a. It shows us what is the right Christian spirit. b. Professors of Christianity may be taught as to their experiences whether they be real Christian experiences or not. c. It shows the amiableness of the Christian spirit; d. also the pleasantness of a Christian life; e. the reason why contention is so destructive to religion; f. hence the need of watchfulness against envy and malice and all like passions; g. hence no wonder we are commanded to love our enemies; h. we learn the importance of seeking a spirit of love, and of growing in it more and more.]

---

3. A comparison of the gifts of prophecy and of speaking with tongues, in respect to their worth for the edification of the Church. Rules for the right regulation of their use according to their end, and according to the benefit they render to the Church.

Chapter XIV.

Follow after charity [love, τὴν ἀγάπην], and [but, δὲ] desire [the, τὰ] spiritual
2 *gifts*, but rather that ye may prophesy. For he that speaketh in an *unknown* tongue

[a tongue] speaketh not unto men, but unto God: for no man understandeth [hear-
3 eth, ἀκούει] *him;* howbeit in the spirit [Spirit] he speaketh mysteries. But he that
prophesieth speaketh unto men *to* [*om. to*] edification, and exhortation, and comfort.
4 He that speaketh in an *unknown* tongue [a tongue] edifieth himself; but he that pro-
5 phesieth edifieth the church (congregation, ἐκκλησίαν]. I would that ye all spake
[Now I wish you all to speak, θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς λαλεῖν] with tongues, but rather
that ye prophesied [might prophesy, προφητεύητε]: for [but, δὲ][1] greater *is* he that
prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret, that the church
6 [congregation, ἐκκλησία] may receive edifying. [But, δὲ] Now, brethren, if I come
unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you, except I shall speak to you
either by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine [teaching,
7 διδαχῇ]? And [*om.* And] even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or
harp, [yet ὅμως ἐὰν] except they give[2] a distinction in the sounds,[3] how shall it be
8 known what is piped or harped? For [also, καὶ] if the trumpet give an uncertain
9 sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? So likewise ye, except ye utter by
the tongue words [a word] easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken?
10 for ye shall speak into the air. There are,[4] it may be, so many kinds of voices in the
11 world, and none of them[5] *is* [none are] without signification. Therefore if I know
not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian [foreigner,
12 βάρβαρος], and he that speaketh *shall be* a barbarian [foreigner] unto me. Even so
ye, forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual *gifts* [spirits, πνευμάτων], seek that ye may
13 excel [abound, περισσεύητε] to the edifying of the church [congregation]. Where-
fore let him that speaketh in an *unknown* tongue [a tongue] pray that [in order that,
14 ἵνα] he may interpret. For if I pray in an *unknown* tongue [a tongue], my spirit
15 prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with the
spirit, and[7] [but, δὲ] I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spi-
16 rit, and[7] I will sing with the understanding also. Else, when thou shalt bless[8] with
the spirit [shalt have blessed in spirit, εὐλογῇς πνεύματι], how shall he that occupieth
the room [place] of the unlearned [one not so gifted, ἰδιώτου] say [the. τὸ] Amen at
17 thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? For thou verily
givest thanks well [verily thou doest well to give thanks, σὺ μὲν γὰρ καλῶς εὐχαριστεῖς],
18 but the other is not edified. I thank my [*om.* my][9] God, I speak[10] with tongues
19 [a tongue, γλώσσῃ][11] more than ye all: Yet in the church [congregation] I had rather
speak five words with my understanding,[12] that *by my voice* [orally, κατηχήσω] I might
20 teach others also, than ten thousand words in an *unknown* tongue [in a tongue]. Bre-
thren, be not children in understanding [minds, ταῖς φρεσίν]: howbeit in malice
[wickedness, κακίᾳ] be ye children [babes], but in understanding [minds] be men [full
21 grown, τέλειοι]. In the law it is [has been, γέγραπται] written, With [in, ἐν] *men of* other
tongues and other[13] lips [in lips of others, ἐν χείλεσιν ἑτέροις] will I speak unto this
22 people; and yet for all that will they not hear me, saith the Lord. Wherefore [the,
αἱ] tongues are for a sign, not to [for] them that believe, but to [for] them that be-
lieve not: but prophesying *serveth* [the prophesying is] not for them that believe not,
23 but for them which believe. If therefore the whole church [congregation] be come
together into one place, and all speak with tongues,[14] and there come in *those that are*
unlearned [not specially gifted, ἰδιῶται], or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are
24 mad? But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or *one* un-
learned [not miraculously endowed], he is convinced of [by, ὑπὸ] all, he is judged of
25 [by] all: And thus[15] are [*om.* And thus are] the secrets of his heart [are] made mani-
fest; and so falling down on *his* face he will worship God, and report that God is
26 in you of a truth [in truth is in you]. How is it then, brethren? when ye come to-
gether, every one of you [each one, ἕκαστος, *om.* of you][16] hath a psalm, hath a doc-
trine [a teaching, διδαχὴν], hath a tongue, hath a revelation [hath a revelation, hath
27 a tongue],[17] hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying. If any
man speak in an *unknown* tongue [a tongue, γλώσσῃ], *let it be* by two, or at the most
28 *by* three, and *that* by course; and let one interpret. But if there be no interpreter,
let him keep silence in the church [congregation]; and let him speak to himself, and
29 to God. Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge.
30 [But, δὲ] If *any thing* be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his

31 peace. For ye may [can, δύνασθε] all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and
32 all may be comforted. And the spirits[18] of the prophets are subject to the prophets.
33 For God is not *the author* of confusion [tumult, ἀκαταστασίας], but of peace, as [peace.
34 As], in all churches [the congregations, ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις] of the saints.[19] Let your
[saints, let, *om.* your][20] women keep silence in the churches [congregations]: for it is
not permitted[21] unto them to speak; but *they are commanded* to be under obedience
35 [in subjection, ὑποτασσέσθωσαν],[22] as also saith the law. And if they will learn any
thing, let them ask their [own, ἰδίους] husbands at home: for it is a shame for wo-
36 men [a woman, γυναικὶ][23] to speak in the church [congregation].[24] What! came the
37 word of God out from you? or came it unto you only? If any man think himself to
be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you
38 are the commandments [a commandment, ἐστὶν ἐντολή] of the Lord.[25] But if any man
39 be ignorant, let him be ignorant.[26] Wherefore, brethren, covet to prophesy, and forbid
40 not to speak with tongues. [But, δὲ] Let all things be done decently and in order.

[1] Ver. 5.—*Rec.* has γάρ, and it has many MSS. in its favor, but the oldest (A. B.) read δέ. [To these must now be added Sinait., a cursive of the 11th century, and the Copt. version. On the other hand, D. E. (F. G., the Ital. and Vulg., and some others, have γάρ ἐστιν, or *est enim*) K. L. Sinait., (3d hand), many cursives and versions, with Chrys., Theodt., Jerome and Ambrst., favor γάρ.—C. P. W.].

[2] Ver. 7.—*Rec.* has δῷ, *Tischendorf* has διδῷ; and this has strong but not decisive support. The ὦ might very naturally be an attempt to conform to the δῷ in ver. 8. [*Lachmann* and *Alford* receive δῷ on the authority of A. B. D. (1st hand), Sinait., many cursives, Orig., Chrys., Œcum.—C. P. W.].

[3] Ver. 7.—*Lachm.* has τοῦ φθόγγου, but it is not sufficiently sustained. [His principal evidence is B. (which, however, shows its uncertainty by omitting the τοῦ), and some Italic and Vulgate copies (which, with Pelag. and Bede, give *sonituum*, or *ex phthongis*). After the preceding φωνὴν διδόντα the change of this dative into the genitive, and of the plural into the singular, was very natural (Meyer).—C. P. W.].

[4] Ver. 10.—*Tischendorf* edits εἰσίν after the best MSS. The ἐστίν of the *Rec.* was probably a grammatical correction. *Meyer*, on the other hand, reasons that the singular verb is an amendment to suit the neuter plural noun. [See also *Alford*. In behalf of the plural we have certainly the predominance of documentary proof: A. B. D. E. F. G., Sinait., seven cursives, with Clem., Damasc. and Theophyl.—C. P. W.].

[5] Ver. 10.—The αὐτῶν of the Rec. has against it the best MSS. [A. B. D. F. G. Sinait., eleven cursives, Vulg., the Lat. version of E., with Clem., Damasc., Ambst., Bede.—C. P. W.].

[6] Ver. 13.—*Rec.* has Διόπερ instead of Διὸ, which is edited by Alford. The evidence in favor of Διὸ (A. B. D. E. F. G., Sinait., 17, Damasc.), is, on the whole, decisive, though the ancient Greek expositors are nearly all for διόπερ.—C. P. W.].

[7] Ver. 15.—The δὲ is left out in both instances before καὶ by many and excellent MSS. But there appear to be no satisfactory reasons for the omission. [The former is inserted by A. B. D. E. L., Sinait., many cursives, the Peschito, Copt., and several Greek Fathers; and the latter by A. D. E. K. L., Sinait., the later Syr., Copt., and the same Greek Fathers. *Alford* inserts both, and *Lach.* cancels only the second.—A. D. E. F. G., Sin., and three cursives have προσεύξωμαι before τῷ πνεύμ., but B. K. L., many cursives, the Vulg., and many Fathers have προσεύξομαι.—C. P. W.].

[8] Ver. 16.—*Lachm.* has εὐλογῇς. The evidence for εὐλογήσῃς is by no means convincing. [It has F. G. K. L., many cursives, Chrys., Theodt., Œcum., Theophyl., but εὐλογῇς has A. B. D., Sinait. and Damasc.—C. P. W.].

[9] Ver. 18.—*Rec.* inserts μου after θεῷ, but in opposition to the most decisive authorities. It was probably taken from chap. i. 4 and Rom. i. 8. [It is omitted in A. B. D. E. F. G., Sinait., nine cursives, several Latin and Vulgate versions, the later Syr., Copt., Aeth., Chrys., Theodt. (codex), Jerome, Sedulius and Bede, but it is given in K. L., many cursives, Peschito, Ital., Vulg, Copt., and many Latin Fathers.—C. P. W.].

[10] Ver. 18.—*Rec.* has λαλῶν, but it is feebly sustained. Others have ὅτι λαλῶ. [The principal witnesses for the *Rec.* are K. L., a number of cursives, Chrys., Theodt., Damasc.. *Reiche* defends it. But B. D. E. F. G., Sinait., 17, 67 (2d hand), the Ital., Vulg., Copt., Syr. (both), Œcum., Orig. and the Latin Fathers are decisive against it. A. omits both words. The insertion of ὅτι and the change into the participle are intelligible, if the original had been the difficult present, whereas the contrary change would have been without motive.—C. P. W.].

[11] Ver. 18.—Many and excellent MSS. have γλώσσαις with the *Rec.*, but *Meyer* thinks it "probably a change to favor a previous prejudice." [It has for it B. K. L., many cursives, Syr. (both), Copt., Chrys., Theodt., and Orig.; but against it A. D. E. F. G., Sinait., Damasc., Ambst., Pelag., Bede. The Vulg. has *quod omnium vestrum lingua loquor*.—C. P. W.].

[12] Ver. 19—*Rec.* with *Tischendorf* has διὰ τοῦ νοός μου, but the evidence is stronger in favor of τῷ νοί μου. [It must be conceded that the documentary evidence preponderates in favor of the dative (A. B. D. E. F. G., Sinait., 12 cursives, with the Vulg., Syr. (later), Copt. versions, and Œcum., Orig., and the Latin Fathers), and that the harshness of saying that the understanding was the instrument of speaking supplied a strong motive for a change. And yet *Tisch.*, *Meyer* and *Bloomfield* think it more likely that the dative was an attempt to conform to ver. 15, and that Marcion's reading (διὰ τὸν μόνον without μου) shows that the copyist must have had before him διὰ τοῦ νοός.

[13] Ver. 21.—*Rec.* has ἑτέροις, but it was probably occasioned by the preceding datives.

[14] Ver. 23.—There are various positions of the words πάντες γλώσσαις λαλῶσιν, but the sense of the passage is not affected by them. [A. B. F. G., Sinait., Boern., Basil, Theophyl., have πάντες λαλ. γλώσ.—C. P. W.].

[15] Ver. 25.—*Rec.* has καὶ οὕτω τὰ κρυπτὰ (taken from the following καὶ οὕτω), but with inferior evidence of the MSS. (comp. *Meyer*). [*Meyer* thinks that "the result or consequence of which the Apostle was about to speak was thought by many most properly to commence here; and hence the subsequent καὶ οὕτω was anticipated here and left out in its proper place (as it is by Chrys.). Afterwards this second οὕτω would be in some cases reinserted without the removal of the first καὶ οὕτω." The MSS. which are against the words (καὶ οὕτω) in the beginning of the sentence are A. B. D. E. F. G. Sinait., twelve cursives, the Lat., Syr. (Pesch.), Copt., Aeth., Arm. versions, Basil, Chrys., Cyr., and the Latin Fathers.—C. P. W.].

[16] Ver. 26.—*Rec.* has ὑμῶν after ἕκαστος, but it remains quite uncertain. [It is omitted in A. B. Sinait. (1st hand), 74, and Copt., but is inserted by D. E. F. G. K. L., Sinait. (3d hand), almost all the versions and cursives, with Chrys., Theodt., Damasc. and the Latin Fathers.—C. P. W.].

[17] Ver. 26.—*Rec.* has γλῶσσαν ἔχει ἀποκ. ἔχει, but this order of the words is feebly supported. [A. B. D. E. F. G., Sinait., cursives, Vulg., Copt., Syr. (both), Aeth. (both), Arab., Bas., Œcum., Theophyl. and Lat. Fathers have ἀποκ. ἔχει, γλῶσσαν ἔχει.—C. P. W.].

[18] Ver. 32.—*Rec.* gives as a Var. Reading, πνεῦμα instead of πνεύματα. This was a correction, because the plural seemed strange. [Alford says: "As one Spirit inspired all the prophets, πνεύματα was not understood." A. B. K. L., Sinait., many cursives, Vulg., Copt., Syr. (later)., Orig., Epiph., Chrys., Theodt., Damasc., Œcum., Theophyl., Tert., Didym., have the plural.—C. P. W.].

[19] Ver. 33.—The words ὡς ἐν πάσαις τ. ἐκκλ. τ. ἁγίων are joined with ver. 34, and a period is put at εἰρήνης by *Lachmann*, *Tischendorf*, *Meyer*, *Stanley*, *Conybeare*, *Hodge*, *Kling*, and most of the later commentators. (*Lachm.* puts a comma after ἐκκλησ., so that ἁγίων becomes emphatic, and αἱ γυναῖκες, without ὑμῶν belongs to it). *Osiander*, *Neander*, *Bloomfield*, *Alford* and *Wordsworth* adhere to the punctuation of the Fathers and of all modern Comm. until Cajetan, according to which these words are joined to the preceding. Some MSS. (F. G Vulg., Syr. (later), Arm. and Chrys.) add διδάσκω after εἰρήνης. It was probably taken from chap. iv. 17.—C. P. W.].

[20] Ver. 34.—Here, as in ver. 26, ὑμῶν is very doubtful. Neither here nor there are the MSS. decisive against the word. [*Tischendorf* and *Reiche* defend it, with D. E. F. G. K. L., cursives, Syr. (both), Arab., Slav., Chrys., Theodt., Theophyl., Œcum., Amb., Ambst.; but it is left out by Lachm. and Alford, with A. B., Sinait., Vulg., Copt., Aeth., Arm. and some Fathers. It seemed superfluous, but its antiquity, especially in the East, makes it probable.—C. P. W.].

[21] Ver. 34.—*Rec.* and *Tischendorf* have ἐπιτέτραπται, but it is not so well sustained as the present ἐπιτρέπεται. [It had become common to regard the law as of only former validity, and yet in *this* matter it was natural for the Apostle in his time to speak of its present signification. The authority of the oldest and best uncials (A. B. D. E. F. G. Sinait.), the Vulg., Ital., Basm. versions, all the Latin and some of the Greek writers, is in favor of the verb in the present.—C. P. W.].

[22] Ver. 34.—*Lachmann*, on the authority of some good MSS., edits ὑποτασσέσθωσαν. *Meyer*, however, considers it a gloss. [It has for it A. (adds τοῖς ἀνδράσιν), B., Sinait., seven cursives, Copt., Basm., Marc., Epiph., Damasc. The infinitive has for it the weight of the cursives, the versions, and the Fathers.—C. P. W.].

[23] Ver. 35.—*Rec.* with many MSS. has γυναῖξιν for γυναιξί, but it was probably a correction to make the word conform to the preceding plurals.

[24] Vers. 34, 35.—These two verses are placed after ver. 40 by D. E. F. G., Ital., Ambst. and Sedul.—C. P. W.].

[25] Ver. 37.—*Rec.* has τοῦ κυρίου εἰσὶν ἐντολαί. *Lachmann* has more authority for ἐστὶν ἐντολή. But both are probably glosses. Some MSS. have θεοῦ instead of κυρίου, but their authority is very feeble.

[26] Ver. 38.—*Lachmann*, after many Greek and Latin MSS., has ἀγνοεῖται, instead of ἀγνοείτω. It was probably an oversight of transcribers. See *Meyer* and exeg. notes. [In favor of the indicative is: A. (1st hand—the present -αι seems to be a rescript for a former -ω of the 1st hand), D. (1st hand), F. G., Sinait., Orig. and the Latin writers. Some versions (including the Vulg.) and fathers have *ignorabitur*, and Hilar. has *non cognoscetur*. The ω might easily have fallen out, as ἀγνοείτω and the following ὥστε were anciently written continuously and without punctuation, and then the αι could be supplied. On the other hand, it is difficult to imagine a sufficient motive for changing the indicative into the imperative. The sense of the indic. would also have been quite ambiguous, while that of the imper. was very much in Paul's spirit and manner.—C. P. W.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VERS. 1–5. [He now turns from his digression to the main topic on hand, *viz.*, the proper management of spiritual gifts. Before entering on this, however, he presses a final exhortation in regard to that which he had been so warmly eulogizing].—**Pursue love,**—*i. e.*, use all diligence in obtaining and cultivating it; chase it as a hunter pursues his game; press towards it as your chief good, as men make for the goal in a race; such is the force of διώκειν here (Rom. ix. 30; xii. 13 f., 19; Phil. iii. 12, 14). The omission of all inferential particles like οὖν adds to the energy of the injunction.—**but be zealous for the spiritual gifts,**—the same language as is used in xii. 31. But it is not simply to resume what was there said, as though all that intervened was but a parenthesis [so Stanley]. Rather, the δέ, *but*, is designed to set the second clause over against the first, by way of showing that though they were to pursue love, still this was not to prevent their seeking for spiritual gifts also. In urging the former he was not intending to disparage the latter, as they might be disposed to infer. Hence we may render δέ by *meantime*, *however*, or *nevertheless*. Neander takes the second injunction in the light of a permission, rather than of a positive command, and supposes that Paul chose the stronger word in the first instance in order to teach his readers that a Christian's main endeavor should be to become quickened by love. [“He observes, therefore, an admirable medium by disapproving of nothing that was useful, without at the same time preferring, by an absurd zeal, things of less consequence to what was of primary importance.” CALVIN].—In regard to spiritual gifts see on xii. 1. A more restricted application of the term here, to denote simply ‘the gift of tongues,’ might, indeed, be favored by the contrast implied in the “rather” directly following, and by ver. 2, and also by ver. 14 ff., inasmuch as the gift of tongues, because it was a speaking and praying in the spirit, might well be called by way of preëminence ‘spiritual.’ But the plural form, as well as the more extended connection had with the foregoing chapter, declare for the broader interpretation of: gifts in general.—**but rather**—μᾶλλον is to be construed comparatively and not as=μάλιστα, *q. d.*, ‘*more than all the other gifts.*’—**that ye may prophesy.**—Instead of using the noun ‘prophecy,’ he employs the verb with the telic ἵνα, as the object of ζηλοῦτε, *be zealous for*. In this there was undoubtedly a design; but not such as to warrant Meyer's rendering, ‘in order that ye may prophesy.’ [Stanley says, that ἵνα is here passing into the Romaic sense, in which it is used as a substitute for the infinitive. Comp. for this use, ver. 12; Matth. vii. 12: Mark vi. 8, 25. See also Winer, P. 1, xi. § lxiii. 2, 1]. The reason of the preference he next assigns.—**For he that speaks with a tongue,**—*i. e.*, in some strange language prompted by the spirit. [Bloomfield takes the “speaking” (λάλῶν) to signify *preaching*, *exhorting*, and says, ‘the context requires this;’ but it must be the context only as read in the light of a certain theory. There is nothing in the language to warrant it, and to construe it thus would be to make this the only passage where the gift of tongues must be supposed to have been used in addressing others directly].—**speaketh not to men,**—*i. e.*, not with the design of imparting anything that the hearers can understand and profit by.—**but to God:**—It is with God that he is in communication, [“according to the proverb: ‘He sings to Himself and the muses’”.—CALVIN]. Of this the proof—first, negatively.—**for no one heareth.**—By this he does not mean literally ‘heareth not,’ as though the words were inaudible, like those muttered by Hannah, 1 Sam. i. 13; since this would neither suit the expression ‘speaketh;’ nor yet the context, especially of ver. 7; nor yet the corresponding passage in Acts ii. 10, 19. The word ἀκούειν rather denotes here the inward hearing, the mental appreciation of what was uttered. [So the word is used in Acts xxii. 9, where the attendants of Paul are said not to have ‘heard the voice’ which in Acts ix. 7 they were said to have heard—an ambiguity which can be explained only by taking the word in the former instance to mean ‘understand.’ See also Mark iv. 33. “He spake as they were able to hear:” also Gen. xi. 7; xlii. 23; Is. xxxvi. xi. where for ‘understand’ the lxx. has ἀκούειν]. The negative “no one” is not hyperbolical as if signifying ‘very few,’ but absolute; the exception arising from the as-

sistance of some interpreter will of course be understood.—**but in the spirit he speaketh mysteries.**—The 'but' is not designed to express a contrast, as though equivalent to *sondern* (Rückert); but it is explicative, introducing a further specification, *viz.*, "in the spirit;" while the remaining words alone state the antithesis to what is asserted in the previous clause. The word "mysteries" is not to be understood as in iv. 1.; xiii. 2. [As Stanley, "Here, as elsewhere, it means 'God's secrets;' here, however, not as elsewhere in the sense of secrets *revealed*, but in the sense (nearly approaching to the modern word mystery) of secrets *concealed*. The only other instance is Rev. xvii. 5." And Alford: "Things which are hidden from the hearers, and sometimes also from the speaker himself"]. So understood, the statement would, as related to the previous one, appear tautological; hence the words "in the spirit" must here be so taken as intended to bring out more fully the characteristic of the gift in question. Accordingly they must be interpreted not simply of the inward man, *q. d.*, 'he speaks to himself in his own thoughts' (Le Clerc, Locke, Semler). Still less can πνεύματι be the objective dative either to λαλεῖ, or to μυστήρια, *q. d.*, 'he speaks things which are mysteries for the spirit of others.' Rather the expression is used here as in ver. 14, of the activity of the higher religious consciousness, uninfluenced by reflection (Meyer), ["of the spirit as opposed to the understanding, his spirit as the organ of the Holy Ghost while the understanding is unfruitful" (Alford)], of the inner life as abstracted from the outer world (Beek), "of a state of inspiration only through the medium of the intuitional side of the human spirit directed God-ward—a state in which the self-consciousness is, as it were, suppressed or overpowered by the divine influence completely taking possession of the human soul; in short, of a state of mystic ecstasy which, when partaking of the character of a gift, creates for itself a form of speech in which the soul breaks forth, as it were in holy dithyrambics" (Delitzsch v. § 5).* [So also De Wette; πνεύματι he explains by "through the spirit," *i. e.*, his higher unconscious spiritual faculty which is filled by the Holy Spirit, and is without the νοῦς. Bloomfield and Hodge, however, follow the Greek commentators, and most early modern ones, in taking the word "spirit" to mean, not the higher spiritual powers of our nature, but the Holy Ghost as in chap. viii. 14. "In favor of this interpretation is: 1. The prevailing use of the word *Spirit* in reference to the Holy Ghost in all Paul's epistles and especially in this whole connection. 2. That the expression to "speak *in*" or "*by* the Spirit," is an established Scriptural phrase, meaning to speak under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. 3. When *spirit* is to be distinguished from the *understanding*, it designates the affections; a sense which would not at all suit this passage. 4. The meaning arrived at by this interpretation is natural and suitable to the connection. "Although he who speaks with tongues is not understood yet guided by the Spirit, he speaks mysteries." Hodge. To this it may be replied in order 1. That πνεῦμα, when used without any qualifying term in Paul's writings, more commonly denotes the higher nature of man, especially as quickened by the Holy Ghost. 2. In every instance where the idea of speaking "in the Holy Ghost" is intended, it is indicated by the use of the prep. ἐν, *in*, and usually with the addition of the article (as in Rom. i. 9; viii. 9; xv. 16; 1 Cor. vi. 11). Wherever the simple anarthrous dative πνεύματι is found as here, to denote that in reference to which a thing is done, it stands for the spirit of man, as might be expected (Jno. iv. 24; Rom. viii. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 21; vii. 34; Gal. v. 5, 16). It is in this broader sense that the word is here to be understood. It means not simply the intellect, but the higher nature of man in all its emotions as stirred by the Holy Spirit. 4. While the meaning "in the Holy Spirit" gives good sense even here, still the other meaning is more in accordance both with the *usus loquendi*, and with the train of argument, and should therefore be adhered to as it is by all English versions, and by nearly all commentators].—The case is otherwise with the prophet.—**He that prophesies, speaks unto men**—In the prophet who is called to be the mediator of divine mysteries in behalf of others, there is united with the state of ecstasy (which however is not the exclusive mode of revelation with him), the ability of reproducing that which he has seen in the spirit, by the aid of his understanding and psychical faculties in adequate and intelligible language (Delitzsch § 5). What the prophet imparts is threefold,—**edification, and exhortation, and comfort.**—The first of these terms (οἰκοδομή), properly implying a building up of the Christian life in its successive stages, may be taken as expressing the genus of which the other two express the species, though not all the species. By παράκλησις, *exhortation*, we understand that by which the will is aroused to greater earnestness in self-culture and to greater Christian activity and to more zealous endeavors. [Stanley who unites with exhortation the meaning of *consoling* or *strengthening* as in the word παράκλητος, *Comforter*, says: "how closely connected this gift was with prophesying may be seen in the fact that the name of 'Barnabas,' 'the son of prophesy,' is rendered in Acts iv. 36, υἱὸς παρακλήσεως, 'the son of consolation.'" By παραμυθία we understand that by which the spirit is quieted and cheered. Though sharing with the former, the sense of *consolation*, it implies something more tender and soothing. As to the conjunctions και-και, the first may be taken as annexing to the chief word something further explanatory, like *and indeed;* or they may be taken as distributive particles, *both and.* Osiander follows the earlier commentators in co-ordinating the three particulars, and gives to the first a relation to faith as implying the furtherance and strengthening of the Christian life therein; to the second, a relation to love as implying a stimulus to the cultivation of it, as in the more active duties of Christianity; and to the third, a relation to hope, as the source and

*[This work of Delitzsch presents a masterly analysis of Biblical doctrine on this and all kindred subjects, and deserves a better translation than that it has suffered from the hands of Dr. Wallis. It cannot be understood in that English dress].

effect of all comfort; furthermore, he subordinates the two last to the first as their root.—That a subordination here is intended is sustained by the fact that the word "edification" returns again alone in ver. 4.—**But he that speaks with a tongue edifies himself;**—He here refers to the effect of those inward excitements and elevating impressions which a person experiences in this intercourse with God—in this state of prayer and praise, or of mystic ecstasy wherein the operations of the Holy Spirit reach their culminating point (comp. Delitzsch, as above). "This does not imply a benefit derived through a distinct understanding of that which he speaks; but there is left upon the spirit of the speaker an impression made by the whole experience, of a quickening and elevating though mystical kind." MEYER. And in like manner OSIANDER: "He could allow the total impression and feeling of his discourse to work on in him." ["This view is necessary on account of what is said in ver. 5, that if he can *interpret*, he can edify not only himself, but the church." ALFORD. HODGE, on the contrary, ignoring the fact that any benefit could be derived excepting through a distinct intelligence of what was uttered, says, "this verse proves that the understanding was not in abeyance, and that the speaker was not in an ecstatic state." But this is a mere assumption, against which might be put the following counter testimony: "The gift might and did contribute to the building up of a man's own life (1 Cor. xiv. 4). This might be the only way in which some natures could be roused out of the apathy of a sensual life, or the dulness of a formal ritual. The ecstasy of adoration which seemed to men madness, might be a refreshment unspeakable to one who was weary with the subtle questionings of the intellect, to whom all familiar and intelligible words were fraught with recollections of controversial bitterness or the wanderings of doubt. (Comp. a passage of wonderful power as to this use of the gift by Edw. Irwing. 'Morning Watch,' v. p. 78.") See SMITH'S *Bib. Dict.* p. 1558].—**but he that prophesies edifies the church.**—The article before ἐκκλησίαν is unnecessary. The church as a collection of individuals is here brought forward in contrast with the speaker himself. [Not so however Alford. "The article," as he says, "being often omitted, when a noun in government has an emphatic place before the verb; accordingly in ver. 5 the article reappears"].—Lest any should think that he was here seeking to set aside all speaking with tongues as calculated to provoke envy, he proceeds—**I would that ye all spake with tongues,**—This must be regarded as a hearty wish and not an unworthy concession to the Corinthians, on the score of their partiality for this gift. This is evident from the fact that he goes on at once to adduce prophecy as the higher and worthier gift which he still more earnestly desires that they should have and exercise.—**but rather that ye prophesied.**—He here passes over into the telic construction with ἵνα, "indicating a stronger intention towards the higher object" (Osiander). According to the common reading μείζων γάρ, *for greater*, he adds a reason for what has just been said. But if with some good authority we read δέ, *but*, instead of γάρ, we must regard him as simply continuing his discourse.—**but greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues,**—The greatness here consists in usefulness, and hence also in dignity. This however is qualified by the exception,—**except**—ἐκτὸς εἰ μή. The μή here appears pleonastic (xv. 2; 1 Tim. v. 19). [This redundant expression arises from the blending of two constructions, ἐκτὸς εἰ and εἰ μή, instances of which are found also in the classics. Hence, not a Hebraism. Winer iii. § 65 3 c.].—**he interpret.**—The subject of the verb is not any other person, but the speaker himself who could unite the two gifts of speaking with tongues and interpretation in himself. By the exercise of the latter gift for the purpose of edifying the church, he put himself on a par with him that prophesied. In regard to the subjunctive form after εἰ comp. on chap. ix. 11, (*respectum comprehendit experientiae.* Meyer). [HODGE says: "this passage proves that the contents of these discourses delivered in an unknown tongue were edifying; and therefore did not consist in mysteries in the bad sense of that term, *i. e.*, in enigmas and dark sayings. The absence of the gift of interpretation does not prove that the speaker himself in such cases was ignorant of what he uttered. It only proves that he was not inspired to communicate in another language what he had delivered." The reasoning is not conclusive. It is grounded on the assumption that no benefit could be derived from any experiences that were not distinctly intelligible and capable of being communicated under the ordinary forms of thought and language. And it may be asked if that which was spoken in the unknown tongue was distinctly intelligible to the speaker, what need was there of a special gift of interpretation to enable him to communicate it to the church? The understanding (νοῦς) is the parent of language; and what a person understood he surely could utter. Would this not be in violation of a well known rule, 'not to introduce a divinity upon the stage unless the occasion required it']?—Ver. 6-11. **But now,**—νυνὶ δέ here also as in xiii. 13 in a logical sense, *q. d.*, 'since in speaking with tongues the edification of the church depends altogether upon the interpretation which followed, then without this,'—**if I come unto you speaking with tongues,**—he uses himself as an illustration without laying stress upon his personality, [as Chrys.], in which case αὐτὸς ἐγώ, *I myself*, would be required; or it is a mode of individualizing the case as is found in vv. 11, 14; xiii. 1, 12.—**what shall I profit you,**—This question here forms the main proposition which (as often happens in the classics) is inserted between the two hypothetical clauses, the second of which stands in contrast with the first, or is its negative parallel (not its subordinate so as to indicate how the speaking with tongues must take place; nor yet does it stand in any closer internal relation to the main proposition).—**unless I shall speak unto you either by revelation,**—The ἐν, *in*, or, *by*, denotes as in Matt xiii. 3 the form which his discourse might take, or the sphere in which it would move.—**or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine?**—The four

hings specified may be referred back to two gifts: first, to prophecy, whose ground and contents is revelation; and secondly to doctrine which rests upon knowledge and furnishes its fruit; [as Hodge says, "there are not four, but only two modes of address contemplated in this verse. Revelation and prophecy belong to one, and knowledge and doctrine to the other. He who received revelations, was a prophet; he who had the word of knowledge, was a teacher." So likewise Calvin. This construction is derived from the sense, and not from the grammar of the text. There the four items stand coördinate as though distinct and independent]. Revelation is to be understood as in ver. 26, subjectively (otherwise as i. 7). It signifies occasional disclosures respecting anything which concerns the kingdom of God, or an unveiling of mysteries. As what is thus disclosed is uttered in the ardent and apt discourse of the prophet, so, that which an enlightened inquiry affords for furthering our insight into divine things, is expressed in the calmer diction of the teacher, and is termed doctrine. As Bengel says: "prophecy relates to particular facts, not well understood before, to mysteries to be known only by revelation." Doctrine and knowledge are brought from the common storehouse of believers, and refer to obvious things in the matter of our salvation.—He next proceeds to illustrate his point by various analogies; and first from musical instruments. Some difficulty arises as to the proper rendering of what follows, in consequence of the unnatural position of ὁμῶς. Some take this as equivalent to ὁμοίως, *in like manner;* but this would be unsuitable and unnecessary. The signification, *nevertheless, yet even*, would fit better. But still it is questionable whether the word mainly affects or gives prominence to τὰ ἄψυχα, *lifeless things*, as its position appears to indicate; so that this drawn out in full would be τὰ ἄψυχα εἴπερ ἄψυχα, ὅμως, 'lifeless instruments, though lifeless, yet give sound' (Winer); or whether by the thing introduced in proof is set up as absolutely valid against all objection, *q. d.*, 'one cannot yet understand,' *i. e.*, 'this must at any rate be conceded, that we cannot understand' (de Wette); or, whether, by virtue of a transposition which appears also in Gal. iii. 15, and elsewhere in the classics, the word is placed first, while it properly belongs before ἐάν; so that the concessive protasis is formed by the words ὅμως ἐὰν διδόντα, which then would be equivalent to καίπερ φωνὴν διδόντα. The last construction is the correct one, being the only one which corresponds to the use of language, and to the course of thought.—**Things without life, though yielding sound, whether flute or harp, yet if they do not**—Respecting the various positions occupied by ὅμως, how the word or clause limited by it sometimes precedes and sometimes follows it as here, comp. Passow ii. p. 77. By being put first it carries an emphasis. "There is an inference drawn from the less to the greater," *q. d.*, if, indeed, such is the case with lifeless objects, how much more must it be with men?—**give a distinction to the tones,**—*i. e.*, by various distinct modulations of high and low, strong and weak.—**how shall it be known what is piped or harped?**—This refers to the significance of that which is played on each instrument (comp. ver. 8 ff.): *i. e.*, 'a person will, in that case, not be able to discern or perceive what tune is played.' [The article is here repeated to show that two distinct instances are contemplated, not necessarily one tune either piped or harped. Meyer regards this passage as decisive against the opinion that the tongues used in the gift in question were distinctly articulated foreign languages, and that the utterance in this case was a confused jargon of sounds, such as that which would be made through the instruments without observing their proper modulations. But this is pressing the analogy too far. The point made is simply with reference to the unintelligibleness of the things played, unless the well-known laws of the instrument and of the music were observed]. The argument is confirmed by another example of the same kind, which sets the case in a still clearer light.—**For also,**—[The "for" serves for a climax, the higher confirming the lower].—**if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound,**—The trumpet, so strong in its tones, and unmistakable in its character, even this requires a certain definite modulation when giving its various signals, if it is to be known whether the signal is one for battle or not. The adjective "uncertain" expresses the antithesis to the previous expression, "give a distinction to the sounds." [Different sounds of the same trumpet summoned soldiers to different duties, one succession of notes giving the signal for attack, and another for retreat. Hence the question].—**who shall prepare himself for the battle?**—The application to the point in question he next proceeds to make.—**So likewise ye, through the tongue,**—These words are put first by way of emphasis, as contrasting the Corinthians in the exercise of their divine gift with the lifeless things which he has just been speaking of.—**unless ye give a word easy to be understood,**—This clause unquestionably stands opposed to the assumption that inarticulate sounds are implied in the gift, if for no other reason than on account of the use of the term "word," which denotes a rational, articulate utterance, even though we would wish to take the qualifying expression in with it. Nor is it favored by the other expression "through the tongue," as though this meant the simple organ of speech; for in that case it would only be used as in contrast with the musical instruments specified.—**how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall be** (ἔσεσθε so long as ye speak) **a speaking into the air.**—εἰς ἀέρα λαλοῦντες; the phrase denotes the uselessness of an unintelligible discourse. It dies away into the atmosphere, reaching not the mind of the hearer.—He next pushes his range of analogy still farther, so as to include the various human languages which can furnish no means of intercourse between man and man, so long as their meaning is not understood.—**There are, it may be,**—εἰ τύχοι, a phrase commonly found with numerical nouns, and never means *for example*, it only states the number as problematical, or denotes uncertainty in the more definite statement.—**so many**—τοσαῦτα. ["The word here has the force of a definite number. If men could

ever have counted the number, Paul would have set it down here: but he leaves it indefinite." BENGEL].—**kinds of voices in the world,**—φωνή, *voice*, here signifies 'speech,' or 'language,' (as also in Gen. xi. 1, 7; and in the classics often, and γένη φωνῶν denotes the 'various languages,' of which each one forms a γένος, *genus*. He does not use the word γλῶσσα, *tongue*, because in this whole paragraph this is employed to denote the special gift which is under consideration.—**and none**—οὐδὲν refers to γένη. It does not mean 'no rational creature;' but the right relation is expressed by the αὐτῶν, *of them*, of the Rec. which, however, is not original.—**is without signification.**—ἄφωνον, literally *speechless* (like βίος ἀβίατος), *i. e.*, 'without that which is the essential thing in speech,' 'unsuited for the purpose of intelligible communication.' "The Apostle intends to say that every language has its definite signification; inasmuch as it is designed to be the vehicle for communicating thought." NEANDER. [HODGE says, "The illustration contained in this verse goes to prove that speaking with tongues was to speak in foreign languages." If by "foreign languages" is meant languages of other countries on the globe, then spoken, the inference is too broad. It supposes that no other language was possible, save such as were then in vogue. If language is God's gift, and not a mechanical contrivance of man, why could not the Spirit inspire men to utter their new experiences in a new and "clean speech," which, though used by none others, was fully entitled to be called a language? And may it not have been one intent of the Spirit in the production of this new language to furnish a sign that the things it reveals were such "as eye had not seen, nor ear heard, nor had entered into the heart of man" to conceive, and such therefore as required to be expressed in forms corresponding? To understand these "tongues" to denote foreign pagan languages, most of which were but the defiled vessels of impurity and falsehood and idolatry, and utterly inadequate to convey spiritual truth, is to miss the import of this remarkable phenomenon].—From the fact that none of the various languages of earth lacked the character of language, *viz.*, the power of communicating thought, he goes on to infer that where one person was incapable of understanding another, there was reason to believe that they stood in the relation of foreigners to each other. This would not be inferred were the "speech" "without speech" (ἀφωνος), *i. e.*, in itself unintelligible, since the speaker in this case could be understood by no one. He might be looked upon as one deranged, but not as a foreigner. The very force (δύναμις) of the language, its sense, its significance, *viz.*, is precisely that thing which would be excluded by its being "without speech" (ἄφωνος).—**Therefore, if I know not the force of the language, I shall be to him that speaketh a barbarian,**—Βάρβαρος, the common term to designate one not a Greek, one who stood outside the sphere of the Greek language and culture. Here it is used in no bad sense, but simply to denote a stranger.—**and he that speaketh a barbarian in me.**—As in the former clause, τῷ λαλοῦντι is the dative of judgment, meaning, 'in the estimation of him that speaketh;' so ἐν ἐμοί, *in me*, must be construed 'in my eyes,' or 'according to my judgment,' (comp. Passow i. 2, p. 909.)

VERS. 10–19. The connection with the previous verse is more correctly determined by making the conditional clause here refer to what was perverse in their desires and efforts as corresponding with the relation set forth in the previous verse, where it was shown that by reason of not understanding the language spoken, one appeared to the other as a foreigner; and by regarding the injunction which follows as urging them to the adoption of a contrary course,—first, in an indefinite general way; from which he at once proceeds in ver. 13 to draw the inference in relation to the matter in question, *viz.*, speaking with tongues.—**So also ye,**—This expression is used as in ver. 9; the "so" indicates that which corresponds to the analogy previously introduced, and for this reason it stands at the beginning of the clause to which it belongs, as there. It is as if he had said: 'in this way, as ye are foreigners to each other from not understanding each other's language, and no intercourse can take place between you—a condition of things which is palpably wrong,' *etc.* So Meyer. Proceeding from this interpretation of the word "so," some insert a colon or period after "ye," making the clause mean 'such barbarians are ye who speak with tongues without interpreting; but this would be to separate unnecessarily matters belonging together. Others construe the clause "so also ye" as an apodosis, implying that the Apostle meant to have them entirely avoid, making each other as barbarians. But in such a construction not only would there be no suitable relation to form the ground of a parallel, but a contrast would be introduced. We should have to insert that in thought to which the "so" should refer, somehow after this fashion—'in order to avoid coming into the relation of barbarians, it will be necessary to introduce an interpreter, so also should ye endeavor to make yourself plain.' But where is the necessity of such a subaudition, if another explanation offers itself which is sustained by the analogy in ver. 9? [Alford and Bloomfield in accordance with the great majority of commentators from Chrys. interpret the connection more simply. They give οὕτως the sense of *therefore*, *i. e.*, 'after the lesson conveyed by this example,' or, 'to apply this to your case,' which has the advantage of simplicity].—**since ye are zealots of spirits**—ζηλωταί πνευμάτων, *i. e.*, 'are ardently devoted to them and admire them;' so the objective genitive often occurs in classical writers. "Of spirits" is a bold expression, adopted in accordance with the diversity which appeared in the operations of the Spirit. The principle at work is itself spoken of as manifold. As OSIANDER says: "the individual gifts are designated as active powers, existing independently in those endowed with them." Or as MEYER: "what were in reality diversities of gifts, and therefore only different manifestations of the Spirit, presented themselves to the popular apprehension as diversities of spirits." That Paul himself actually believed in a plurality of spirits (Hilgenfeld) is at variance with xii. 4, 7. Some,

arbitrarily, limit the word to denote simply the gift of tongues. It is here, however, to be taken in its broadest sense as standing by metonymy for spiritual gifts in general.—He now comes for the first time to the practical application of his argument. The duty he urges upon them corresponds to the object for which spiritual gifts were given.—**for the edification of the Church,**—The end to be aimed at is put first by way of emphasis. But the words are not to be joined simply with the following imperative, —**seek,**—as though this was to be construed absolutely, and the words after it,—**that ye may abound.**—were to be construed as a final clause (Meyer), as though the meaning were: strive for the edification of the Church in order that ye may abound!—for the verb *ζητεῖν, seek*, can hardly be used without an object. This object is rather to be found in the verb following it, which is introduced in accordance with a later lax usage by *ἵνα, that*,*—'Seek that ye may abound,' or, 'seek to abound.' Then the words, —*for the edification of the Church*, — would belong to the combined phrase 'seek that ye may abound,' and not to the latter verb exclusively, although this conveys the chief idea; at least not so that *πρὸς* should be made equivalent to *εἰς*, and the sense this, 'that the blessings of their gifts may be poured out more and more abundantly upon the Church for its edification.'—Next comes the application of this fundamental principle to the matter of speaking with tongues.—**Wherefore, let him that speaketh with a tongue, pray that he may interpret.**—*προσευχέσθω, ἵνα διερμενεύῃ*. [This passage, simple as it seems, has caused no little perplexity among commentators. The mode of interpreting it has a decided bearing upon the theory a person may form in regard to the nature of the "gift of tongues;" and it in turn has been determined largely by whatever theory has already been formed. There are three ways of explaining it. 1. To take *ἵνα* in its laxer sense, and construe the verb *διερμενεύῃ* with it as the object of *προσευχέσθω, q. d.*, 'let him pray that he may be able to interpret,' *i. e.*, for the gift of interpretation. This is the sense given it by all the Greek commentators, and is adopted by most of the modern ones. Among these Grot., Beza, Hamm., and Hodge. Adopting this view, we are at liberty to suppose that the person speaking with a tongue was not necessarily engaged in worship, but was addressing the assembly; and so to infer that this gift was used not only for the purposes of prayer and praise, but also for popular discourse. The objection to this view is, that in the subsequent argument in support of the injunction here given, the act of praying is spoken of absolutely; and standing, as the next verse does, in close logical connection with this by means of the "for," we are constrained to interpret the praying spoken of in both verses in the same absolute or general sense, and that the use of the gift was in the act of prayer. Hence it will not do to limit the praying in this verse to the object specified in the final words, as though the Apostle meant that the person who was employing the gift, should pray that he might interpret. Besides, it assumes a purely ecbatic signification in *ἵνα*, which it is questionable whether it ever has in the New Testament. (See Winer, p. III. § 53. 10. 6). 2. To take *ἵνα* in the sense of *ὥστε, so that, q. d.*, 'let him so pray, that he may interpret,' *i. e.*, let him not pray unless he can interpret. So Luther, Rosen., and others. But the propriety of giving this sense to *ἵνα* is very doubtful. The only way left us then is 3.] to construe *ἵνα διερμενεύῃ, that he may interpret*, as a final clause. [So Meyer, Winer, Alford, and others]. This would give to the whole injunction a meaning of this sort, 'In the outgushing of his emotions in prayer and praise let the person who speaks with a tongue, make it a point to edify the Church through interpretation.' In other words, 'let him pray, not in order to make a display of his gift, but with the intention of interpreting his prayer.' This, of course, implies that the person alluded to has already the gift of interpretation, and very rightly, for otherwise he was not at liberty to allow himself to be heard in Church meeting at all (ver. 28).—The reason for this injunction is next more clearly set forth in ver. 14, where the Apostle, agreeably to the hint already given in ver. 2, enters more fully upon the inward character of this gift, and from what he says there it is clear that the mere speaking or praying with tongues without interpretation excluded all relation to the external world, and in this case, to the congregation.—**For if I pray with a tongue, my spirit prays, but my understanding is unfruitful.**—Here the *νοῦς* denotes that faculty of the soul by which we have to deal with the outer world, [that which reasons, conceives and begets the thought that is coined into words] (Beek, *Bibl. Seelenlehre*, p. 49). This is said to be unfruitful in that it confers no benefit on others (comp. Eph. v. 11; Tit. iii. 14; Matth. xiii. 22). The passive interpretation, 'experiences no benefit,' does not suit the connection. As the words "my understanding," so must also the words "my spirit" be interpreted of that which belongs to our nature, and not be understood as meaning 'the spirit of God in me' [as Hodge]. On the other hand the antithesis with "my spirit" does not allow of our interpreting the word *νοῦς* to mean *sense*, that is, of the words. Bengel has already presented the essentially correct view: "The *πνεῦμα, spirit*, is the power of the soul, when it sweetly *suffers* the Holy Spirit's operations; but the *νοῦς, understanding*, is the power of the soul, when it goes abroad, and *acts* with our neighbor: as also when it attends to external objects, to other things and persons, although its reasonings may be concealed." [The distinction is more thoroughly given by Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychologie*, iv. § 5. In explaining this passage he says: "The exercise of self-consciousness is here suppressed by the divine influence which entirely takes captive the person speaking with tongues. The thinking power of the *νοῦς*, as it brings forth fruit in words and

*[This would hardly comport with the theory that *ἵνα* always has to a greater or less degree a telic force, and so Bloomfield subaudits *ταῦτα*, referring to *πνευμάτων*, the object of *ζητεῖτε, q. d.*, 'seek these things that ye may abound.' This corresponds better with its use in the following clause].

thoughts profiting both itself and others without any further intervention, ceases, and the divine influence goes on exercising itself in the human sphere of direct feeling and intuition, and expresses itself also in a language that corresponds to this directness, and is not pervaded by the understanding (*νοῦς*) of the speaker, and is therefore unintelligible to the understanding (*νοῦς*) of the hearers. This sphere of direct feeling and intuition the Apostle calls the spirit (*πνεῦμα*) in distinction from the understanding (*νοῦς*). It is the spirit in the narrower sense distinguished from the spirit in a wider sense (1 Cor. v. 3; vii. 34; 2 Cor. vii. 1), as feeling and especially as directly beholding—a copy as it were of the divine Holy Spirit"].—He next proceeds to draw an inference for the regulation of the conduct of the Corinthians in this matter.—**What then is it?**—Some supply *πρακτέον, to be done*, which is unnecessary. [He means, 'what is the practical conclusion at which we arrive?' This he gives in what follows].—**I will pray in the spirit,**—[On the reading *προσεύξωμαι* (subjunctive instead of Ind. fut.) which is strongly attested by A. D. E. F. G. and the Cod. Sin., ALFORD remarks: that "the use of the subjunctive in this as well as in other places grew out of a tendency in those who transcribed some of our MSS. to give such assertions a hortatory, or where interrrogative a deliberative form." Meyer calls it "*schlechte Besserung*." It is note-worthy that the important Codex Sinaiticus has the subjunctive form here, while in the next clause it has the indicative future. In this case we should take the first as conditional, 'let me pray,' or, 'if I am to pray with my spirit, I will pray also with my understanding.' The propriety of this is seen in the fact that praying in the spirit was not always optional with the individual, nor a matter of resolve. It came by gift, was the inspiration of the spirit who distributed unto each as He would; whereas the use of the understanding (*νοῦς*), which combined in itself both intelligence and will, was voluntary. It seems to be with the perception of this fact that WINER, who adopts the future form, says: "this sentence expresses not a resolution, but a Christian maxim which the believer intends to follow."]—**and I will pray with the understanding also;**—By this is meant praying with the use of "interpretation" which would make the contents of the prayer intelligible to others, and so edifying. It will be seen from the antithesis that the "understanding" alluded to is that of the person praying and not that of others,—as though the dative were that of the remote object, *q. d.*, 'to the understanding of others.'—**I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also.**—A proof that the prayer was accompanied with song and harp also (comp. Osiander). "We see here two forms of Glossolaly—prayer and praise; it mounted therefore into the poetic mood; and there was involved in it that which resembled what appeared later in Christian poesy." NEANDER.—[That these were the main, if not the only forms in which this gift was exercised, and very rarely, if ever, in discourses to the church-assembly, is here pretty clearly proven. Had it been otherwise, as Hodge and others maintain,—had the person 'who spoke with a tongue' undertaken to address the audience in his unintelligible language, how much more pertinent to Paul's argument would it have been to show the uselessness and absurdity of speaking to others in words unknown, than to instance only the cases of praying and singing in a foreign tongue. Here the words uttered affected the audience only indirectly, and the speaker might plead that he was engaged with God; but in the other case he would profess to be communicating what he could not hope to have reach the hearer's mind and heart without interpretation. Here therefore was the point where speaking with tongues without interpretation would touch the extreme of inappropriateness, and which in the case supposed Paul would most likely have alluded to. As to the distinction between worshiping "in the spirit" and worshiping "in the understanding," we must abide by the views already given. The former denotes the state into which the Holy Spirit lifts the person inspired—a state wherein he sees and feels things which it is impossible for him to utter, inasmuch as they transcend the scope of his understanding; and which break forth in a language that the spirit forms, suited to give them utterance; and which none can understand and interpret save he to whom it is given,—whether it be the person himself or some other one].—The resolve expressed in ver. 15, which partakes at the same time of the nature of an exhortation, is next corroborated by a reference to the indecorum that would be occasioned by pursuing the opposite course.—**Else,**—*ἐπεί, for then, in that case;* [such is the meaning the word takes before questions implying a negative (see Ron. *Lex.*)]. Here the conditional clause, which in the use of *ἐπεί* is usually omitted (comp. v. 10), is fully stated.—**if thou shalt have blessed,**—*εὐλογεῖν, to bless*, (x. 16) is essentially the same as *εὐχαριστεῖν, to give thanks*, (v. 17); only here the idea of praise is more prominent.—**in spirit,**—as in ver. 15, here with the exclusion of the understanding. [Hodge, to maintain his consistency, interprets this of the Holy Spirit where of all places such an interpretation would appear least appropriate, since the word is evidently used to express an abnormal condition].—**how shall he who occupies the place of the private,**—*τοῦ ἰδιώτου*; some commentators interpret this word as expressing simply an antithesis to him 'who speaks with a tongue,' as denoting one who did not come within the sphere of this gift;—just as in other connections, *e. g.*, one not a physician is termed an *ἰδιώτης, idiot*, in comparison with one who is; or one unacquainted with art in comparison with an artist; or any unskilled ignoramus in comparison with a learned person. If now, with Meyer, we interpret the word "place" in a local sense, then the person in question would be one of the congregation who sits anywhere except in the seat of the speaker. But as the phrase, 'to fill the place of a friend' (*φίλου τόπον ἔχειν*) is a common one, it is questionable whether the idea of locality can be well insisted on. More correct perhaps would it be to say that the word was expressive of a distinction quite current at the time, between the active members of the church who

engaged in speaking and praying, and the silent recipient members; and that it here stands for the whole multitude of those who did not understand the person who was speaking with a tongue. [So Alford, Stanley, and Hodge who adds, "The context shows that Paul does not refer to laymen in opposition to church officers; for the officers were just as likely to be *ἰδιῶται*, *unlearned*, as to the language used as others."]—**how shall he say**—The question implies the impossibility of the thing.—**the Amen,**—*τὸ ἀμήν*; [the article here is specific and points to a customary use of the word in the church at that time]. "Amen" is a Hebrew adjective, meaning *true* or *faithful*, and was employed in the synagogue by the whole assembly in concert to express its ratification of what was said by one in the name of all, or its confidence in being heard if that thing spoken was a prayer. The formula thus used was equivalent to 'so let it be,' or 'so it is.' [In illustration of the importance attached to it, STANLEY gives the following citations from the Rabbins: "He who says Amen is greater than he who blesses." (Berashoth viii. 8). Whoever says "Amen," to him the gates of paradise open, according to Is. xxvi. 2, 'open ye the gates that the righteous nation, that which keepeth the Amen, may enter in' (Wetstein *ad. loc.*). An "Amen" if not well considered was an 'Orphan Amen' (Lightfoot *ad. loc.*). Whoever says an 'Orphan Amen' his children shall be orphans; whoever answers 'Amen' hastily or shortly, his days shall be shortened; whoever answers "Amen" distinctly and at length, his days shall be lengthened (Berashoth, 47, 1; Schöttgen *ad. loc.*). So in the early Christian liturgies it was regarded as a marked point in the service; and with this agrees the great solemnity with which Justin speaks of it, as though it were on a level with the thanksgiving: 'the president having given thanks, and the whole people having shouted their approbation.' And in later times, the Amen was only repeated once by the congregation, and always after the great thanksgiving, and with a shout like a peal of thunder"].—**upon this your thanksgiving,**—*ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ*; the *ἐπί* here denotes immediate sequence. ["Thy" would seem to be emphatic, to make prominent the peculiar manner in which the thanksgiving was pronounced by the one who spoke in an unknown tongue, or perhaps still better, to distinguish between the prayer offered by such a speaker and the regular thanksgiving which was pronounced at the institution of the Supper. If the latter, it would go to show that whatever prayer was offered by those who employed the gift of tongues and interpreted, was responded to by the congregation as offered also in their behalf; or that the Apostle intended to assert that this ought to be the case and that in consequence no one should utter a prayer in presence of the congregation which they could not be made to understand and could not intelligently respond to. It is a question whether with this precedent before us amounting almost to an authoritative precept, so large a portion of the Christian church have not done wrong in entirely omitting so important a part of the public service].—**since he knows not what thou sayest?**—[Men cannot assent to what they do not understand, because assent implies the affirmation of the truth of that to which we assent. "It is impossible, therefore, to join in prayers uttered in an unknown tongue. The Romish church persists in the use of the Latin language in her public services not only in opposition to the very idea and intent of worship, but also to express prohibition of the Scriptures. For the very thing here prohibited is praying in public in a language which the people do not understand. It is indeed said that words may touch the feelings which do not convey any distinct notions to the mind. But we cannot say "Amen" to such words, any more than we can to a flute. Such blind, emotional worship, if such it can be called, stands at a great remove from the intelligent service demanded by the Apostle." HODGE].—The question thus asked is still further explained and that too with a concession in reference to the character of the thanksgiving.—**For thou indeed givest thanks well,**—The *καλῶς*, *well*, is not to be taken ironically, but is earnestly meant; since he regards the act as truly an operation of the divine Spirit. The only difficulty in regard to it is expressed in the next clause.—**but**—Instead of *δέ* as the antithesis to *μέν*, we have *ἀλλά*, which expresses a more emphatic contrast.—**the other**—*i. e.*, the private person just spoken of,—**is not edified.**—The thanksgiving not being understood can never promote devotion, nor lift the soul to God; and therefore it cannot prompt to the right utterance of the Amen. The declaration just made he goes on to confirm by his own example; and in so doing he first recognizes the worth of the gift in itself, and magnifies his own distinguished endowment with it. In this way he obviates all misconception as to his own estimate of the gift, or as to any personal jealousy which might be supposed to move him to speak as he did.—**I thank God,**—He thus renounces all claim to merit in reference to what he is about to assert of himself. The verb here is followed by an objective clause which, according to the original reading, has no conjunction to unite it, as is often the case in the classics. 'That' is to be supplied. The readings *ὅτι λαλῶ* and *λαλῶν* are merely different attempts to conform the text to grammatical rules. The omission of *λαλῶ* in Cod. A. is to be explained on the ground that the copyist thought it necessary to continue the use of *εὐχαριστῶ* in the same absolute sense in which it stands in ver. 17, [*i. e.*, 'I utter thanksgiving' just as the person before spoken of; and in this independent sense some commentators construe the word]. But if this sense had been intended, the Apostle would not have added the word "God."—**I speak with a tongue more than you all:**—[It is worthy of note that, according to the correct reading—"a tongue" and not 'tongues'—both here and elsewhere, when an individual is spoken of as endowed with this gift, he is said to speak only with a single tongue. This shows that the gift in question did not signify a faculty for speaking in various languages as some suppose—not even in the case of a Paul; but that each one had his own language which constituted his specialty. Have we not here a significant hint in confirmation of the theory that the gift denoted an ability conferred by the Spirit to utter

thoughts and feelings awakened by His inspiration in forms peculiar to the individual himself, which might be termed *his* tongue? Hodge, it must be observed, utterly ignores the more authenticated reading here, and tacitly adopts the received text in proof of the theory that the speaking with tongues meant speaking in foreign languages, in which respect Paul asserts that he surpassed all others. If this were really so, it is very strange that we find not a particle of evidence to prove that he really used any of these languages in his preaching tours, but everywhere seems to have spoken and written either in Aramaic or in Greek. The gift appears to have stood him in no service in proclaiming the Gospel. If he spoke with these many tongues at all, it must have been not to man, but to God—where they were the least necessary. For the Apostle's power of speaking with a tongue compare the description of his visions and revelations in 2 Cor. xii. 1, 2].—**But**—whatever I may do in private—**in church I prefer to speak five words**—The 'five' stands tropically for "a few" (comp. Isa. xvii. 6; xxx. 17).—**with my understanding,**—The reading *διὰ τοῦ νοός μου* may with Meyer be considered as an interpretation of the more strongly attested *τῷ νοΐ μου*. On the contrary de Wette deduced it from ver. 16.—**in order that I might teach others also,**—*κατέχειν*, whence our word 'catechism,' means *to instruct orally*, and shows what is meant by 'speaking with the understanding,' and what most contributes to edification.—**than ten thousand words in a tongue.**—As Besser says: "rather half of ten, if of the edifying sort, than a thousand times ten of the other."

Vers. 20–25. In winning style he introduces an earnest admonition in reference to their own estimate of the gift of tongues,—**Brethren,**—and their high valuation of a gift so fitted to excite great astonishment, but yet so profitless for the church as a whole, he denounces as something childish, as a mark of immature judgment—**become not little children in your minds.**—*ταῖς φρεσίν*, [the only occurrence of the word in the New Testament]. *φρένες* means the *outgoings of the mind*, the inward movements of thoughts and feelings in their most diversified aspects. Regarded as a whole, the word is nearly synonymous with *νοῦς*; hence *φρένας ἔχειν*, *to have insight*. He here intimates to them that by their conduct they were virtually setting aside that superior intelligence in which they so much gloried, and were descending to the level of childhood; since they were estimating the worth of a thing not by its ends and uses, but by its outward show. The childlike state belonged to the Christian, only in another respect.—**howbeit in wickedness,**—*κακίᾳ* is the direct opposite of love, that fountain of all good; and in respect to it babes may be considered most innocent.—**be babes,**—*νηπιάζετε* is from *νήπιος* which denotes a more infantile state than *παίδιον*, and is used to denote an advance upon the previous expression "children." Burger explains the whole to mean: "know nothing of the moral corruption that is in the world, to say nothing of an experimental acquaintance with it."—**but in understanding become mature.**—*τέλειοι*, *i. e.*, full-grown men. "To plant and propagate childlike innocence and maturity of understanding both in one—this is the great problem of Christianity. (Comp. Rom. xvi. 19; Matt. x. 6)." Neander.—He next appeals to Scripture by way of teaching them how they ought to regard the gift of tongues.—**In the law it is written,**—*γέγραπται*, [lit. *has been written*, but inasmuch as what has been written is supposed to abide permanently the perfect, is here equivalent to the present]. The term "law" is here to be taken in a broader sense than in John x. 34; Rom. iii. 19, as including also the prophecies. This use is grounded on the fact that prophecy was but the development of the fundamental revelation both of law and of promise given in Pentateuch.—**With (men) of other tongues and with the lips of others will I speak to this people; and neither so will they hearken unto me saith the Lord.**—The citation is from Isa. xxviii 11; but it accords precisely neither with the LXX. nor with the original text. The original passage is a threatening pronounced upon the children of Israel for their unbelieving and contemptuous treatment of God's messengers. They had asked derisively, whether it was thought they ought to be treated like little children in that they were perpetually dinned with line upon line and precept upon precept after the fashion in which little children were instructed. In reply God threatens that because they had despised this simple teaching, He would hereafter instruct them through persons of a different language and foreign utterance. The persons here meant were Gentile nations especially the Assyrians, by whom they were to be treated just as contemptuously as they had treated God's Word.—But how are we to understand the application made by the Apostle to the case in hand? Meyer, in his 2 Ed., assumes that the Apostle here disregarded the historical and empirical sense of the word *ἑτερόγλωσσος*, and applied it to those who spake with tongues, since they spake *as if* they used other tongues than their own, and the lips of others, so that their utterances were strange. But this is a very hazardous assumption. In his 3d Ed. he takes the historio sense of the original typically, as though the phenomenon of the Apostle's time was foreshadowed in the prophet's language:—1. as to the essential fact, that in both cases "other tongues" were employed; 2. as to the effect, since in neither instance "would the people hear." The analogy between the type and the antitype is founded on the extraordinary phenomenon of God's speaking to His people in a foreign tongue—formerly it was through the Assyrian language; now it was through the gift of speaking in a manner at variance with the ordinary intelligible language. [Hodge on the contrary, and apparently for the purpose of obviating an inference fatal to his theory, says: "Paul does not quote the passage as having any prophetic reference to the events in Corinth"—which certainly it has not—"much less does he give an allegorical interpretation of it in order to make it a condemnation of speaking with tongues." But why not? The whole drift of the argument goes to show that he is here appealing to the law for the purpose of sustaining his own disappro-

val, not indeed of the gift of tongues, in itself, but certainly of their use of it without interpretation; and he is here showing that as they employed it they were virtually carrying out that divine threatening in relation to the church, which was pronounced upon the unbelieving Jews of old. There was, therefore, great pertinency in this citation]. From the analogy, thus understood, Paul proceeds to draw his conclusion applicable to the case in hand. — **so that** — [ὥστε serves to connect more closely than ὡς a following clause with the preceding, expressing an event, result, consequence, whether real or supposed. It here shows that the following clause is to be construed in harmony with what precedes, and is an inference from it. This is important to be observed, for in the interpretations given of ver. 22, commentators seem to have felt at perfect liberty to deviate from the fair implication of the prophecy used in the argument].—**tongues are for a sign, not to believers, but to unbelievers**;—[For a sign, in what sense? Here interpretations greatly vary. De Wette, and Alford, and others insist that no emphasis is to be laid on the word, and that the meaning is much the same as if it were omitted, and still further that in not seeing this commentators have differed widely about the meaning]. Others construe it to mean a token by which not believers, but unbelievers were to be recognized. Here the correct view is aimed at, but the error lies in the subjective reference, as though the persons speaking with tongues were branded as unbelievers. In this case the genitive would have been used instead of the dative (ἀπίστοις). The same is true of that explanation which regards the "sign" as a penal token; here a meaning is foisted into the word which can hold good only as it stands connected with unbelievers as a whole. [It cannot be maintained in the following clause where "a sign" is to be supplied, and the word is used in connection with "believers." HODGE says: "the most satisfactory explanation is to take 'sign' in the general sense of any indication of the divine presence. 'Tongues are a manifestation of God, having reference not to believers but to unbelievers.'" And by interpreting the word "tongues" as denoting not 'the gift of tongues,' but 'foreign languages,' he draws from the whole the meaning, "that when a people are disobedient, God sends them teachers whom they cannot understand." This approaches the correct view. But if by "unbelievers" we are to understand the world at large, it would seem as if the tongues, *i. e.*, the foreign languages which he supposes the gift to imply, were especially designed for these, and that not in the way of judgment, but in the way of instruction. And, so understanding it, we destroy the force of the analogy. Hence it will be necessary to restrict the meaning of the word "unbelievers" as denoting those who, having known, refuse to believe—to the incorrigible, and to the hardened]. The meaning, then, is this, that when God speaks unintelligibly, He exhibits Himself not as one that is opening His thoughts to His faithful ones, but as one who is shutting Himself up from those who *will* not believe. The speaking is indeed a powerful one, but nothing is accomplished by it; the ear and mind are not directed to Him; "neither so will they hearken unto me." So was it formerly in the speaking of God to His people by men of other tongues. They, indeed, called themselves His, but in this very circumstance they showed that they had incurred His judgment. In like manner it also appeared here, if a person spake unintelligibly to the church; he made it appear as if God had withdrawn from His people—as if they, by reason of unbelief, had incurred His judgment—as if they were persons for whom the most powerful divine manifestations—such as speaking with tongues—were useless, and who could not be brought by them to reflection. [Such would be the effect of employing the gift of tongues in the church without interpretation. And here the force of the passage would be all the same whether we interpreted the gift of tongues as an ability to speak in foreign languages, or as the endowment of some heretofore unknown formal speech. The main thing here, which stands as a sign, is the use of language unintelligible to the hearers. And this may exist in either case].—**but prophecy (is for a sign) not to unbelievers, but to believers.**—[The E. V. overlooking the fact that the two clauses of this verse were alike in structure, and stood antithetically, has supplied the ellipsis by the word "serveth," therein following the earlier versions of Tyndale, Cranmer, and Geneva. This somewhat embarrasses the interpretation. The two clauses should be rendered alike as above. Here "prophecy" stands in contrast with the gift of tongues as denoting intelligible communications. Hence, if what was spoken by a tongue were only interpreted, it too would stand on a par with prophecy. This served as a sign not for unbelievers, but for believers. But in what sense are we to understand this? Observing the analogy furnished in the previous clause, we must say that prophecy was a means of divine communication to those who either did believe, or were disposed to believe, and was to them a token of favor, and a source of blessing, while it was withheld from those hardened in unbelief. By such interpretation we both preserve the antithesis, and carry out the signification of the prophecy in Isa., which is here applied].—**If, then, the whole church should come together in one place, and all should speak with tongues, and there should come in common people, or unbelievers, would they not say, ye were mad?**—[The οὖν may be taken either as strictly inferential, or as simply transitional. The latter most accords with the course of thought]. It would be a mistake to suppose that what is stated in ver. 22, is still further enlarged upon, and explained in this and the following verse, by showing the different effects of speaking with tongues, and of prophecy upon unbelievers and the believing, as though these had been already intimated there in a concise way; as if he had said: 'tongues are for a sign not to believers for the purpose of producing faith, but for unbelievers for the purpose of strengthening them in their unbelief.' There is a severity of meaning here which ought not to be concluded upon, if in any way avoidable. So also is it a mistake to suppose that the Apostle

meant to say that the gift of tongues was intended to be used for the conversion of unbelievers, *i. e.*, those not Christians, and that this result was hindered by such a use of the gift as was contrary to its original intent, it being employed by Christians collectively (all speaking together, and not one by one) and for Christians merely, in a style fitted only to be for a sign to those who are not Christians, so that in this case an effect would be produced upon the minds of casual observers directly contrary to that intended, and the whole phenomenon would be made to appear to those common persons and unbelievers who might come in to witness this abuse, as something exceedingly absurd, and in fact a most crazy piece of business (Meyer).—The assumption that the gift of tongues was designed to lead to the conversion of those who were not Christians, [whether it be as Hodge says, through the use of foreign languages which the various nations of unbelievers could understand, or, as others think, through the remarkable character of the phenomenon itself as an ecstatic utterance], is wholly groundless. It is neither probable in itself (Acts ii., furnishing no proof of this opinion); nor can it be inferred from ver. 21, except by a most arbitrary interpretation. That passage from Isa. is the announcement of a judgment; the prophet there asserts that the most powerful speaking on the part of God would effect no change upon the people hardened in unbelief. So the Apostle argued that in his day the speaking with tongues was a sign from God to unbelievers, of a like sort—an instrumentality in the form of a judgment which, however cogent in itself, would produce no salutary results. The supposition, therefore, that the gift in question was intended as a means of conversion, is contrary to the line of the Apostle's argument.—Still, in all this no condemnation is at all implied of the gift in question, viewed by itself; nor are the recipients of the gift in any way disparaged. Paul is only speaking of the relation which the gift sustained to the church, and of the absurdity of their using it there without an accompanying interpretation. Employed in this way, no gracious communication came through it from God, as was the case in prophecy; but, rather, God appeared as one who shut Himself from their apprehension, just as He was wont to exhibit Himself towards unbelievers. Accordingly, we are not to regard the passage before us (ver. 23) as designed to show how a gift, which was intended to convert unbelievers, had failed of its intended effect by a wrong use; but what the Apostle aims at here, is to exhibit the picture of a church abundantly endowed with the gift of tongues, even to the fullest extent its admirers would deem desirable, and putting it in fullest exercise in its assembly; and then to show the impression which such a scene would make on casual observers. He imagines 'the whole church convened in one place'—"a rare occurrence in so large a city," as Bengel observes, yet one calculated to produce a strong impression of the solemnity of the occasion), and 'all speaking with tongues'—not necessarily simultaneously [as Stanley supposes] any more than in the next verse they are to be regarded as prophesying together, but one after another—and then the coming in of private persons (*ἰδιῶται*) and unbelievers (*ἄπιστοι*) to watch the proceedings. What the impression on them must be, he leaves for his readers to decide in answering the question, "would they not say ye were mad?"—an assembly of crazy people rather than a church possessed by the Spirit of God? On this point there could be no doubt. And here he finds a fresh argument for their not employing this gift of tongues without interpretation.—*μαίνεσθαι* is not to be interpreted as sometimes in the old classic Greek, *to be possessed by a god*, with the additional implication that no one was present to explain what those thus possessed were saying; but it means, as above, *to be mad*, as in Acts xxvi. 24.—But who are intended by the *ἰδιῶται* and *ἄπιστοι* who come in to observe and take the impression? As to the second word *ἄπιστοι*, *unbelievers*, we are not to understand it in this and the following verse in the same sense which it bears in the one preceding, where its meaning is determined by the connection with verse 21, and by the antithesis with "those who believe." Here the import of the verse must govern. Such variations in the signification of the same word in passages closely connected are not without a parallel. A similar one occurs in xv. 1, 3, in the use of *παραλαβεῖν*. In the previous case (ver. 22) the word carried a strongly ethical force denoting those who *would not believe;* but here, as is evident from its being associated with *ἰδιώτης*, and especially from the import of the next verse where it is used in the same sense and connection, we must understand by it simply *those not Christians*, heathen, it may be, who out of curiosity, or from a desire to learn, or by reason of a mysterious longing after truth, might have been induced to enter the church. But *ἰδιῶται* cannot in like manner be taken to denote those not Christians (whether as Jews, or as persons approaching near to Christianity, or as those who are perfect strangers to it, nor yet that class who were in a transitional state (such as catechumens and neophytes); but simple *laymen* or *common people* in distinction from those who spoke with tongues or prophesied; or even perhaps Christians from abroad since it is presupposed that the whole church belonging to that locality were in the assembly. [The meaning here given to *ἰδιώτης* is its primary one, implied in the root *ἴδιος*; but the rendering *unlearned* is in accordance with its secondary signification, and is adopted by all who hold to the theory that "the tongues" employed were foreign languages. Hence Hodge says in reference to the distinction between the words in question:—"The two classes (the unlearned and the unbelieving) are not so distinguished that the same person might not belong to both classes. The same persons were either *ἰδιῶται* or *ἄπιστοι*, according to the aspect under which they were viewed. Viewed in relation to the languages, they were *unlearned;* viewed in relation to Christianity, they were *unbelievers*." This is consistent with the general theory, but can hardly be admitted.—The superiority and so the greater desirableness of prophecy is next shown by way of contrast in the effect it would be likely to produce under the same circumstances.—

But if all prophesy,—Here let it be remembered that "prophecy" not only implies the use of the vernacular and the exercise of the *νοῦς*, the understanding, but was also a disclosure of the hidden things of the spiritual world whether in God or man—not simply a prediction of future events].—**and there should come in some unbeliever or private person**,—As in the former case, a full meeting of the church is here presupposed to enhance the impression made. Observe also a change in the order of the words and of the number in which they are introduced. As MEYER says: 1. "In the former instance *common persons* are mentioned first, and *unbelievers* afterwards, since the common persons being Christians and supposed to be acquainted with the object of the gift, naturally step into the foreground, and the opinion expressed would fall from them first; on the contrary here "the unbeliever" appears first, because he is speaking of conversion, and therefore he is the one principally intended; the other party is added by the way, inasmuch as his case is not altogether dissimilar." BENGEL: 2. "In the former case we have the plural, where the aim is to set forth a general impression which was to be made and expressed—one speaking to another; with equal suitableness the singular appears in the second case, where the aim is to exhibit a converting effect in its progress, which can best be shown in the instance of a particular individual."—**he is convicted by all**,—*ἐλέγχεται, is made conscious of his sin and unbelief.* The secret movements of his heart—concealed more or less from the subject himself—are exposed in so striking a manner by the speakers as one after another goes on prophesying and deepening the impression, that the individual feels himself to be one pointed at, is compelled to see himself in his true light, and at last is forced to confess the correctness of the delineation.—**is judged by all**:—*ἀνακρίνεται, is examined and searched into;* this is closely connected with the preceding. The conviction brings with it a judgment on the man's moral character. He hears it already pronounced in the speeches he listens to, and conscience compels him to accord therewith, and acknowledge its propriety.—**the secret things of his heart become manifest**;—There is no further chance for disguise. The revelation scatters all darkness and solves all doubt. The three verbs and their relation to each other are more fully explained by Osiander: *ἐλέγχειν* expresses the inner conviction and reproof—this is the whole work; *ἀνακρίνεται* the more searching investigation, as it were the inward trial—this is the chief instrumentality; *φανερὰ γίν.*, the disclosure of what is within that sets all at rest,—this is the result. Or we have here coördination and gradation: 1. the first strong, but yet general impression of the truth, the sentence passed through it; 2. its development,—the investigation and judgment of the individual, or besides, the refutation of his reply to the charge; 3. the advance to the interior, the centre of the moral life, where each particular is set in full light and the trial reaches its consummation. All is as one inward revelation, designed especially to overcome the person's unbelief; mediated by the power of divine truth which spoke inspiringly through the mouth of the prophets, and by the force of his own moral consciousness as apprehended by the truth and strengthened through the depth of his own inward experience and through the abundant outpouring of the Holy Spirit. It is doubtful whether there may not also have been searching glances, as of a seer, into significant circumstances of the inward moral life of the unsatisfied one (Grot.)—**and so**—*i. e.*, in consequence of this conviction,—**falling upon his face, he will worship God**,—["Comp. the effect of Samuel's prophesying on Saul, "He lay down all that day and night. 1 Sam. xix. 24." STANLEY].—**reporting**—*ἀπαγγέλλων*, a plain emphatic avowal, suitable to the mighty impression made; and what is reported is directly the reverse of their being mad.—**that God is in you**—[not, 'among you,' but in your minds working there "this inward illumination and spiritual power,—a most conclusive argument in favor of religion from the divine operations." BENGEL. "It is through this in-dwelling of God in the individuals through His Spirit, that He dwells in the church as a whole, which thereby becomes His Temple." MEYER]. See for a like effect the confession of the woman of Samaria, JNO. iv. 19.—**of a truth**.—*ὄντως* appears also in Mark xi. 32.

VERS. 26–33. From what has been said he proceeds to draw some practical lessons for regulating the use of spiritual gifts in the church.—**What is it, then, brethren?**—*τί οὖν ἐστιν*, as in ver. 15. ["It is a *conclusive* phrase, introduced at the end of discussion, the sense of which is always *nearly* the same, but which requires to be *accommodated* to the context." BLOOMFIELD. Its meaning here, then, is not, "what is then the condition of things among you? How, in point of fact, do you conduct your public worship?" (Hodge), as though about to introduce a description of a state of things he was about to disapprove. But it means 'what, then, is the inference to be drawn from what I have said? What, then, is to be done?'—The clauses which follow have been variously interpreted. Some like Locke, Doddr., Stanley, Hodge, regard Paul as here exposing a state of things which needed to be corrected. They lay stress upon the use of the present tense, as though intended to exhibit the eager haste of the parties endowed with gifts to exercise these gifts in unseemly haste and forwardness. This, however, would be to foist into the words a meaning or a force which does not readily appear, and which seems unnecessary. All we can fairly find there is] a statement of the case in a protasis and apodosis, [in view of which he lays down the rule he wished to enforce].—**when ye come together**,—[*i. e.*, 'as often as ye come together' (Meyer, Hodge)].—**every one of you**—The *ἕκαστος* must be understood of those endowed with spiritual gifts, and be interpreted distributively—not that every one has all the gifts about to be enumerated, but that each one has something—one this and another that.—**has**—as ready for communication. [LOCKE adds: "so that he is not able to endure any delay." But this is an unnecessary intensification of the present].—**a psalm**,—[not one taken from the book of Psalms, as though none other were allowed to be used in public wor-

ship, as some of our Scotch brethren imagine], nor one previously composed and committed for the occasion; but the meaning is, that he comes to church in a state of mind inspired by the Spirit, to produce and pour forth some song of praise [after the manner of Miriam, Deborah, Simeon]. Inasmuch as having a tongue is particularly mentioned afterwards, we are not here to understand a song in the spirit, *i. e.*, with a tongue, as in ver. 15.—**has a doctrine,**—*i. e.*, is ready to give an exposition of some particular portion of Christian truth.—**has a revelation,**—*i. e.*, some disclosure from the unseen world, which forms a basis of prophecy which some take as synonymous with this.—**has a tongue,**—*i. e.*, has the inspiration on him to speak with a tongue. —**has an interpretation.**—*i. e.*, the qualification to interpret what is spoken with a tongue. [Some would end the apodosis here; but, as DE WETTE well says: "The reader cannot well stop here, but is forced on by the opening question to the concluding thought which follows, and which forms, as it were, a second apodosis"]. **Let all things happen to edification.**—[*i. e.*, 'let all these gifts be so employed and timed that the whole church shall be built up and perfected thereby; and let no one seek to employ them either for his own private edification, or for his own glory.' This is a general rule which he lays down for the regulation of all their public services], and which he now goes on to apply more particularly in relation to glossolaly, and to prophecy.—**Whether any one speaks with a tongue,**—The εἴτε, *whether*, which introduces the first instance, has no "or" corresponding to it in the second—an anacoluthon which arises from the manner in which he carries out his instructions in regard to the former.—**by twos, or, at most, by threes,**—The plural refers back to what is implied in the previous clause, *i. e.*, 'if there are any speakers with tongues.' Hence we are to supply the verb, 'let them speak.' We can also take this as declarative (with de Wette and Meyer): 'In case a person wishes to speak with a tongue, let him know that two or three ought to speak, *i. e.*, not more than two to three in one and the same assembly.' ["This limitation implies that there had been a danger lest the whole assembly should be engrossed by them," STANLEY; and thus the time be spent in the use of this the least useful of all the gifts].—**and in turn;**—This is the second direction instructing them not to speak at once—a thing they might be disposed to do in the glow of their inspiration—but one after the other. A third direction is,—**and let one interpret.**—Not 'one after the other,' for this is contrary to the usage of the language; but one who has the gift of interpretation, whether it be one of those who speak with a tongue, or some other person. By the employment of only one person to interpret the discourses of the successive speakers, time would be gained for other discourses. According to Osiander, this direction may have been grounded in the fact that the fulness and manifoldness of the creative power of the Spirit manifested itself in this productive charism in a rich variety of forms, and in an inspiration that wrought in many individuals; while the reproductive charism of interpretation referred back the variety of form to the unity of the Spirit, and the fundamental contents of that spoken: and also in the fact that the gift of the Spirit made itself known much more powerfully if one person interpreted several tongues. Whether the composition of the verb διερμηνεύειν is to be pressed, as Osiander thinks, so as to make it mean an exact interpretation extending to all points, is doubtful.—**But if there be not an interpreter,**—*i. e.*, either in the person of him who speaks with tongues, or of any other,—**let him keep silence in church;**—Here there is a change of subject. It is not the interpreter that is to keep silence, but the person who has a tongue; as is evident from the context. If we assume that the latter person is meant in both clauses, as though the first read, 'but if he be not an interpreter,' then it would be supposed that interpretation was exclusively the gift of one who spake with tongues, which is contrary to xii. 10. ["The gift of tongues and the interpretation of them appear to have been usually imparted to separate persons, for thereby the power of the Spirit was more conspicuously manifested; but it seems too much to say that these gifts were invariably distinct." Quoted from Slade by Bloomfield, who goes on to say: "Certainly the present passage does not compel us to suppose they were distinct. For the Apostle's injunction might only be given on the supposition that the person had, as in ordinary cases, the gift of tongues without the power of interpretation. But the phrase in question no more precludes the possibility of a person being his own interpreter, than the phrases in vv. 5 and 13 preclude the possibility of interpretation by others"].—But though compelled to keep silence in church, his gift need not be wholly suppressed.—**but let him speak to himself and to God.**—That this cannot be explained of an inaudible, or altogether mental communication, is refuted by the verb λαλεῖν, which always denotes loud utterance. The thing here meant must therefore be private devotion at home. The datives here ἑαυτῷ—τῷ θεῷ are not dat. commodi, as though they meant 'for his own improvement, and for the glory of God;' but they are to be rendered either '*to* himself,' and '*to* God,' or '*for* himself,' and '*for* God.' The whole injunction presupposes that the person who spoke with a tongue was master of himself, and not entirely overruled by an irresistible impulse; also, that he knew for himself what he felt and uttered (comp. on vv. 2, 14).—[But if "the tongue" was some foreign language, why should he speak "to himself, and to God" in it, when in all probability it was not half so suitable a vehicle for uttering religious thought as the Hebrew or Greek? and not reserve it till he found some foreigner who could readily understand him without an interpreter? On the condition supposed, the latter would be the more natural course to be pursued].—An analogous direction he gives in regard to the prophets.—**And let the prophets speak two or three,**—*i. e.*, in one meeting. Opportunity would thus be given for other edifying discourses, such as doctrine.—[He does not add "at most," because he does not wish to appear as if limiting this most edifying of the gifts. ALFORD]—And as in the former

case interpretation was to be used, so here judgment.—**and let the others discern.**—*i. e.*, judge what in the discourse proceeds from the Spirit of God, or from a foreign spirit (Neander and Burger). By "the others" we most naturally understand the rest of those possessed of the gift of prophecy who are not discoursing, who possessed also the gift of discernment; not members of the church generally, since all could not be regarded as qualified for this; nor yet such as possessed the gift of judgment without that of prophecy, although there must have been persons of this class likewise. [The original subject "prophets" here runs through the whole sentence].—In what follows the duty of speaking in turn is still further insisted upon. And first we have the precept itself.—**And if anything be revealed to another sitting by,**—and thereupon his spirit was moved to prophesy, then—**let the first be silent**—and sit down; for the speaker stood (comp. Luke iv. 17). "The fact that the Spirit impelled another to speak was a hint to the first speaker that it was time for him to be done." Burger. ["It was of more importance to catch the first burst of a prophecy than to listen to the completion of one already begun." Stanley. But this would imply that an inspired discourse reversed the order of ordinary discourse where the peroration is generally the most eloquent part]. By this injunction the Apostle does not intend that the second speaker should wait until the first had finished [Hodge*], but that in case he gives some token, perhaps by rising, that he has received a revelation and wishes to speak immediately, the first should not then prolong his speech, but should give way to the first gush of inspiration in the other, although perhaps not so as to break off too abruptly. † Besides, the revelation is not to be regarded precisely in the light of a new disclosure occasioned by the speech just heard; although, as a general thing, a susceptibility for further revelations would be awakened and furthered by the prophetic discourse of another. The injunction just given is next sustained by offsetting to the disinclination to restrain the impulse to speak the thought that, while avoiding the confusion occasioned by several speaking at once, the opportunity might thus be afforded for all to exercise their gift; and he encourages them to the exercise of self-denial in this respect by pointing them to the result which would thereby be attained.—**For one by one**—He here takes up again the import of the injunction just given, laying a stress thereupon, as well as upon the word "all" which follows.—**ye can all prophesy,**—The possibility here implied is simply an outward one, that of an opportunity to express themselves if not in one meeting yet, at least, in several subsequent ones (and also, perhaps, to finish out what was left unsaid when they were compelled to be silent). A simpler explanation than this which properly subaudits προφητεύονες after καθ' ἕνα, is that which emphasizes δύνασθε and καθ' ἕνα, *q. d.*, 'you *can* indeed all *individually* prophesy; there is nothing to withhold you from it forcibly.' [So Alford, who explains it, "you have power to bring about this result—you can be silent if you please, and so prophesy one by one."]—The result of thus bringing the prophetic gift into full exercise would be that all the members of the church would find nourishment and satisfaction for all their intellectual and moral wants—a result that could not be obtained in case several spoke at once.—**that all may learn, and all may be exhorted** (or **comforted**).—According to the first of the interpretations given above, this result would be reached by the fact that all had had the opportunity of speaking. ["The discourse of one might suit the wants of some hearers; and that of another might be adapted to the case of others. Thus all hearers would receive instruction and consolation." Hodge]. Besides, the second πάντες, *all*, may possibly include also those prophets not precisely active. [Was their comfort to consist in the chance for speaking, or in the opportunity of hearing others?] To think of these exclusively is inconsistent with the change of persons, 'ye may prophesy,' 'all may learn' (μανθάνωσιν).—In ver. 32 he proceeds to show that the nature of prophetic inspiration did not hinder the maintenance of such order, but rather promoted it. His meaning is 1. 'ye are *able* to do this;' 2. 'it *becometh* you also as prophets to do this by virtue of the character of your gift.' This character is thus set forth,—**And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.**—The "and" connects this verse to the preceding as containing an additional reason for the injunction given above. In regard to the expression "the spirits of the prophets," it is a question whether he means the inspiring Spirit, in the variety of its manifestations [Hodge, de Wette and others], or, the inspired spirits of prophets themselves which, because he is here speaking of prophets in general, are naturally put in the plural [Meyer, Alford, Stanley]. The latter interpretation is the more probable as is seen by the drift of the argument since the statement that the spirits are subject to the prophets would hardly be suitable on such a construction. The meaning 'inward motions,' 'excitements,' 'inspirations' [Wordsworth] cannot be admitted. But who are the prophets to whom the spirits are subject? Some understand by these other prophets, and interpret the verb ὑποτάσσεται of that mutual subordination which is implied in the silencing of the one by the rising of another; or, according to Bengel, in the learning of the person silenced; or, according to others, in the subjection to the 'discernment' exercised over them by others—which however is too far fetched. Others understand by these prophets the individuals to whom the spirits belonged; so that the expression "to the prophets" would be equivalent 'to themselves,' only being more emphatic and pointing, as it were, to the circumstance that this subjection was grounded in the very essence of the gift itself

*["Two reasons may be urged for this view. The interruption of a speaker was itself disorderly, and therefore contrary to the whole drift of the Apostle's directions; and secondly, what follows is most naturally understood as assigning the reason why the receiver of the first revelation should wait." Hodge. The strongest objection to these reasons is the force of the imperative σιγάτω, *let him be*, not *become, silent.*]

†[Did not the Apostle also intend here to suggest a convenient way by which tedious and long-winded speakers could have a period put to their too protracted harangues?]

The 'subjection' he speaks of is that which is involved in a sound Christian disposition and accords with the true prophetic spirit.—In the first explanation, *viz*, that which supposes the subjection to be to other prophets, the reference to the injunction "let him be silent," as that about which he is treating, is the only correct one, *q. d.*, 'let him be silent inasmuch as the spirit of one prophet is subject to that of another;' neither can we say with Meyer, that that injunction would have been superfluous in this case; since indeed it is only confirmed by pointing to that which is becoming to the Christian prophet as such. But the second interpretation deserves the preference as the finer one, *q. d.*, "ye are able all of you, by restraining your impulse to speak, to prophesy one after another; and such control over the spirit, however powerfully excited, belongs to the prophets themselves who are no mere enthusiasts obeying their own impulses involuntarily, but voluntary agents." ["In this way he distinguishes these impulses from those of the heathen pythonesses and sibyls." STANLEY]. The absence of the article before *πνεύματα προφητῶν προφήταις* is accounted for by the fact that these words are used qualitatively. [It generalizes the assertion making it applicable to all Christian prophets].—The position thus taken is still further substantiated theologically by a reference to God whose Spirit is the active principle of prophecy.—**For God is not of confusion, but of peace.**—By not maintaining this control over their spirits, they would appear as not true prophets moved by the Spirit of God; since by allowing their impulse to speak in an unbridled way, there would arise a state of things that could not possibly come from God, *viz.*, disorder; that peace which is essentially God's work would be broken up. *ἀκαταστασία* (3 Cor. xii. 20; Jas. iii. 16; Luke xxi. 9) is *disorder, confusion*, which also involves disunion; hence the antithesis *εἰρήνη* in which order and subordination are implied. These are put in the genitive, as indicating both what belongs to God as an attribute, and what proceeds from Him as an effect. God is not a being who either has in Himself or produces confusion; but who both has and produces peace (comp. the genitives Heb. x. 39 and the expression "the God of Peace" Rom. xv. 33).—Here some commentators directly annex the clause—**as in all the churches of the saints**.—[So likewise the E. V.]. In this case something must be supplied in order to put it in relation to the altogether general proposition just laid down. For example, 'God is such a being among you as in all the churches of the saints.' 'This His character must show itself among you, just as in all the churches, through this subjection I am speaking of.' But whether we effect the connection in this or in some other way, there will nevertheless always remain in it something peculiar and harsh. Whereas, on the contrary, what is said in opposition to uniting it with what follows, *viz.*, that Paul elsewhere does not use a protasis with *ὡς*, without following it with a *οὕτως*, and that the word 'churches' would occur close together with diverse significations, ought to be of little weight; to this it may be added that afterward, in ver. 36, there occurs a reprimand founded thereupon. ["I am compelled," says ALFORD, "to depart from the majority of modern critics of note, *e. g.*, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Billroth, Meyer, de Wette, and to adhere to the common arrangement of this latter clause. My reason is, that taken as beginning the next paragraph, it is harsh beyond example, and superfluous, as anticipating the reason about to be given *οὐ γὰρ κ. τ. λ.* Besides which, it is more in accordance with St. Paul's style, to place the main subject of a new sentence first, see 1 Tim. iii. 8, 11, 12; and we have an example of reference to general usage coming in last, in aid of other considerations, ch. xi. 16; but it seems unnatural that it should be placed first in the very forefront of a matter on which he has so much to say." To this it may be added that the clause standing where it does in the E. V., as connected with what precedes, seems to furnish a demonstration of the general position assumed and especially of the concluding assertion. The peace and the order which belongs to God and comes from God, might be seen manifested in all the churches of the saints, and ought therefore to have been manifest at Corinth in like manner. Hodge and Wordsworth follow the old punctuation without comment. So likewise does Bloomfield who however takes the words, "for God is not, *etc.*," as parenthetical; and in the words, "as in all, *etc.*," he would understand the law, *viz.*, "for the prophets to have in subjection the spiritual influence for *good*." As to the new punctuation, he adds: "it occasions a very offensive tautology, and derogates much from the weight and gravity with which the direction is brought forward." But see below.]

VERS. 34–36. This little paragraph, prohibiting women from speaking in public assemblies, forms an adjunct to the precepts in vv. 26–33, and its connection with these would be still closer, if we suppose Paul to have had in mind such women as had the gift of prophecy (comp. Acts xxi. 9), or of tongues. Both Greek and Roman as well as Jewish custom forbade the public appearance of women (comp. Grot. and Wests. i. h. l). Christian church order attached itself to this custom (1 Tim. ii. 11), suitably to the old divine order (*νόμος*, Gen. iii. 16) which strictly imposed upon woman subjection to man, since she, by her voluntary act, had involved him in apostasy. To this belongs the duty of keeping silence in public assemblies; while public speaking, whether in the way of holding discourse, or of asking questions, appeared, on the contrary, as an effort at independence calculated to foster woman's vanity, and to take her out of the subordinate position appointed her by God. Even in the matter of putting questions, this was the more true in proportion as the question was keen and pert. Aside from this, also, it involved a sort of intercourse with men on the part of the women, and a renunciation of their dependence upon their husbands, from whom, or through whose aid they ought to obtain the knowledge they were in quest of—a matter important for preserving the integrity of the marriage relation; while, on the other hand, this holding direct communication with other men in public assemblies, even on spiritual subjects, might serve to

disturb it.—Unmarried women are here not taken into the account. That these had more freedom than the married, cannot be inferred from Acts xxi. 2, since nothing is there said of public prophesying. In them a modest less-restraint is naturally presupposed. Their desire for knowledge might also be gratified in other quiet *ways*, *e. g.*, through their fathers, relatives, friends, teachers, deaconesses, *etc.* The same held good of the converted wives of the heathen.—**As in all churches of the saints.**—[On the connection of this clause see above. As STANLEY: "Though in the older texts joined to the preceding, it has since the time of Cajetan, and rightly, been joined to the following, the connection being the same as in xi. 16"]. These words stand first by way of emphasis, in order to cut off all objections in advance. Nothing here needs to be supplied, since from the context we readily understand it to be meant 'as the women keep silence in the churches.' [The early Greek fathers, the Vulgate, Wickliffe, Cranmer, and the Rheims' version, who all connect this clause with the preceding, subaudit 'I teach,' apparently, to obviate the otherwise natural, but hardly allowable inference, that the Apostle was appealing to the condition of things in other churches to prove a conceded and undeniable truth, that God was a God of peace and of order. The necessity felt for supplying some such expression to render the sense pertinent in such a connection, is a strong argument in favor of the other punctuation here advocated]. The τῶν ἁγίων belongs to ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (comp. ἅγιοι i. 2) and serves to add force to the reference. That which obtains in the churches of persons consecrated to God, *i. e.*, of the saints, is more than an ordinary human custom; it is a higher divine ordinance which must be ascribed to the Spirit of God ruling in them.—**let the women keep silence in the churches**;—To connect τῶν ἁγίων, as Lachmann does with what follows, omitting ὑμῶν as though it were 'let the wives of the saints,' *etc.*, is too forced, and is not demanded by the somewhat emphatic expression "their own husbands," in ver. 35. If we maintain the reading ὑμῶν, *your*, an antithesis would be implied therein between the special designation of "women," and the more general mention of "all the churches." This, however, does not well suit, since the emphasis lies upon the word "women." Paul does not intend to say that *their* women, in distinction from all others, were to keep silence in the churches; but the point made is in reference to women in general.—It is a question, however, whether "your" may not be put in relation to "churches," and then, also, the word "churches" in the protasis be understood only of the assemblies.—The prohibition is confirmed by a reference to the established order in this respect.—**for it is not permitted unto them to speak**:—of course it is public speaking that is here intended as the context implies. ["In the O. T. it had been predicted that 'your sons and your daughters shall prophesy;' a prediction which the Apostle Peter quotes as verified on the day of Pentecost, Acts ii. 17; and in Acts xxi. 9 mention is made of four daughters of Philip who prophesied. The Apostle himself seems to take for granted in xi. 5, that women might receive and exercise the gift of prophecy. It is therefore only the public exercise of the gift that is prohibited." HODGE]. Inasmuch as in such public speaking there would be manifested a certain degree of social independence, we see the propriety of his putting in contrast with this,—**but to be under obedience**,—We here have an instance of brachylogy. Comp. 1 Tim. iv. 3. Instead of "it is not permitted," we must here supply some expression corresponding with the second clause, such as 'it is commanded them,' or 'it is incumbent on them.' The variation ὑποτασσέσθωσαν, *let them keep silence*, though apparently well sustained, was no doubt intended as a grammatical correction through ignorance of the above construction.—**as also saith the law.** [See Gen. iii. 16, "and he shall rule over thee;" also Numb. xxx. 3–12. The speaking of women was also strictly forbidden in the Synagogues].—**But if they wish to learn anything**,—[a thing most certainly to be anticipated in quick, sensitive, eager natures; and which, to repress altogether, would be both injurious and painful, and was therefore to be provided for, yet, in consistency with that refinement and delicacy which is the beauty and the glory of the sex].—**let them ask their own husbands at home**;—"This is on the supposition that their husbands were Christians," BURGER; [and were able to answer them. Their incapacity in this respect is either passed over as not to be supposed, or as an evil which was remediless]. The verb ἐπερωτᾶν generally means *to enquire*, and is not to be taken as expressing a "desire to hear yet more in addition to that which they had heard in the church." OSIANDER. ["Their own" (ἰδίους) is emphatic, confining them to their own husbands to the exclusion of other men]. The teachings of the law he shows to be sustained by the public sense of propriety. —**for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.**—["The word used is αἰσχρός, which properly means *ugly, deformed.* It is the predicate of anything which excites disgust. As the peculiar power and usefulness of women depend on their being the objects of admiration and affection, anything which tends to excite the opposite sentiments should, for that reason, be avoided." HODGE]. Any objection that might possibly be raised against what was thus founded upon the general custom and order of the churches, he encounters with a question.—**Or went the word of God out from you? or came it unto you only?**—*i. e.*, 'are you the original church, so that your wisdom is to set the standard of propriety; or are you the only church, so that you are at liberty to stand alone by yourselves and your own conceits?' This question which so plainly exhibits the impertinence of any opposition on the part of the Corinthians, cannot be put in relation to the foregoing precepts (ver. 26 ff.), but only to the shamefulness of the conduct in question just spoken of. This is required by the close grammatical connection, *q. d.*, 'this public speaking is in violation of the public sense of decency; or, are you the original or the only church of Christ?' *i. e.*, you can oppose this only on the ground that you are such, so that either all the other churches must conform their regulations to yours as the

mother-church, or you, as the sole depositaries of the revelation of God, are at liberty to set yourselves up as the only rule of what is becoming. Now, since this was not the case, it was incumbent on them, as a part of a community of churches of Christ, to put themselves in agreement with the rest in regard to their rules of divine worship.—In respect to the language of the text comp. Isa. ii. 3; Micah iv. 2.—"The word of God" here means Christian doctrine as being preëminently the revelation of God (2 Cor. ii. 17; 1 Thes. i. 8).

VERS. 37–40. These verses form the conclusion to the whole discussion concerning spiritual gifts and their use. He here sets himself against all such spiritual presumption as would exalt the impulse of the free spirit above apostolic precepts, and affirms that the person who recognizes what has just been written to be a precept resting upon the authority of Christ, indicates thereby the reality of his own inspiration, so that in the opposite case all claim to such inspiration would prove itself to be but a vain fancy. This is what the word δοκεῖ points to in what follows, which here, as in xi. 12, does not mean 'appear,' but *think*, involving a possibility of self-deception.—**If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual,**—In consequence of the disjunctive "or," many take the word "spiritual" in a restricted sense as denoting one speaking with tongues. [So Stanley]; but ἤ, *or*, is equivalent both to *and*, as well as to *vel.*, *i. e.*, it serves to separate ideas which might be taken for one another as well as those which exclude one another (Passow. I 1320). Accordingly the term "spiritual" might designate the genus, under which "the prophet" might be included, denoting any one endowed with the spirit, and implying therefore the possession of any other gift which together with prophecy belongs to this class, and certainly not the gift of tongues exclusively.—**let him acknowledge what things I write to you, that**—ἐπιγινωσκέτω ἃ γράφω—ὅτι, a case of well known attraction for ὅτι ἃ γράφω, *i. e.*, 'let him acknowledge that the things which I write to you.' [But what are the prescripts referred to? those in the verses just preceding? or to the whole contents of this chapter? Plainly the latter, as may be seen from the characters specified—'prophet' and 'spiritual person' which show that he had in mind all the regulations given in relation to the exercise of spiritual gifts].—**they are the (commandments) of the Lord.**—There are various readings here; the most probable is κυρίου ἐστίν, 'are of the Lord.' To this there was then added as a gloss ἐντολή, 'commandment,' which then crept into the text, and was there changed into the plural with a verb to correspond, εἰσὶν ἐντολαί to accord with the antecedent ἃ, 'what things.' The meaning however is all the same. The Apostle here gives them to understand that the regulations prescribed by him came from the Lord and were His; yet not as though Christ (for He is the one meant, not God) had in person ordained the rules in this matter, but that he in enjoining them had spoken as one who "had the mind of Christ" (ii. 16; comp. vii. 40), and so acted upon the authority of Christ (comp. Osiander and Meyer). ["The continued influence of Christ by the spirit over the minds of the apostles, which is a divine prerogative, is here assumed or asserted." HODGE]. It was precisely of such as claimed to be spiritual that Paul could fairly demand that they should acknowledge the ordinances laid down by him to be the dictates of the Spirit of Christ—the expressions of His mind and will. ["Here, as in 1 Jno. iv. 6, ("He that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth not us") submission to the infallible authority of the apostles is made the test of a divine mission and even of conversion. This must be so. If the apostles were the infallible organs of the Holy Ghost, to disobey them in any matter of faith or practice is to disobey God." HODGE. "No more direct assertion of inspiration can be uttered than this." ALFORD.]—The requirement just made he next enforces with severity.—**But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant.**—The ignorance here may be taken absolutely, as denoting the possession of erroneous views; or it may be a simple lack of knowledge or intelligence; in which case then it must be understood as a guilty ignorance, since the words "let him be ignorant" clearly express a penalty.—Some (Beza) interpret this verse as simply a contrast to the preceding, and so put the clauses in counterbalance. "The 'ignorant persons' here would thus be the opposite of the 'spiritual' spoken of in ver. 37, who is, in this case regarded as one possessed only of an ordinary illumination; and then the phrase 'let him be ignorant' stands antithetic to 'let him acknowledge.' The whole would then mean: 'But if a person is unintelligent, being neither a prophet nor a spiritual person,—then will he not be able to perceive that these injunctions are from the Lord and authorized by Him, and for this (?) let him have his ignorance as his punishment'" (Osiander). The artificiality of this interpretation is not to be mistaken. It is better to take ἀγνοεῖ transitively, and put it in relation to the second clause of ver. 37, *q. d.*, 'if any one is ignorant and so does not acknowledge that the things which I write are of the Lord, then the state of ignorance to which he is given over must be regarded as his punishment;' 'let him remain ignorant at his peril.' As BENGEL says: "let him keep it to himself; we cannot cast away all things for such a man. Those who are thus left to themselves, repent more readily than if you were to teach them against their will." The Apostle here expresses his despair of further instructing a person whose ignorance he is constrained to regard as a refusal to learn. A similar use of the imperative we have in Rev. xxii. 11: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still, he which is filthy, let him be filthy still,—and he that is holy, let him be holy still."—Instead of the imperative a number of authorities, some of them important, have the indicative form ἀγνοεῖται, *he is ignored.* This reading may be explained on the ground of offence taken at the imperative; or that in the succession of ως (ἀγνοείτω ὥστε) one was dropped out and then ἀγνοεῖται was adopted, so as to obtain a sort of relation between the active and the passive, such as is found in viii. 2; Gal. iv. 9. If this reading be adopted,

it may be interpreted either: 'so he becomes ignored, disregarded, abandoned to his own self-will,' or: 'he will be ignored by the Lord in the day of judgment' (Matt. vii. 23; x. 33).—**Wherefore, brethren, covet to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues.**—And here again the old preference for prophecy is expressed. This gift is to be decidedly preferred and sought for, the other is only not to be hindered. "We recognize here an advance in the development of thought. At the start Paul said: 'covet earnestly spiritual gifts,' and planting himself on the stand-point of the Corinthians, he had included among these the gift of tongues. But after having explained how prophecy subserved the welfare of the church far more, he here gives this preference and only expresses the wish that no obstacle be put in the way of the other." NEANDER. For the proper order of the text see critical notes. Ver. 40 sums up the whole of what is stated in ver. 26 and onward.—**But let all things be done decently and in order.**—In the term 'decently' he does not refer exclusively to the duty of women's keeping silence in the churches, ver. 34. To decency in church there belongs also the preservation of order enjoined in ver. 26 ff. which is more pointedly expressed in the words following: "in order" (*κατὰ τάξιν*), which refer to what is suitable as to time and measure, *i. e.*, ['not tumultuously as in a mob, but as in a well ordered army where every one keeps his place and acts at the proper time and in the proper way.' HODGE].—"It might seem as if the instruction given with such minuteness by Paul in these chapters was of little importance, and had but little practical bearing for us, now that the gifts alluded to are no more dispensed. A high value is nevertheless to be attached to it: 1. because it affords us a glimpse into the condition of the first Christian congregations, their rich endowments, as well as the dangers connected with them; 2. because it is easy for us to draw practical inferences from it suitable to our existing states and relations; and much that is said is still pertinent to the present time; 3. because it furnishes us, as in a mirror, a picture of that we have lost, and thus serves as a spur to urge us on to recover it again by earnest prayer. Moreover, it contains a warning that we should not in our prayers put what is non-essential on a par with that which is essential, to say nothing of preferring the former to the latter." BURGER.

EXCURSUS ON THE GIFT OF TONGUES.—In chap. xiv. we have exhibited to us the essential character of this remarkable gift. We see that it is preëminently a form of worship, a mode of speaking, praying, and offering thanks, which goes on in spirit (*ἐν πνεύματι*), and not in the understanding (*τῷ νοΐ*); and that it is unintelligible without interpretation, consequently contributes nothing towards the edification of the church, but is simply a means of self-edification in communion with God (vv. 2–4; 5–19). We must now consider the question which of the theories broached in relation to this gift is best sustained, or whether we must pass beyond these in order to hit the truth in the matter.—In the observations already made (comp. on xii. 10; xiii. 1), the hypotheses of Eichhorn and Wieseler may be regarded as having been already disproved and set aside. The view of Bleek, even as modified by Baur, [that the word "tongue" (*γλῶσσα*) stands for a foreign word imported and half naturalized in the Greek], is opposed not only by its being a use of language both rare and altogether foreign to the New Testament, but also by such expressions as divers kinds of tongues, "tongues of angels," and the like; and Baur contradicts himself when in one place he takes "tongues" to mean "organs of speech," and in another "the utterances of those organs," *i. e.*, forms of language. Meyer's theory (also that of Schultz and others), which starts from the signification "organ of speech," is sustained by no inconsiderable arguments. His view is, that the tongue, set in motion involuntarily and independently of the understanding by the power of the Holy Spirit, spoke apparently of its own accord. It was not the *person*, but the *tongue* itself which spoke,—such was the *aspect* of the affair, and hence its designation. And because this mode of praying manifested itself with various characteristic modifications (which certainly cannot be explained, owing to our lack of experience), and because the same speaker was obliged to vary his manner of speaking according to the ever-changing degrees, impulses, and tendencies of his ecstasy, so that he seemed to be speaking with different tongues, there arose such expressions as: "to speak with tongues," "divers kinds of tongues." The unintelligibleness of a speech thus disconnected and mysterious is readily conceivable. But aside from the particular modes of expression which refuse to accord with this view, such as "he hath a tongue," xiv. 26, it is opposed by the fact that it compels us to regard the narrative of what took place on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2) as a traditional perversion of what actually occurred: since its advocates cannot—with propriety, at any rate—undertake to deny the essential identity or similiarity of the Pentecostal miracle with the gift of speaking with tongues at Corinth.—[The theory that the gift of tongues was an ability to speak in foreign languages, and was conferred to assist in propagating the Gospel in foreign parts (Chrys., Calvin, Hodge, and others) is encountered by difficulties sufficient to render it untenable. 1. There is not the slightest evidence that it was ever used for this purpose. 2. So far as it bore on unbelievers, it was a sign of reprobation. 3. Its only use seems to have been in worship—in prayer, and praise, and thanksgiving. If there was no interpreter, its possessor was to speak in it to himself or to God. 4. There was needed a special gift for its interpretation, which would not have been the case were any foreigner present who understood the language. 5. It seems strange that the Spirit should have bestowed a gift designed for use in foreign parts so abundantly upon a church where it does not seem to have been specially needed. 6. Wherever an individual is spoken of as endowed with this gift, he is said to have "a tongue"—even in the case of Paul (according to the right reading) which clearly implies that this manifestation of the Spirit was in accordance more with individual peculiarities than with external demands. 7. On this theory the gift would

be quite on a par with the natural ability of multitudes in the city of Corinth, who, from their commercial intercourse with foreign nations, must be supposed to have learned many foreign languages. Hence in that city would this gift have been least needed, and have in it nothing striking. 8. Paul desired that all had this gift. Why so, if it was not for personal edification, but for the sake of preaching the Gospel? Did he want all to become missionaries?]—If, now, we proceed from the earlier phenomenon, then we get as the full expression of it, "to speak with other tongues," to which there corresponds that in Mark xvi. 17, "to speak with new tongues." A more abbreviated expression occurs in Acts (which we maintain to be the work of the Pauline Luke) x. 46, "to speak with tongues" with unmistakable reference to the first outpouring of the Spirit, with the effect it produced (comp. xi. 15). The same expression occurs xix. 6. But here it will be impossible to avoid taking the word "tongue" to denote a form of speech, and the "speaking with tongues" to mean speaking in languages, *viz.*, in other than the ordinary ones (*ἑτέραις γλώσσαις*), or in so far as they were something before unheard in that place—"new tongues," (*καιναῖς γλώσσαις*). Neither can we maintain the supposition that one person and another, while struggling for expression under the overwhelming stress of feeling, wove in words and forms of speech taken from some foreign language to him otherwise unknown. Rather we feel constrained to recognize in this church of heathen converts the reverberations of the great miracle of Pentecost; in which the power of Christianity, overcoming the distinctions of nationality in language, made itself known as the absolute religion which was to lead mankind out of their apostasy from God, and out of their mutual alienations, into their primitive unity. It was, however, no such speaking in any particular foreign language as would furnish to a person acquainted with it at once an intelligible meaning (comp. xiv. 2, "no one understands him"); but it was something entirely aloof from the reach of the understanding (while in the phenomenon of Pentecost we may assume an operation of the Spirit which ensured at once the interpretation, whether in the speakers or in the hearers); and it was unintelligible for this reason, because those powers of reflection which condition the intelligibility of speech, and unfold the subject matter to others, were suspended in their action, and the ordinary consciousness of self and of the world was kept in abeyance. In so far as this consciousness was always exercised within a particular national peculiarity and form of speech, the suppression of it involved the possibility of being lifted out of this particular sphere into a higher and broader one. The Spirit of Christ, which embraced humanity in all its various nationalities and languages, and possessed the power of uniting them all in one, effected a momentary dissolution of all these limitations in the inmost depths of the individual spirit, and so let it forth in various degrees and measures into this unity which made itself known in the ability to produce signs of thought or forms of speech out of other spheres of language, and to express in these the spiritual feelings and views which had been awakened. This, nevertheless, was done in a constrained manner, corresponding to the nature of the ecstasy, or in forms and connections so new and foreign to the ordinary modes of thought and speaking that no one could obtain from it any clear connected sense, unless specially qualified for the work by the Holy Spirit.—Something akin to this we see in clairvoyance; which, indeed, even in its highest form is essentially distinguishable from these spiritual states in the fact that the gift of the Spirit was conditioned upon no physical peculiarity, that no cataleptic states were connected with it, and that its possessor was perpetually master of himself (xiv. 18 ff., 28); to which may be added, that he was in no communion with the outward world, but was wholly absorbed in communion with God (Delitzsch, p. 317 ff.). If we assume that the various languages of earth are but the *disjecta membra* of the original speech of humanity, then was this gift of tongues a symbolic anticipation of the unity which is to be restored when humanity is perfected—a unity which will include in itself a boundless diversity in the most perfect harmony.—At any rate we are not to regard the utterances made through this gift as a promiscuous medley, a mere mish-mash of sounds. The individual inspired either took his parts of speech out of one language, as is shown in the sphere of clairvoyance; or, if he took them out of several languages, he took them in such a way as not to make them appear a crude amalgam of words, but a harmonious combination of terms most expressive of deep spiritual emotions all wrought together with a plastic skill and creative power that removed their separating peculiarities.—[And so far as its practical use was concerned, may we not take these tongues in their unintelligibility to have been a sign that in the kingdom of God, and under the mightier influences of the Spirit, there was a sphere of thought and feeling transcending the ordinary one, into which the saints would one day be brought, and which now could only be imperfectly interpreted to our common apprehension by means of earthly analogies, and the common forms of speech? as a convincing token that a new and marvellous power had come down on men to lift them into direct communion with God, and impart to them the experiences and mysteries of a higher life for the expression of which no existing human language was adequate? And was it not to give assurance of this that persons immediately, on their conversion, began to speak with new tongues?]—With such an understanding of the phenomenon, it cannot surprise us if, in relation to the unintelligibility of what was uttered, a reference should be made to human language as not understood by foreigners (xiv. 10 ff.); and, as contrasted with musical instruments, the tongue as the organ for exercising this gift, should be mentioned in its most direct signification (xiv. 9). Besides, the various expressions used in respect to this gift suit very well with this view—even the one "he has a tongue"—which would thus mean, 'he has a speech in readiness,' *i. e.*, is prepared to hold discourse in a language which, as is evident from what has hitherto been said, was unintelligible to the hearers.

[The whole subject is one of peculiar interest. One can hardly avoid the supposition that it stands in some way related to the remarkable phenomena witnessed in clairvoyance and animal magnetism, or to those ecstatic states observable in times of deep religious excitement. There is nothing disparaging to "the gift of tongues" in such a supposition. The Spirit of God, we know, employs the various susceptibilities and faculties of our nature for accomplishing its own ends, and moulds its operations on human conditions. He communicated His will through dreams and visions, and, as in the case of Peter (Acts x. 10, compared with 13), even shaped the form of instruction to the bodily state of the person acted upon; yet what is more illusory than a dream? And why should not these, as yet so little understood powers of our nature, be made the vehicle of these supernatural gifts? Why should the fact that they are so wild and strange, so often partake of the animal passions, are so often perverted to bad ends, serve for an objection to the supposition that they were so employed? Indeed, does not the power of "discerning," associated with these spiritual gifts, clearly imply that there was danger of confounding the natural with the supernatural by reason of this very thing, and that there was need of a sharpened critical faculty to discriminate between what was from the Spirit, and what was not? We need, therefore, have no hesitation in looking in this direction for some explanation of this remarkable phenomenon of the early church, as though by so doing we should invalidate its divine character. Certain it is that there is something about it more mysterious and awe-inspiring than the simple ability to speak in one or more unacquired languages. We can in no way bring the Apostle's method of dealing with it, and speaking of it, into harmony with the idea that this was all that was meant by "the gift of tongues." Whether a recurrence of this gift can be looked for, is another question, not to be here discussed].

Aside from the commentaries, comp. also Heubner p. 310ff.; E. F. Fritzsche: *Nov. Opusc.* p. 102 ff.; Kling: *Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1829, p. 487 ff.; Bleek: *ibid.* 1829, p. 17; Baur and Steudel: *Tüb. Zeitschrift* 1830, 2; Baur: *Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1838, p. 628 ff.; Wieseler: *ibid.* 1838, p. 378; Schultz 1839, p. 765 ff.; *ibid. Spiritual Gifts*, p. 57 ff.; Zeller: *Theol. Jahrb.* 1849; Neander; *Hist. of planting and training of the Christian church*, i. 14 ff., 240 ff. (4 Ed.); Hilgenfeld: *Glossolaly in the primitive church*, 1850; Rossteuscher: *The Gift of Tongues in the apostolic times*, 1850; Steinbeck: *The Poet a Seer*, p. 547 ff.; Pabst: *A word about Ecstasy* 1834, p. 29; Delitzsch: *Psychol.* p. 314 ff., 143 ff.; Fabri.: *The Rise of Heathenism, etc.* 1859, p. 18 ff., 60 ff.; Kahnis: *The Doctrine of the Holy Ghost*, i. 61–68; who like Delitzsch assumes a double form of charism in Acts 2, a speaking in actually existing languages; in 1 Cor. 12–14, in newly formed languages. [Owen's *Works*, Vol. iv. p. 472 ff.; Smith's *Dict. of Bib. Ant.* "*Tongues*"; E. Irving's *Works* Vol. V. p. 509 ff.; "*Gifts of the Holy Ghost called supernatural.*" Herzog's *Ency.* Vol. xviii: "*Zungenreden*"].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Language* is the articulate expression of man's thought and feeling; in it there is concentrated that whole spiritual life which lifts him above the brutes. Hence, it is a gift conferred on him directly, in his primitive condition, in and with his spirit itself; it is, as it were, an innate organ or faculty—"no mechanical product of his own ingenuity, but a spontaneous emanation of the spirit" (W. v. Humboldt). In the beginning man possessed the word, and this word was from God; and from the vital power which was bestowed on him in and with this word, there streamed forth the light of his existence" (Fr. von Schlegel).* In the original unity of men's convictions respecting God and the world, was grounded also the unity of language. With the rupture of that unity by reason of man's hostility to God, in which mankind, before united, went their several ways and strove by their own power to bring Heaven down to themselves (Gen. xi.), the unity of language was also lost. A criminal pride—the root of heathenism,—was also the cause of divergence both in nations and languages. It was a divine judgment by which the historical development of the race was revolutionized in its fundamental principles.—Only by a new and wonderful condescension on the part of God could the salvation promised to man be still brought to pass in the earth. In Christ alone does man wake again to a universal divine human consciousness. A reunion of man with God can only be perfected in and with the reunion of men among themselves—a union which is to take place first morally and

*["The four or five hundred roots which remain as the constituent elements in different families of language, are not interjections, nor are they imitations. They are *phonetic types* produced by a power inherent in human nature. They exist as Plato would say, by nature; though with Plato we should add that when we say by nature, we mean by the hand of God. There is a law which runs through nearly the whole of nature, that everything which is struck rings. Each substance has its peculiar ring. We can tell the more or less perfect structure of metals by their vibrations, by the answer which they give. Gold rings differently from tin, wood rings differently from stone, and different sounds are produced according to the nature of each percussion. It was the same with man, the most highly organized of Nature's works. Man in his primitive and perfect state was not only endowed like the brute with the power of expressing his sensations by interjections, 'and his perceptions by *onomatopoieia*. He possessed likewise the faculty of giving more articulate expression to the rational conceptions of his mind. That faculty was not of his own making. It was an instinct, an instinct of the mind as irresistible as any other instinct. So far as language is the production of that instinct, it belongs the to realm of nature." MAX MULLER. "The origin of language is shrouded in the same impenetrable mystery that conceals the secrets of our primary mental and physical being. We cannot say with some, that it is of itself an organism, but we regard it as a necessary and therefore natural product of intelligent self-conscious organization.— But though the facility of articulate speech may be considered natural to man, it differs from most other human powers, whether organic or incorporeal, in this: that it is a faculty belonging to the race, not to the individual, and that the social condition is essential, not to its cultivation, but to its existence." G. P. MARSH. If such be the nature and origin of language, how absurd to suppose that this which was the product of the Spirit's inspiration which was to be the sign of a new power bestowed on men, could be any other than a clear distinct, articulated utterance worthy the name of language and corresponding to the dignity of the Being from whom it emanated].

spiritually, and then really, in vivid outward manifestation, so that the end shall refer back to the beginning.—On the day of Pentecost, after Christ's mediatorial work was finished, the heavens descended in a plentitude of spiritual influences upon mankind already prepared for it, knitting together the ruptured bond.—Pentecost was Babel reversed. The mighty baptism of the Spirit wrought at once a powerful convulsion. The consciousness of those on whom it fell was for a while overwhelmed and swallowed up by the power of the divine Spirit, so that all particularism vanished, and the most perfect unity of spirit combined them all in one. As the result of this real unity of the God-consciousness—in other words of experience and conviction in regard to God—the one primitive language again disclosed itself, and in this they all with one mouth proclaimed the wonderful works of God; Parthians, Medes, Elamites and the rest hear the proclamation each in his own language. They hear it; for even in their ruptured state the several languages are but the torn, and as such mutually unintelligible members, of the one primitive language; yet however, in such a way, that where this primitive language as the common mother of them all sounds forth again, even the stiffened members are, as it were, breathed into and made resonant by the original Spirit.—Hence, even the hearers, though speaking the most diverse languages, understand, each one in his own language, what the apostles proclaim. But at the same time the unity is not yet perfected into something real and permanent. We have here not the beginning of the consummation, but only the dawn of a new day for the kingdom of God upon earth. Speaking with other tongues is, as it were, only a powerful gust of the Spirit, heralding what is to come,—a prophecy or a pledge that, according to the divine purpose, mankind, though now rent asunder, must be and would be restored to a perfect union by means of that redemption which was made manifest through Christ. (According to Fabri and others).

2. *The kind of address suited to a Christian assembly.* The value of any disclosure in a Christian assembly is to be estimated according to its general intelligibility and the impression which it makes upon the hearts of those present. Mere rhapsody of a mystic theosophic kind, all attempts to enwrap men to the heights or to take them down to the depths of knowledge and learning and subtle exposition, all flights of poetry and rhetoric, all dazzling display of fine talking and the like, which make the listeners stare, or may attract people of merely secular culture and imaginative tastes, or which go to foster intellectual curiosity, or which pay court to that folly which delights in what is dark—all things of this kind have no place in a Christian church. To the enquiry of a young and gifted preacher who was just entering upon his ministry at the Capital of the nation as to how he could best insure success, an old experienced clergyman replied: "So preach that even the servant girls can understand,—that will be good for all." This is a thing which a preacher must lay to heart; and it will impress itself upon him, the more he enters into the spirit of the Holy Scriptures and their style as set forth in Luther's version [and we may add the English version too,] and the more he studies the works of this great master of popular speech and preaching.—Another thing to be considered and striven after is what may be called the prophetic element of discourse—that which touches the heart so as to lay open its mysterious ongoings, its innermost impulses and feelings, its hidden movements and propensities so that the hearers shall be constrained to ask, 'Has he then seen through us? through our secret thoughts and purposes and acts? Has he, while withdrawn from observation, been spying out our sayings and doings? or had any one been informing him respecting us?' To the attainment of this skill there is required above all things a spiritual endowment and illumination. But this can be acquired only by a more and more searching self-scrutiny and by a more thorough acquaintance with men in their various conditions and relations; these things are obtained in the light of that Divine Word which reveals to us both the ways of God and man, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. And in order to make his speech still more impressive, the preacher must go to school to the prophets, and make himself acquainted with their style and language, and so become qualified to use it according to his measure and existing necessities.

3. *The public speaking of women* is not to be easily reconciled with a truly feminine character, and with woman's position in a divinely constituted social state. Particular exigencies and extraordinary endowments may here and there go to form an exception; but, as a general rule, such an independent forth-putting of the female sex in public is unseemly, as all ecclesiastical discipline has maintained ever since the times of the apostles. Even in domestic worship it indicates a bad state of things, if the woman takes the lead, whether it be from the fact that she assumes it to herself from the love of ruling, or is constrained to do it by reason of the unchristian character of her husband, or of some other incapacity on his part. And still more must it be regarded as indecorous for women to pray and exhort in those social meetings which occupy a middle ground between domestic and public worship, — presupposing, however, that these meetings are of a promiscuous character, and not wholly confined to women and children. At all events it is important for women, in case there should be any occasion for their thus taking part in public services, to watch over themselves with care, lest they lose their modesty and expose themselves to perilous temptations.—On the other hand, it greatly enhances the beauty of a Christian home, when there exists between the husband and the wife a confidential intercourse in respect to the important questions and problems of Christian experience, such as are discussed in the public assembly; when the woman asks her husband for further explanations respecting any point which has struck her mind and awakened her thought, and exchanges views with him in regard to the topic. In such a case, that which was spoken in public will be the more deeply impressed on the heart; Christian knowledge will be promoted in the family; and the

wife also will gain in that independence which belongs to her as a mother within the domestic circle, and become the more capable of contributing her part towards the edification of the whole.

4. *A Test.* The distinction between men truly enlightened and spiritual, and those who, with all their gifts and attainments, are still carnally minded or mere fanatics and sectarian, is seen in this—whether they modestly recognize and respect the divine order, as laid down by Christ and His Apostles, or as established throughout the Church in the mind and Spirit of Christ; or whether they under the pretext of being impelled by the Spirit, proudly disdain it. With the latter, when once they have become stiff in their opinions, it is in vain to dispute; since they pay no regard to reason and set up their own will in opposition to the general order, as though their will were the mind of the Spirit. Such persons must be given over to the blinding of their own spiritual pride.

[4. *Primitive Christian Worship.* Of this, as observed at Corinth, we have a vivid picture afforded us in this chapter. Indeed, it is the only one extant of the kind, giving us a clear and instructive glimpse into the nature and workings of Church life in those early times. The first thing that strikes us is the absence of all fixed order. No hint is given of the superintendence of any individual or class of persons regulating the services in the Church assemblies — even where the mention of such would most naturally be made—as in the case of the disorders spoken of in vv. 26–34. The exercises seem to have gone on spontaneously—very much as is now the case in many social gatherings where "the meeting," as the saying is, "is thrown open." Individuals employed their gifts under the promptings of the Spirit, as seemed to them best, governed only by considerations of mutual regard and general utility. All enjoyed the right, yea, felt it a duty, to contribute something toward the public edification according to the ability conferred on them severally. The idea that a special priesthood was necessary to mediate between the worshipping assembly and God, is not for a moment entertained. Indeed, it is altogether ignored and excluded on the supposition that all were now made priests unto God by the unction of the Spirit, and had an equal right to speak the truth that was in them, and to offer prayer. The disorders arising from the fullest concession of this right, were not regarded an evil so great as would have arisen from the repression of the Spirit that wrought in all the members "severally as He would." The Spirit was not to be quenched; prophesyings were not to be despised; and whatever there was of the carnal and selfish element mingling with what was spiritual and divine, was to be separated and rejected by the critical faculty of the more discerning. The hearers were expected "to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." This fact should be commended to the attention of those who in their excessive regard for having "all things done decently and in order," proceed to the extreme of repressing the spontaneous life and activity of the Church as a whole, by putting the meeting entirely under the control of a special order of individuals.

The exercises consisted of prayer, praise, thanksgiving, prophesying, and speaking with tongues, accompanied by interpretation, — together with the celebration of the Lord's Supper at stated seasons. The several parts of the service seem to have followed one another without settled plan. The only rules to be observed here were non-interference, so as to prevent confusion, and a regard for the edification of the Church as a whole, rather than for that of the individual. The latter necessarily excluded all that was unintelligible to the majority of the assembly. No language was to be employed which could not be understood by all alike. It is a rule which by implication condemned in advance the practice of the Romish church in using a liturgy composed in a language wholly unknown to the great mass of the people, and thus precluding them from participating intelligently in the service. Hence, in this anti-Christian church worship the necessity of a little bell to notify the congregation when to give their responses, instead of that free intelligence which having understood what was spoken, expresses its hearty assent in the loud "Amen," with which the early Christians were wont to ratify the prayer and the thanksgiving, thus making it the act of the whole assembly].

[5. *In all true Christian worship,* that is honorable to God, or beneficial to man, *the Holy Spirit is the efficient agent.* It is only so far as He helps our infirmities, and teaches us how to pray, only so far as He enlightens our understandings, and gives us an insight into divine truth, only so far as He inspires our songs and praises, that our worship is truly spiritual and edifying. Hence, the prime and indispensable necessity of preparing for these services by seeking His presence and aid. No amount of learning, no natural gifts, no acquired skill, no refinements of art can compensate for that unction of the Holy One which is promised the believer to teach him all things].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE :—Our lack of love measures our lack of true Christianity (1 John iv. 7).—The Holy Spirit indeed imparts to us spiritual gifts, yet it is on the condition of our striving after them in the use of suitable means, such as prayer, reading, meditation.—Ver. 3. The preacher must aim chiefly at improvement in life and doctrine, and, to this end, he must sometimes exhort and sometimes warn, and sometimes comfort.

HED: — Ver. 6 f. God reveals Himself in various ways; rejoice in Him and learn to recognize Him who thus seeks to make Himself known to thee; thy salvation consists in this.—A preacher should so preach as to be understood. What does all your art avail for rustics?—the chaff of human wisdon for souls hungering after the Bread of life? Step down from your artificial heights and do not be ashamed of simplicity in the presence of a thousand illiterate persons, because of a few whose hearts seek after wisdom, and whose ears itch for novelty.—Ver. 8. The reason why many do not strive against their spiritual foes, is that they are not urged to it by their teachers.—Ver. 13. So to

sing and pray that all who are present may understand, and be able to sing and pray with you—this is the best kind of singing and praying (Col. iii. 16).—Ver. 16. O, the wretched, sapless worship, when the poor laity comprehend nothing, and see nothing besides ridiculous gestures and all sorts of attitudinizing! Let us recognize it as a high and noble gift of God, that we have His Word presented to us intelligibly in our mother tongue.—Ver. 20. To lust for things which are void of meaning, is childish.—Well is it for those who in reference to sins remain simple-minded, yet daily grow in the living knowledge of God (2 Tim. iii. 7; Col. i. 9).—Ver. 21. Unknown tongues may become also a token of God's wrath, when God lets a person come among a people whose speech they understand not.—Ver. 22. The Church of God, being already planted and established, no longer stands in need of tokens and wonders, but rather requires the exposition of Scripture for its edification.—Ver. 23. A Christian must nowhere allow himself to be the subject of mockery,—least of all, in a public assembly; he must strive to conduct himself wisely in all things. To direct all discourses to an unbeliever, would rather embitter than benefit him; but the Holy Spirit does not allow himself to be without a witness, and brings believers to so testify of Him that the unbeliever shall be rebuked and judged.—Ver. 25. Praised be God, who gives power to His Word, and reveals His true teachers before many consciences (2 Cor. iv. 2).

Ibid:—Ver. 26. Observe what should be the aim of all Christians—teachers, counsellors, fathers—in their labors, *viz.*, edification.—Ver. 27. All things are not given to all; one must tolerate another at his side, and one must be ready to follow another, and all things be directed to the edification of the Church.—Ver. 28. If we see that we can be of no use to our neighbor, then it is best for us to be silent, to be by ourselves, and to pray and to be content with our own edification, and deal with God in behalf of our neighbor. — Ver. 29. Divine worship allows of no disorder. To speak without gifts and calling, is improper.—Ver. 30. Let a person have what gift he may, yet he should be willing to let others speak, and be content to hear (Job xviii. 2).—Ver. 31. He who has failed in the exposition of Scripture, should allow himself to be corrected, and if he hears something better, accept the true in place of the false.

Luther:—Ver. 32. Some think that, because they have understandings and gifts of the Spirit, they should yield to no one, nor be silent. But, since the gifts of the Spirit are in their own power, they certainly should not use them to disturb harmony, and then urge as a pretext that the Spirit constrained them.—Ver. 33. An irresistible impulse should be regarded as impure, since a carnal passion is mixed with it which ought to be restrained by grace. God designs that we show ourselves peaceful in all our conduct, and especially in divine service; otherwise we give offence, and allow place for the evil spirit.—Ver. 34. To teach in public, is an exercise of a certain kind of lordship in the place of Christ; and it is so much the less suitable for women, since there is in men much to be rebuked. At home, they may instruct their own, as far as they know and can.—Ver. 35. The man is the bishop of his family. Men ought to surpass their wives in divine knowledge, and be prepared to assist them therein; and the wives ought themselves to be willing to receive instruction, and to this end make inquiry on points which they do not understand (1 Tim. ii. 11). — Ver. 36. Art thou adorned with gifts, think not thou hadst them of thyself, and possessest them alone; they are God's, and are still more abundant with others. Be humble, and use them rightly. He who stiffly opposes the truth, has not the Spirit of Christ, however much he may make pretension to it.

Hedinger: — Ver. 38. Go hence, thou who refusest to learn! Do not grieve, my friend, on this account. It is with many obstinacy, stupidity also, and is for the most part a judgment of God upon them.—Ver. 40. Both in and out of the assemblies everything should be done *decorously*, out of respect to the presence of God, and the holy angels, and the sanctity of the things themselves; and *orderly*, with a becoming regard to time and place and other circumstances, so that no offence may arise.

Berlenburger Bibel: — Ver. 1. "Pursue after love!" We must urge ourselves to it, that we may pray ourselves into a fight of love. For it will always appear to us as if the others were not striving for the same thing. Therefore our love will naturally shrink back; hence, the necessity of pursuing after it. And by this, there is indicated the true vessel wherein spiritual gifts should lie, *viz.*, love. Among these the best is the possession of the prophetic word, and an ability to investigate further in reference to its meaning. He who means to be diligent, will find spiritual work enough; but begin with yourself.—Ver. 3. The Scripture calls all proclamation of the truth, prophesying; since God has revealed to us in his word both how it will be with us, if we obey, and how, if we disobey, all those who speak to others in the name of God, are virtually prophets.—Ver. 4. Thou sayest well: 'I edify myself for myself;' but where is thy neighbor? Love seeks not its own.—Gifts should always flow into the Church.—Ver. 6. We can impart something to others for their edification: 1. when we remove the covering which hangs over the inmost recesses of their hearts, and show the substratum, and disclose the things hidden there (revelation); 2. if we produce what we have experienced of divine truth, and the mysteries of faith in our hearts (knowledge —a result of the former); 3. if we open up the prophetic word and the promises of the future world, and seize the continuous thread of all prophecies, even the pathway of God; from which it can be inferred whether a person is in the right way, both in teaching and hearing; 4. by instruction in the catechism, or by doctrine also which is gathered out of all the foregoing points.—Ver. 12. Zealots have need to take care that in seeking light they do not, like the devil, fall into the fire.— Ver. 17. "Not edified" — a defect which Christianity has suffered from, far and wide, in empty teaching.—Ver. 18 f. The teaching should be such that others can apply it to themselves, and it should be as simple and hearty

as if it proceeded from a father to his children, for which no miraculous gifts are needed.—Ver. 20. Spiritual childhood consists in that simplicity, innocence, and uprightness which makes a man perfectly guileless; and with all this there may exist the perfection of wisdom, which is able to answer everything, and to assign reasons for all things.—Ere we can become children possessed of this divine simplicity, qualified to receive the kingdom of God, all ambitious desires to display our piety must be exterminated, and all heights be laid low.—Ver. 21. The most fundamental truths are, to most Christians, a foreign language.—Since for a long time there has existed but little love for the truth (2 Thes. ii. 10), God has in judgment suffered teachers, without number, to arise, whose speech has departed heaven-wide from the simplicity of the apostles (2 Tim. iv. 1–3).—Ver. 22. Believers must not boast of that which is appointed of God, because of unbelief.—Ver. 24. The Word of God carries a convincing power among those who give heed to it. It must go to the heart. It pierces very deep. The Word of God shows its power when it discloses the hidden things of the heart.—If ye will be a church of God, then prove by the spirit and power of your word that God's Spirit quickens you, so that others also may be convicted by it.—Ver. 26–33. To *judging* there belongs the spirit of proving in suitable measure. But this faculty all the sheep of Christ ought to have who, by this means, can detect the voice of strangers. Sheep can also distinguish one herb from another.—All have need of edification and instruction; and this one person can obtain better through this one, and another, through that one, and the process is assisted by inquiry.—Let each one guard his own impulses; where peace reigns not, there God is not present with His gracious rule.—Ver. 34. As a general rule, women should be silent in church, provided God Himself has not pointed out a different course, as He sometimes has done in the instance of some heroic women whom He has awakened to act for the public good. Apart from these instances, the rule holds good.—Ver. 35. But where do you find such husbands? If their wives are to inquire of them, they must first have learned something.—According to the real mind of the Spirit, many *men* must also learn to keep silent. They, indeed, are called *men*, but they are not able to testify of the truth as it is in Jesus, and know nothing of the new birth, because they have experienced nothing of it, neither have they the will or the courage to go to the death in a manly spirit. — In Christ there is neither man nor woman, but all are one in Him, in whom the Word of life itself testifies, as the right man.—Ver. 40. Prudence is an important part of piety.

Rieger:—Vv. 1–11. Spiritual gifts stand, for the most part, in the freedom of the Spirit who imparts to each one as He will. Yet much depends upon the spirit in which they are exercised.—Prophesying in its broader sense is the gift of explaining the wonders and mysteries lying in God's word, for general use, so that others can derive from it, partly, growth in grace and knowledge, partly, incentive to the cultivation of Christian virtues, and, partly, strength to endure under manifold temptations; and this can be awakened by diligence, prayer, practice in God's Word, and watchfulness over one's own heart. The gift of speaking in foreign tongues serves as a beautiful reminder of the fact that the distinctions introduced among the nations by diversity of speech, has been removed by the blessing of the Gospel, and all have been brought to praise God with one heart and mouth. —Vv. 12–22. Special regard must be paid to the larger, and commonly the weaker portion of the Church. In church matters it is God's ordinance that everything shall be so constituted as to make the stronger and more gifted lowly, and to raise the weak. Nevertheless, there must not be such a concession to weakness as to hinder growth; nor yet must the lead be so rapid that the weaker shall not be able to respond Amen! Many a one may have too little knowledge of anything to express himself suitably in regard to it, who yet may be able to assent to the testimony of another, observe that it is true, and that the seed of faith already so far exists in his heart that he can join in prayers and wishes for the success of the truth. A man of sound understanding accords to everything its value, according to the use which may be had of it.—Vv. 23–40. Public testimonials and confession respecting the power of the Divine Word upon the heart, have become, at this day, very rare. In the early churches the contributions made in this direction, were richer than would be the case now, were any to undertake to edify others in this way. Yet, still much may be done in aid of the truth.—He who casts off all regard for others, and insists on pushing everything according to his own views, falls into a temptation to become more and more ensnared by this habit (30 ff.).—Much may be done without speaking, through the exercise of love, by quietness, obedience, modesty. This is often loud preaching enough. Women also can be employed in the kingdom of heaven, in carrying glad messages, in awakening and confirming faith (see the Hist. of the resurrection); and we should use their aid in the education of children, in caring for the sick, *etc.* —He who will not yield, had better be left awhile to go on in his own self-conceit, than be perpetually contended with.

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 1. Love is so precious that to hunt after it is the chief thing in the Christian life; and even he who has attained to love, must still follow after it, since there is no one who does not daily have to put off the *old man* with his lovelessness, and to put on the *new man* with his love. We must continue the pursuit (Heb. xii. 4), until we rest in simple love. If we follow after love, we are on the way to spiritual gifts (xii. 31.)—Ver. 3. Edification has for its particular end, faith; exhortation, love; consolation, hope. — Vv. 10, 11. Speech serves not to conceal, but to express thoughts.—The *tongues* at Pentecost were given as a sign that God had sanctified the languages of all nations for the accordant confession of the one right faith; and the speaking with tongues (which, in order to be intelligible languages, needed exposition), serve for a sign that in the future world there awaits us a language which stands in the relation to all present speech, as the utterance

of a man to the prattling of a child.—Vv. 25, 26. Nothing is more powerful and quick than the Word of God; and that sermon is a true miracle of grace which has the effect to make the hearer feel that he was addressed by one cognizant of the hidden things of his own heart, even as Nathaniel felt (John i. 48).—Ver. 37. What serves for peace and good order, will be maintained for the sake of the Lord, even though resting on human authority. The love of the Spirit teaches us both to find out the regulations which are profitable for every season, and to maintain them in obedience to the God of peace.—Ver. 40. Because faith works in love, so does it work also in order.

Heubner:—Ver. 1. Admonition is most needed where the spirit of ambition has place.—Vv. 15, 19. Both prayer and sermon must be intelligible, and serve for edification. It is better to be understood than to be wondered at.—Ver. 20. To be incapable for wickedness is a blessed incapacity.—Ver. 34. The grounds for this: 1. It lies in the nature of the woman; her softer nature renders her more fit for receiving than for giving; 2. her weakness forbids her teaching; 3. sin came into the world by woman; 4. there is danger of being captivated.—Ver. 37. A true prophet is shown by his attention to God's Word. —Ver. 38. A stiff-necked person deserves to be left to his own ignorance. Chief practical thoughts of this chapter: 1. Shun all parade in the use of spiritual gifts, especially in public worship. 2. Seek after and promote simple edification in divine service. 3. For this, there is needed above all things that simplicity of heart which seeks not its own. [See on these points Hare's Miss. Com. p. 950.] 4. Such divine worship makes an impression also upon unbelievers, touches and awakens their hearts, and makes them feel the sanctity of a Christian assembly, and the presence of God. 5. In divine service, outward order and decorum must be maintained in order that disturbance may be avoided.

XVI.

DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

A. Refutation of its deniers (1) from the well attested facts of the resurrection of Christ, which with all connected therewith, pre-supposes its possibility, and is the pledge of its actual occurrence.

Chapter XV. 1–28.

Moreover, brethren, I declare [make known, γνωρίζω] unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have [*om.* have] received, and wherein ye stand [have
2 been standing, ἑστήκατε]; By which also ye are [being] saved, if ye keep in memory [hold fast, κατέχετε] what [with what discourse, τίνι λόγῳ] I preached unto you, unless
3 ye have believed [became believers, ἐπιστεύσατε] in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the
4 Scriptures: And that he was buried, and that he rose [has risen, ἐγήγερται] again the
5 third day[1] according to the Scriptures: And that he was seen of [appeared to, ὤφθη
6 Κηφᾷ] Cephas, then of [to] the twelve[2]: After that, he was seen of [appeared to] above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this
7 present, but some[3] are [have also, καὶ ἐκοιμήθησαν] fallen asleep. And after that, he
8 was seen of [appeared to] James; then[4] of [after that to, ἔπειτα] all the apostles. And [But, δὲ] last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time [as to the
9 untimely-born-one, he appeared to me also, ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι, ὤφθη κἀμοί]. For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet [sufficient, ἱκανὸς] to be called an
10 apostle, because I persecuted the church of God. But by the grace of God I am what I am: and his grace which *was bestowed* upon [was towards, εἰς] me was not in vain; but I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God
11 which was [*om.* which was] with[5] me. Therefore whether *it were* I or they, so we
12 preach, and so ye believed. Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead,[6]
13 how say some among you[7] that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen [not even Christ hath risen, οὐδὲ
14 χρ. ἐγήγερται]: And if Christ be [hath] not risen, then *is* our preaching[8] vain, and[9]
15 your faith *is* also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we

have testified of [against, κατὰ] God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up,
16 if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised:
17 And if Christ be not raised, your faith *is* vain [fruitless, ματαία]; ye are yet in your
18 sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep [fell asleep, κοιμηθέντες] in Christ are
19 [*om.* are] perished. If in this life only we have hope [If only in this life we have
20 been hoping] in Christ[9], we are of all men most miserable. But now is Christ risen
[has Christ been raised, ἐγήγερται] from the dead, *and* become[10] [*om.* and become]
21 the first fruits of them that slept [have been sleeping, κεκοιμημένων]. For since
22 by man *came* death, by man *came* also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam
23 all die [are dying, ἀποθνήσκουσιν], even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every
man in his own order [orderly rank, τάγματι]: Christ the first fruits; afterward they
24 that are Christ's at his coming [appearing, παρουσίᾳ]. Then *cometh* the end, when
he shall have delivered up [he delivereth over, παραδιδῷ] the kingdom to God, even
the Father; when he shall have put down [done away with, καταργήσῃ] all rule, and
25 all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his
26 feet. The last enemy *that* shall be destroyed *is* death [Death, the enemy, shall at last
27 be done away with, καταργεῖται]. For he hath put all things under his feet. But
when he saith, All things are [have been, ὑποτέταχται] put under *him*, *it is* manifest
28 that he is excepted, which [it is with the exception of him who, ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος]
did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then
shall the Son also himself be subject [subject himself, ὑποταγήσεται] unto him that put
all things under him, that God may be [the, τὰ] all in all.

[1] Ver. 4.—*Lachmann, Tischendorf,* and *Alford* put τῇ τρίτῃ after ἡμέρᾳ. *Alford* thinks that the Rec. (which puts those words before ἡμέρᾳ) was an alteration to conform to Matth. xvi. 21; xvii. 23; and from not perceiving the solemnity and emphasis of the other arrangement. Lachmann's reading is best sustained by the uncials (A. B. D. E. Sinait.), but the Rec. has in its favor F. G. K. L., with the Vulg., Pesch., Goth., Basm., Chr., Theodt, *et al.*—C. P. W.].

[2] Ver. 5.—For δώδεκα, D. E. F. G., the Ital., Vulg., Goth., later Syr. (Marg.), Arm., Slav., and a number of the Fathers have ἑνδεκα. Augustine mentions "*nonnulli codices*" of this kind. It was, however, a correction for greater accuracy, while the Apostle used the official designation. Comp. John xx. 19; comp. 24.—C. P. W.].

3 Ver. 6.—*Lachmann* throws out καὶ; but it has important MSS. in its favor, and it was likely to be left out as superfluous, [or from the copyists confounding -ε καὶ with the first two syllables of the next word. It is omitted by A. (probably), B. D. F. G., the Ital., Vulg., Goth., Copt., Basm., later Syr., Aug., Ambst.—C. P. W.].

4 Ver. 7.—*Tischendorf* has ἔπειτα, but the *Rec.* and *Lachmann* have εἶτα. The MSS. are about equally balanced.

5 Ver. 10.—*Lachmann* has σὺν ἐμοί without the ἡ before them [with B. D. E. F. G., Sinait., Ital., Vulg., Orig. (latin), and the Latin writers]. In like manner *Meyer*, who thinks that "the article was inserted partly, perhaps, in a merely mechanical way after ἡ εἰς ἐμέ, but also to some extent intentionally, from a dogmatic prejudice, to bring out more completely a contrast to οὐκ ἐγὼ. A reason similar to this last was probably the occasion for the more feebly supported ἡ ἐν ἐμοί. Before εἰς ἐμέ, also, the ἡ is wanting in D. (1st hand), F. G. The Vulg., Ital., and the Latin Fathers read *gratia ejus in me.* In this case, however, its introduction was not occasioned by the context, but the article seemed superfluous, and it was therefore omitted."—C. P. W.].

6 Ver. 12.—*Tischendorf* has ἐκ νεκρῶν ὅτι, but the *Rec.* and *Lachmann* have ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν. The latter is best sustained. [It is thus found in A. B. D. (2d hand), K. L., perhaps all the cursives, the Vulg., Goth., Chrys., Theodt., and Iren. (translation).—C. P. W.].

7 Ver. 12.—*Tischendorf,* with very good MSS., has ἐν ὑμῖν τινες, but the *Rec.* has τινες ἐν ὑμῖν. [The former order is found in A. B. Sinait., Syr. (both), Orig., Chrys., Damasc.—C. P. W.].

8 Ver. 14.—The καὶ before τὸ κήρυγμα is doubtful, as also is δὲ after κενή. *Tischendorf* has both; *Lachmann* has καὶ, but [brackets it, and] leaves out the δὲ; probably correctly. [A. D. E. F. G. K., Sinait., 20 cursives, Goth. and Basm. versions, Dial., and Œcum. have ἄρα καὶ (some Latin writers omit ἄρα also), and A. B. D. F. G., Sinait., 5 cursives, the Latin, Copt. versions, and a few Fathers omit δὲ.—C. P. W.].

9 Ver. 19.—*Lachmann* and *Tischendorf,* with a great preponderance of authority, place ἐν χριστῷ after ταύτῃ. The Rec. puts these words after ἐσμὲν, although this is not the *lectio difficilior*, [and hence it is likely to have been a transposition for perspicuity. *Lachmann's* reading (ἐν χρ. ἠλπικότες ἐσμὲν μόνον) is also adopted by *Alford, Stanley,* and *Wordsworth*, in accordance with A. B. D. E. F. G., Sinait., 5 cursives, the Vulg. and Goth. versions, and some Latin Fathers. The confusion into which this text early fell, is apparent from the evident attempt (in Orig., the Vulg., Ital., Goth., Ambr.) to make μόνον precede ἐν Χριστῷ, so that it may be referred more distinctly to ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ alone, and not to the whole sentence, as it would, be if it were placed after ἐσμὲν. See Exeget. notes and *Meyer.*—C. P. W.].

10 Ver. 20.—The *Rec.* adds ἐγένετο at the end of the sentence, but it is feebly attested, and is pronounced by *Meyer* "a supplemental gloss."

11 Ver. 21.—In several important MSS. the article is wanting before θάνατος. *Meyer* thinks it was derived from Rom. v. 12; but it might have fallen away on account of the parallel ἀνάστ. νεκρῶν.

12 Ver. 24.—The *Rec.* has παραδῷ; but better authority exists in favor of παραδιδῷ, and some good MSS. have παραδιδοῖ. The aorist was occasioned by a conformity to καταργήσῃ [without observing that ὅταν in the one case required an indefinite present, and in the other an aorist in the sense of a Fut. exact. Instead of παραδῷ (defended by *Reiche*, with K. L., Orig., Euseb. (com.), Epiph. (often Damasc.), we have παραδιδοῖ in B. F. G., and παραδιδῷ in A. D. Sinait., Goth., Basm., and Sahid. versions, and the rest of the Greek Fathers.—C. P. W.].

13 Ver. 25.—The authority for ἂν in the *Rec.* before θῇ is feeble. It is from the Sept. of Ps. cx. 1.

14 Ver. 25.—The authority for αὐτοῦ after ἐχθροὺς is not sufficient. [A. F. G., several codices of the Vulg., with the Goth., and a few Greek writers insert it, but it is omitted in B. D. K. L., Sinait. the Vulg. (best MSS.), the later Syr., and the most important Greek Fathers.—C. P. W.].

[15] Ver. 26.—This verse is transferred by D. E., Sinait. (1st hand), one copy of the Vulg. (tolet.), Jerome and Ambrst., so as to stand after τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ in ver. 27. Two cursives entirely omit ver. 26 and 27, doubtless in consequence of copyists mistaking the ὑπὸ τ. πόδας αὐτοῦ of the one for that of the other (homœoteleuton).—C. P. W.].

16 Ver. 27.—Some good MSS. [B., two cursives, the Vulg., the Lat. translations of Iren. and of D.] omit the first ὅτι. *Lachmann* brackets it.

[17] Ver. 27.—Sinait. inserts τὰ before the second πάντα; F. G. omits it before the third.—C. P. W.].

18 Ver. 28.—*Lachmann* brackets καὶ after τότε, but *Tischendorf,* with very good authorities [A. D. (3d hand), K. L., Sinait., Vulg., Syr. (later), Copt., Basm., and many Greek writers], retains it.

19 Ver. 28.—The *Rec.* and *Tischendorf* have τὰ before the last πάντα. *Lachmann,* with some good MSS. [A. B. D. (1st hand) 17, Hippol.], omit it. [D. (3d hand) E. F. G. K. L., Sinait., and nearly all the Greek Fathers insert it, and rightly, for it might easily fall out, and it adds great force to the Apostle's expression.—C. P. W.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

[We now come to what may be called the crowning glory of this Epistle, *viz.*, a demonstration of the truth of a future resurrection. Forming, as it does, a portion of the burial service in nearly every Christian church, it has come to be associated with our tenderest and most hallowed recollections, as affording to us precious consolation in regard to departed friends, and laying the foundation for our own triumph in the hour of death. It is not surprising, therefore, that it should have been made the subject of more earnest study than any other portion of this Epistle, and that every line and word of it has been searched for golden meanings. Happy will it be for us, if we shall be able to set forth its deep significance in any thing of its true light, and so contribute some share towards increasing and strengthening the faith of the Church].

For fuller information respecting the opponents of the doctrine of the resurrection, who are here refuted, see what is said on ver. 12.

[The points of the argument are as follows: 1. Whether there is any resurrection of the dead (vv. 1–34). The affirmative is proven—*first*, by a reference to the fact that Christ did rise from the dead with the evidence which establishes it (vv. 1–11); *secondly*, by showing the absurdity of the contrary doctrine in several particulars. 2. What will be the nature of the bodies that shall be raised up (vv. 35–51). This is illustrated by various analogies, and also set forth in direct statement as to some of the peculiar characteristics of the risen body. 3. What will become of those who shall be alive at the second advent (vv. 51–54). 4. The practical consequences of this doctrine].

Vers. 1–4. Paul here begins to lay the foundation for his demonstration, which rests upon a fact not denied by the opponents of the doctrine of a general resurrection, *viz.*, that of Christ's resurrection. First of all, he reminds the Corinthians that this doctrine had formed a part of the fundamental contents of that Gospel which he had proclaimed among them from the first.—**Moreover,**—δέ here indicates an advance in his discourse, a transition to an entirely different subject; for there is no connection between this and the preceding chapter.—**brethren, I declare unto you**—γνωρίζω; the word is neither equivalent to ὑπομιμνήσκω, *I remind you*, [Chrys., Bloomf., Billr.]; nor yet to *I call your attention to* [(Rück.); both which meanings are inadmissible from the usage of the word, as may be seen in Ron. *Lex.*; though Stanley affirms that in all the passages, where it is used in the earlier epistles, it carries these significations]. It means, *I make known, I declare.* The expression has something of solemnity in it, as though he were about to make a new proclamation. What he *intends*, however, is to remind them of something already known, about which their recollection needed to be refreshed; [unless there is a latent sarcasm in the word, intimating that though professing Christians—"brethren," they had so far forgotten one of the fundamental tenets of their faith that they needed to have it proclaimed to them anew].—**the Gospel**—[Not indeed the *whole* Gospel (as Alford), but that which so lies at the foundation of the whole Gospel, that which is its main condition and verification to such an extent that by metonymy it might be said to be *the* Gospel, so that the expression is here used for the purpose of showing the essential importance of the subject of which he was about to treat. And, also, by applying to the doctrine of the resurrection the designation of *Gospel* he teaches them that it is not a point on which they were at liberty to form any opinion they might choose, without prejudice to their own salvation]. —Respecting this he mentions four particulars, in regular climax, by which he exhibits its claim upon their faith.—**which I preached unto you,**—[*i. e.*, when he first went among them to lay the foundations of the Church].—**which also ye received,**—[not '*have* received.' The aorist signification must be adhered to as important, pointing to what took place at the first—their cordial reception of his proclamation].—**in which also ye stand;**—He here indicates the firm maintenance of what had been accepted as truth on the part of the great majority of the Church (2 Cor. i. 24; Rom. v. 2). [This remark is not intended to flatter them; because all to whom he wrote firmly believed that Christ died and rose again. Were it not for this, he could have built on the fact no argument that was valid for them. But though believing this, all had not drawn the same conclusion in respect to a resurrection as he had; so that he is here pointing to that faith among them to which he was about to appeal in support of what he had to say. And then, to finish his climax by showing the personal importance of that faith, he adds,—**through which also ye are saved,**—By the use of the present tense the attainment of salvation is here presentiated, as though it were something altogether certain]. Yet that he means hereby an attainment still future, is clear from the conditional clause appended. The repetition of the καὶ, *also*, serves to introduce the successive particulars which form the climax, [and also to strengthen the assertions].—**with what word I preached unto you, if ye hold fast,**—There is a question as to the connection in which this clause stands with what precedes. Luther and some after him take this to be a further definition of what is alluded to in the opening clause of the first verse, *q. d.*, 'I remind you of the gospel, in what form I proclaimed it to you;' but the conditional words "if ye hold fast" do not suit with the expression "I remind you." They also contradict the assertion that they were standing still on the doctrine in question, and they furnish no point of junction with what follows, "unless ye have believed in vain." We must therefore connect the clause before us with what immediately precedes, recognizing here an inversion of the natural order of words for the sake of emphasis, *q. d.*, "if ye hold fast with what word I preached the gospel unto you." To be understood, we here see the condition stated upon which their salvation would be secured; [so that it is an *argumentum ad hominem*, put in advance for the purpose of conciliating their interest in the truth he was about to

demonstrate].—By the expression "with what word" (*τίνι λόγῳ*) he denotes either the *contents* of what he had delivered to them (Meyer) [so that it is equivalent to "what," as in the E. V.]; or the grounds out of which (Acts x. 29), or with which he established his argument. So Bengel: "*qua ratione, quis argumentis.*" The latter is the more correct interpretation; since in what follows he not merely gives the contents of his preaching (the fundamental facts of redemption), but also he brings emphatically to view the grounds of its truth and validity. Luther's *welcher Gestalt* may embrace both significations. To suppose an allusion here to the simplicity of his style, is a little too far fetched. By 'holding fast' (*κατέχειν*) he means, not simply an intellectual retention, a preservation of the thing in the memory, to which the interrogative *τίνι* appears to point, but a holding fast, in such a manner that a person is certain of the thing. [May it not go still further and point to the practical regard for the truth in their life and conduct, so as to signify their perseverance in saving faith?]—That the fact of their salvation is admissible only on the condition of a steadfast maintenance of this truth, is still further exhibited apagogically.—**unless ye believed in vain.**—*i. e.* their failure of salvation was conceivable only on the hardly supposable condition that their exercise of faith was a vain and fruitless thing.—*εἰκῇ, in vain* (comp. Gal. iv. 11; iii. 4). [It may mean either *without cause*, or *without effect, i. e., to no purpose.* If the former, then Paul means to say, 'unless ye believe without evidence' 'had no ground for your faith.'* If the latter, the meaning is 'unless your faith is worthless,' and this was a thing not to be supposed. The latter best suits the connection]. On *ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ* see xiv. 5. This clause is more correctly attached to the main proposition contained in the word "ye are saved," to which that which follows is subordinate, and to be taken as confirming it together with the condition annexed. The act of believing stands in the closest relation to the gospel as the subjective appropriation of its proffered salvation; and to assert its fruitlessness (which from the Christian standpoint is utterly unconceivable) would be equivalent to the denial of all salvation through the gospel. But, if we attach the words before us only to the conditional clause immediately preceding, and that too in relation to the phrase "with what word I preached to you," then would *εἰκῇ* be equivalent to *rashly, i. e.*, without sufficient grounds, *q. d.*, 'if ye hold fast the grounds on which I preach the gospel to you; otherwise it would follow that ye believed without grounds, in a shallow, superficial manner.' Or, if we connect it with the words "if ye hold fast," then some such clause must be supplied as 'but ye do hold it fast altogether,'—which would not suit. Adopting the former reference, the connection is indeed simple, and the sense good and strong, but it is calculated rather to awaken confidence, than to warn against danger (Meyer assumes both?!), or to hinder their abuse of it to a false security (Osiander).—**For I delivered to you**—The question here arises, first of all, with what is this to be connected? Is that here set forth an explanation of his manner of discourse (*τίνι λόγῳ*), either as to its contents (Meyer and de Wette), or as to its grounds? or is it to be referred back to the main statement in the first verse, "I declare unto you?" The latter is to be preferred, inasmuch as the manner of discourse is spoken of in a subordinate clause. His meaning is, 'what I now hold up before you, *viz.*, the truth of Christ's resurrection in its bearing on our salvation, is only a proclamation of that gospel which I preached unto you at the beginning.' Here he speaks in relation to the fact itself, and that too in its significance for the faith, according to the Scriptures.—Catholic expositors use the word *παράδωκα* in support of the legitimacy of tradition.—**among the first (things)**,—in the order of time [Chrys.]; or still better, in importance, *in primis, before all*, "as belonging to the weightiest articles of faith. Burger: "as one of the first points." Neander. [Rückert connects the words directly with "to you," as though the Corinthians were "among the first" to have the doctrine preached to them; which is not true. The following passages from LXX. may throw some light on the expression: "and he placed the two maid servants and their children *first*, *ἐν πρώτοις* (Gen. xxxiii. 2); "and David said whosoever smiteth the Jebusites first," *ἐν πρώτοις* (2 Sam. v. 8).] He here takes into account, not simply the order of time, but also the momentousness of the thing communicated.—**what also I have received,**—*παρέλαβον*, because it stands correlative to *παράδωκα*, is to be understood otherwise than in ver. 2, as denoting the simple reception of a thing imparted; and this, not through human tradition only, but also by special inward revelation from the Lord. The fact itself, *i. e.*, of Christ's death which he was about to speak of, he had undoubtedly learned before his conversion; but he is here treating not solely of the fact, but likewise of its significance for a life of faith, and this he had to learn by revelation. So too in regard to the resurrection. This he had heard of and flouted as fable; but its verity was at last disclosed to him in such a manner by the glorious appearance of Christ in the way, that all doubt in reference to it as though the death had been only one in appearance, or a deception, was entirely dissipated; and by a subsequent illumination, which explained to him the bearing of Scripture upon these facts, they had obtained his full and firm faith as the fundamental articles of his religious creed. [And in saying that 'he delivered' only what 'he had received,' he was but asserting the faithful discharge of his duty as an apostle, which was to proclaim at first hand, as it were, the truth of Christ].—**that Christ died for our sins,**—Here the expiatory power of Christ's death is clearly indicated as in i. 13; Rom. v. 8 (by the simple *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*); comp. Gal. i. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 24; Rom. iii. 24 ff.; iv. 25.—*ὑπὲρ=περὶ, for the sake of.* [Stanley says, "for our sins," not merely 'in our behalf,' which would have been *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, as in Rom. v. 8; nor

*[This accords with the classic use of the word. Thus Plutarch *τοῦτο ἡμεῖς εἴπομεν ἐν τί τῶν εἰκῇ πεπιστευμένων*—"this we said was one of the things believed without good authority." Similarly the Latins use *credere frustra*, 'to believe in vain' or 'rashly.' Alex. *Paraphrase*].

'in our place' which would have been *ἀντὶ ἡμῶν*; but 'as an offering in consequence of our sins,' 'to deliver us from our sins' "Ὑπὲρ has the same ambiquity as the English *for, in behalf of;* but the idea of service and protection always predominates. Whenever in speaking of Christ's death the idea of substitution is intended, it is under the figure of a ransom; in which case it is expressed by *ἀντὶ* (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45). Whenever the idea of covering or forgiving sins is intended, it is under the figure of a sin-offering in which case the word used is *περὶ*, as in Rom. viii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 18; 1 Jno. ii. 2; iv. 10; *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* or *ἁμαρτιῶν*.—But what connection has this with the doctrine of resurrection? Much every way. Christ's death could not have availed to expiate sin had he remained under the power of death. In order to prove that He died not for His own sins, but for the sins of others, and to demonstrate this ability and right to confer pardon and blessedness as the Lord of life, it was necessary for Him to rise again. Hence though atonement is secured by His death, yet righteousness comes through His resurrection (Rom. v. 25). To deny his resurrection, therefore, is to annul also the efficacy of His sacrifice, and with this all hope of pardon through Him. And the fatal extent to which the denial of any fact must carry us, should be shown as a part of the argument in its defence].—**according to the Scriptures**:—He here intimates that Christ's death for our sins was the fulfilment of the divine counsel foretold in the Old Testament Scriptures. The use of the plural points to the long line of witnesses which runs through the various portions of the sacred record (comp. Matt. xxvi. 54; Luke xxiv. 32). "We must keep in view the manner in which the calling of the Messiah was regarded. It was one towards which the entire development of the theocracy was continually tending, and which therefore might be found indicated in various ways. The apostles do not distinguish between the ideal and the literal reference, as this was not the way of the Holy Spirit, but only of scientific investigation." NEANDER. Paul here undoubtedly had in mind, not simply such prophecies as Isa. liii., but also such types as the offerings and the paschal lamb. (Comp. v. 7). [Paul protested before Festus that in preaching the Gospel he had said, "none other things than those which Moses and the prophets had said, should come that Christ should suffer, and that He should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people and to the Gentiles." And he assured the Romans that his gospel was "witnessed to by the law and the prophets." Thus it will be seen that the doctrine of atonement for sin by the death of Christ pervades the entire Word of God. Hence not to believe in it was declared by our Lord to indicate "folly and slowness of heart" (Luke xxiv. 25, 27)].—**And that he was buried**,—[This is an important fact, both as indicating the undoubted truth of His having died, and as the necessary antecedent to the resurrection. In entering the grave our Lord but finished the course appointed for all mankind, and it was the natural fulfilment of His earthly career. The fact, therefore, properly forms a distinct article in our creed].—**and that he has been raised on the third day**,—*ἐγήγερται*. The perfect indicates that the fact is not a transient one like that of dying and being buried,—marks the continuation of the state just begun, or of its consequences—'has been raised and is alive.'—**according to the Scriptures**:—The testimony here referred to bears primarily on the fact of His having risen (comp. Ps. xvi. 10; Acts xiii. 34 ff.; Isa. liii. 8–10ff.), including also the time of His rising which is hinted at in the type of Jonah (comp. Matt. xii. 40; xvi. 4). But this type, as well as the prophecy in Isa. liii. 9, allows also of a reference to the burial; but the repetition of *ὅτι* before *ἐγήγερται* forms an objection to this reference. Besides, it is only the two essential factors in the work of redemption, *viz.:* the death and the resurrection of Christ that are sustained upon Scripture testimony. So Meyer Ed. iii. [But how can this be, when Peter referred in his speech at Pentecost to the declaration of David, "thou wilt not leave my soul in hell neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption," as a prophecy of Christ's burial and resurrection?]

VERS. 5–7. **And that he was seen of Cephas**,—The *ὅτι*, *that*, shows that in grammatical structure the dependance of the clauses upon *παρέδωκα*, ver. 3, is still maintained; while the independent statements begin at the next verse. From this, however, it does not follow that he had delivered to them merely that which is asserted in ver. 5. He undoubtedly is here recapitulating the whole testimony in proof of Christ's resurrection, as he had often given it to them. That he is following the chronological order of the evidence, is clear from the use of the definite adverbs of sequence, "then," "after that," "last of all."—The appearance of the risen Saviour to Peter, recorded Luke xxiv. 34, is mentioned first, not "because the authority of Peter was the chiefest, as being the prince of the apostles" (Estius), but in accordance with the historical order of occurrences, passing over, however, the manifestation previously made of Himself to Mary Magdalene (John xx. 14 f.). "Mary Magdalene was, indeed, a witness to the brethren, but not to the people at large,"—W. F. BESSER; [and to have cited her testimony would, with multitudes, at that period, have tended to call out a sneer, rather than strengthen belief].—**then of the twelve**:—This was the common designation of the smaller circle of disciples, although it was not then complete ["*twelve* being a name, not of number, but of office"]; and the manifestation here alluded to (Luke xxiv. 36 ff.; John xx. 19 ff.) is not to be confounded with that which followed eight days after (John xx. 26). Thomas also was not present. The apostles appear also here as witnesses of the resurrection of Christ (Acts ii. 23; iii. 15; x. 40 ff.; xiii. 31) By *ὤφθη*, *was seen*, we are to understand a literal perception by the senses, and not a vision. **After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once**;—The manifestation here spoken of is nowhere else recorded; in Matt. xxviii. 16 mention is made only of "the eleven." The expression "at once" implies that the "more than five hundred" saw Him, not separately, but altogether; and this probably took place at a time when numerous Galilean disciples

were still at Jerusalem, and therefore before the termination of the festival season. The fact that about the time of Pentecost only about one hundred and twenty disciples are spoken of, does not militate with this supposition. [HODGE says, "This manifestation may have taken place on the occasion when Christ met His disciples in Galilee." Before His death He told them, "After I am risen again, I will go before you into Galilee," Matt. xxvi. 32. Early in the morning of His resurrection, He met the women who had been at His tomb, and said to them, "Be not afraid; go tell my brethren, that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me," Matt. xxviii. 10; and accordingly in ver. 16 it is said, "Then the eleven went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them." "This, therefore, was a formally appointed meeting, and doubtless made known as extensively as possible to His followers; and it is probable, therefore, that there was a concourse of all who could come, not only from Jerusalem, but from the surrounding country, and from Galilee. Though intended specially for the eleven, it is probable that all attended who knew of the meeting, and could possibly reach the appointed place. Who would willingly be absent on such an occasion?" —HODGE].—**of whom the greater part remain until now,**—This is added to show that a large number of witnesses of the resurrection could still be called upon for their testimony. [And here we have a most striking proof of the fact before us. Had the resurrection of Christ been only a fiction, "so many false hearts and tongues would never have acted in concert; nor would they all have kept a secret, which remorse, interest, and perhaps often torture, might urge them to divulge—especially as there had been one traitor among the twelve; on account of which, had they been conscious of a fraud, a general suspicion of each other's secrecy must have arisen." DODDRIDGE].—Μένειν, as in John xxi. 22; Phil. i. 25).—**but some are fallen asleep.**—[The sweet language of the gospel for expressing the nature of the believer's death—transforming its very terrors into attractions. It carries in itself also the implication of an after-awakening, and hence is the only term that could be used when speaking of death in a discourse on the resurrection].—**After that he was seen of James;**—This manifestation, which happened to a single individual, is also alluded to only here. This James is undoubtedly the brother of our Lord mentioned Gal. ii. 9, as among the "pillars" of the church; he is also introduced in Acts xv. 13; xxi. 18 as a specially important personage, one of "the brethren of the Lord," ix. 5. It was this manifestation of the risen Saviour that proved indeed for him and his brethren the turning-point of their lives, so that they at once became His decided followers (Acts i. 14). According to the legend in 'the gospel of the Hebrews,' cited by Jerome, James was honored before all others with a manifestation of Christ. This story is a product of the Jewish tendency to hero-worship.—**then by all the apostles.**—Inasmuch as the twelve have been already mentioned, the disposition with many (Chrys., Calvin, and others) is to take these words in a more comprehensive sense, so as to include James also, and other eye-witnesses of the life of Jesus. It is a question whether this manifestation occurred immediately before the ascension. There is nothing in the narratives of this fact to contradict the supposition. ["The word 'all' may be used to indicate that the appearance was to the apostles collectively; and this, from its position, is the most natural explanation. Or the meaning may be, He appeared to James separately, and then to all the apostles, including James. If the James intended was James of Jerusalem; and if that James were a different person from James the son of Alpheus (a disputed point), then the former interpretation should be preferred. For 'the apostle' answers to 'the twelve,' and if James of Jerusalem was not the son of Alpheus, he was not one of the twelve." HODGE]. "It was a providential circumstance that Paul was led to adduce these witnesses for the appearance of Christ after the resurrection. Should any one be inclined to doubt the genuineness of the testimonies of the Evangelists on this point, and to assume in these a mythic element, he is here entirely debarred from so doing; since nobody ever *has* doubted, or will doubt the genuineness of this epistle, and Paul is here speaking of historical facts throughout. Accordingly, we may say that the resurrection of Christ is a fact as well attested as any in the past. Without it there would be a gap in history unfilled; since the resurrection is essentially presupposed in the very existence of the Church as built up by the Apostle." NEANDER.

VERS. 8–10. He here mentions himself as the last apostolic witness of the resurrection. In one respect, indeed, he stood after the others; but in respect of that which he had wrought by the power of divine grace, he had become distinguished above them all.—**But last of all,**—πάντων, *of all*, is not to be taken as neuter (as de Wette, [Hodge, Alford, who take the whole phrase here as an adverb of order, winding up the whole series]), but as masculine, and is to be referred in accordance with the context to the apostles.—**as it were by the untimely born,**—ὡσπερεὶ precedes for the sake of modifying the strong and remarkable expression which follows. The τῷ is neither to be taken for τῳ=τινί, since this form no where occurs in the New Testament, not even in 1 Thess. iv. 6; neither is it equivalent to the indefinite article; but it is here emphatic, *the*, and by it Paul designates himself as preëminently *the* unworthy one among all the rest, ["the only abortion in the whole company—the one whose relation to the rest in point of worthiness was as that of the immature and deformed child to the rest of the family." ALFORD]. The point of comparison is not in the matter of a suitable education, such as was furnished to the other apostles by a longer intercourse with the Lord wherein he lacked [Enstatius, Bloomf., and Macknight]; nor yet in the suddenness and violence of his conversion and appointment to the apostleship (Calvin); and still less his diminutive form (Wetstein); but as ver. 9 shows, his unworthiness in comparison with the other apostles. ["The corresponding word *abortivus* in Latin was metaphorically applied as here to such senators as were appointed irregularly. SUET., *Oct.* c. 35, 2). The

word itself is of Macedonian Greek and corresponds to the Attic "ἀμβλωμα". STANLEY].—**he was seen also by me.**—The seeing here cannot be regarded as a mere mental vision, [as some are inclined to interpret the event which took place on the way to Damascus; but in consistency with all the previous manifestations here spoken of, we must regard this appearance] as an actual objective one, just such as we are to anticipate from the glorified Redeemer in His second advent. [There is a meaning not to be overlooked in the order of the words here. "Also by me" forms a sort of climax expressing the great wonder in the condecension of Christ to him in this manifestation of himself. Paul could never advert to the grace of Christ shown towards him without being brought both to feel and express in contrast therewith his own great unworthiness. See Tim. i. 12, 13. On the subject of "Paul a witness for the resurrection of Jesus," see an able article by Prof. G. P. FISHER, in the "*Bib. Sac.*" Vol. XVII. p. 620 ff.] And now comes the reason for this self-disparagement.—**For I am the least of the apostles,**—(comp. Eph. iii. 8). Ὁ ἐλάχιστος, *the least*, as contrasted with *μέγιστος, the greatest*; without any reference to the order of time, as though implying 'the last'; for the word is never used in this sense in connection with persons. It is more fully explained in the following relative clause.—**who**—ὅς=*quippe qui*, 'inasmuch as I'—**am not fit**—ἱκανὸς=ἄξιος, *worthy* (comp. Matt. iii. 11; with John i. 27). lit. *sufficiently qualified, fit, suitable*, as in 2 Cor. iii. 5.—**to be called**—καλεῖσθαι here denotes honorable designation 'to bear the name of'—**an apostle,**—The reason of this is—**because I persecuted the Church of God.**—[This is the sin which Paul never forgave himself, and from it we see that the forgiveness of sin does not obliterate the remembrance of sin, neither does it remove the sense of unworthiness and ill-desert (Hodge)]. Comp. 1 Tim. i. 13; Acts viii. 3; ix. 1; xxii. 4; xxvi; Gal. i. 13 ff. ["Paul does not refuse to be the most worthless of all, as next to nothing, provided this contempt does not impede him in any degree in his ministry, or does not at all detract from his doctrine." CALVIN]. But the lower he humbles himself, so that no opponent might see him lower, the more decidedly he brings to view the other side—the glorious operation of divine grace in him or through him. "His apostolic office he will not allow to be contemned inasmuch as God had through him wrought more abundantly. By reason of opposers he feels constrained to array himself in his calling and boast."—LUTHER.—**But by God's grace I am what I am:**—χάριτι, *grace*, stands first by way of emphasis. No article is needed. What he means to say is, 'God's grace it is which has made me what I am.' Grace presupposes unworthiness in the recipient. It is unmerited love, favor; here as forgiving, renewing and qualifying for office (comp. iii. 10). The latter element, grounded upon the two former, appears more prominently in what follows. In "what I am" he refers to his office as an apostle and to his qualification for it; (or as Meyer, Ed. 3, his whole present state and condition as distinguished from what he was before his conversion. This is further developed in the following clauses, where he points to the consequences of the divine favor toward him in fitting him for his work; first, negatively.—**and his grace which was (manifested) toward me was not made vain**;—*i. e.*, was not void of fruit. But that this negative statement was far below the actual facts of the case, he goes on to show.—**but more abundantly than they all did I labor:**—And this was precisely the fruit of the operation of the divine grace. And lest this should seem to be regarded by him as an occasion for boasting, he at once repudiates all claim to honor in the most emphatic manner, showing that, after all, the efficient agent in all his labors was not himself, so much as it was the grace of God working in him and through him.—**yet not I, but the grace of God with me.**—If we read σὺν ἐμοί without the article then it must be taken as connected with some words to be supplied as the following: 'labored more abundantly with me,' *i. e.*, standing by me, or in active coöperation with me (Meyer). [See the critical notes on this point. Calvin attributes the omission of the ἡ to the blunder of some old translator, and insists on its maintenance to obviate the inference of Semipelagians from this text, who would ascribe half the praise of success to God and half to man as being joint-laborers in the work. But the preponderance of authority is for the omission of the article, it being obviously inserted apparently for the purpose of vindicating the absoluteness of Divine Grace. But it is not needed for this. The language of the Apostle is decisive enough without this—"*not I*, but the grace of God did it"]. Comp. Mark xvi. 20. By this antithesis, which is not to be weakened into, '*not only* I, *but also*,' or into, '*as well* I, *as*,' the entire glory of successful achievement is attributed to Divine Grace (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 5; Phil. ii. 13; Matt. x 20, and elsewhere). περισσότερον, neuter accusative, not to be taken adverbially [(Alford Stanley)].—αὐτῶν πάντων, not, *than any individual of them*, but, *than all put together*. The explanation of this is to be found in his widely extended sphere of labor.—κοπιᾶν properly means *to be weary*, or, *become weary*; then, *to exhaust one's self* by working, *to strain one's self*; but here on account of the contrast, "not in vain," and because afterwards the Divine Grace is shown to be the real subject, it can only denote the work with its results; while elsewhere it denotes the work as an exhausting effort (comp. iv. 12; Gal. iv. 11).—From this digression, introduced no less by the fervor of his spirit than on account of the condition of affairs in the Corinthian church—a digression, however, not to be construed as a grammatical parenthesis—he now returns to his main theme.

VERS. 11, 13. **Whether, therefore,**—οὖν as in viii. 4.—**I or they,**—*i. e.*, the other apostles with whom he henceforward associates himself. "Such was the perfect agreement among all the apostles in reference to the appearance of the risen Saviour." NEANDER. In the expression "I or they," the Apostle casts a polemic glance at the oppugners of his apostolic office.—**so we preach,**—The "so" is to be explained from what is said from vv. 4 to 12. It refers to the

great fact in question and its proofs.—**and so ye believed.**—The "so" here is equivalent to "thereby," *viz.*, that such doctrines have been preached to you; [or, it may be like the previous "so," meaning *after this manner, viz.*, as above stated].—ἐπιστεύσατε, as in ver. 2. "The accordant and powerful testimony of the apostles is here accredited by its fruits; the Corinthians themselves are here summoned as witnesses through the faith they once exercised." OSIANDER. "Faith once accorded often strengthens subsequent faith; and its former strength not only obligates, but often retains the wavering." BENGEL.

VER. 12. Over against the preaching of the eye-witnesses of Christ's resurrection, and the faith it secured, he now exhibits in contrast the denial of any resurrection from the dead on the part of some in the church. And he mentions it as something in the highest degree strange and incredible that such a denial could be made, when (as he afterwards shows) it involved a denial also of that which was the burden of the apostles' preaching, and lay at the foundation of their faith.—**But if Christ is preached**—εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται—not a hypothetical but an actual condition (Passow, εἰ, I. A. 1. a.), *q. d.*, 'since Christ is preached.'—Christ is mentioned first by way of emphasis: for the contradiction lies here between the preaching of Christ as one risen from the dead, and the denial of any resurrection from the dead.—**that he rose from the dead,**—Some readings put ἐκ νεκρῶν before ὅτι; if this were critically established, the transposition of the natural order would be for the sake of emphasis also; but such a double emphasis is hardly probable.—**how say some among you**—i. e., how is it possible that they can say? It does not comport with the fact supposed, that in the midst of *you*, a *Christian church*, there are any who say—**that there is no resurrection from the dead?**—οὐκ ἔστι, *is not*, 'is not to take place' (comp. Eph. vi. 9). The whole exposition proceeds on the supposition that the fact of Christ's resurrection was not a matter of controversy. Hence, the Apostle was able to plant himself on this well-attested theme of Apostolic preaching, and controvert opposers on the ground that their assertions would, by implication, go to undermine the foundations on which both stood, and with it overthrow the whole scheme of salvation by Christ. That these people were Sadducees, is altogether improbable, since this class, by reason of their peculiar views, altogether ignored the preaching of the resurrection of Jesus (Acts iv. 2), and kept far aloof from Christianity. Besides, had they been contemplated, the mode of argument pursued would have been far different. From what is said in ver. 32, we might suppose them to have been Epicureans; but these persons whose anti-christian tenets would have required a still more definite refutation, remained at as great a remove from Christianity as did the Sadducees; and what is read in ver. 32, is no more than a practical deduction of the Apostle from the premises assumed, and it naturally follows upon his description of a practical Epicureanism (Isa. xxii. 13). So, too, we can hardly look to find in Corinth Jewish Christians of a theosophic class, who denied the doctrine of a re-incorporation of the soul on the grounds of a false spiritualism. "The Essenes certainly may have accepted the doctrine of a personal existence after death, in a form not involving the doctrine of the resurrection; but there is nothing else here which points to the elements of their faith." NEANDER. It is more natural to suppose that these opponents were heathen converts of a certain philosophic training, who sought to impose, or taught doctrines that were very seductive to the Corinthians, predisposed as they already were to them. Such would regard, with abhorrence, the idea of a restoration of their material part, and hence for such, an argument like that in ver. 35 ff. was entirely suitable. Among the philosophically educated of all ages we discover a disinclination for this doctrine; and in this question, to seek out a reference to the several parties that existed in the Christian church, would be uncertain business. In any case, these opposers could not have belonged to the party of Cephas, or of Paul; and they could be reckoned in the Christ party, only on the doubtful supposition that this was characterized by a theosophic spiritualism. And if we assigned them to the party of Apollos, they could only have been certain individuals of this party who denied the doctrine in question by reason of their philosophical peculiarities, and not the party as a whole. It was, in fact, no party question. Besides, there is no warrant for supposing that, like the false teachers mentioned in 2 Tim. ii. 18, they regarded the resurrection as past already. Moreover, we are not to infer from ver. 19 that, together with the resurrection of the body, they also denied the immortality of the soul. Rather we are to infer from this verse only this, that in the Apostle's view the immortality of the soul was inconceivable without assuming the possibility of a re-incorporation or of a restoration and glorification of the bodily life, that the continued existence of the simple personality (*Ichheit*) was no true life.

VERS. 13, 16. That the preaching of Christ's resurrection was inconsistent with a denial of the resurrection of the dead, the Apostle proceeds to show by a chain of conclusions and consequences connected by δέ—**But**—["the *but* argumentandi frequent in mathematical demonstrations." ALFORD.]—**if there is no resurrection of the dead, then not even Christ is risen:**—[First consequence—a palpable absurdity, not only in view of what a being Christ was, but also in view of all the testimony offered to the contrary.] He here argues from the general to the special, since the denial of the former naturally involved that of the latter, it being included under it. 'If there is no such thing at all as the resurrection from the dead, then must this hold good also of Christ. He also has not risen from the dead.' The identity of Christ's nature with that of mankind at large—a fact which underlies this whole argument—is not suspended or dissolved by His Divine Sonship and His sinlessness. For, in that He emptied Himself of His former glory, He became a veritable actual man (σάρξ); and if He died, though sinless, then can the restoration of His body not be affirmed, if such a restoration is impossible

for men in general who are dead. Of Christ as the first-fruits (ver. 20) nothing is as yet said, so that an argument can be drawn of this sort: 'If the effect is done away, then also must the cause go with it.' The statement, "then is Christ not risen," is not put forth here as a premise (Osiander); but with the exhibition of the impossible conclusion here set forth his whole series of inferences, as it were, celebrates its first triumph. What consequences must arise if Christ be not risen, if he still remains in the grave, he now goes on to show.—**And if Christ has not arisen, vain then is our preaching,**—[A second consequence—the absurdity of holding that the Gospel with all its provisions and promises, with all it had done, and yet proposed to effect, was a delusion]. κενόν, which stands first by way of emphasis, means here *groundless, untrue, without reality*, not 'fruitless'—a thought which first appears in ver. 17. Still less are we to take the two meanings as here combined. The thought is this: since the redemption in Christ is the grand theme of gospel preaching, and has the resurrection of Christ as its essential foundation, therefore, all preaching without this must be empty, groundless, unreal. ἄρα, *then*, brings the inference yet more prominently to view. If the καί is genuine, then the meaning is, 'if the former be not true, then the latter is not true *also*.'—The same inference holds good also of the subjective reception of the preaching.—**vain also is your faith.**—The two refer back to what is said in ver. 11; although the preaching must here be taken in a more comprehensive sense.—ὑμῶν, *your* is undoubtedly the correct reading; not ἡμῶν *our*.—To the former clause there is added a third inference, which sets the preachers in a very bad light.—**And we are found also false witnesses of God**;—From the fact that this again is to be inferred from the supposition that Christ is not risen, it does not follow that this clause belongs in with the previous apodosis, and that simply a comma is to be put after ὑμῶν (Lachmann and Meyer), [or after 'faith,' as in our version]. Such punctuation and construction is also inconsistent with the δὲ καί; [besides, as Alford says, ver. 15 does not depend on the condition expressed in ver. 14, "if Christ be not risen," but has its reason given below.]—εὑρισκόμεθα is put first for emphasis, and means *we are found*, or *proven*, as before a tribunal of investigation.—ψευδομάρτυρες τοῦ θεοῦ, either *false witnesses concerning God* (gen. obj.,) or *false witnesses belonging to God* (gen. subj.), *i. e.*, who pretend to be witnesses and are not. The former interpretation is sustained by the following explanatory clause.—["Observe, *false* witnesses, not *mistaken* witnesses. Paul allows no loophole of escape. The resurrection is a fact, or else a falsehood; and it is such persons as Peter, and John, and James, and himself, that are guilty of perpetrating it—a monstrous supposition, when we think of the men, and the truthful ring of their earnest declarations, and the seal they put to them." Robertson.]—**because we testified against God that he raised up Christ**:—If a person says of God that He has done something which He has not done, and yet could have done, then is he a false witness in relation to Him, and the false testimony given is a testimony *against* Him (κατά as in Matt. xxvi. 59–62 not equivalent to περί, *in respect of* [Alford], nor yet as summoning God for a witness like ὀμόσαι κατά Heb. vi. 13). For, knowingly to ascribe to God anything untrue, is a wicked and hostile crime against Him; and this would be a veritable lie, since they had announced something as an act of God actually witnessed by them, which yet never did take place, and indeed was impossible,—**whom he did not raise, if in reality (as they assert)**—such is the force of εἴπερ, the strengthened εἰ; and ἄρα which means *accordingly*.—**the dead are not raised.**—The last statement is confirmed in ver. 16, which is almost a literal repetition of ver. 13, and is introduced for the sake of precision. ["But why is this? Why may not a man admit that Christ, the incarnate Son of God, arose from the dead, and yet consistently deny that there is to be a general resurrection of the dead? Because the thing denied was that the dead could rise. The denial was placed on ground which embraced the case of Christ." Hodge].

Vers. 17–19. Here follows a new series of inferences exhibiting the sad result of the doctrine of his opponents upon the salvation of Christians themselves. As before he expressed the groundlessness, and hence the falsity of the faith, on the supposition of these deniers, by the word κενή, *empty, idle;* so now he expresses its fruitlessness by the word ματαία.—**And if Christ is not risen, vain is your faith**;—Vain *i. e.*, without any beneficial results (comp. iii. 20; Tit. iii. 9; Jas. i. 26), as is clear from the clause which follows.—**ye are yet in your sins.**—Here we see that his reference is mainly to the matter of justification, which is primarily a remission of sins. All this is frustrated by the denial in question, since, as Paul asserts (Rom. iv. 25), Christ *was raised* for our justification. If Christ was still detained in the power of death, then could no pardon be pledged by Him; He could not act the part of Redeemer and Reconciler, but like all other sinners, would appear to have fallen under the doom of sin. Thus that expressed in 11. 2: "Ye are justified in the name of the Lord, and by the Spirit of our God," is all done away. The ethical side of Christianity, *viz.*, sanctification and liberation from the dominion of sin, does not lie in the context.—The frightful consequences are shown to extend yet farther, affecting not only the living, but also the departed.—**Then they also who have fallen asleep in Christ,**—*i. e.*, who have died in communion with Him, being united to Him by faith (comp. 1 Thes. iv. 6; Rev. iv. 13). By these he means, not the ancient saints who lived before the time of Christ, but deceased Christians, and these, too, not simply the martyrs (ἐν=διά), but believers in general. — **perished.** — Perdition, according to the Scripture, is not annihilation, but the state of damnation, remaining in Gehenna; and this is here brought forward as a consequence of being yet in sin. If Christ did not rise for our justification, then those whose death seemed but a blessed sleep to a happy awaking in fellowship with their living and glorified Redeemer, so far from having been received into eternal life, were doomed still to abide under the

wretched dominion of death. A consequence like this must have made too profound an impression upon the loving disposition of Christians to be lightly allowed. Whatever doctrine constrained them to regard their beloved associates in the faith as lost, must needs appear to them as in itself highly questionable. ["Here," says Stanley, "we find the climax of the whole argument. As may be seen from 1 Thes. iv. 13, one of the most harrowing thoughts to the apostolic Christians was the fear lest their departed brethren should, by a premature death, be debarred from that communion with the Lord which they hoped to enjoy; and in itself nothing could be more disheartening to the Christian's hope, than to find that Christians had lived and died in vain"]. The method of proof here adopted, though indeed not carrying the force of a mathematical demonstration for unbelievers, is nevertheless fitted to strengthen the hearts of the faithful against the doubts of unbelief. It concludes with an impressive reference to the sad state of those Christians whose hope of eternal life, pledged through the resurrection of Christ, was thus cut off. This touching assertion is introduced without any verbal connective. Comp. vii. 24 ff. **—If only in this life we have been hoping in Christ,**—And here we must, first of all, take into consideration the correct order of the words. The received text puts *ἐν χριστῷ* after *ἐσμέν*. In this arrangement, which is feebly attested, we might be tempted to unite the *μόνον* with *χριστῷ* as if equivalent to *ἐν μόνῳ τῷ χριστῷ*, *q. d.*, 'in Christ alone,' which would be the better expression (Rückert). But in order to obtain a correct relation of the apodosis to the protasis, we must supply that on which it is properly conditioned, *viz.*, 'and Christ is not risen.' But if *ἐν χριστῷ* is to be put after *ταύτῃ*, which is the more critically authorized order, then might we dispense with this otherwise not probable explanation. But then the question arises, to what does *μόνον*, *only*, belong? Is it to the words: "if we have hope," so that it serves to express simply a hoping which remains unfulfilled, *q. d.*, 'if we have hope only?' or to the words: "in this life," putting it in contrast with eternal life; *q. d.*, 'if we have hope in this life only [Hodge]? Or, finally, does it belong to the whole clause; *q. d.*, 'if we have no more than put our hope on Christ in this life, and do not hope in Him even after having gone to our rest;' or, as Meyer says, "if the hope of future glory which the Christian grounds upon Christ in his earthly life perishes with this life, inasmuch as death but transfers him to a state where the Christian hope proves but a deception" [Alford, Stanly]? The last interpretation deserves the decided preference. According to the first, it is not easy to perceive why the words: *ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ*, "in this life," are put first. Indeed, they appear to be altogether unnecessary. The second is opposed by the position of *μόνον*, *only*. The expression *ἐλπίζειν ἐν* appears also in Eph. i. 12, (*spes reposita in Christo*), and is analogous to *πιστεύειν ἐν*. The use of *ζωή* to denote the present *period* of existence as distinct from a *state* of existence, occurs only here and in Luke xvi. 25. Very short and impressive is the conclusion.— **more miserable than all men are we.**— *i. e.*, all men, aside from us Christians that still live. In this statement, the Apostle by no means stoops to the level of a common eudemonism, [arguing here from a main reference to happiness as the ultimate end of life]; but his meaning is this: 'Christians who live as strangers in this world, denying themselves in every way, and bearing life's heavy load, and enduring all manner of sufferings, and this in the hope of an eternal reward in the kingdom of heaven, are, in case their hope is a vain dream destined to vanish with this life, more miserable than all those who take enjoyment in earthly things: for these things have some sort of reality; while, on the contrary, the salvation for which Christians forego all, and fight, is but a delusion. (Comp. Osiander). [If by *ἐλεεινότεροι* we understand a positive wretchedness, this declaration must be limited as applicable only to Christians as they were in the times of the apostles—exposed to all manner of privations and sufferings; for it can hardly be affirmed as true of Christians in general, that their faith makes their *temporal* condition more miserable than that of men of the world. Godliness hath the promise of the life that *now* is, as well as of that which is to come. This is a part of its glory—a glory which is not all eclipsed even amid the greatest tribulations; for martyrs rejoice and triumph even amid tortures and flames, "not accepting deliverance." The inward happiness they experience is something which no mere outward circumstances, however painful, can wholly overcome. Would it not, therefore, be more appropriate to abide by the original signification of *ἐλεεινός*, *pitiable*, and understand it as referring to the delusion under which Christians would live, and the great disappointment they were destined to experience; in case, having given up all for Christ, and exulted in hope of living and reigning with Him after death, they should find at last that He had not risen, and there was no resurrection for them. Taken in this sense the declaration would admit of universal application. Some commentators, like the translators of the E. V., instead of construing the adjective in the comparative as governing the genitive *πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, suppose a Hebrew idiom here, and take the genitive partitively, and construe the adjective as though superlative—'of all men most miserable' (Jelf. *Gr. Gram.* § 534)].

Vers. 20–22. In contrast with the whole deplorable results which would follow on the supposition involved in the denial of his opponents, Paul now triumphantly sets before them the irrefragable fact of the resurrection as established by the testimony previously adduced (ver. 4 ff.), and also the significance which it has for the faith and hope of Christians—a significance which is itself a refutation of all skepticism. As Neander says: "He passes on to unfold the chain of consequences arising from the resurrection of Christ, and to exhibit it as the beginning of a new creation which is to find its consummation in the life to come. Nor does the rapture of the apostle, borne on as he is by the contemplation of the glorious theme, allow him to stop at the point where the argument first conducts him; but he follows out the truth onward to its final ground and goal."—**But now,**—*νυνί*

δέ, logical as in xiii. 13; xiv. 6; and elsewhere. It suggests the subaudition: 'If Christ has not risen then does it go ill with us.' *But now*, as the matter stands, the case is far otherwise; these sad consequences cannot be admitted; our faith is not vain;—**Christ is risen from the dead, the first fruits of them that have slept.**—Instead of confronting gainsayers with a negative assertion, he strongly lays down a positive, which involves the denial of all the evil consequences above pointed out. Not only *is* Christ risen, but, as the risen One, He is the beginning of a whole line of those who are destined to arise out of death's sleep to life eternal—the first fruits, as it were, of a resurrection harvest. The expression: "first fruits" stands in apposition with the previous clause, and contains the theme of the whole subsequent exposition. Ἀπαρχή as in xvi. 15; Rom. viii. 23; xi. 16; xvi. 5. The same thought is expressed in Col. i. 18; Rev. i. 5, by the words, "first born of the dead," or, "from the dead" (comp. Acts xxvi. 23).—That the primacy of time includes also a primacy of worth, and a causal relation to all that follows, is clear from the position which Christ holds as the Head of humanity, as well as from what is asserted in ver. 21 f. But whether there is such a reference here to the waving of the first sheaf on the day after Easter Sabbath by way of consecrating the harvest (Lev. xxxii. 10), is a matter of question. In favor of it there is: 1. The typico-symbolical interpretation which the apostle elsewhere employs (x. 3 ff.; ix. 8 ff.); 2. That Christ rose on that very day; 3. The composition of this epistle about the time of Easter (comp. v. 8). In this case the statement would involve the idea of a consecration and pledge of the coming harvest. ["The apostle does not mean merely that the resurrection of Christ was to precede that of His people: but, as the first sheaf of the harvest presented to God as a thank-offering, was the pledge and assurance of the ingathering of the whole harvest; so the resurrection of Christ is a pledge and proof of the resurrection of His people." Hodge.] Neither the resurrections from the dead recorded in the Old and New Testaments, nor yet the instances of Enoch and Elijah are in contradiction with what is here said of Christ as the first fruits. In the case of the former, there was no arising to an immortal life; in the case of the latter, there was no dying, so that a resurrection could occur.—But whom are we to understand by "them that have slept?" believers, or the dead in general? The latter seem to be implied from what is said in ver. 21; but that the former are meant is evident both from the expression "first fruits," and also from the designation "sleep," which is used in the New Testament to denote the death of believers only. The question must be decided by the interpretation we put on the following verses, [where we find the explanation of what is here asserted], in a parallel drawn between Adam and Christ,—first, in the form of a general proposition stating a rule of the divine administration, that what has been taken away from us by *man* shall be restored to us also by *man*. — **For since** — ἐπειδή, a particle of cause, not of time (as in i. 21; Acts xiii. 46); so that here we have a fundamental principle stated, apart from all relations to time, requiring in the following ellipsis only the supply of the ordinary copula. — **through man (is) death, also through man (is) the resurrection of the dead.**—The antithesis shows that by "death" is here meant only the death of the body. [The underlying truth here is that community of nature is requisite for the transmission of powerful and all-pervading influences. Like can best act on like. The nature of the causal connection is, however, not stated. Meyer thinks that a knowledge of this is presupposed in the readers, as having been imparted to them by oral instructions of which they are here reminded].—The general fact grounded on the organic union of the race, on the one hand, with the head of its natural development, who introduced death into it, and, on the other, with the head of its spiritual development who brought about the destruction of death, he proceeds to exhibit more fully by referring to the actual fulfilment of this law as it took place in the former instance, and as it is to be anticipated in the latter. And here we have the formulas of the comparison,—**As-so**—The headship in the one case is Adam, in the other is Christ.—**in the Adam**—Instead of δι᾽ ἀ we here have ἐν *in*, denoting that each of these processes of development has its *ground*, or *source*, in its peculiar head. Accordingly, "in the Adam" means 'as partakers of his nature which is doomed to death as united with him.' The nature of this union as expressed by δι᾽ ἀ, *through*, and its consequences are more fully exhibited in Rom. v. 12, 15, 17, "Through one man death passed upon all men." **all are dying,**—[In what sense? Hodge extends the meaning of the word so as to include moral death. The scope of the apostle's argument, however, requires us to abide by the literal signification. He is here speaking solely of death natural and life natural, and we are to construe his language as bounded within this province (so Calvin and others). As Alford says, "The practice of Paul *to insulate the objects of his present attention* from all ulterior considerations must be carefully borne in mind." Barnes also argues for the same limitation with great pertinence].—As the other member of the comparison we have—**so also in the Christ shall all be made alive.** In the former case, since death was ever in progress, the verb was in the present, ἀποθνήσκουσιν, but here on the contrary the restoration is spoken of as something yet to be,—hence the future ζωοποιηθήσονται. Here, however, commentators divide. Some, starting from the idea of a vital communion with Christ which reaches its perfect consummation at the resurrection, understand by 'being made alive' an introduction into a state of supreme blessedness. In this case, they interpret the term "all" either *relatively*, taking it to denote all believers only, who alone are spoken of in the context; or *absolutely*, finding in this passage a statement of universal salvation (comp. ver. 28)—"the restoration of all" (ἀποκατάστασις πάντων). The question is, Ought not the word "all" to have the same scope in the two clauses? The context does not justify our limiting it to believers in the first clause; for he is throughout treating of the resurrection of the dead in general, what-

ever may have been their religious state, and of Christ as the person who in this respect has taken the lead, and by His resurrection has fixed a point in history from whence death as the separation of soul and body should date its cessation, even as from Adam it dated its commencement. But whether the dogma of a *general restoration* is a Pauline doctrine is, *to say the least*, very problematical (comp. vi. 9 ff.; 2 Thess. i. 9.) As Burger says, "It is not possible to prove from our text, nor yet from the whole context, the doctrine of a so-called restoration of all things, which asserts that all at last, both good and bad, even the devil and his angels, shall be made partakers of divine grace." Elsewhere, Paul speaks of "a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust" (Acts xxiv. 15). Of this mention is made also in Jno. v. 28 ff., where it appears as the work of the Messiah whom the Jews expected to be the general quickener of the dead (comp. Lücke on Jno. v. 21 ff.; and de Wette, *Bibl. Dogm.*, p. 203).—But the expression, "be made alive" might be used to signify the resurrection of both classes (Rom. iv. 17). It means *to be restored to life* in general; its specific application must be determined by the context: an ethical, natural introduction into life generally, and into a truly blessed life. Accordingly we must side with those who take the word "all" in its broadest sense, and understand 'the being made alive' of a general resurrection. For to interpret the second clause of the comparison ideally, of the original *destination* of all men to a blessed resurrection and of the *power* of the Redeemer to make all share in it (J. Müller *Stud. und Krit.* 1835. p. 751) would hardly be doing full justice to the expression.—But is not the above interpretation opposed by the words "in Christ?" No; for we might say, the whole race obtains in Christ the principle of the Resurrection. He, the second Adam, has been implanted in humanity as the destroyer of death; and the result of this will indeed prove glorious or fearful according to the relation which the individual may sustain towards Him, whether positive or negative. Nothing, it would seem, can be decisively adduced against this broader interpretation, from the fact, that in the onward course of his argument the apostle brings into view only the resurrection of believers; since the problem before him by no means required a complete unfolding of the whole subject, in all its aspects. With all this, however, it still remains doubtful whether "the resurrection unto damnation," which is contrasted with "the resurrection unto life" (Jno. v. 29,) can be covered by the expression "made alive." At all events, a consistency with the main clause (ver. 20) would be preserved if we interpreted "all" in the second clause of the antithesis to mean the totality of those who shall be made alive, whoever they are, as in the first clause, to mean the totality of those who die. Accordingly the main thought would be, that Christ, as the risen One, is the informing principle, and commencement of all restoration to life in the race on the part of God. In this respect, He constitutes a parallel to Adam, who was the informing principle and commencement of all death. It is true, the expression "each one" in the next verse, so far as it may stretch even beyond "those that are Christ's," seems to require us to take "all" in the broadest sense, and also to give the broader meaning to "make alive" (Meyer); but, opposed to this, there stands, again, the word "first fruits," the inconsistency of using which in relation to those awaking to "the resurrection of damnation," reasonably awakens doubt. [Hodge, interpreting the word ζωοποιεῖσθαι in a moral as well as physical sense on grounds hardly tenable, restricts the term "all" to believers. But the great majority of commentatators, ancient as well as modern, (Chrys. Theod. Theoph. Beza, Olsh. de Wette, Meyer, Bloomf., Barnes) abide by the universal reference, preserving the parallelism in both clauses. "As the death of all mankind came by Adam, so the resurrection of all men came by Christ; the wicked shall be raised by Him *officio Judicis*, by the power of Christ as their Lord and Judge: The righteous shall be raised *beneficio Meditatoris*, by virtue of their union with Him as their head." VALPY. The necessity for adopting this view will more fully appear as we proceed.]

VERS. 23–28.—Passing on now from the successive stages of the resurrection, the apostle proceeds to open a view into the final consummation of the divine economy, at the conclusion of the ways of God with man. First—we have the several steps of the great process of restoration in Christ set forth. **But every one**—sc. 'shall be raised,' or 'made alive'—**in his own order**:—The word τάγμα does not mean *series*, but *a well ordered multitude, a division of the army, a cohort;* and only in this sense can it be translated *order*. Those who are raised at successive periods of time are conceived of as coming forth in troops or bands, in some one of which every one will be found. [Hodge says, however, that "the word is used by later writers, as Clemens in his epistle to the Cor. i. 37 and 41, in the sense of τάξις, *order of succession*. And this best suits the context, for Christ is not a band. All that Paul teaches is, that, although the resurrection of Christ secures that of His people, the two events are not contemporaneous."] Ἴδιος, *his own*, that which belongs to him, and fits him=ἑαυτοῦ. [If we adopt the meaning of *band* or *cohort* for τάγμα, then the implication is that those *in Christ* will come forth by themselves, and the wicked by themselves—those of a kind keeping together. And this will be the natural order, since "those who sleep in Jesus, God will bring with Him."]—**Christ the first fruits**;—He forms the first division, [as being a host in himself], which leads the ranks of those who are to be made alive hereafter. The expression corresponding to the figure would be ἀρχηγός, *leader, captain* (comp. Meyer *hoc loco.*) The resurrection of all, Christ's included, is a great fact.—The next division is composed of—**those that are Christ's**—The expression is found also in Gal. v. 24.—The time of their rising is **at his coming**.—By the παρουσία here, is not meant Christ's continued presence on earth (Matt. xxviii. 20) onward unto his "glorious appearing;" but, as elsewhere (1 Thes.; 2 Thes.; 2 Pet.; 1 John; James; Matt. xxiv. 3, 27, 37, 39), His revelation in power for the setting up of His kingdom. With this the first resurrection, that of the dead in the Christ (Thes. iv. 16; comp. Rev. xx. 5) is coincident, and it follows

upon the destruction of the anti-Christian powers (Rev. xix.; 2 Thes. ii.). By those who are Christ's, we may understand either true Christians or Christians in general. Meyer says, the latter, referring to 2 Cor. v. 10; Rom. xiv. 10. But it is a question whether the expressions, "those who are Christ's," and, "the dead in Christ," can be used of formal Christians who finally perish.—**Afterwards**—εἶτα introduces a new epoch (analogous to ἔπειτα) which follows after an interval, when we have the conclusion of the whole development. [Hodge questions this, and says, "it has been the constant [?] faith of the Church that the second advent of Christ, the resurrection of the just and of the unjust, the final judgment and end of the world, are parts of one great transaction." But to interpret thus, would be both to make the τάγμα (=τάξις), *series*, very short, consisting of only two items! and also to contradict the constant use of εἶτα which never stands for τότε, *then*, as indicating a point of specified time, but always *afterward, next*, denoting successive occurrence (Mark iv. 28; 1 Cor. xii. 28). It is a singular illustration of the power of a theory to warp the mind from the fixed meaning of words, that Calvin, while using the Latin text which rightly translated εἶτα, *postea*, yet goes on to comment in the use of *tunc*, utterly ignoring the difference of signification. By the words ἔπειτα and εἶτα, two separate epochs are distinctly marked; and it is a violation of all usage of terms to construe them otherwise. The interval between the first and second is stretching beyond 1800 years; how many ages will intervene between the second and third—who can tell?]—**the end**,—τέλος in this connection means *the termination* of the process of the resurrection, and stands correlatively to "the first fruits;" it marks the period of the resurrection of the rest of mankind who do not belong to Christ, yet among whom may be found some that are susceptible of the divine quickening (comp. Matt. xxv. 31; [where, at the general judgment, those on the right hand, by reason of their declared ignorance of Christ, are supposed, by many, to be those among the heathen who, by their fidelity to the light within them, and by their general kindness and charity, had evinced a state of mind which qualified them for a welcome into the society of believers. Consult Stier, Olsh., and Alford on this passage.]) The period, thus designated, is one which coincides with the end of the world, with the entire destruction of the present order of things, and with the coming in of the "new heavens and the new earth." [Alford, Hodge, and others, however, interpret τὸ τέλος absolutely, THE END, *i. e.*, of the world, when all shall be accomplished, and the mediatorial work of Christ is come to its conclusion]. As to what shall intervene between these two points—the first and the second resurrection—and as to the duration of the interval, there is nothing in the apostolic writings (save what is contained in the Apocalypse) clearly determined as yet. Thus far this whole subject is enveloped in darkness—just as in the prophets, the coming of Christ in the flesh, and His coming in glory were not definitely separated; but the intervening period, with all its history, lay for the time concealed. In the parousia or revelation of Christ, we may distinguish between the *beginning* of that manifestation of the Lord's power in the first resurrection, and in all that which is to precede or is connected with it, and its *consummation* in the general resurrection of the dead, and in the great events connected with that (Matt. xxv. 31 ff.); and this, in fact, amounts to a distinction between a second and third advent. Respecting "the end," he explains himself more fully by mentioning that which is to occur contemporaneously with it. —**when he shall deliver up the kingdom to the God and Father**,—From this passage some have unwarrantably inferred that we are to understand "the end" to be the end of Christ's kingdom, and so supply the words, 'of his kingdom.' But that which is asserted here of His kingdom is something appended, to which the course of the Apostle's reasoning does not immediately conduct him. The transfer of the kingdom to God and Father (who is at the same time the Father of Jesus Christ—the article prefixed embracing both words (τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ) as in Rom. xv. 6 f.) presupposes that revelation of Christ as the Sovereign of God's kingdom—as the Possessor of a power that covers heaven and earth (Matt. xxviii. 18), which takes place at His advent; and it is itself the termination of the mediatorial reign (*i. e.*, of that progressive struggle with the hostile powers of darkness, and subsequent subjection to God in the power of the redeeming and atoning work of the Lord, who is the royal Theanthropos, the God-Man, the perfect Vicar of God), and the commencement of the absolute, immediate, Divine rule, when the Son is to transfer unto the Father the whole universe as a realm made entirely subject to Him, having in it no opposing force, where He can rule with majesty serene and undisturbed; inasmuch as the Son who entered into the course of its history, and took part in its strife, has overcome all opposition, so that resistance no more is to be found.—["Nothing is here said which can affect either (1) His co-equality and co-eternity with the Father in the Godhead, which is prior to, and independent of this mediatorial work, and is not limited to the mediatorial kingdom; or (2) the eternity of His humanity: for that humanity ever was, and is subordinate to the Father; and it by no means follows that when the mediatorial kingdom shall be given up to the Father, the humanity in which that kingdom was won, shall be put off; nay, the very fact of Christ in the body being the first-fruits of the resurrection, proves that His body, as ours will endure for ever; as the truth that our humanity, even in glory, can only subsist before God *by virtue* of His Humanity, makes it plain that He will be *very man* to all eternity." ALFORD].* Βασιλεία here

*["The Scriptures constantly teach that Christ's kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and of His dominion there is no end. In what sense, then, can He be said to deliver up His kingdom? It must be remembered that the Scriptures speak of a threefold kingdom as belonging to Christ. 1. That which necessarily belongs to Him as a Divine person, extending over all creatures, and of which He can never divest Himself. 2. That which belongs to Him as the Incarnate Son of God, extending over His own people. This also is everlasting. He will for ever remain the Head and Sovereign of the redeemed. 3. That dominion to which He was exalted after His resurrection, when all power in heaven

means not the subjects of kingly rule—the kingdom so far as its *contents* are concerned, but the *royal power* itself, in its exercise—the reign of Christ. "Inasmuch as the work of Christ, founded upon His redemptive acts, proceeds towards a definite goal, it must needs come to a termination when this goal is reached." NEANDER.—The transfer takes place,—**when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power.**—Of course such only are meant as are anti-Christian and anti-Divine—the kingdom of Satan, with every thing appertaining to it, which holds supremacy and exercises power, whether it be demoniac (Eph. vi. 12; Col. ii. 15), or human that has become subject to demoniac powers. Calvin's supposition, that "powers legitimate and ordained by God," or Olshausen's, "that all rule, good and evil, even that of the Son," is here meant, is inconsistent with the connection (ver. 25), and also with the signification of καταργεῖν, *to put down*. The extermination of the powers of the higher spiritual world can be understood to denote only the destruction of their external activity—the stripping them of their power, but not of their existence (Neander).—But the whole idea of *a transfer* and of *a kingdom* is altered, if we assume the meaning here to be, that God shall be generally acknowledged as the Supreme Ruler (Theod. Estius, *etc.*; comp. *per contra* Osiander, p. 711). Unsatisfactory, also, is Meyer's conception of Christ as the under-regent—as it were, the life-bearer of God.—The explanation of the Fathers who interpret it of the leading of the elect to behold the face of God, the transfer of the heirs of the kingdom into the immediate communion and glory of God the Father; and that of the Reformers, who take it to denote the presentation of the risen members of the divine kingdom before God, *c. g.*, "He presents the elect to God, in whom, henceforth, the Father will reign *per sese* without intervening token, and in whom He will reveal His glory *per sese*, and not *in Christo* only,"—transcend the correct meaning of the words and the scope of the context. From this surrender of the kingdom, we are not to suppose that the eternal kingship of Christ is disowned or denied; for He is indeed the Eternal associate with God on the throne (σύνθρονος). This relationship is only, as it were, taken up in with the glory of the Father. After the great battle has been victoriously fought through, and the work of the Mediator has been finished up, then that rule which has been occupied in the conflict and mediation, naturally ceases. But inasmuch as every thing has at last been brought into subjection to the Father, and so the purpose of the mediatorial reign has been accomplished, the regal glory of the Son, so far from being annihilated thereby, has only been enhanced.

The fact of such a transfer of the kingdom ensuing upon the putting down of all alien rule, and not before, is next referred to a higher necessity, even to a divine decree, and on this it is made to rest (γάρ).—**For it must needs be that he reign until he hath put all enemies under his feet.**—The authority had in mind by the Apostle is Ps. cx. 1, "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit Thou at my right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool." From this it might be inferred that the subject of the verb θῇ, *hath put*, is God; and then, inasmuch as this verse expresses essentially the same thought as is found in the last clause of the previous verse, "when He shall have put down all rule," *etc.*, we must likewise suppose that God was intended there also. But it is evident that He who "puts down all rule," must be the same as the one who "gives up the kingdom;" and neither the reference to the Psalm (which is here not literally cited, but only appropriated, and freely handled), nor yet ver. 27, (where indeed God is the subject of ὑπέταξεν, *put under*, but so that a passive clause intervenes) constrains us to suppose that there is any other subject than Christ in this verse. And were it otherwise intended, we would, for the sake of clearness, naturally expect that God would be definitely mentioned both here and before καταργήσῃ (ver. 24), because these clauses are so closely connected with clauses where Christ is the expressed subject. From the phrase "all enemies," it is perfectly clear that the words "all rule" (πᾶσαν ἀρχήν) are not to be taken in a middle sense. The necessity here spoken of (δεῖ) is founded on a divine decree (Neander). Comp. Luke xxiv. 26, 46. The arch-enemy of all is he from whom all opposition to Christ and His kingdom proceeds (comp. Matt. xiii. 39); with him are connected all powers instrumental in carrying on this opposition, and every thing wherein this opposition is manifested—hence, also, death itself. Comp. what is said in Hebrews ii. 14, "that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, even the devil."—ἄχρις οὗ marks the point of termination. Only in case ἄχρις ἂν stood without οὗ could it mean also *so long as;* but such a rendering is decidedly opposed by the context (ver. 24) as well as by the aor. subj. (θῇ). The putting under foot denotes the most perfect subjection in connection with the deepest humiliation. Comp. Josh x. 24, where Joshua bade the captains of the men of war come near and put their feet upon the necks of the conquered kings of Canaan. A similar expression occurs in Rom. xvi. 20, "The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet." That which already has taken place in its essential principles through the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ (comp. Luke x. 18 f.; Jno. xvi. 11, 33), comes at last gradually to its fulfilment, being realized onward, step by step, until the grand termination is reached. Or, we may say, that that which was consummated by those acts in relation to Christ's person, and which His followers may regard as having been accomplished also for them (comp. 1 Jno. v. 4), is carried out at last in relation to the whole sphere of redemption along the lapse of ages, and finally comes to its complete fulfilment after the fearful conflicts of the last times

and earth was committed to His hands. This kingdom, which He exercises as the Theanthropos, and which extends over all principalities and powers, He is to deliver up when the work of redemption is accomplished. He was invested with this dominion in His mediatorial character for the purpose of carrying on His work to its consummation. When that is done, *i. e.*, when He has subdued all His enemies, then He will no longer reign over the universe as Mediator, but only as God; while His headship over His people is to continue for ever." HODGE].

Out of the whole number of foes here alluded to, the apostle brings prominently to view that one whose destruction forms the close of the forementioned subjugation.—**The last enemy (that) shall be destroyed (is) death.**—[So the English version renders Ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος. Ἔσχατος is an adjective used for an adverb of time. (Jelf. *gr. gram.* § 714, 2, b). Accordingly we should perhaps better translate: "Lastly, death, the enemy, shall be destroyed." Tyndale: "And at the laste, death, the enemy, schal be distried." Rheims: "And the enemie death shal be destroied last."*] This enemy is destroyed when the resurrection is complete. By this event the power of death is forever annulled, and there is no such thing more as dying or being dead. Death is here personified as in Rev. xx. 14. He is termed an enemy, inasmuch as he entered as a disturbing force into the original constitution of God, which was one of pure life and the unfolding of life. Moreover, in the destruction of death, the devil, —he who has the power of death—is rendered utterly powerless, as it were, in his last bulwark, and incapacitated for any injurious reaction upon the kingdom of God. But from this fact we are by no means justified in identifying death and the devil, as Usteri does.

That all hostile powers are finally done away, is still further established (ver. 27).—**For he hath put all things under his feet.**—The argument is either this, "He hath put everything under Him, hence also death;" or, more indirectly, "Inasmuch as God hath subjected every thing to Him, by this means a perfect harmony has been established, which would not be possible, unless death were done away." The apostle here introduces, without any formula of citation, words taken from Ps. viii. 7. (lxx. "*πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.*" "Thou hast put all things under his feet.") That he intended these words as a quotation, is seen from what follows. What the Psalmist said in relation to man whom God had endowed with divine majesty and worth, and established as lord over this lower creation, is referred anagogically by Paul to that person in whom the idea of humanity is perfectly realized; and in so doing he takes the word "all," on which the emphasis rests, in its most comprehensive sense. ["This may be called the hidden meaning of the Psalm, because it never would have been discovered without a further revelation, such as we find in the exposition given by the inspired apostles." Hodge]. To understand "God" as the subject here was, in part, very possible, ("since, indeed, He is the One who works through all things," Neander), and, in part, very natural, because of the obvious suggestion of the text of the Psalm.—He now turns back to the subject of the surrender of the kingdom, showing more fully that it included also the subjection of Christ himself. But before exhibiting this point positively, he obviates an unsuitable extension of the word "all," as though God himself might be included therein. This exception he states as something self-evident, and then introduces the positive counterpart.—**But when he shall have said,**—*ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ*; the subject here is God. The point intended is differently interpreted. Some take it that Paul here meant to explain the language of Scripture, and to obviate any misconception in regard to it, so that the word "said" refers back to the Scriptural expression, which is thus designated as a declaration of God himself. (Comp. on vi. 16.) In this case, "*when*" (*ὅταν*) would be equivalent to, 'in so far as,' or, 'in that,' *q. d.*, 'in that he said.' Others, like Meyer, regard it as an expansion of the thought, and as designating a future point of time, 'when he shall have declared,' *i. e.*, has publicly announced that the subjection has been complete, and the work of Christ finished,—**that all things have been subjected,**—Since this yields a good sense, it is not necessary to deviate from the ordinary use of "when," which prevails in the context.—**it is evident that**—We are here to supply, 'all things have been subjected,'—**excepting him who subjected all things to him.**—This observation might be attributed to the germs of the Gnostic view, which elevated Christ above the Father as an imperfect O. T. God. It is, however, unnecessary to suppose such a reference; and the remark may have also a purely dialectic significance, as implying, 'so far from this expression meaning, that God should be included in the "all," that, on the contrary, when he shall have said: all things have been subjected, the exception is manifest,' *etc.*—**And when all things shall have been subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject to him,**—The verbs *ὑποταγῇ* and *ὑποταγήσεται* may be both taken as middle, *subject themselves*, only with this difference, that in the former case the subjection is one grounded in the consciousness of a perfect weakness, and in the latter case, as an act of the highest willingness; or both verbs may be passive, *be subdued*, only with the distinction that in the former case the subjection is one of constraint, and in the latter of free self-determination. Both interpretations amount to the same thing. The self-subjection of the Son coincides with that surrender of the kingdom mentioned in ver. 24; and we must here either limit the idea of the Son to the human nature of Christ, from doing which the expression "the Son also himself," is sufficient to restrain us; or we must refer it to the church, the mystical body of Christ, for doing which, xii. 12 gives us no justification on account of the diversity of the expressions, "Son"—"Christ;" nor yet are we warranted in interpreting the self-subjection into the perfect oneness of thought (*πολλὴ ὁμόνοια*) between the Son and the Father, or into a manifestation of His dependence on God in respect to His glory. The Apostle here points to one of the deep things of the Godhead, *viz.*, that the coequal Son, who is

*[We here give R. Hall's criticism, which is worthy of note in this connection. "It may not be improper to remark that there is an inaccuracy in our common version, which so vitiates its application that it does not seem to sustain the conclusion to which the Apostle had arrived. It was his purpose to establish the perfection of our Saviour's conquest, the advancement of his triumphs, and the prostration of all enemies, whatever beneath his power. Now to say that "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death," by no means affords a proof of this position. Though death might be destroyed, and he the last enemy that should be destroyed, it would not thence appear but that other enemies might remain not destroyed. But the proper rendering is, "Death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed"].

Himself essentially God, even when at the highest point of His glory, subjects Himself, with all that has been subdued under Him, unto the Father, choosing even in His majesty as Lord of all to be dependant upon the Father wholly and forever. The title Son is given to Christ in our epistle, in only one other passage. "Christ gives the power conferred on Him, back into His Father's hands, not to possess it no more, but in order to possess it again, as He possessed it in communion with the Father, from all eternity, before the foundations of the world were laid." BURGER. "The historic Christ, as such, is perpetually distinguished from God. Christ will subject Himself, yet not in the same way as He subjected His enemies." NEANDER. ["The subjection here spoken of is not predicated of the eternal Logos, the second person of the Trinity, any more than the kingdom spoken of in ver. 24, is the dominion which belongs essentially to Christ as God. As there the word *Christ* designates the Theanthropos, so does the word *Son* here designate, not the Logos as such, but the Logos as incarnate." HODGE]. The adjuncts "also himself," serve to set forth more prominently the exalted character of the Son. ["Himself"—voluntarily. "Himself" is contrasted with "all things," so that it denotes the infinite excellence of the Son; and besides, as often, it signifies something *voluntary;* for the Son subordinates Himself to the Father; the Father glorifies the Son." BENGEL]. That by this subordination the Trinity itself becomes, as it were, dissolved, is a very strange assertion (de Wette); on the contrary, the absolute unity in the distinction of persons will only become the more entirely, conspicuous. Now comes the final clause with which this survey concludes, stating the object to be obtained — **in order that God may be the all things in all.**— This statement is used as the main authority for the support of the doctrine of a final restoration of all things. The expression, "be the all things," signifies primarily absolute supremacy, or rule, [without the intervention of mediators or subordinates, such as acted with a sort of delegated authority under God in the mediatorial kingdom.] But how are we to understand the other expression—"in all?" Is the adjective to be construed as masculine or neuter? On the former supposition its scope must be limited to believers, members of the kingdom that has been hitherto ruled by Christ (Meyer); and this entirely excludes the doctrine of restoration. On the other supposition, all created existences must be here understood, in which God will be the all determining power,—hence, also Satan and his angels included; and thus with this will come the cessation of damnation, and so the restoration of all things. But could the Apostle Paul, who puts the lost in contrast with the saved, as he does in i. 18 (comp. Phil. iii. 19), have had such a doctrine in mind? Still less indeed could he have intended any pantheistic absorption of all creatures in God, and so the annihilation of all distinct personality, since this is already opposed by the doctrine of the resurrection. If we take the words "in all" in a narrower sense it is natural to include in them also the angels (comp. Eph. i. 10), and to suppose not only the absolute supremacy of the divine will among them, but also an absolute communication and perfect revelation of the divine love, as intended. In both these things together there is included the complete manifestation of God's glory. According to Rom. viii. 19 ff. the expression "in all" might be extended to the entire irrational creation making the adjective neuter. The immediate context however does not conduct us to such an interpretation, though the idea is in itself correct and appropriate. Neander explains the thought thus: "that God may work with all things without the intervention of a Mediator."—If we take the expression "in all" in its widest sense, including therein also beings until then hostile to God, then we might with Calvin explain the expression "be all," so far as it bears on such parties to imply "that in their destruction the glory of God will be conspicuous." But although we may variously modify and limit the words "be all" according to the various capacities or receptivities of the creatures contemplated, yet we cannot include in it both the idea of glorification as shown in the highest self-communication of the Deity and also that which is shown in the destruction of the creature: and only when we look away from the subjective side, or have in view the absolutely objective universal sovereignty of God can we take the words "in all" in this comprehensive sense, so that in reference to beings that are hostile to God there will be meant here the removal of all opposition on their part and their absolute impotence. But the question is, whether in setting forth the consummation of the ways of God, or of His entire economy, such an interpretation of the expression "be all" suffices?—The problem here presented is, so to understand the word *destruction* (ἀπώλεια) that God's being 'all in all' is possible when understood even in the wider sense, and not simply as a controlling power in the hearts of the faithful; and so to explain the being 'all in all' that the idea conveyed by the destruction of the wicked shall not be altered. And it is a question whether this problem has been solved in the doctrinal method proposed by Beck, according to which the Scripture exhibits the destruction (ἀπώλεια) of the lost (unspiritual) soul as an ultimate result in which, as a second death, the whole being becomes pervaded by death, and so the very personality ceases in dying; or, in other words, the personal conscious life becomes annihilated, although all existence itself does not cease (*Bibl. Seelenlehre*, pp. 19, 40). This will then be more accurately conceived thus; 'that the kingdom of heaven, by means of a regeneration which with the purging away of all dross restores a pure state of life, obtains for itself a new organization of the heavens and the earth to be the theatre for the display of its own peculiar glory, and so becomes an immediate theocracy in the absolute and perpetual reign of God, without the human mediatorial form of Christ which had been assumed only for a season, but not therefore without His distinctive character as a Son which He holds in the being of the Triune God, where God is the fullness of life in all its purity and perfection in all the living. To enter however more fully into

this subject does not fall within the province of exegesis.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

[1. *The Gospel—its historical character.* In its essential elements the Gospel is not a system of abstract truths deduced by reason, but a summary of marvellous facts which have occurred in the history of the world through the direct interposition of God, and which were designed for man's salvation. Of these the great central ones are the appearing, expiatory death, resurrection and ascension of the long foretold Messiah, forming altogether the good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people. It was mainly in the proclamation and attestation of these facts that *preaching* originally consisted; and such must ever be one of the chief characteristics of evangelical preaching, differencing it from all other kinds of discourse. The ground on which it relies for acceptance must be, therefore, primarily of a historical kind—the testimony of sound and competent witnesses declaring plainly that the facts announced are so as stated. And in accordance with this, evangelical faith must ever have the form of a cordial belief in the testimony adduced, and of an acceptance of the facts unto the ends contemplated in them. If, then, the testimony be such as stands the test of the most searching scrutiny, and seems altogether unimpeachable, we may go on preaching and believing, undisturbed by any objections which human science or philosophy may be disposed to make. No argument can have available force against any stupenduous fact of which it may be said, "thus it was foretold ages ago, and thus it has come to pass as witnessed by a large number of honest and sane men." And in regard to such a fact we may feel assured that, let objectors argue as they may, it will prove its consistency with all other facts and truths of the world's history, and will also vindicate its importance by other manifestations accordant in dignity and kind with itself. It cannot stand alone. If *e. g.* it be a fact that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures," there was manifested here in human nature a power over death which, as happening by itself and for its own sake only, must ever remain an inexplicable phenomenon. Therein we behold a revelation of Divine Omnipotence and Love, which at once inspires hope, and seems to render the resurrection of others both possible and probable. The inference is one which nothing can hinder us from drawing and resting in. The main thing which concerns us, therefore, is the certainty of the underlying fact; and in regard to this we are not left in doubt. The resurrection of Christ is one of the best attested events in history. The skepticism which discards this must, to be consistent with itself, at the same time set at naught all history. And the faith which accepts this must, to be consistent with itself, accept the whole Gospel which centres in Jesus Christ, "who was declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead."]

2. *The Resurrection of Christ,—its import and bearings.* This great fact which, next to that of our Lord's atoning death, formed the main topic of the apostle's preaching, serves at once to illustrate and confirm the truth of man's salvation in a two-fold direction. 1. *Retrospectively.* That Christ rose from the dead in fulfilment of what He had, in part, hinted, and in part, definitely predicted before His death, furnishes abundant proof in favor of His incarnation and atoning death. Had He remained in the grave the conclusion would have been that He was nothing less than a false prophet, a betrayer, a blasphemer, who had suffered death justly; but then, what an inexplicable riddle his life would have been! Besides, how fatal to the faith and hope of Christians would such continuance under the power of death have been! There could be no forgiveness of sins through His blood, no life, no blessedness through His name! To follow Him in self denial and devotion were but to make life more miserable, and those who died believing in Him only perish like all the rest of mankind. But now having in truth arisen to an endless life by the power of God, He appears before as God's Holy One who could not see corruption—as the servant of the Lord, who, in his death, has been commissioned to bear *our* sins—as the righteous One who, having made His soul an offering for sin, would still prolong His days and see His seed, and through His knowledge justify many—as the Son to whom the Father hath given to have life in himself, and so could impart life to others—in short, as the one who is to abide forever as "the Way, the Truth and Life." 2. *Prospectively*, in relation to what must yet happen for the fulfilment of God's gracious consel. Through Christ, as the risen One, death, the wages of sin, is essentially destroyed. It has been so already, in so far as by His resurrection the atoning power of His death has been sealed. But it will be so still more, in so far as He, the Head of a new humanity, redeemed and restored to God, had passed out from under that death in which He had suffered the judgment of sin for all, into an imperishable life, and has thereby, been, as it were, set up, both *in* humanity and *for* it, as the principle and power of a new life, capable of vanquishing death and enduring unto immortality, and is now carrying on a most comprehensive work, first, *inwardly*, in creating the new man through the regenerating and quickening power of His Spirit, and, *next*, in developing this spiritual life throughout our entire organism. The life thus begun and developed, will be manifest, first, in those who belong to Him, when he shall appear again in glory (this is called the first resurrection); and then it will show itself in the rest of mankind—so far as through all the revelations of His life onward to its onward consummation some susceptibility for these can be awakened—until the work of redemption is accomplished, and all opposition is vanquished, and the power of death is entirely destroyed, and a new external realm is organized, suited to the inward perfection of the whole mass of redeemed men and celestial spirits, who are united in Christ as their Head, and in and with Him are made absolutely subjected to God—a realm pervaded in all its parts by the power of the Holy Love of God that is henceforth, to reg-

ulate all things. All that is not included in this new organization will utterly perish through obstinate resistance, being excluded from all the blessed realities of a universe that has entered into the Divine life with and in Christ.

[3. *The mediatorial reign of Christ.* The risen Saviour is declared in the Scriptures to have "ascended on high" and to be "set down on the right-hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens," "far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age, but also, in that which is to come." His ascension was, therefore, the inauguration into universal sovereignty of the incarnate Logos, the God-Man, or Theathropos—a sovereignty which had indeed been prepared for from the beginning, and also had been in a measure, exercised in another form (for the Word or Logos had been in the world before, as a Light which lighteth every man), but which was not actually entered upon until after the successful achievement of the priestly work on which it was conditioned. It was *because* "He had been found in fashion as a man, and had humbled himself, and become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, that God exalted Him and gave Him a name above every name, that to Him every knee should bow and every tongue confess that He was Lord." And the ulterior end of all this was "the glory of God, the Father." But, although now reigning in heaven, it cannot yet be said that His kingdom has come, since its *glory* is not manifest. This is an object still to be anticipated and prayed for. Meanwhile, a great preparation is making for its advent by the ministration of the Spirit; and this dispensation will go on until He who has gone to take unto Himself the kingdom, shall return in power and great glory, gather about Him the servants whom He had entrusted with His gifts, and appoint the faithful to their larger trusts of dominion under him. It is at this point that the Redeemer's kingdom may be fairly said to begin in its perfect form upon the earth; as it is then that the proclamation will be made, "The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign unto the ages of ages." What the particular nature of this administration will be, this is not the place to discuss. But as this reign will have a beginning, and a specific object, it is natural to conclude that it will also come to an end, when this object shall have been accomplished. And that there will be a fixed period for its perfect accomplishment, when Christ can say "it is finished,"—just as when He made this same solemn declaration on completing His work as Mediator and Sacrifice on the cross, we have every reason to infer from the very fullness of power that dwelt in Him. To be ever doing and never to have done, especially in such a work as the overthrowing of rebellion, would be an imputation upon His all-sufficiency. We must, therefore, look for a time when the object for which He took upon Himself our nature shall be accomplished, and the glory of His victory shall shine forth in unquestionable splendor and majesty At *what* moment this crisis will arrive, we know not; but we know that it will not come until after a long series of mighty events, both blessed and awful, of the nature of which we have some foreshadowing in the book of Revelation. The conclusion of all these will be the general resurrection, and the final judgment which shall determine the ultimate destinies of all the righteous and the wicked. This will be "the end," when Christ shall deliver up this mediatorial reign unto the Father that appointed Him, and God shall rule, just as He did before the apostasy of Satan and the fall of man, throughout a universe, untroubled by the presence of evil and hence not needing the intervention of a theanthropic Mediator and his subordinates.

Here certain questions arise. (1) What shall become of the wicked when God is the "all in all?" Shall they be restored? or annihilated? or still continue to exist in some place outside the sphere of God's presence and glory? Certainly not restored; for in the general judgment they are sentenced to "depart" as "cursed into everlasting fire." Not annihilated; for then where would be the necessity of the *everlasting* fire? We must, therefore, suppose them to be shut up, as it were, in some prison house, in some outer darkness, where they shall be as if they were not; and neither the sight, nor the hearing, nor the influence of them shall, in any way disturb the blessedness which shall reign supreme throughout the realms of God, the Father, in whose presence there will be a fullness of joy forever and ever.—(2) What are to be the relations of the glorified God-Man unto the people whom He has redeemed? That the Logos will cast off the nature which He had assumed, and become as before the incarnation, can hardly be supposed. If not, how will the surrender of the kingdom to the Father then affect His previous position as the head of the Church?—Is His sovereignty over believers to cease, and His followers to be brought into any more direct connection with God the Father, than before? The intimations of Scripture in regard to the perpetuity of Christ's Headship hardly allow of such a supposition. And yet, a change of administration in some sort is very plainly predicted. God is to be the "all in all" in some special and more perfect sense than He was before the surrender. It may be that on the quelling of rebellion, and on the ingathering of all the redeemed (the veil of all mediatorship being removed) there will shine forth upon the immediate apprehension of saints and angels, as the result of this long and wonderful history, far richer displays of the Divine wisdom, power and glory, than ever were witnessed before, and that in that beatific vision their happiness is to be perfected. But on this point the wisest course, perhaps, will be to suspend all speculation, and leave the subject in that sublime suggestiveness where the language of the apostle leaves it—"God shall be all in all."]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—Vv. 1, 2. HED.: Do not forget what you so often hear, nor yet adulterate the savor of the word. Thousands hear and receive not—receive and keep not—keep and feel not the word of life. This is the great condemnation and blindness of these times!—If thou re-

ceivest the word, then thou art already blessed, not only because thou hadst a sure hope of blessedness, but also because thou hast within thee the earnest of the future world, and with this the foretaste of blessedness in thine heart (Heb. vi. 5).—It is not enough to have begun well, if the end does not also accord with the beginning. He who apostatizes from the faith, has believed in vain, and incurs a greater damnation than if he had never believed (2 Pet. ii. 21).—Vv. 3, 4. Christ is the center of the Holy Scriptures, the foundation of our faith, especially in His death for our sins and His resurrection for our righteousness. Without the knowledge of these facts all science is ignorance.—The Holy Spirit explains through the apostles what He had formerly spoken through the prophets concerning Christ.—Ver. 5 ff. Upon sorrow follows joy: thou weepest because Jesus thy Friend has concealed Himself; thou wilt rejoice again when He shall reveal Himself unto thee (John xvi. 22).—Hast thou sinned, repent; then will Jesus appear to you with His grace (Matt. xxvi. 75).—Who can doubt the resurrection of Christ? It has been confirmed by some hundreds of witnesses.—Though thou hast not seen Jesus the risen One with thine eyes, yet behold Him in faith, and thou wilt hereafter be certain to behold Him in glory (John xx. 29; 1 Pet. i. 8).—Ver. 8ff. The grace of God is shown where the greatest of sinners are; and such often become the most edifying preachers, when through the grace of God they have been led to cast off the yoke of sin (Ps. li. 13).—The sins committed before conversion are indeed forgiven; but they leave behind them a troubling remembrance for our humiliation, especially when others have been scandalized thereby, and the world knows of them.—Heb: Humble boasting, holy pride, to say to Satan, 'God has become strong in us!' But what does this word mean in the mouth of the godless? Are they partakers of Divine grace? Does it work in them to God's glory?—Ver. 12 f. It is all the same whether we deny the resurrection by word or deed.—The articles of our Christian faith hang together like a chain. When one is broken, the whole is broken. This is what makes error so fearful. Let a person guard himself at the start, lest he fall from one error into another.—Ver. 15. Preachers should see to it that they do not make themselves false witnesses for God by producing lying fables, and turning aside from the truth of the Gospel in their teachings.—Ver. 16. Those who deride the resurrection of the dead are like wild boars of the forest who would root up and overturn the very foundations of the faith. But they will not succeed. The truth will stand while they perish.—Ver. 17. Faith must lay hold upon Christ as a *living* Saviour, and enter with Him into eternal life.—Ver. 19. The simple life of the children of this world is indeed more miserable than the cross-life of believers. Nevertheless that man is to be deemed the most miserable of all, who, while not believing in the resurrection of Christ and eternal life, yet subjects himself legally to the rules of Christianity and endures persecution for its sake.—Ver. 20. A true member of Christianity who, without any self-deception, carries in himself the witness of his spiritual resurrection has no cause to be afraid of death—no more than he has to be afraid of that natural sleep, which the weary court for their refreshment.—Through the resurrection of Christ we receive all power unto life, and upon this there follows the full harvest of the general resurrection.—Ver. 22. Let no one be astonished that we shall all be made alive on account of the Lord Jesus: for if one man was able to introduce death upon all; why should not also one man, who is at the same time God, and who makes all things alive, restore life to all the dead?—Ver. 24. Spener: The Lord lays aside His previous sway over His kingdom, where he commanded His gospel to be preached, and equipped and sent out His servants into the work, and poured out His Spirit and His blessing upon the word given, in order that men might be converted, enlightened, regenerated, justified, sanctified, disciplined by the cross, and protected against the devil, and where He now wins over him one victory after another—this supremacy he lays aside with the public and actual attestation in heaven before God and all the angels and saints that He had fulfilled His Father's will, and had finished his work; and, together with this he will then, as their Head, present his believing ones to the Father as henceforth fully blessed and fit for the enjoyment of a perfect felicity for ever more. *Regnum non cessabit, sed modus regnandi per fidem.* (Chemnitz).—Ver. 25 ff. After Christ has overcome everything in the subjects of His kingdom, there yet remains Death, who, so long as they lie in their graves, still in a certain sense holds them captive; but in the resurrection Death too is destroyed, and in its place there reigns eternal life (Rev. xx. 14; xxi. 4.—Ver. 28. In the surrender of his kingdom, Christ, as the God-Man, the Head and Mediator of the church, will show also His own subjection to the Father.—For the present, and so long as the work of restoration endures, Christ is called "the *all in all*" (Col. iii. 11); but when the saints are made perfect, and, having been freed from all sin and its consequences, are surrendered to the Heavenly Father, then, by virtue of Christ's accomplished mediation, will the Heavenly Father together with the Son and Holy Spirit, become directly "the all things in all" to them, and fill their understanding with His Divine wisdom, their wills with His Divine holiness, their desires with His Divine sweetness and joy, their bodies with heavenly glory and delight, and, in short, their entire selves wholly with Himself forever and ever. Spener: God will then hold converse with His saints without any mediation, since they will see Him as He is, and He, without obstruction, will have glory over all, and shine in all and through all.

Berlenburger Bibel:—Ver. 1 f. The Gospel must be *inwardly* received, and for this result God must prepare, enlighten, and sanctify the heart. This happens when we yield to the Holy Spirit. Then the hungry heart receives the Word with joy, and learns to behold Jesus and His salvation there, because it sees itself to be so empty and destitute of grace.—It belongs to the proper acceptance of the Word that we learn to abide fast in known truth; since the know-

ledge of our need ever drives us to our own hearts, where the Lord Jesus and His holy word are implanted. God's gift and calling are without repentance. God has taken us once for all into His care. If we will only abide therein, nothing can be wanting to us in the future, for our salvation will never cost Him more than it did at the beginning. For our sakes, however, it is, said, "Hold fast that which thou hast "(Rev. iii. 11).—The tidings that 'Christ lives,' and that this brings after it the resurrection of the others is so important that, for the sake of it, Paul is willing to let every thing else go. If the truth of Christ's history is not *inwardly* confirmed, then an hour of temptation may easily come when, for many, all foundation in Christ may be shaken by reason and unbelief, as well as by the assaults of foes.—Ver. 3. When the soul wrestles against sin, it will often appear to it as if Christ had not died for our sins. But Christ *has* died, and thereby expiated our sins, in order that we, being planted together with Him in the likeness of His death, may die unto sin, and live unto righteousness (1 Pet. ii. 24). We then truly experience that Christ was slain for our sins in the flesh, when, through His death, our own sin is also daily slain. How can we comfort ourselves in the death of Jesus Christ if we still live in those sins unto which we must die?—Sharp compunctions of heart in repentance under the law are needed, ere we can become fit for, and participate in the super-abundant grace of Christ. This pearl belongs only to the pure, and not to swinish hearts which trample it under their feet. —Ver. 4. Where the new life does not exist, there can be no power or certainty in the resurrection of Christ. Indeed, men are rather ashamed of it in works, when they confess it only with the mouth.—If we believe not the power of Christ's life, then we have neither the will nor the power to be free from sin. But if such truths are not made known in power, how will men be disposed to receive them, and to stand therein?—Ver. 5. It was necessary that Christ should reveal Himself also as a living one; for in so doing He has adapted Himself to our understandings; for he, who proposes to impart a great light to any one, does this gradually, for the sake of those weak eyes which could not endure a strong light let in upon them at once.—The seeing of Christ bodily did not help those Jews who believed not. We must therefore know Him in Spirit, and learn to recognize Him as present in our hearts.—He must dwell in us by faith, speak in us and through us, enlighten, sanctify, and purify us, as He needs did it in Paul.—Ver. 9. This is what a scholar of Christ learns from his Master, when, as a weary one, he comes to the "Lowly in heart," *viz.*, the deepest humility.—Ver. 10. Whatever of good we have or do, is all owing to the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. This grace, then, by which Christ designs to live in us, we should not suffer to remain in us to no purpose.—When we are in Jesus, we learn to arrogate nothing to ourselves exclusively, but to lay the greatest gifts of grace humbly at the feet of God, and to be as if we had them not. Only the grace of God must not be suffered to lie idle in us. This is an essential part of holiness, to unite with the holy and the glorified in heaven in casting all crowns, all praise, and honor, and glory, at the feet of God and the Lamb, and to confess, "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but Thine be the praise." In this way a soul sinks and loses itself in God, who is the source of its being, just as a drop of water is merged in the great sea, and becomes again what it was in the beginning.—Ver. 14. If we have no living Saviour, whereupon then does the whole Christian religion rest? All grace, forgiveness, righteousness, springs from the resurrection of Christ, and is founded thereupon.—Ver. 17. The greatest fruit of the resurrection is deliverance from those sins for which Christ died. Then does our faith become true, and firm, and actual. — Ver. 19. Men who long after pleasure and worldly delights, and riches, and honor, have some actual good here; but it is only a seeming good. But if Christians, who make the life of God, even eternal life, their chief end, and hope for the same, and strive after it, have only a hope of it, and not the actual enjoyment and the substance of it, then are they of all persons the most miserable.—Ver. 25. "He must reign"—this is not yet fulfilled, but it is in process of consummation, and it must pass through many stages ere it comes to the end.—Ver. 26. The appropriation of the ransom involves the removal of all that which deserves to be called death. The full consummation of this is indeed to be deferred unto the end; but since so much precedes, we cannot doubt the result.—Ver. 27. All created things, in the end, become subordinate to their rightful Lord, and become so subject as to stand under Him in whom God had created them in the beginning.—Ver. 28. The divine subjection of the Son of God unto the Father will bring with it something more glorious than His previous sovereign rule. Sin and imperfection will no more be found in any creature; but every thing will be directly ruled by God, each in its own measure, just as the humanity of Jesus was ruled by His divinity: hence, there will be no more any need of governing through the person of a Mediator.—When God shall become "all in all," and when the creatures made subject to God and Christ are thoroughly penetrated by the Spirit of God in all their being and powers, so that they with God, and God with them, shall become one spirit, then will the future holy and righteous world, wherein Christ has ruled, lose itself, as it were, in the still all-blessed eternity; yet, it will not thereby pass away, but only enter into the sweetest state of peace, where we shall know by experience as little of what is meant by devil, sin, death, wrath, or hell, as was known of these things when as yet all creatures lay concealed in the eternal creative power of God, or when, in the beginning of their creation, they were all alike very good.—O, what a depth of riches, wisdom, righteousness, mercy, and love in God!

HEUBNER:—Ver. 1 f. In regard to every new doctrine that is propounded, we must inquire first whether it is consistent with the original apostolic doctrine, and whether we have reason for changing the old faith. Thoughtlessly to change our faith is a matter which touches our salvation. An unchanging adherence to primitive Christianity must be a fundamental principle

with the Christian; he who objects to this, ceases to be one.—Ver. 3 f. Christianity is: 1. established upon accredited facts; 2. exceedingly simple. Its sum is: 1. the atonement through Christ; 2. the divine acceptance of it proved by the resurrection; and 3. the fruit of redemption, viz., our future glory. If Christ's death purifies us from sins, justifies us, and obligates us to die unto sin, so does His burial show us how we should conceal ourselves from the world, and avoid its temptations; and the resurrection gives us new eternal life, that we may long after heavenly things and strive to obtain them.—Ver. 9. In all that we have become through God, we should never forget what we once were. The greater our former humiliation, the more wonderful the height to which God raises us.—Ver. 10. The humble recognition of divine grace characterizes all saints.—Humility does not require the ignoring of what we are, and what we have performed; but we must give God the honor.—LUTHER: "Of myself I have enough to humble and crush me; but on and in God I have reason to be proud, and to be glad at His gifts, and to rejoice, and triumph, and boast. But it is all to the praise and glory of God." Without humility, high achievements, distinguished success and labors bring us into great danger, and make us the more guilty before God.

W. F. BESSER:—Ver. 2. All, all is given to us by the grace of God. He calls us through the gospel; He works faith; He makes us happy in the fellowship of His dear son, and not so much forces us into such happiness as keeps us back from the iniquity, and the unfaithfulness, and the unthankfulness of those who refuse the gospel (Heb. xii. 25), or who turn from it after they have received it.—Vv. 2–4. Preserve us, O Lord, by thy Word! Grant us such a hearing of the Word that we may derive from its proclamation a clearer knowledge of its chief facts, the proper seat and fountain of gospel life, and may look ever more profoundly, even to the very foundation whereon our salvation is based.

VERS. 1–20. Pericope for Easter. 1: The Christian's faith is a well-grounded one; it rests, a. upon our own experience of its beatific power (vv. 1, 2); b. upon Christ's holiness and truth, confirmed by His death and resurrection (3); c. upon several divine confirmations of the mission of Jesus, among which the resurrection is the chief, established by many witnesses (4–7); d. upon the continual operations of Christianity (the conversion of Paul, the spread of Christianity), which are evidently a work of divine grace (8–10). 2. *The progressive stages of Christian faith.* a. The knowledge of the gospel from its preaching, which one has often heard and considered (1), and has understood as to its great object (2); b. a firm conviction of the truth of the history of Jesus, His death and resurrection; c. experience of the power of the grace of God in one's own heart, which sheds a light in the soul (8); and puts us to shame, and discloses our former hostility to God (9); but also creates us anew unto good works (10). 3. *The close connection between doctrine and history in Christianity.* On vv. 3, 4, compare Dr. Steinkopf in "*One Lord, one faith,*" p. 189 f. *Three chief pillars of the Christian faith.* a. Christ's death for our sins sweetens to every believer that death which appears so fearful to the unbeliever or formal Christian. b. His burial and rest in the grave eclaircises the view of the Christian as he looks into the grave so dark and fearful. c. His victorious resurrection has stamped upon the Saviour's person a doctrine and word the seal of divinity, and is the sure pledge of our resurrection. On ver. 10th see Harm's "Winterpostille." Man's work, without God's grace, is, a. low, bad and vain; b. through, with, and in God's grace it is glorious, righteous, and enduring.—Ver. 13. In all the propositions which we receive, we should consider their bearings upon faith.—Ver. 17 ff. He who takes from us faith in Christ, snatches away all consolation. The Christian faith, without a future life, is a thing most irrational and comfortless; since Christianity would then impose upon its confessors the severest self-denials, conflicts and sacrifices, and in earthly things insure us nothing; and Christians would then cleave to a deceptive image, and contemn the only real thing which remains to them. Earthly life, without its consummation in eternity is a vain sport.—Ver. 20. The resurrection of Christ as the entrance into an eternal, indestructible life, is the pledge of eternal life for us—not simply a proof for the possibility of our resurrection.—Ver. 22. Our mortal first parent begat mortal men. Christ has the right and the power to quicken all again; this happens through our spiritual union with Him.—Ver. 24 ff. The history of Christ will not come to its end for a long time. The most important thing is still in advance.—So long as the Messianic kingdom stands, God's glory is mediately bound to this economy. Every thing which God does, He does through the Messiah. This economy, when it has fulfilled its object, will give place to the immediate reign of God. God, as Lord and Father, will reign immediately over all, and impart Himself directly to all, without the intervention of a mediator. The use of the Scriptures, and of the sacraments, will cease, because no more needed.—Ver. 26. *The victory which Christ has achieved over death: a.* What death had been for us without His resurrection. *b.* How Christ has conquered him through His resurrection.

[I. BARROW:—Ver. 3. *The death of Christ.* 1. Its nature—a true and proper death. 2. Some peculiar adjuncts, which commend it to our regard as being, *a.* a result of God's eternal decree; *b.* a matter of free consent and compact between the Father and Son; *c.* anciently prefigured and predicted; *d.* executed by God's hand and providence; man concurring; *e.* the death of a person so holy and so excellent. 3. The principles and impressive and meritorious causes thereof. *a.* It originated in the love of God the Father, and in the love of the Son. 4. The ends aimed at, its fruits and effects. *a.* The illustration of God's glory. *b.* The dignifying and exalting of the Lord Jesus. *c.* The salvation of mankind. 5. The practical influences which its consideration should have; *a.* should beget the highest degree of love and gratitude toward God and Christ; *b.* should excite in us great faith and hope in God; *c.* should comfort us and satisfy conscience in regard to guilt; *d.*

should discover unto us the heinousness of our sins; *e.* should work in us kindly contrition and remorse; *f.* should deter us from the repetition of sins; *g.* should engage us to patient submission and resignation to God's will; *h.* should oblige us to the deepest mortification in conformity to Christ's death; *i.* should engage us to the fullest measure of charity toward our brethren; *j.* should bind us to yield us up wholly to the service of our Saviour.]

R. STIER:—Vv. 1–10.—*The three pillars of our faith.* 1. Scripture—giving the account of Christ beforehand. 2. History—proving Scripture fulfilled. 3. The effects of grace in converting the bitterest of foes, such as Paul.

[I. NEWTON:—Ver. 20. *The Lord is risen, indeed;* as proven by reliable testimony. 1. The witnesses were competent judges of what they asserted, as is evident: *a.* from their numbers; *b.* from the nature of the fact. 2. They were faithful and upright witnesses. *a.* Their writings proved them well meaning. *b.* Had no advantage to gain. *c.* They met with success such as God only could give. 3. There is besides the witness of an ever-present Spirit, which takes of the things of Christ, and shows them to us.

IBID:—Vv. 21–22. *Death by Adam, life by Christ.* 1. The malady. *a.* Death moral. *b.* Death natural. *c.* Death eternal. 2. The cure. *a.* Deliverance from condemnation. *b.* Deliverance from the power of sin. *c.* Deliverance from the fear and power of death. *d.* Eternal blessedness and glory.

A. BUTLER:—Ver. 22. *The power of the resurrection of Christ.* 1. A great public manifestation of His authority over the power of physical decay and death. 2. This power exercised with a view to the beings He came to redeem. 3. Consequently, the resurrection power did not cease after Christ's departure, but, on the contrary, it was not till then adequately in action. 4. The final consummation of the resurrection work to be greatly desired.

R. HALL:—Vv. 26. *Death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed.* 1. Nature of this enemy, and why called the last. 2. The manner and the successive stages in which our Lord has already conquered in part, and will completely conquer this last enemy.

H. MELVILL:—*The termination of the mediatorial kingdom.* 1. Christ is now vested with a kingly authority, which He must hereafter resign. 2. As a consequence of this resignation, God himself will become all in all to the universe].

B. Refutation of the impugners of the resurrection of the dead (2) *from the inconceivableness of certain facts, except on its supposition.*

CHAP. XV. 29–34.

29 Else what shall they do which are baptized [have themselves baptized, *οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι*] for the dead, if the dead rise not [are not raised, *οὐκ ἐγείρονται*] at all? why are they then baptized [do they have themselves baptized, *βαπτίζονται*] for the dead?
30 [*om.* the dead. *ins.* them, *αὐτῶν*[1]]? And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?
31 I protest by your[2] rejoicing [by the boasting which I have concerning you,[2] brethren, *νὴ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν, ἀδελφοί*[3]] which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily.
32 If after the manner of men [with the views of common men, *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*] I have [*om.* have] fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let [me? If the dead rise not, let] us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die.
33 Be not deceived: evil communications [associations, *ὁμιλίαι*] corrupt good manners
34 [useful habits, *ἤθη χρηστά*[4]]. Awake to righteousness [awake at once, as it is right, *ἐκνήψατε δικαίως*], and sin not; for some have not the knowledge of God: I speak[5] *this* to your shame.

[1] Ver. 29.—The *Rec.* has *τῶν νεκρῶν* instead of *αὐτῶν*, but the reading is feebly attested. [It has for it D. (3rd hand), L. Syr. (Pesch.) Chrys. Theodt. Oecum. Theophyl. and Jacob (Nisib.); but against it A. B. D. (1st hand), E. F. K. Sinait. 20 cursives, Ital. Vulg. Goth. Copt. Basm. Syr. (later), Arm. Orig. and several Greek and Latin writers. *Alford* calls it a mechanical repetition of the last words of the preceding clause,—C. P. W.]

[2] Ver. 31.—Others have *ἡμετέραν*. *Meyer* thinks that *ὑμετέραν* was not understood, and *ἡμετέραν* seemed demanded by *ἣν ἔχω*. It has however the weight of evidence against it.

[3] Ver. 31.—The *Rec.* leaves out *ἀδελφοί* with D. E. F. G. L. several Ital. versions, the later Arm. Orig. Chrys. Theodt. Damasc. Ambrst.; but A. B. K. Sinait. Vulg. Syr. (both) Goth. Basm. Arm. Aeth. Arab. and Slav. Dial. Aug. Pel. Bede insert it. Some of these add *μου*. C. P. W.]

[4] Ver. 33.—The *Rec.* has *χρῆσθ'*, and *Lachmann* edits *χρήσθ'* but they have no good MSS to support them. Clemens Alex. and Amphilochius (of Leon.) have the word thus abbreviated to constitute with the previous syllable a spondee; in our passage read as an iambic trimeter acataletic, which the Latins call *senarius*. *Winer*, Gram. of the N. T. § 69.—C. P. W.]

[5] Ver. 34.—*Lachmann* and *Tischendorf* have *λαλῶ*. The *Rec.* gives *λέγω* on equally good authority. [The former is sustained by B. D. E. Sinait. Dial. Several Latin versions and Armbrst. have *loquor*. The latter is favored by A. F. G. K. L., Chrys. Theodt. The Vulg. (Flor.) and two Latin and one Vulg. MSS. have *dico*—C. P. W.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 29.—**Else what shall they do,** — The connection here with what precedes involves some difficulties. [As Stanley remarks: "it is one of the most abrupt to be found in St. Paul's Epistles. He leaves the new topic just at the moment when he has pursued it, as it were, to the remotest point, and goes back to the general argument as suddenly as if nothing had intervened. The two instances most similar are v. 9, ii. 6, 8; 2 Cor. vi. 14; vii. 1. Here, as there, the confusion may possibly have arisen from some actual interruption in the writing or the material of the letter; the main argument proceeding continuously from ver. 20 to ver. 29, and the whole intervening passage being analogous to what in modern composition would be called a note"]. Inasmuch as ἐπεί, *since*, ordinarily indicates a connection with what immediately precedes, Meyer insists upon our interpreting it so here, *q. d.*, 'for if there is nothing in this development of human history onward to the end, when God shall be all in all, then what shall they do, etc.' Such a construction can be maintained only in so far as we regard the resurrection as the chief event in this final consummation. Neander, on the contrary, says: "We must suppose a digression to begin at ver. 22, since, at that point, there opened upon the Apostle's view a prospect of the whole process of the world's development proceeding from the redemption of Christ. He started with the idea of the necessary connection which the resurrection to eternal life has with Christianity; and with this he now proceeds." [The ellipsis here may be thus supplied: 'The dead are certainly to be raised, else what shall they do, *etc.*' (HODGE); or, inserting it after "else," 'if it be as the adversaries suppose, what, *etc.*' (Alford)]. —The question here suggests the utter uselessness of the practice he is about to adduce in confirmation of his position. "Every baptism that you perform in behalf of the dead, would be without meaning, if those who deny the resurrection were in the right. He indicates the subjective absurdity of the proceeding in this case." MEYER.—**who are baptized for the dead,** —How are we to understand these words? The simplest explanation of the act here spoken of is, the suffering of one's self to be baptized for the benefit of deceased persons, or in their stead, so as to redound to their advantage, *i. e.*, that the salvation mediated by baptism, might fall to their lot, so that those who themselves died unbaptized, might pass for baptized, and thus have part in the resurrection and in the kingdom of Christ. A custom of this sort is discoverable in subsequent times; yet, however, only among heretical sects, such as the Cerinthians and the Marcionites (comp. Epiph. *haer.* 28, 3; Tertull. *de resurr.* 48; *adv. Marc.* 5, 10; *Chriss.* i. h. l.). The article before νεκρῶν, *dead*, points to definite cases ('for *the* dead' in question). "We might imagine that many, having come to the exercise of faith, resolved to receive baptism, but died ere the rite could be performed. This was so much the more likely to have been the case, inasmuch as according to xi. 30, there was an epidemic prevalent. If, then, a relative had suffered himself to be baptized in the conviction that he was only doing what the deceased would have done had he survived, the proceeding would not have been quite so superstitious." NEANDER. But it is probable that this custom could have sprung up so early, and could have been mentioned by the Apostle without disapproval, when it was so inconsistent with his fundamental views of faith and of its efficiency for the attainment of salvation?—The latter, indeed, is perhaps supposable, since he has here primarily to do only with the testimony which might be adduced from an actual occurrence; respecting the relation of which, however, to the truth, there was no need of his explaining himself.* Bisping considers the use of the third person ("what shall they do") as an indirect intimation of disapproval. [And so Alford: "There is in these words a tacit reprehension of the practice which it is hardly possible altogether to miss. Both by the third person and by the article before βαπτ. he indirectly separates himself and those to whom he is writing from participation in, or approval of the practice." He translates οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι 'those who are in the habit of being baptized,' not οἱ βαπτισθέντες. The distinction, he says, is important as affecting the interpretation]. Indeed, that Paul, as well as the other apostles, exercised a counteracting influence upon this custom, may be inferred from the fact that it afterwards vanished out of the orthodox church, and was perpetuated only among heretics. It is by no means improbable, that the high estimation of baptism, at so early a period, had acquired a superstitious taint. Since the deeply-rooted heathenish notion of the magical influence of sacred rites might easily have been preserved, or at least, have re-appeared, among those of whom the Apostle asserts that they were yet carnal, and who took so low a position in their estimate of spiritual gifts. This view is to be maintained all the more decidedly from the circumstance that all other views are, in part, opposed to the ordinary use of terms, and in part, improbable, and arbitrary on other grounds. But what we have adduced cannot well be questioned.—Proceeding from the signification of ὑπέρ here pre-supposed, *viz: in behalf of*, Olshausen could have interpretated it to imply that it was done *for the benefit of* the dead, in so far as a definite number (pleroma) must needs be baptized ere the second advent

*[In similar style Hodge accounts for Paul's appeal to a wrong custom. "This method of arguing against others from their own concessions, is one which the Apostle frequently employs. When his mind is full of a particular subject, he does not leave it, to pronounce judgment on things incidentally introduced. Thus, in chap. xi. 5, when treating of women speaking in the church unveiled, he expresses no disapprobation of their speaking in public, although he afterwards condemned it. A still more striking example of the same thing is to be found x. 8, where he speaks of the Corinthians "sitting at meat in an idol's temple," without any disapprobation of the thing itself, but only of its influence on the weaker brethren. Yet, in x. 14–22, he proves that the thing itself was an act of *idolatry*. The entire disappearance of this custom in the orthodox church, although other superstitious observances, not less objectionable, soon prevailed, is probably to be referred to the practice, having been forbidden by the Apostle as soon as he reached Corinth. This may have been one of the things which he left to be set in order when he came xi. 34."]

and resurrection could ensue; but this view appears in itself questionable, since there is nothing in the context intimating it, and it inclines to another signification of words, *viz*: 'instead of the dead,' *i. e.*, to fill up the gap made by these deceased. But this interpretation would be devoide of significance, and also, in respect to the use of language, very doubtful. Luther's translation, "over the dead," *i. e.*, over their graves, is opposed: 1. by the N. T. use of language which no where takes ὑπέρ with the genitive in a local sense; 2. by a lack of all historical trace of any such burial ceremony in apostolic times. Still less admissible is the explanation that applies it to the baptism of the *Clinici*, those upon the bed of death, *jamjam morituri* (Estius), or, *quum mortem ante oculos positam hebeant* (Bengel); since the words could not mean this, and besides we hear nothing of the baptism of the *Clinici* at this time. Equally untenable is the reference of the words "in behalf of the dead" to Christ (the plural here being taken in a general sense to designate the category [as Wordsworth,]; since water-baptism would require the preposition εἰς, and to the blood-baptism no allusion whatever can be found in the context, and the word is never used in this sense by Paul. Besser interprets still differently: "Not a few heathen [convinced by the sight of a believer's triumph over death] would allow themselves to be baptized for the sake of those deceased ones whom they had seen to depart in peace and joy—and before the dying beds and graves over which there seemed to flourish an unfading hope; in order to pass from death into life in company with those who slept in Christ." Here ὑπέρ is taken in the sense of, *on account of, because of*, [not, to their *advantage*, but, out *of admiration*, or *love* for them], as in Rom. xv. 9. "That the Gentiles might glorify God for (ὑπέρ) his mercy; as it is written, *For this cause* I will confess to thee among the Gentiles and sing unto thy name."*

[The most favorite interpretation for the last half century is that of Lightfoot and Rosenmüller, adopted by Robinson in his Lexicon, which takes βαπτιζόμενοι in the sense of 'being immersed in sufferings,' as parallel to 'being in jeopardy,' in the next clause. Referring to Mark x. 33, 39, and Luke xii. 50, it takes ὑπέρ in the sense of ἕνεκα, and τῶν νεκρῶν for death. The complete meaning of the words then would be, 'those who have been overwhelmed with calamities, trials and sufferings, in the hope of the resurrection or with the expectation that the dead would rise.' But the objections to this view are that the words are here taken in an unusual and unnatural sense, to which we are not to resort, unless compelled by some most evident reason; and also, the ellipsis implied is much too harsh to be admitted. Bloomfield and Barnes follow the interpretation of Chrys., and the early Greek Fathers, supported by Hammond and Wetstein, which takes the baptism here alluded to as that which is applied to all believers, who, in receiving the rite, witness to their faith in the resurrection of the dead. Here an ellipsis of the word "resurrection" is presupposed. The great objection to this view is, that in this case the persons alluded to, instead of being, as they obviously are, a distinct class in the church, are the whole body of believers, leaving us nothing special here as the ground of the Apostle's appeal]. The latest attempt now only remains to be mentioned (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1860. 1. S. 135 ff.) There we have the interpretation, "why should a person suffer himself to be baptized on account of the dead," *i. e.*, to belong to them, to come to them, so as to form a kingdom of the dead? However easy and simple this may appear, yet such an interpretation of the phrase βαπτ. ὑπέρ τῶν νεκρῶν is an artificial one, and not sufficiently well grounded. Properly it should read, 'who are baptized on account of the resurrection and in the hope of the same; because death, or coming into the kingdom of the dead, was the only thing to be anticipated without any further hope for this life. Something similar to this appears in Chrys., Theod. and others. Other interpretations may as well be passed over. [For a full list of these, see Pool's synopsis and also Notes by Stanley and Barnes on this text].—The correct parallelism requires that the next clause, which in the Rec. is connected with that just considered, should be joined with what follows.—**if the dead rise not at all?**—ὅλως as in v. 1.—**why are they even yet baptized for them?**—καί is intensive, *still, even yet*. The meaning is, [if we adopt the explanation first maintained above,] in this case nothing at all could be accomplished for the dead; it is therefore, perfectly useless any longer to submit to baptism in their behalf.'

VERS. 30–34. As a second argument in his apogogical demonstration he refers to the perilous self-devotion and the hazards of martyr-death which were incurred by himself and his associates. The utter uselessness and folly of such conduct, in case the dead rose not, are indicated in the form of a question.—**And why also do we stand in jeopardy every hour?**—[With baptizing for the dead, he had nothing to do. But he, no less than those before mentioned, were pursuing a most absurd and irrational course, if they could count upon no compensation for the pains of their self-denial in a resurrection state. Here, it will be observed, all the way through, that, in the Apostle's mind, future existence, apart from the resurrection, was as nothing. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul seems with him to have been identified with that of the restoration of the body. What he looked for was the glorification of his entire constitution, body, soul, and spirit; and to be bereft of any part, was with him a marring of the whole. He "would not be unclothed, but clothed upon," with a nobler vesture than that he had here. His reasoning is of force only on this supposition]. Dropping his associates he now passes over to himself individually.—**Daily do I die.**—As he before speaks of himself and his associates being in hourly

* [See this view wrought out with great originality and convincing argument by the Rev. H. D. Ganse, in the *Amer. Pres. and Theo. Review*, 1863, p. 63. It merits the preference over all others, because, while answering all the requirements of grammar, and conceding to each word its full and proper meaning, it rests on a natural hypothesis and relieves us of the difficulty of supposing that the Apostle here appeals for support to a practice wholly at variance with his fundamental doctrines. The whole article merits attention as a masterly specimen of exegesis, and as illustrating other points in this chapter with great beauty and force.]

jeopardy, so here he expresses the continuance of his own still worse condition, by exhibiting it as a daily death. And this dying may be explained, either of the extreme danger he was ever in, being so much greater than that just spoken of, *q.d.*, 'I daily hover on the brink of death' (comp. Rom. viii. 36; 2 Cor. iv. 10; i. 10); or, it may be construed subjectively of his sense of dying (Osiander, according to Luther). Meyer explains it: "I go about dying; I am moribund,'—a vividly symbolic designation of the fatal dangers by which Paul saw himself to be daily threatened." This explanation also slides over into the subjective, which is supported by the parallels adduced by Wetstein on this passage. This suits well with the adjuration following—**(I protest) by your rejoicing,**—This is the only place in the New Testament where *νή* occurs; but we meet with it frequently in the LXX. It belongs to the Attic style, [and occurs in the celebrated oath of Demosthenes, where he swore by the shades of those who had met death in the field of Marathon, exhorting the Athenians to defend the Republic (Calvin)]. It is here used for strengthening the previous assertion [—"an oath by which he wished to arouse the Corinthians to be more attentive in listening to him as to the matter in hand, *q. d.* 'brethren, I am not some philosopher, prattling in the shade. As I expose myself every day to death, it is necessary that I should think in good earnest of the heavenly life. Believe, therefore, a man who is thoroughly experienced.'" CALVIN. And, in explaining the nature of the oath, Theophylact acutely observes, that, in swearing by his boast over them, "he meant to remind them that he expects them to maintain with constancy this their faith; *q. d.* 'If I *boast* on account of your improvement, so shall I be *ashamed*, if, at last, ye so wretchedly act as to disbelieve the resurrection,'" (cited by Bloomfield)].—That by which he protests, is the boasting which he had over the Corinthians; for we are here to take *ὑμέτερον*, *your*, as standing in place of the genitive of the object, *ὑμῶν*, as in Rom. xi. 31; *τὸ καύχημα ἡμῶν τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, 2 Cor. ix. 3. In reference to this boasting, comp. 2 Cor. iii. 1; x. 15. There is something very touching in this declaration, which is still further enhanced by the affectionate address.—**brethren,**—[On this see Critical Notes]. This boasting over the Corinthians, over their subjection to the faith, and his great success in establishing a church so renowned and gifted, he says, he holds—**in Christ Jesus our Lord.**—*i. e.*, in virtue of his fellowship with Christ, as a servant, who had accomplished great things by His power. The meaning then is, 'as truly as I can boast of you, in Jesus Christ our Lord, do I daily tremble amid the dangers of death.' Meyer Ed. 3, laying particular emphasis on "you," explains it somewhat differently: "So truly as ye, yourselves, are the object of my boasting." "The Corinthians, whose conversion was an apostolic triumph for Him, could themselves bear witness what fatal dangers beset him in his apostolic work" (?). From the general he now passes over into the special.—**If after the manner of men**—Here is where the emphasis in this clause lies. The meaning is not, 'if, according to man's ability, with the exercise of the utmost strength' (Rückert); since neither the contrast points to this, nor is the phrase ordinarily used in this sense. Nor yet does it mean 'to speak after the manner of men,' for there is no *λέγω* or *λαλῶ* connected with it; [nor yet, 'as far as man was concerned.' (Wordsworth)]. But it means, 'according to the ways of common men,' 'according to those interests and views by which men are governed,'—aiming, for example, at reward, or glory, and the like; or, as Neander: "with a merely human hope, and without any expectation of eternal life."—**I fought with beasts at Ephesus,**—Respecting the allusion here, expositors are divided. Some take the words literally, and understand by them that the apostle, when at Ephesus, had been actually condemned to fight with beasts in the amphitheatre, from which contest he had been marvelously rescued; others, construe metaphorically, understanding the apostle to speak of a conflict with violent and dangerous men, or with strong and embittered foes. Expressions implying the latter are found in Appian (*οἷοις θηρίοις μαχόμεθα*), and in Ignatius *Ad. Rom.* v. (comp. 2 Tim. iv. 17; Tit. i. 12; Matt. vii. 6). The former interpretation is rendered improbable, not only because of the rights of Roman citizenship, which Paul enjoyed, which precluded such punishment, and to which he would have appealed, in case he had been condemned to it; but also from the fact that no mention of any such extraordinary occurrence is made in the Acts, nor in 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff.—But in adopting the metaphorical explanation, we are not to suppose the allusion here to be to the uproar excited by Demetrius (Acts xix.), which did not occur until after this epistle was written, and in which Paul incurred no personal danger; nor yet, perhaps, to any one particular circumstance, but rather to his whole conflict with his Jewish opponents. (Comp. Acts xx. 19.) [The arguments for its being taken literally are thus set forth by Stanley, who, however, regards the metaphorical interpretation as the more likely." 1. The metaphor would be more violent here than in Ignatius, where it is evidently drawn from the actual prospect of the wild beasts in the amphitheatre; 2. The Asiarchs, who are mentioned xix. 31 of Acts, as restraining the tumult of Demetrius, appear in Polycarp's Martyrdom to have had the charge of the wild beasts; 3. Although there are no remains of an amphitheatre at Ephesus, yet traces of a stadium are to be seen; and in the case of Polycarp, wild beasts were used in the stadium at Smyrna; 4. the young men at Ephesus were famous for their bull-fights. Artimedor. i. 9 (Wetstein); 5. that *ἐν Σφέσῳ* seems a forced expression, if the allusion is merely to opponents generally. Whatever be the danger, it must be the same of which he speaks in Rom. xvi. 4; 2 Cor. i. 8; Acts xx. 19."] **what advantageth it me,**—a strong way of putting the negative. His conflict was an aimless, useless hazarding of life.—**if the dead rise not?**—This clause is not to be connected with what precedes [as in the E. V.], as though designed to explain the words "after the manner of men;" or as forming a second condition to the question just put—although according to the sense, it belongs with it; but, because of the

concinnity of the clauses, it must be connected with what follows, where it gives a frivolous turn to the question, "What advantageth it me?" in the spirit of a light-hearted unbelief, in order to exhibit in its proper light, how unsuitable, even in a moral aspect, that supposition was, and how it involved the most absurd consequences. — **let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die.**— These words are taken literally from Isa. xxii. 13, where they occur as the utterance of a God-forgetting light-mindedness. The meaning is 'He who denies the resurrection of the dead, by thus robbing himself of all the consolations of faith and hope, comes by natural consequence to surrender himself to the constant enjoyment of the present life, since death was soon coming to put an end to all enjoyment. We are not, however, to infer from this that the Corinthian opponents of the resurrection had actually preached such doctrine. All Paul intends is to let them see the consequences of their own position; and he here intimates that this denial was not altogether unconnected with the cultivation of too great intimacy with the profligate society around them. Similar expressions of Epicurean frivolity occur in Isa. lvi. 12; Wisdom ii. 1 ff, and in the classics;* (Comp. Wetstein i. h. l.) The words "rise not," and "die," do not necessarily involve annihilation. Even existence in Hades, without the hope of resurrection, was a joyless state.

That the frivolous tendency indicated in the foregoing words actually existed among the Corinthian deniers of the resurrection is clear from the warning which follows; for in the "evil communications" he speaks of, he no doubt has these persons in mind, and by reference to a verse of the comedian Menander, expressive of a general truth which perhaps had also taken the form of a proverb among them, he admonishes his readers that they had reason to guard against the influences of such people.—**Be not deceived**:—The caution implies a strong temptation [inherent in human nature and its social tendencies, by which many are insensibly beguiled into the formation of views and habits from which they would at first have strongly recoiled], — **Evil communications corrupt good manners.**—'Ομιλία means *association, intercourse, and conversation* which arises from it; the *plural* form is found in the New Testament only here. Ἦθος, *a mode of action, character, disposition, moral quality.* Χρηστός elsewhere in the New Testament means *kind, mild, good, suitable, etc.*, here being contrasted with κακαί it implies *moral goodness* (Plato: χρηστότης=ἤθους σπουδαιότης). Lachmann gives the reading χρήσθ'. So it reads in the original of Menander; but it is a question whether the apostle observed the metre. The authorities are not sufficient to decide. ["The quotation shows the apostle's acquaintance with heathen literature, and to a certain extent his sanction of it, as in his quotation from Aratus in Acts xvii. 28, and Epimedes in Tit. i. 12. Menander was famous for the elegance with which he threw into the form of single verses or short sentences, the maxims of that practical wisdom in the affairs of common life which forms so important a feature in the new comedy. In the sentence cited, each word is emphatic; *character* (ἤθη) may be undermined by *talk* (ὁμιλίαι): *honesty* (χρησταί) may be undermined by *roguery* (κακαί)." STANLEY].—To those already contaminated by the treacherous influences of such frivolous men he now calls out abruptly—ἐκνήψατε δικαίως *lit.*:—**sober out rightly**,—["An exclamation full of apostolic majesty." BENGEL.] By this he gives them to understand that the susceptibility to such trifling communications lies in a state of spiritual drunkenness, out of which they ought at once to rouse themselves. The same expression is used of drunkards in Joel i. 5. [The aorist form adds force to the imperative, implying that the act must be done instantly.] Δικαίως means *as it befits them, in the right way.* By this he indicates, not so much the *degree* as the *kind* of sobriety he would have them cultivate—in contrast perhaps with the false sobriety of their new light which might appear to them as an emerging from the narrowness of their traditional notions into a state of luminous thought and feeling. Others explain the word of the direction which they were to take; or they refer it to the object to be pursued. So Calvin: 'Turn your mind to good and holy things.' But this transcends the simple meaning of the term. [Alford says, however, "The last meaning is well defended by Dr. Peil from Thuc. i. 21: ἀπίστως ἐπὶ τὸ μυθῶδες ἐκνενικηκότα,—where the adverb ἀπίστως must be rendered 'so as to become incredible,' and seems to be the best"]. **and sin not**;—The imperative is here in the present, and so implies the continued and perpetual abstaining from all sin. The words convey an exhortation, and not in inference, [as Bengel, who says that the imperative after an imperative has the force of a future (John vii. 37. Note)], 'so ye will not sin.' Nor are we to understand by 'sin,' *a mere error of the understanding* (Bengel), (this may accord with the classical use of the word ἁμαρτάνειν, but not with its Biblical and Pauline use); but a *turning aside from the ways of righteousness, moral error* in consequence of unbelief and a denial of the resurrection. "In the apostle's view, a frivolous mind appeared as something sinful." NEANDER. —The reason for this admonition he further assigns by referring that treacherous unbelief which appeared to them as the result of profounder knowledge, to a lack of that true knowledge which is the ground of all other knowledge. —**for some have ignorance of God.**—As his previous admonition was directed to those in the church who were in danger of being ensnared by the talk of the frivolous deniers of the resur-

*[The following instances may be quoted as a specimen:

"O beato Sesti!
Vitae summa brevis nos vetat inchoare longam,
Iam te premet nox, fabulaeque Manes
Et domus exilis Plutonia:

O happy Sestius! the brief span of human life forbids us to indulge a distant hope. Soon will night descend upon thee, and the fabulous Manes, and the shadowy mansion of Pluto." *Hor. Carm.* i. 4, 13–17.

"Sapias, vina liques, et spatio brevi
Spem longam reseces. Dum loquimur, fugerit invida
Aetas. Carpe diem, quam minimum credula postero.

Be wise; rack off your wines; and abridge your distant hopes in adaptation to the brevity of life. While we speak, envious age has been flying. Seize the present day, depending as little as possible on any future one."—*Hor. Carm.* i. 11, 6–8.]

rection, so does this statement here point to the false teachers themselves, setting them in such light as to open the eyes of the others in regard to their true character and to bring them to see the vanity of this unbelief. Accordingly, by the word "some," we are not to understand another portion of the church, but those mentioned in ver. 12, and of these, not simply a portion, but the whole. "The ignorance of God" which they manifested and which was nothing less than a practical alienation from God, is exhibited as an abiding trait by the use of the word "have," *i. e.* they are permanently affected with it. They are thus represented as having settled down upon the platform of heathenism. The thought is essentially the same as in Matt. xxii. 29. "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God." Not knowing God as the Living and Omnipotent One, is the reason why people assert the impossibility of the resurrection.—That such persons should be found in the church of God was a disgrace to the whole church. This he gives them to understand in the words annexed.—**To your shame do I speak.**—["boldly—he speaks more severely than at the beginning on another subject." iv. 14. BENGEL. There is no need of adding "this," as the E. V., since the language here refers to what is said in the whole passage].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The power of the believer's faith and hope. Faith in a living Saviour, who was dead and rose again, and now lives eternally to take His own into the fellowship of His eternal and perfect life,—and also the *root* of this faith, even the *knowledge* of the living God, who is exalted above all changes of life and death, and lifts His kindred creature man out from his transient, mortal state, into His own unchanging felicity, through the redemption of His incarnate Son,—awakens in the believer a lofty, cheerful courage, which shrinks from no danger, which readily exposes itself to the most painful and appalling conflicts, and which is willing to lead a dying life, yea even to lay down body and soul when the Master's cause requires it. For what is temporal life, with all its joys and pleasures, with all its needs and struggles, in comparison with that eternal life, from whence all that is transient has vanished, and where all that is now upon us and in us worthy of preservation, is insured and perpetuated after having been purified, developed and matured for unspeakable blessedness and glory?

Far different is it, where that faith and knowledge are wanting, and where a person is constrained to give up the hope of such blessedness. In such a case all sacrifices of whatever is transient, all hazards and self-denials and conflicts, must appear useless and absurd. The sole reasonable course is to seize the passing moment, and enjoy to the full whatever this life may afford, and to use all means for obtaining, preserving and increasing such enjoyment.—Experience teaches, also, that that system of speculation which abandons the true Gospel foundation—a pantheistic gnosis, for example—however spiritual it may appear at the first, and even though asserting an ethical character, sinks at last gradually, if not suddenly, into downright materialism and carnal license. Its earlier aspects and attitude, both in its theoretical and practical bearings, must be ascribed to a previous knowledge, and regarded as the lingering result of the truth which has been essentially abandoned. We may also say, that the higher moral attitude maintained by any system which lacks the true faith and its attendant hope, is owing to a hidden faith and hope, still slumbering in the depths of the spirit, which, however, in consequence of the prevailing views can attain to no settled form in the thoughtful mind. But those who are of a frivolous nature, and who shamelessly proclaim their folly in word and deed, form a dangerous class for the unsteadfast to associate with. Against these it is needful to guard, since by them the fruit of a good education is often destroyed. And these influences are the more dangerous, in proportion as they carry the appearance of a high tone of spirituality, or fall in with the current of the time. In such a case we may well call to mind the language of the apostle where he speaks of Satan as "the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

LUTHER:—Ver. 34. "He who would recognize God, must learn to know Him through His Word. This they [the worldly-wise] don't do; but they go directly at the articles of faith with their own understandings, and with their own thoughts, and so presume to judge of God, and of all things concerning Him. Hence they never hit Him."

STARKE:—Ver. 30. No pains, or labors, or watchings, or strivings, to serve God are lost. As surely as God is a righteous judge will there come a resurrection of the dead.—Ver. 31. What is the daily spiritual dying of the faithful, and their constant familiarity with sufferings and persecutions other than a confirmation of the resurrection to a life eternal? Ver. 32. Hostile, dangerous men are worse than wild beasts. If thou hast to deal with such, sigh to God; be watchful, circumspect, and patient.—Unhappy man, who believest not in the resurrection of the dead! For such a one grows secure, falls from one sin to another, and slides on towards damnation.

HED.:—Ver. 33. If we flee the plague and contagion, why not also evil companionship? Is temporal life more than the soul? Ordinarily, men guard against disease more than against sin. (2 Tim. ii. 17).—There are words and speeches which, under cover of worldly respect and courtesy, conceal a dangerous poison to faith and life. Whoso is wise let him take heed. (Jas. iii. 8).—Ver. 34. All who have the means for knowing God, and still are blind, are involved in disgrace. Oh! that they may not thereby be brought to shame and everlasting contempt! (Dan. xii. 2).

BERLENBURGER BIBEL:—Ver. 31. *Dying* means to hate one's own life in true self-denial, and to give it over to death and destruction, with everything which is in and upon man from the fall.—The fact itself is well substantiated, but what a

great, deep, rich mystery of God is in it, that faith alone can see. This is already a kind of secret dying, when we dare not even reckon upon our own righteousness before God, but condemn it as a filthy rag. (Phil. iii. 8–10). Accordingly, it is a sort of dying when we abandon ourselves in contradiction to, and beyond our own reason, solely to the unseen, and rest upon the simple promise of God, and that, too, after we have been accustomed to stand upon our own gifts and works. And these secret crucifixions of nature, in its pride and self-willedness, and seeming sanctity, must take place daily, yea, momentarily, in the very best of Christians if they would not backslide. Yea, in all believers there is no surer safeguard against all kinds of pride which may arise easily in connection with much grace, than this daily dying to self, and one's own life. But traces of this are manifest only in the children of light. Crude and unbroken spirits know as little of this as do hypocrites, who put their Christianity in much outward show. No one can occupy himself in this save he who is trained in conflict against the mysteries of iniquity hidden in himself.—He who does not of his own accord daily die unto the *old man* and his evil lusts, constrains God to lay hold on him with power and humble him; but he who willingly resolves to follow Christ, and confesses him honestly before men, will not long be exercised with tribulations.—In sum: Every thing with which man has to do, gives a believer cause and opportunity for mortifying his own life, and hastening to a complete separation from the false things of this world.—Ver. 32. The Christian's life-walk, which consists in the constant renouncing of the works of darkness, in the mortification of the flesh and sin, in turning away from the godless ways of this world, and in the denial of all lusts, desires, and vanities, is an earnest preparation for the resurrection. Hence Christians prefer the Cross of Christ, and all the shame, and persecution, and contempt which may be heaped upon them daily by the children of unbelief, to all the treasures, and honors, and enjoyments, and friendships of this present life. And this they could not certainly do, if they believed in no resurrection. The last refuge and comfort of the world is, to take what one can get.—But is there so much depending upon the resurrection? Could not the simple happiness of the *soul* after death recompense every thing? No. However much of enjoyment it may have, the soul must still always miss something, and through its natural inward longing, must ceaselessly urge God to bestow upon it again a suitable body.—Ver. 33. There are many spirits who transform themselves into angels of light, and go about in sheep's clothing, by whom many persons are befooled into dancing around some Aaron's calf that has been set up. But if any one imagines that he is fully competent to take care of himself, such a person is altogether too confident, and will be certain not to escape unbarmed.—Man has in himself enough which should humble him. But if he insists on spreading his feathers, alas! it is all over with him. The excuse: 'I was young then, does not exonerate a person.—Ver. 34. Ah! what charm is there not for throwing men into a deep sleep? Hence the necessity of holding fast, betimes, to what is fundamental. Wake at once out of such a fool's sleep! Oh, how willingly does man linger in the haven of carnal security and indifference! From such places of ease does He who walks in the midst of His Church summon all to come forth to earnest labor, and to advancement in their holy calling.—People deem it a disgrace if they are told, 'they know not God,' but it should only shame them into improvement.—There are two sorts of divine knowledge; the one is external, literal, dead, and unfruitful; the other is internal, spiritual, living, and fruitful. The former is grounded simply in natural knowledge, in learning, or speaking of God, as when one can use the language of Scripture, or repeat it again to others without experiencing its power. But if that which has been externally apprehended is sealed upon the conscience through the Holy Spirit, and if all the testimonies of God awaken in one a new life, so that he is actually changed and improved thereby, then does God appear before the eyes of the heart, and the man becomes inwardly convinced how righteous, true, good, and holy He is; then are the eyes of the understanding widely opened to see what and how much God does for him, and what he is bound to do in return—what God has promised, and what we have to expect of Him.

RIEGER:—Ver. 30 ff. In all the joy won by communion with Christ, there is daily opportunity to bear about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus. Now if, with all this, I could not set my hope upon the living God who raises the dead; if I could not regard all the steps I take in the communion of His sufferings and in the likeness of His death as well-measured approaches to the resurrection of the dead; if all this is only for the maintenance of my own opinion, and only with reference to this short life, what availeth it for me? To suppose that Divine blessedness and also the sufferings endured in behalf of righteousness should avail nothing, is a thought which destroys all religion and sunders the connection between God and man. If we hold not to the word of promise, and to the hope afforded therein, we have no certainty for eternity, and consequently no assurance that we shall not slide into the old forms of speech, wherein everything runs to the enjoyment of this life, but where death, and its sting are frivolously denied, and all the weighty things which follow thereupon, together with all Christian hope, are thrust out of sight, and all exhortation to diligence in salvation will be heard no more.—That which deserves to be called good morals, and sound knowledge, and correct taste, should aim at what is unseen and eternal, and be sustained and be kept in exercise by a spirit of faith and self-denial. But how full the world is of such idle talk which turns us away from this, and makes us uncertain and credulous, as if over come by some magic potion. Error, slumber and indifference towards God and his counsel, and the observance of His ways, are the cause of much sin.

HEUBNER: — Ver. 30 ff. Without faith in a future life, many acts of the Christian life, many sacrifices and hazards, would be foolish and purposeless. This faith and steadfast virtue are inseparable. Without this faith that virtue

which looks not to the unseen, would be a vain over-straining and fanaticism; and a prudent enjoyment of life would be the highest wisdom. Ver. 34. Sobriety, is the clear consciousness of God and His will. A correct self-knowledge leads to a correct faith. Unbelief comes from thorough self-ignorance, dissipation and unrestrained frivolity.

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 33. If traitors to God find ready helpers in our own lusts, then is it a Christian duty to avoid all needless intercourse with them, and not allow ourselves to purchase their vain words for the sake of setting forth our own hateful inclinations in a seemly garb (Eph. v. 6, 7.).—Ver. 34. The poison of all erroneous doctrine is intoxicating; and in imbibing it, we allow ourselves to be intoxicated. Well for us, if we properly awake when the voice of truth arouses us, in order that we may spue out the poison of sin, ere we die therein!—"God is not the God of the dead but of the living" (Matt. xxii. 32). Hence, he who denies the resurrection of the dead knows not the true God.

[Robertson:—Ver. 32. "How many of the myriads of the human race would do right for the *sake* of right, if they were only to live fifty years and then die for ever more? Go to the sensualist, and tell him that a nobler life is better than a base one, even for that time, and he will answer: 'I like pleasure better than virtue; you can do as you please; for me, I will enjoy my time. It is a matter of taste. By taking away my hope of a resurrection you have dwarfed good and evil, and shortened their consequences. If I am only to live sixty or seventy years, there is no eternal right or wrong. By destroying the thought of immortality, I have lost the sense of the infinitude of evil, and the eternal nature of good.' Besides, with our hopes of immortality gone, the value of humanity ceases and people become not worth living for. We have not got a motive strong enough to keep us from sin. Tell the sensualist that, though the theory of the life to come be a dream, yet that here the pleasure of doing right is sublimer than that of self-indulgence, and he will answer: 'Yes, but my appetites are strong; the struggle will be painful, and at last, only a few years will be left. The victory is uncertain, the present enjoyment is sure, why should I refrain? Do you think you can arrest that with some fine sentiment about nobler and baser being. No, the instincts of the animal will be more than a match for all the transcendental reasonings of the philosopher" (abbreviated).

Hodge:—Ver. 33. "It is only when men associate with the wicked with the desire and purpose of doing them good, that they can rely on the protection of God to preserve them from contamination."]

[*Sermons.*—J. Owen:—Ver. 31. *The Christian's work of dying daily.* This to be done cheerfully, comfortably, and triumphantly in the Lord. To this three things requisite: 1. The constant exercise of faith as to the resignation of a departing soul unto the hand and sovereign will of God. 2. A readiness and willingness to part with this body on the grounds: *a*, That to depart is to be with Christ; *b*, That the body is dead because of sin. 3. Constant watchfulness against being surprised by death. R. Hall:—Ver. 33. *Nature and danger of evil communications.* 1. What these communications are; *a*, such as tend to sensualize the mind; *b*, such as utterly lack a religious spirit; *c*, such as abound in skeptical objections to Christianity; *d*, such as are full of hatred to Christianity; *e*, such as are loose with respects to fundamental moral principles. 2. The way in which they corrupt through the natural susceptibilities of the human mind. 3. The need of the warning, "be not deceived": *a*, by the adduction of false precedents; *b*, by your past experience; *c*, by any complacent reference to your age and attainments in piety; *d*, by any supposed strength of resolution].

C. Refutation of the denial of the resurrection of the dead, in reference to its mode; and the constitution of the resurrection body.

Chapter XV. 35–50.

35 But some *man* will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what [kind of, ποίῳ]
36 body do they come? *Thou* [*om.* Thou] fool,[1] that which thou sowest is not quick-
37 ened, except it die: And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that
shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other *grain* [of some
38 of the other grains, τινος τῶν λοιπῶν]: But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased
39 him [he willed, ἠθέλησεν], and to every seed his own body. All flesh *is* not the same
flesh: but *there is* one *kind of* flesh [*om.* kind of flesh][2] of men, another flesh of
beasts, another of fishes[3] [another flesh of birds], *and* another of birds [fishes][3].

40 *There are* also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial: but the glory of the celestial *is*
41 one, and the *glory* of the terrestrial *is* another. *There is* one glory of the sun, and
42 another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for *one* star differeth from
43 *another* star in glory. So also *is* the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption,
it is raised in incorruption: It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory: it is sown in
weakness, it is raised in power: It is sown a natural [an animal, *ψυχικόν*] body, it is raised
44 a spiritual body. There is[4] a natural body, and there is [if there is an animal body, there
45 is also] a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man[5] Adam was made [became,
ἐγένετο εἰς] a living soul; the last Adam *was made* [*om. was made*] a quickening spirit.
46 Howbeit that *was* not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural [animal]; and after-
47 ward that which is spiritual. The first man *is* [was] of the earth, earthy: the second
48 man *is* the Lord[6] [*om.* the Lord][6] from heaven. As *is* [was] the earthy, such *are* they
49 also that are earthy: and as *is* the heavenly, such *are* they also that are heavenly. And
as we have borne [wore, *ἐφορέσαμεν*] the image of the earthy, we shall also bear [we will
50 wear, *φορέσομεν*, or, let us wear, *φορέσωμεν*] the image of the heavenly. Now this I
say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth
corruption inherit[8] corruption.

[1] Ver. 36.—The *Rec.* has *ἄφρον* instead of *ἄφρων*. It is however feebly attested, and is a correction. [The more infrequent nominative was more likely to be altered, as in several instances it has been, into the vocative. It is however found in A. B. D. E. F. G., Sinait. and some cursives, while the vocative is given only in K. L., many cursives, Orig., Epiph., and some others.—C. P. W.].

[2] Ver. 39.—The *σάρξ* which some [*Rec. et al.*] have put before *ἀνθρώπων* is thrown out [by *Matth.*, *Lachmann*, *Tischendorf*, *Alford*, and *Bloomfield*], on the authority of the best MSS. [A. B. D. E. F. G. K. L. Sinait., 60 cursives, Syr. (later) Copt., Aeth., Greek and Latin Fathers, and indeed is sustained by *no* important MS.]. The same word before *πτηνῶν* is better sustained [B. D. E. F. G. Sinait., several copies of the Vulg., Copt., Theophyl., Tert., Ambrst.], but it is rejected by *Meyer* as a mechanical addition.

[3] Ver. 39.—The position of *ἄλλη δὲ ἰχθύων* before *ἄλλη δὲ σ. πτηνῶν* is not so well attested as the reverse order. [It has for it only F. G. K. L., the larger number of cursives, the later Syr., Theodt., Oecum., but against it A. B. D. E. Sinait., 6 cursives, 3 Latin MSS., the Vulg., Copt., Syr., (Pesch.), Chrys., Dam., Theophyl., Orig., Tert. The order of the words in this verse appears much deranged in many MSS., though the general sense is not thereby affected.—C. P. W.]

[4] Ver. 44.—The *Rec.* has *ἔστιν σῶμα ψυχικόν, καὶ ἔστι σῶμα πνευματικόν*, but a better attested reading is *εἰ ἔστιν σῶμ. ψυχ., ἔστιν καὶ πνευματικόν*. [The uncials A. B. C. D. F. G. Sinait., 9 cursives, the Ital., Vulg., Copt., Aeth., Arm., are all in favor of the latter reading, which is adopted by *Lachmann*, *Tischendorf*, *Alford* and *Stanley*. It was natural from the similarity of the preceding and the commencement of the succeeding clauses that a transcriber should omit *εἰ*. It must however be conceded that the internal evidence is against Lachmann's reading, for as Reiche and Bloomfield remark the sentiment thus becomes jejune and hardly like Paul's usual style. The whole sentence is omitted in several cursives and Chrys., but Meyer accounts for the omission by the homœoteleuton.—C. P. W.].

[5] Ver. 45.—According to the best MSS. *ἄνθρωπος* is to be retained. Its omission in some [B. K. 3 cursives, Did. Iren., (Lat.) Tert., (once)], may be explained by an attempt to conform to the contrasted *ὁ ἔσχ. Ἀδάμ*.

[6] Ver. 47.—The *Rec.* has *ὁ κύριος* after *ὁ δεύτ. ἄνθρ.*, but according to the best MSS. it should be thrown out as a gloss. [It was suspected by *Griesbach*, and erased by *Lachmann*, *Tischendorf* and *Alford*, following B. C. D. (1st hand) E. F. G., Sinait., (1st hand), 17, the Ital., Vulg., Copt., Aeth., Arm., and many Greek and Latin writers. In the Dialogue against the Marcionites printed among Origen's works, and in Tertul. against the same the insertion of *ὁ κύρ*, is ascribed to the heretics. Comp. *Tisch.* N. T. 7th edit.—C. P. W.].

[7] Ver. 49.—The evidence for *φορέσωμεν* instead of *φορέσομεν* is strong, but the word does not seem suitable in this place. See Exegetical Notes. [The documentary authority for the subjunctive (adopted by *Lachmann* and *Stanley* seems absolutely decisive (A. C. D. E. F. G. K. L. Sinait. above 20 cursives, the Ital., Vulg., Copt., Goth., Slav., Theodt., Orig., (de la Rue), Cyr., Macar., Cars., Bas., Meth., Chrys., (in expos.), Max., Epiph., pseud-Athan., Damasc., Iren., (Latin), Tert., Cypr., Hilar., Jerome). The *Rec.* however has for it, the important testimony of B., a number of cursives, the Syr., (both), Arab., Aeth., Arm., Orig., (other editions) Cyr., (gluph. and nest.), Theodt., Theophyl., Oecum. These two last especially mention and explain both readings. (See their remarks in Tischendorf's N. T.). The subjunctive certainly seems untenable, as an ethical exhortation at this point would appear wholly out of place, and was adopted only to avoid making the apostle contradict what he had said in ver. 50.—C. P. W.].

[8] Ver. 50.—Lachmann reads *κληρονομήσει*, but it is not satisfactorily attested [C. (1st hand) D. (1st hand) F. G. Ital. Vulg., Copt., Syr., (Pesch). and the Latin writers. Meyer thinks it was occasioned by its similarity in sound with *κληρονομῆσαι*.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL

VERS. 35–38. After having established the belief in the resurrection of the dead, on the ground of Christ's resurrection—a fact well attested and lying at the foundation of the whole Christian salvation—and, besides, having exhibited the untenableness of the contrast on other grounds, he next proceeds to encounter those objections which related, partly, to the process itself, and, partly, to the result.—**But some one will say**,—He here introduces his opponents speaking in the character of persons who, not satisfied with the argument hitherto, now, for the first time, come in with their own reasons for doubting. [These persons are not to be confounded with sincere inquirers; rather, they belong to the class of mockers, such as Paul encountered at Athens. As Calvin says, "nothing is more at variance with human reason than this article of faith;" and, hence, there is hardly one which provokes such ridicule and calls out so many cavils].—**How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?**—The present tenses are not to be explained as setting forth the future in the form of the present because of its certainty, [Stanley]; but as exhibiting the case simply as a matter of thought. "Ἔρχονται=' Come into manifestation.' Two distinct objections are here introduced, yet standing in close connection, as is seen from the copula *δέ*. [The first originates in a sense of the impossibility of the resurrection, and so asks for the "how," as a demonstration of the possibility of it; and the other seeks to puzzle by asking for the details of new organization, which, when given, it hopes to prove absurd.

Alford resolves the two into one, regarding the second as only stating specifically what is involved more generally in the first. But certainly the mode of the Apostle's reply implies two distinct points here]. The answers to both these questions now follow, so as to illustrate, first, the process of the resurrection by analogies drawn from vegetable life, and, next, the peculiarity of the resurrection body in its distinction from the present, partly, though analogies taken from the several spheres of creation, and, partly, from the difference between the first and the second Adam. He begins with an address to the deniers or the doubters of the resurrection, expressive at once of strong disapprobation and contempt.—**Fool!**—By this epithet he characterizes as irrational those who are inclined to boast of a high degree of rationality, inasmuch as they ought to have convinced themselves at once respecting the matter in question by an analogy so obvious. [The term does not necessarily express any bitterness of feeling, for our blessed Lord used the like to his doubting disciples (Luke xxiv. 15). It was the senselessness of the objection that is here attacked; for it was folly to say, the body could not live again because it died. The case of the seed showed that disorganization was the necessary condition of organization. If the seed remain a seed, there is an end of it; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit. (John xii. 24. So with the body (Hodge)]--**What thou sowest**—Σὺ, *thou*, belongs not to fool, as if it were an emphatic addition to the vocative; but it belongs to the relative clause, and it is placed first to show that the readers ought to understand from their own experience the unreasonableness of the objection (Neander). [It is the pointed finger aiming at the objector present to the author's mind.—'Thou.'] The human sowing is here contrasted with that of the divine in the implanting of human bodies in the grave (as Klopstock sings: "The seed by God is sown, To ripen till the harvest-day"), but not the work of God in the development of the seed (ζωοποιεῖται)—**is not made alive, unless it die**:—What he means is, 'From the fact that the seed sown by man is not made alive without having first passed through a process of death and corruption, thou oughtest to infer that it is just so with the human seed—that dying and corruption furnish no ground for asserting the impossibility of the resurrection.' By the use of the verb "is made alive," instead of 'springs up' (ἀναζέλλει) the type is brought closer to the antitype.—After this reply to the first question, he turns to a more extended explanation of the nature of the new body, in answer to the second. From the process itself, he passes over to its contents and results by showing that, as in the process, there was a contrast in the development (first, death, and then life); so here there was a contrast between the seed corn and the plant which sprung from it. The former is brought prominently to view in the construction of the sentence, since it is set before us at the first in an absolute clause.—**And what thou sowest**,—*i. e.*, 'as to that which thou sowest.'—**not that body which is to appear dost thou sow**,—In view of the fact of which he is treating, the plant is here designated as a physical organism by the term "body;" and in contrast with this he calls that which is sown as, **naked corn**;—γυμνὸν, *i. e.*, either undeveloped, or separated from its proper covering and from the life of the plant; the former explanation is better suited to the context,—**it may be**—εἰ τύχοι. Comp. on xiv. 10.—**of wheat or some of the others**:—τῶν λοιπῶν, *sc.*, σπερμάτων. In opposition to a gross identification of the present body with the resurrection body which lies at the ground of the objection urged, he here asserts a distinction between the two—a distinction, however, which does not exclude the identity of the fundamental substance or the germ.' [That which springs up differs in outward form from that which is sown; yet it is so far the same, that we can say that that which is sown is precisely what springs up. The analogy here, therefore, is sufficient to destroy the force of the objection raised.]* Müller interprets ver. 37 of the intermediate state between death and the resurrection. He remarks "Just as the old seed corn which is sown into death retains a sort of corporeity in ever changing forms (in the germ, in the blade, in the stalk) all through an intermediate state, until it, as it were, attains to its resurrection and glorification in the fresh, green corn, so also do human souls pass through their intermediate state, not without a certain sort of corporeity. But as the old appears again in a rejuvenated form, only when it has attained to a new and perfected kernel, so also, do those who sleep come to their full and

*[But it may be asked, wherein consists the *identity* between the natural and the spiritual body? Certainly not in the material particles of which the two are composed, nor yet in the sameness of structure. All suppositions of this sort, which find a picture of the resurrection in Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones, are set aside by the force of the analogy which the apostle uses. Not even during our earthly state can it be said that the identity of our body in the several stages of existence, consists in the identity of the particles which compose it. These, as science teaches us, are in continued flux day by day. By some mysterious process of life, are we gathering to ourselves new material and passing off the old; and as to the matter of our composition we are no more the same in two successive moments than is the river that we call by the same name and yet is ever passing. Yet, no one thinks of questioning the identity of our persons, or of our bodies. Amid this constant change there is something fixed which makes us recognizable as the same from the cradle to the grave—something which gives form, and feature, and organization, to this ever-moving current of matter which is momentarily condensed into what we call our bodies. And what is this but the plastic principle of life which is ever shaping the materials which nature gives it for its own uses, and in accordance with an inward law which moulds us after our kind? Here then we have the true substance of the body—that which *stands underneath* the outward phenomenon of a corporeal form and imparts to its sole reality. And if this be so, it is easy to see that when by death the materials of our present structure are all dissolved and scattered abroad, this vital, organific principle, abiding still in connection with the spirit, and in the presence of Christ, may, by the power which He, through His eternal Spirit, worketh in our spirits, at the resurrection gather to itself and assimilate new materials of a wholly different kind, suited to that new condition of things which shall be ushered in at the glorious appearing of our Redeemer. How far this new form may resemble the old, so as to enable us to identify acquaintances and friends, is a matter on which Scripture gives us some faint hints. At our Saviour's transfiguration Moses and Elias seem to have been recognized for what they were; and after His resurrection, His disciples were enabled to know their Lord. And there is nothing unreasonable in supposing that the resemblance between our present and glorified bodies will be sufficiently strong to enable us to know our old associates again and so keep up a continuity between our earthly and heavenly state. It is at any rate, a pleasant thing to think such an identification possible].

glorified state in the resurrection of the body, which will take place at the end of the world." He next proceeds to show the divine causation in respect to the future body, thereby showing wherein all development, even the resurrection of the dead included, ultimately rests.—**But God giveth it a body**—"The Holy Scriptures know nothing of an independent development of nature without God, about which modern philosophy has so much to say." BISPING.—**as he hath pleased,**—The past tense here points back to the original determination of the Creator, in accordance with which He goes on perpetually giving to each seed or germ a body, after its own fixed kind, or conducts it onward to the development of the same. [In all the continued processes of nature, the Creator abides by the primitive constitution of things. The uniformity of His operations should not lead us therefore, to ignore His perpetual free agency, and to regard the universe in the light of a dead mechanism. Nature is alive with an ever-present, ever-active God].—**and to each of the seeds** —σπερμάτων, lit., *sperms*, not only of fruits, but also of animals—a gradation to ver. 39. (Bengel). —**its own body.**—ἴδιον, *own, i. e.*, suited to the species, peculiar to the individual, produced from the substance of the seed. The argument here is this: that inasmuch as this is the way of God's working, we may expect something of the like sort in relation to the germ of the human body, and that it is absurd to dispute this. [And still further; inasmuch as we cannot infer from looking at a seed what the plant is to be, so it is very foolish to attempt to determine from our present bodies what is to be the nature of our bodies hereafter. (Hodge)].

VERS. 39–44. The diversities of organization in the several spheres of creation, and also the diversities in their glory, are next exhibited as analogous to the diversity between the present and the resurrection body, as that of a new and higher organization. He starts from the animal life, where man occupies the first position. With the unity of the genus (σάρξ, *flesh*,) there exists a striking difference in the species.—**All flesh is not the same flesh**;—[De Wette explains "flesh" as the animal organism].—**but one is of men, and another flesh of beasts,**— κτῆνος, κτέανον, κτῆμα properly, *animals* owned by man, such as sheep and oxen; but here in distinction from what follows, the word denotes *quadrupeds* in general.—**and another of birds, and another of fishes.**—The difference predicated here is not as to substance, but as to quality (Calvin); and this is manifold and marked. [If, then, we see such a variety in the organization of flesh and blood here, the inference is that we may find a still greater variety of organizations existing in other spheres. God is not limited in His power and wisdom, so that He must make all bodies alike.]—(**There are**) **also bodies celestial**:—It is not agreed whether the apostle here means the bodies of angels, or heavenly bodies, such as the sun, moon and stars. The first interpretation, taking the expression to mean 'bodies found in heaven,' is maintained by Meyer and de Wette (comp. Matt. xxii. 30); the second is the more common one, followed by Osiander and Neander, [Hodge and Alford]. The latter has no support in the usage of antiquity, and is vindicated, partly on the ground that the heavenly bodies were regarded by Plato, Plutarch, Galen, and others, as animated beings; and partly on the ground that in ver. 38, the term "bodies" is applied to plants; and to this it may yet be added, that not only the clearness and the beauty with which the stars shine, but also the interest attached to this whole treatment of the idea of corporeity, explains this rare use of the word σῶμα, *body*, as denoting a material whole bound together in unity of being. But it may be asked, whether the contrast between the stars viewed as heavenly bodies and the world of men, animals and plants, viewed as earthly bodies, is a suitable one? Perhaps, indeed, not so suitable as that between the bodies of angels and those of men and beasts. The latter "would also touch and explain far better the distinction between the earthly body of death and the supramundane body of the resurrection" (Osiander); and nothing unsuitable, nothing disturbing to the symmetry of the whole analogy, can be found in it. Moreover, we are led to the supposition that angels have bodies, from what our Lord says in Luke xx. 35, 36, of the equality between angels and the children of the resurrection in the future world. So far as the unfitness of this analogy to meet the case of the skeptics is concerned, it must be remembered that the apostle has not so much to do with these, as with a congregation established in the faith, to whom such a view of angels would be neither strange nor incredible.*—This comparison between the two kinds of bodies is followed by an exhibition of their diversity in respect to glory. In the one case it is a heavenly radiance; Matt. xxviii. 3; and in the other case it is strength, beauty, grace, artificial culture, in their several manifestations (Meyer).—**There is one glory of the sun,** *etc.*—Not only do the heavenly bodies differ from the earthly in glory, but there is great diversity among the heavenly bodies themselves. The sun has one degree of lustre, the moon another, and even the stars exhibit a wonderful variety of size and brilliancy among themselves. The allusion here might naturally lead us to think of the various degrees of glory in the resurrection bodies, as compared with each other; but the context does not point to this, and all the allegorical deductions, such as we find in Tertullian and others, must be pronounced erroneous. [So Calvin:—"A mistake is here commonly fallen into in the application; it is supposed that Paul meant that, *after the resurrection*, the saints will have different degrees of honor and glory. This, indeed, is perfectly true, and is proved by other declarations of Scripture; but it has nothing to do with Paul's object." Paul is

*[But with all these arguments in favor of regarding the apostle as meaning angelic bodies, Kling prefers the other acceptation. And so Calvin, Bloomfield, Henry, Poole, Barnes, Hodge who, while speaking of it as doubtful, gives it the preference. But one naturally inclines to go with Meyer, De Wette, and Alford, Stanley, in supposing *angelic bodies* to be meant. All the accounts given of the angels imply the possession of a material vehicle, more subtil and glorious than that of man, capable of visibility or invisibility, at the option of spirit within; and Paul speaks of being 'clothed upon with his house, which is from heaven' (2 Cor. v. 2): and certainly this view suits the case in hand far better].

arguing here from existing diversities in the various organizations found throughout the universe, to prove that there may be still other and greater varieties yet to appear—that neither the wisdom nor power of God has been exhausted in the production of different kinds of bodies, and will be made more signally manifest in providing for saints a vesture suited to the glory of Christ's coming kingdom]. In the next verse we have the apodosis of the comparison.—**So also (is) the resurrection of the dead.**—The connection is this: as we see so great a variety of forms above and below, there is abundant room for modifications of every sort in the human body, and it indicates only great narrowness of mind to infer from the condition of the dying human body that it could undergo no transformation. (Bunger). The general proposition to which the comparison leads, *viz.*, that there is a distinction between the constitution of the earthly body and that of the heavenly, is now more fully carried out.—**(It) is sown in corruption,**—The subject of the sentence is indicated by the connection. Instead of saying, 'it is buried,' as pertinent to the case of the human body, he borrows his expression from the analogy above employed. [The bodies of the saints are as seed sown in the ground; and, hence, every graveyard or cemetery is most aptly termed, in German, "God's Acre." The dissolution that is there quietly going on, out of sight, is but preparing the way for a more glorious appearing, when the winter is past, and the millenial spring breaks upon us.] As the antithesis we have—**(it) is raised in incorruption:**—Ἐγείρεται, *is raised*,—the expression is not inconsistent with the figure. For we may take it in the middle sense, 'it raises itself,' or, 'it rises,' just as the plant does out of the seed corn. On account of what is said in ver. 36, Neander interprets the sowing, not of burial in the grave, but of the development of life upon the earth; [and so Hodge: "it is now a corruptible body, constantly tending to decay, subject to disease and death, and destined to entire dissolution." In this case the whole earth must be taken for God's seed-field, and our present condition must be regarded as, in some sort, an underground one]. The preposition "in," in both clauses, expresses the condition in which the body is found in the two stages; in the first, the elements hitherto organically united are dissolving and scattering; and in the second, we are raised above all corruption and harm, above all pain, and disease, and suffering, into a state imperishable and fixed.—**It is sown in dishonor,**—Ἀτιμία, not simply denotes the unseemliness of the earthly body, and the humiliating infirmities of its corruptible state, by reason of which Paul elsewhere calls it "our vile body" (Phil. iii. 21), but also, since he is speaking of burial, the foulness of the corpse, which is a reminder of the disgrace incurred in the penalty inflicted by death.—**it is raised in glory:**—By this he means the revelation of the dignity of the children of God in the resplendent brightness of their resurrection bodies, pervaded and glorified by the divine life. It is to be fashioned like unto the glorious body of the Son of God.—**it is sown in weakness,**—Ἀσθένεια does not refer simply to the feebleness of the earthly body when living [Bloomfield], but also to its perfect powerlessness as a corpse, its inability to resist corruption.—**it is raised in power:**—Δύναμις denotes a fullness of strength, energy and elasticity, which a renewed vitality will confer on the resurrection body, enabling it to execute all the purposes and volitions of the spirit with the utmost ease and readiness.—All that is implied in these contrasts is condensed into the final one. **It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body.**—Respecting the term "natural," [or, more properly, 'animal,' 'psychical,'] comp. on chap. ii. 14. The expression, "natural body" (σῶμα ψυχικόν), denotes, in general, an organization that corresponds to the soul (ψύχη); and "spiritual body" (σῶμα πνευματικόν) one that corresponds to the spirit (πνεῦμα). The former is one which carries the impress of the soul; the other, the impress of the spirit. The soul is that by means of which our spiritual part is linked to a physical life—a life of impulse and sensation, dependent for its nourishment upon a world of sense. The corporeity corresponding to this and determined by it, is precisely on this account made dependent upon this outward world, and is affected by it; and by reason of it, it is exposed to all that which has just been expressed by the words "corruption," "dishonor," and "weakness," of which death is the catastrophe. The nature of the spirit is, on the contrary, a free, supermundane life of light and love in God; and the spiritual body is an organization suited to its character, being lifted above all dependence on the outward world, and the consequences following from it, and displays itself in incorruption, glory and power. The antithesis to the animal or natural body forbids our explaining the epithet "spiritual" here, as though it meant *ethereal*, or *refined*, ["much less made of spirit, which would be a contradiction." Hodge].—According to the ordinary reading, the following sentence would be simply a short and emphatic confirmation of what has already been said. But the better authenticated text, which we are by no means justified in setting aside as an easier reading, or as a correction, presents us here with two clauses—the second conditioned upon the first, which is supposed to be conceded.—**If there is an animal body,**—which the soul has as its corresponding organism—a thing perfectly obvious—**there is a spiritual body.**—*i. e.*, the same must hold good also of the spirit; this likewise must have its corresponding organ as its means of expression, and as the instrument of its operations, [suited to the new order of things introduced by the coming of Christ]. The emphasis here lies upon the word "is." [If the one exists, so does the other].

Vers. 45–49. According to Ewald, the sense and connection of this passage may be given thus: 'This order of succession in the whole course of the world's history, it is impossible should be otherwise. The finer forms always follow the grosser; those more spiritual succeed the more sensuous. Christ could appear only after Adam; and the purely heavenly Christ, as an external manifestation, is yet to be looked for. In like manner, the entire glorified humanity can only follow upon the present.'—**And so it is written, The first man Adam was**

made a living soul,—The citation is from Gen. ii. 7, with the addition of the qualifying words "first" and "Adam;" [ἐγένετο εἰς ψύχην ζῶσαν, from the LXX, being a literal rendering of the Hebrew לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, lit., *for*, or, *unto a living soul;* and to this the following expression is accommodated: εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν—The expression living soul, as used in Genesis, is often taken to indicate an order of being superior to the brute, and is the text of many an argument to prove the immortality of the soul. The incorrectness of this assumption will be readily seen by referring to Gen. i. 20, 21, 24 and elsewhere, in which passages the words translated "living soul" are applied also to the entire lower creation. They are used indifferently of man and beast to express animal life in general; and it is in this light that the apostle uses them as the very course of his argument shows. Adam is spoken of as a living soul, not to prove his immortality, but rather his mortality. It is by means of the soul that he and all descended from Him, are linked to this changing and corruptible world, and so become the heirs of corruption. The only superiority ascribed to man in the history of creation, is found in the fact that 'God breathed into him the breath of life,' and in this it is intimated that in the act of becoming a living soul, man at the same time was endowed with higher capacities, which brought him into relationship with God, and made him capable of communing with Him, and so of rising to a spiritual existence. But the possibilities here involved for leading a true, spiritual life, could only be carried out by his abiding in fellowship with God and partaking of the Divine Spirit. And had this been maintained by obedience, there is every reason to believe that the higher life of the spirit would have glorified the lower and made it partaker of immortality without the intervention of death. But by reason of the Fall, this possibility was cut off, and man becoming animal (ψυχικός) or as our version renders it "natural" in the very elements of his character, or in the springs of his existence, became at the same time mortal. Herein lay the necessity for the new creation through the intervention of a Redeemer who shall be nothing less than a quickening spirit]. That the Apostle wished to have the following clause also, regarded as a scripture quotation, is an assumption as groundless as that the whole was taken out of the Apocrypha. That which was affirmed in scripture respecting the first man Adam, suggests to his mind the thought of Christ, the antitype of Adam; the lower plain upon which Adam was said to stand, points to the higher. Already by the addition of the epithets "first" and "Adam," the apostle gives us to recognize the significance of the scripture language, and introduces the contrast which he wished to set up.—**the last Adam, a quickening spirit.**—"He attaches his own words directly to the passage from Scripture, as if to intimate, that the latter as necessarily followed from the former, according to its typical significance, as though it had been already spoken. He, therefore, merely gives expression to the inference which is implied in the passage itself, without any intimation that it also did not belong to the language of Scripture—it being a self-evident result plainly contained there. ("Let a person read the first clause," and man became a "living soul," dwelling thoughtfully upon the expression "living soul," and then repeat, "the last Adam, a quickening spirit," somewhat less slowly and loud," MEYER, Ed. 3.) The whole sentence, however, is by no means, to be regarded as a logical parenthesis, as though ver. 46, were to be connected immediately with ver. 44; but it enters directly into the whole course of thought, and was designed to be a confirmation of the preceding statement (ver. 44) from Scripture, which, by its declaration in regard to the first Man, that he became a living soul, from whence the soul-body or animal organization proceeded, points directly to that higher state which was first realized in the last Adam, *viz.*, to the quickening Spirit on which the spiritual body was founded.—The adverb "so" introduces the scripture text a-corresponding to that which had just been asserted and likewise confirming it. Adam's becoming "a living soul" is represented as the effect of God's breathing into him "the breath of lives," נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים. This is the term used to express the principle of life taken absolutely, which has its source in the divine Spirit, of which the soul of man is the efflux forming the bond or *nexus* between his body and his spirit, [See Delitzsch, Ed. 2. Part II. Sec. 3, and Heard, *Tripartite Nature of Man*, p. 36—45]. The man, however, is נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, *living soul*, wherein body and spirit meet in living union. By means of this union is he constituted and made capable of a spiritual life; or in other words, herein consists the foundation of his moral and intellectual culture and final glorification into a divine life (Beck, *Seelenl.*, p. 9.) "This life of the spirit as it increases in intensity is destined to make the soul, and by means of it the body likewise ever more and more, the proper image and exponent of itself, so that the two-fold life of man, as in a natural and necessary way it has the soul for its uniting bond, so also in an ethical and voluntary way it has the spirit as an all-pervading and controlling principle." [See Delitzsch, Part II. Sec. 5]. The first man, not as yet having transcended the character of a living soul (with which, however, sin must not as yet be supposed, nor even the necessity of its occurrence, but only the susceptibility for it, Meyer, Ed. 3,) since his personal life, by a free act of his own, had not appropriated as it should the Divine life of the spirit, but had apostatized from it through sin, which ran its fatal course in subjecting man more and more to the power of death, required now a new beginning which should actually lead to that glorification for which he was originally intended. This was to be achieved by such an appropriation of the Divine life of the Spirit that the result should be a quickening spirit. And this is just what we find in the other and second Adam who winds up the history of the race; since soul and body are in Him thoroughly pervaded by the Divine life and He as the perfected and glorified One, has the power continually to beget this same life in others, and

so by renewing and transforming them, actually to develop the original capacities and intent of our common nature. "But for the very reason that this quickening Spirit was obliged to assimilate every thing to itself, there arose a necessity for its bursting this earthly covering in order to fashion for itself a new and glorified organ." NEANDER. —Now, it is evident, that the point of time from which Christ became this "quickening Spirit" was, not His birth, but His resurrection; for until that moment He was in the likeness of sinful flesh and had an animal body; and it was not until after He had solved the problem of maintaining the original sinlessness of the spirit through all the stages of His natural life in a world of sin, that He, who, by a living resemblance, was the representative of a humanity that had become flesh in all its natural susceptibility to sin and death, became in like manner the representative and head of a humanity spiritually and divinely glorified, by virtue of having glorified human nature through the power of the Spirit, and in the maintenance of a perfect obedience, and of thus having overcome the curse of sin (Beck, *Lehrwiss.*, p. 465 ff. 472). The point of transition from the one to the other stage is His resurrection. Through this, in the very might of that love which led him to incur judgment and lay down His life for the deliverance of the lost, He became henceforth in His newly quickened and glorified corporeity the divine organ for that life-renewal, that quickening of the dead, which reaches its perfect realization at the resurrection, and so, "a quickening spirit" (comp. Rom. viii. 11). The verb to be supplied is not *ἐστίν, is*, but *ἐγένετο, became*. While it belongs to the soul to be only "living," and that through the spirit; so, on the contrary, does it belong to the Spirit "to make alive," to impart the divine life-power which it has in itself, or which it *is* in a personal way (Osiander and Meyer). As the expression, "the first man," designates the founder of the human race whose type is impressed upon all who spring from him, so does the expression, "the last Adam," designate Him from whom issues the second final development of humanity that leads on to perfection.

And now, since it were natural to wish that the perfect had existed from the beginning, he proceeds to state the law of the divine order.—**Howbeit, not first the spiritual, but the animal; afterward the spiritual.**—Such is the established order in the development of humanity; and this order he means to set forth as something necessary, [founded in the very plan of the entire creation, the analogies of which were to be seen everywhere. Nature, through all the stages of existence, forms an ever-ascending series. In all the realms of life we mount from the lowest organizations to those more refined and complete. Why this was so ordered, the apostle does not pretend to say. The reason for it is deeper than science can go, and is among the hidden things of the Eternal Wisdom. All that Paul means to assert here is, that such is the order required by the general constitution of things]. First, the earthly nature must needs manifest itself in Adam, and then only could it attain afterwards to a higher development (Neander). The adjectives, "spiritual" and "animal," had better be taken here in a general way, as designating different stages of life, without supplying the noun "body."—That the natural is first, and then the spiritual, is shown in the instances of the two great heads of humanity.—**The first man (is) of the earth, earthy;** —By the epithet "earthy," which relates to the body, and not to the whole man as imbued with earthly affections, he designates that physical conformation which corresponds to his origin as taken from the earth. With this is connected the animal state. But the inward quickening of the body, which proceeds primarily from the spirit, does not take place directly; but through the operation of the soul, which, in man, by virtue of the breath of the Creator, is, as it were, formed out of the essence of the spirit in the body (Beck, *Seelenl.*, p. 31). Now, inasmuch as in the creation of the first man there existed, first of all, a body fashioned out of the dust of the earth, this, at the start, could only bear the impress of the soul, which mediated the quickening power of the spirit. And such a body carries in itself the possibility of death, which, however, is only realized through sin (Gen. iii. 19; Comp. Rom. v. 12 ff.), *i. e.*, the alienation of the soul, which determines the condition of the body, from the Divine Spirit-life. Apart from this, however, it has the possibility also of not dying, which might have been realized through the perpetual appropriation of this spirit-life by means of which, as the soul advanced in spiritual glorification, it would become ever more qualified for the progressive quickening and glorification of the body (comp. Osiander, p. 777). As the antithesis we have—**the second man is from heaven.**—The fuller reading of the received text, "the Lord from heaven," is opposed by an overwhelming balance of authorities; and the rejection of the words "the Lord" is not to be explained on the ground that it did not seem to suit as the proper contrast for "earthy." It is far more likely that some transcribers attempted to fill out what appeared to be an imperfect antithesis, by adding "the Lord" in the margin by way of a gloss, and that this afterwards crept into the text. By the term "Lord" (which would belong not to the subject, but to the predicate, and as the nobler designation would be put before the other), there would be exhibited the divine glory, the supramundane exaltation and power of the second man coming from heaven, in contrast with the earthly imperfection and weakness of the first man springing from the earth; and this certainly would not simply refer to his bodily life, but to his entire personality, which carries in itself the fulness of the spirit, and of divinely quickening power; from which, then, it might be inferred in regard to the expression "earthy," that it denoted the earthly constitution and characteristics of the entire person of the first man.—In the case of the shorter reading, however, the question arises whether it means the heavenly origin of the second Man, in relation to His human life; which, then, in case the term "earthy" refers to the body of the first man, might be referred in like manner to Christ's corporeity (hence the hereti-

cal assumption that Christ's body was from heaven);* or whether it means the final appearing of the second man, His second advent, for the perfection of His work, of which the resurrection of the dead is a part. The whole context appears to imply the latter (comp. vv. 22, 23, 45, 49).† What is here meant, therefore, is His coming from Heaven at His second Advent, which will take place in celestial glory and in His transfigured humanity. And this presents to us the real antithesis to the earthiness of the first man.

The following verses express the fact that the peculiar qualities of each of these two heads are reflected in those of the persons who belong to them severally, *viz.*, in respect to the natural body on the one side, and the spiritual body on the other. This is what is meant by ὁ ἐτος and τοιοῦτοι.—**As the earthy, such they also that are earthy**:—By the latter are meant those who have descended from Adam, and like him are of an earthy nature.—**and as the heavenly, such they also that are heavenly.**—By the latter are meant those belonging to Christ in their state of heavenly perfection, or those who are taken up with Christ, the glorified, in the fellowship of His glorified life in heaven. Comp. Eph. ii. 6, "and hath made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus;" and Phil. iii. 20, "Our citizenship is in heaven;" to which may be added still further, ver. 21. "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body." The latter is here carried out in ver. 49, in the same antithesis as in ver. 48.—**And as we bore**,—namely, during our earthly life,—**the image of the earthy**,—*i. e.*, the animal body (Phil. iii. 21, "the body of our humiliation")—**we shall bear**—namely, at the time of His appearing, from the resurrection onward,—**the image of the heavenly.**—*i. e.*, the spiritual body which is made like unto His glorious body. In the verbs ἐφορέσαμεν and φορέσομεν, he places himself and his readers at the turning point of the second Advent, when they will have the life which they led in their earthy state behind them, and that of their heavenly state just before them.—Φορεῖν,—an image taken from dress. It means *to wear* as a garment; it occurs also in tragedy in relation to bodies (φορεῖν δέμας), and particular parts of the body, such as the hair. The more feebly attested reading φορεσομεν, *we shall bear*, corresponds to the entire connection and force of thought. The other, φορέσωμεν, *let us bear*, would introduce a paranesis, which would constrain us to take the word "image" in an ethical sense. So Chrys., and Theoph.: "By the image of the earthy he means evil deeds, and by the image of the heavenly, good deeds." It is in connection with this reading also that the following verse is interpreted in an ethical sense, which, however, is in contradiction with the uniform usage of the words "flesh and blood." Perhaps, however, it was the ethical interpretation of ver. 50, that gave rise to the reading. [Stanley, in obedience to the preponderance of authority, gives preferance to the hortatory form of this sentence, which he acknowledges to be in no connection with the context].

VER. 50. He here winds up the whole of this exposition respecting the body in which believers should come forth, and confirms the declaration, "we shall bear the image of the heavenly," by a solemn asseveration.—**Now this I say**,—It is a formula for emphasizing a subsequent statement, and implies no concession to his opponents. ὅτι, as in chap. vii. 29, not 'because,' but,—**that**—Ver. 49 rests on ver. 45, not on that which here follows.—**flesh and blood**—By these words, according to Theodoret, are intended [not our sinful, fallen nature, as some, like Chrys,, understand it construing the words in an ethical sense; but] our mortal nature, which, as such—**cannot inherit the kingdom of God**;—or, as Lange, "the constitution originating in natural birth." It is the animal body in its present organization. "Flesh" denotes the earthly substance of the "body and blood," the animal element in it, according to its corruptible nature. That this corporeal constitution cannot enter the kingdom of God without change, is still further shown from the incompatibility between the two.—**neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.**—Corruption, not as distinct from flesh and blood, as the dead are distinguished from the living; but the word exhibits to us prominently a characteristic of our present state, which sets it in marked contrast with the constitution of the kingdom of God, as that of an imperishable life—φθορά is here the abstract for the concrete φθάρτον. The present κληρονομεῖ expresses a constant relation (Meyer), and an established truth. The idea of time is not here taken into account.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. *Skepticism* would fain wear the aspect of an enlightenment that transcended the ordinary scope of faith, of a more comprehensive and loftier view of the world which was justified in looking down upon a belief in the doctrines of revelation as a sign of narrowness and bigotry. But, regarded rightly, the narrowness will be found on its part. It is skepticism that betrays a lack of sound reason, which, at the same time, includes a lack in the higher moral constitution. There lies at the foundation of it a dullness of thought, a dislike for the labor of profound contemplation, a disposition to be readily satisfied with what is most obvious, and to abide within the wonted circle of human notions. Nay, still more, there is at the bottom of it a pride of understanding which delights in the supposed discoveries of truth, and is opposed to the acknowledgment of a wisdom surpassing its own range of thought and opinion—even a wisdom to which it is the business and duty of the human under-

*["This passage was used by the early heretics of the Gnostic to sustain their doctrine that our Lord was not really born of the Virgin Mary, but was clothed in a body derived from Heaven: in opposition to whom the early creeds declare that He was as to His human nature consubstantial with man, and as to His divine nature consubstantial with God." HODGE].

†[This is the view given by Meyer and other commentators, both ancient and modern. But Bloomfield, and Alford, and Hodge, and de Wette, and many others, prefer the reference to the heavenly origin of His entire personality as the God-Man. This view is ably supported by Bp. Bull, in his *Jud. Eccl. Cathol.* v. 5, and is also rendered probable from Jno. iii. 13, where the Son of Man is spoken of as "He that came down from Heaven."]

standing to submit, cordially accepting its doctrines and endeavoring to understand them more and more, if it is ever properly to come to itself, since it here enters upon its own proper ground, the Spirit of God, and in the light of truth is enabled to recognize more and more, on every side, the nature and laws of Divine providence, and the manifold ways of God, and the correspondencies which exist between the natural creation in its varied developments and the kingdom of grace or the work of redemption in all its rich unfolding.

2. *The resurrection of the dead*, stands in close analogy with various phenomena which constantly present themselves to our notice, and in which the creative omnipotence of God displays itself from year to year. In these death, dissolution, and corruption, are seen to be the conditions of a new life—stages of transition to new forms of existence. The kernel contained in the ripened fruit, conceals a vital germ, which, when the kernel is planted in the soil and there dissolved, bursts forth and springs up into a new growth in conformity with the constitution originally given it by the Creator, and by means of His ever-present, everywhere active, power. Essentially the same process occurs in the resurrection of the dead. Corruption is only the dissolution of that which was the result of a previous vital development, in order that the germ of a new body which was included in the inmost kernel of the old, may break forth and unfold itself into a new and living organism. But the new is not [as some suppose, the restoration of the old, a recomposition of the same particles that existed in the old body,] but of another and nobler quality [and better suited to be the organ of a perfectly sanctified spirit]. In the resurrection body we enter upon a distinct and higher stage of life than that occupied by the body which has been laid in the earth. [The apostle calls it "a building of God, a house not made with hands" in contrast with the former, in which, as the seat of pain, and suffering, and sin, we groaned being burdened. What its particular attributes and peculiarities are, it doth not yet appear. It is sufficient for us to know, that it will be like unto Christ's glorious body; and from the hints afforded us in the account given of His several appearances to His disciples, we may obtain some idea of its superior adaptation for the service of the spirit]. It must be understood that we are here speaking only of those who have been taken unto a fellowship with the new divine life in Jesus Christ, and have come within the sphere of His redeeming grace; or, in other words, who belong to that new development which proceeds from the last Adam. [What the condition of those will be who are to come forth to the resurrection of damnation, we are not here informed, and on this point to offer conjecture would be to go beyond our province].

This higher stage of corporeal existence has its analogies in the broad range of creation; since here also, we behold manifold distinctions and degrees of organization, as well in the sphere of animal life as among the higher orders of being, including man and angels, and also among the celestial bodies shining with varied glory. Somewhat corresponding to the distinctions here observable, will be the superiority of the resurrection-body in the comparison with the earthly body—a superiority, which viewed in the contrasts presented at the time of death and of resurrection, is expressed in the antithesis between corruption and incorruption, weakness and power, dishonor and glory.

3. *The resurrection as illustrated by the account of the divine plan in man's creation.* Much light is cast upon the great distinction between the present and the resurrection-body, by the divinely revealed economy of the Creator, or, in other words, by the divinely ordained development of the human race, as set forth in Scripture. The all-quickening Spirit of God first produced a creature with a living soul. The soul, as the vehicle and instrument of his life-power, by which being quickened, the earthly body prepared for it by God becomes animal or psychical, *i. e.* conformed to the character of the soul, is the organism of a personal life which is capable either of appropriating to itself ever more and more that divine spiritual life in which it is rooted, or of apostatizing from it. In the case of apostasy, such as actually occurred, instead of a progressive glorification of the earthly, physical body into a heavenly, spiritual one, there would ensue a progressive mortality and corruption. And such man has already incurred. Nevertheless, that condition for which he was originally constituted and destined, was still bound to come to pass. Through a Divine act of love, a new process of development was introduced into the human race, which, as in the first instance, entered into life through the quickening power of the divine Spirit, and in the like manner, involved the possibility of a free self-determination in both directions, *i. e.*, a true human life according to soul and body. But by a style of conduct opposed to that pursued in the first stage of development or by its head, the first Adam—by the perpetual appropriation and maintenance of the divine, spiritual life amid all the temptations of our lower nature, and amid all the difficulties, struggles and necessities which attended upon a loving entrance into the accursed state of the first Adamic humanity, this reached a height upon which the animal nature, glorified into a truly spiritual condition, becomes the principle of a like glorification for the earthly animal race of man (in so far as this enters into the fellowship of the second Adam), so that everything which had been corrupted by means of sin is again restored, and aims at rising to the highest stage of life which had been ordained from the beginning as the proper goal of all human endeavor, but which had become unattainable after the apostasy. Now after that we have become incorporated into the second Adam by faith, by means of which His Spirit as an inwardly sanctifying power takes possession of our personal life, and delivers it from all selfishness, and all entanglement with our earthly sensuous being, and attracts it with all its powers and entire organism into the service of the Divine life, and assimilates it to that; there then follows, as the natural completion of this process, an unfolding of the germ of this Divine spiritual life that has been implanted in this organism (after the process of dying which be

longed to the old Adamic state, has been gone through with) into a new organism which corresponds to the glorified body of the second Adam.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—Ver. 35. HEDINGER: Shall I rise again out of the grave, the dust, the fire, the abyss of the sea, and appear in beauty and glory? Reason says, No. Oh, blindness! Ask the beautiful fruit-bearing stalk, what and where it was a short time ago.—Ver. 36. "Thou fool." Paul here calls conceited reason by its right name, in order to rebuke unbelief (Gal. iii. 1). To him who believes in the infinite knowledge, wisdom and power of God, and in the creation where God brought all things out of nothing, it will not be hard to believe that God knows where every little particle of dust of this or that body or member is, and how that which has been mingled in with the seeds of other bodies is to be again separated from them, and how each particle is to be brought again to its place, so that each body may be the same body.* If it is possible that a corrupted little seed of corn shall spring up to new life and verdure, and bring forth new kernels, although thy reason cannot comprehend how this can happen; then it is not impossible that God should quicken again the bodies that have been dissolved.—There is such a depth and breath in the works of God, that our feeble understanding becomes lost in them, even as a little drop of water is swallowed up in the great sea.—Ver. 37 f. That the nature of every plant, with all its peculiarities is included in the little seed-corn, and springs from that, is certainly a work of God's wisdom and omnipotence. If He now produces from the buried kernel a particular plant which bears upon its stalk many other like kernels, how can we doubt that God would be both able and willing, according to His own infinite power, to bring forth out of the seed of a decaying human body a like result once more? (Luke xviii. 27.)—Ver. 43. The most beautiful of mankind, during their whole life, are but dirt, and are obliged to conceal much that they have both upon and in themselves; but the resurrection will glorify all that, and render our bodies perfectly pure vessels.—Ver. 45. We must carry about with us this mortal body in humility, endure it with patience, and let it die with fresh courage. In this way we rightly labor towards transforming it into that glorious and spiritual body which we expect from the second Adam.—Ver. 47. HEDINGER: Since the earthly Adam, endowed with earthly attributes, came first, and the second spiritual Adam followed after, so must that body which we inherit from Adam first be earthly and born, ere it become spiritual according to the image of the second Adam.—Ver. 48. Every thing in its own time—the body must first lay off its earthly qualities through death, and after that spring up anew.—What at last is born anew at the resurrection—should not this be glorious? Ver. 49. Here upon earth the glory of the divine image mirrors itself in believers to some degree; but at the resurrection they will possess all this glory in its perfection.—Ver. 50. Perhaps thou wouldst gladly journey on to heaven with thy body and soul without dying, and so inherit its glory (2. Cor. v. 4); but that which is to live there must first perish, ere it be made anew.

BERLENB. BIBEL:—Ver. 35 f. Man takes too much upon his phantasy, and means to see every thing thereby. Happily such are first pointed to the operations of Nature. For the lower and the transient world is an image of the higher and the enduring. If such wise spirits would investigate more exactly the operations of Nature, this would enable them to read in living characters, what follies they, with their wisdom perpetrate before God. Even in natural things we do not succeed in understanding how one thing and another transpires; and how much more will this be the case in heavenly mysteries (Wisdom ix. 16).—It is a folly which emanates from the pool of our corrupt hearts to be always inquiring—'how? how?' If we take our reason only with us and use it beyond its proper limits, it turns to unreason. We should learn to understand that things come from a higher hand, and abide in the way of faith.—Ver. 37. The outer hulls do not germinate, but are sloughed off from the inner germ, decay and mix with earth; but the germ itself springs up again in living green. Accordingly it is not precisely the same body with all its dust that is to rise again. Yea, even during this life, this mortal body is subject to a perpetual change, so that in a short time not one particle of that which we once were, remains in us, [so it is not necessary in maintaining the identity of the body to preserve the same material particles of which it was at any one time composed]. Though our bodies are in continual flux, yet no one says that we become new men every quarter of a year.—Ver. 38. The best is concealed in order that we may not confound Nature with God. Nature hides itself. There God alone is master, and has the key. If we do not go to Him we shall bring nothing out.—Ver. 44. We must not draw our conclusions from one body to another, and say: A body is a body. No; great distinctions exist among bodies. There is a spiritual body which is through and through like pure spirit, as well as a natural and beastly body.—Ver. 45. God has created men not purely spiritual, in order that they may not exalt themselves, but ever be mindful of their dependence. The natural life is, in respect to the other life, only as a field; but in the field a spiritual seed is sown which shall hereafter spring up through the power of the second Adam.—Ver. 46. The state of weakness comes first: otherwise, we would not know how to esteem that of highest glory, nor yet to distinguish between the two. Hence, this order is good; and he who takes it into account will avoid the miserable snares which are spread by reason.—Ver. 47. The first and the second man—these two are as wide asunder in their nature as heaven and earth, yea, as God and the creature; and yet one has come to the other, so that we have share in both.—Ver. 48. We must not become more earthly than Adam was. The

* [This comment is founded on the false assumption once so prevalent, that the identity of the present and the resurrection bodies was to consist in the identity of the material particles out of which the present body is composed].

Heavenly Adam was provided in order that we may and should again erect ourselves upon Him. In this way, then, do those that are heavenly spring from Him by a new birth and life in Him. But if this is to happen, our old earthly man, must and will, in thought, word, work, become united to Christ, in his sufferings and death, and the new man arise in us.—This is the great mystery, on account of which God became man, and proposes now to exhibit us as the children of God through His incarnation.

Rieger:—Ver. 35 ff. In inquiring after the exact ground, *how* any event comes to pass, every thing for the most part turns upon the *intention* of the inquirer—whether he inquire from a desire of learning, and a delight in the truth, or from doubt and pleasure in mocking; whether he does it from faith and for the sake of advancing in knowledge, or simply to find pretext for unbelief. The difficulty in respect to the resurrection is the dying and the dissolution; but this, indeed, in a thousand cases, is the only way to new life and verdure, and fruitfulness. This thou wouldst question, if thou hadst not seen it so often.—It is enough that now the way through death to life is so pictured before our eyes. What God does daily and yearly in the realm of Nature, this He does in the kingdom of His Son, for the destruction of the last enemy. Let the change and expansion and manifold increase in the seed that is sown be what it may, yet all this has had its ground and cause in the seed itself. Even so the resurrection is but a quickening and up-springing of that very thing which has died.—What else is the denial of the resurrection but an ignoring of the power of God, which can produce out of its inexhaustible fulness just what it will. Ver. 42 ff. Precious foundation for our patience, —to suffer under the body of this death, because the germ of a future spiritual body exists therein! How deep down into the inheritance of Adam: until thou returnest again to dust! How highly exalted in the inheritance of Christ: until we shall become like unto His glorious body! Lord Jesus, prepare me that I may bear thy heavenly image.—Ver. 50. The natural life which we have in common with other living creatures upon the soil of earth, is not fit for the kingdom of God; it would be far too weak to sustain the powers in exercise there.

Heubner:—Ver. 35. All question after the *how* in the mysterious doctrines of religion must be asked with modesty, with a recognition of the limits of our knowledge, with the design of warding off unbelief and strengthening faith; and hence, not in those cases where all comprehension on our part is absolutely denied. Close reflection, strictly carried out, will never stumble at revelation.—Ver. 37. The present and the future life are related as germ and fruit; hence, the resurrection is not the creation of a new organism. The study of nature should help revelation, and should lead us to the Lord of Nature and [illegible] Giver of Revelation. Especially does the ever-recurring change from death to life, which we see in nature, assist a Christian's faith in the resurrection.—Ver. 39 ff. The inexhaustible manifoldness of the kingdom of God opens to our contemplation an unfathomable sea.—Ver. 42 ff. The fundamental stuff remains, but development gives it another body. We know nothing of the innermost, finest parts of the body, and it is from these that the main stuff of the future body is formed. Since the heavenly body will not be like the earthly, it will be no burden to man. Finite spirits also must necessarily have an organ (contrary to Kant).—Ver. 45 ff. Christ, the Regenerator of man, gives the spiritual life—He creates in us not only the new life of regeneration, but His spirit and His power will directly quicken our bodies.

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 47. Great is the miracle of creation, by which God called the first man out of the earth into a natural life; but greater still is the miracle of Redemption, by which God has created a spiritual body, of which the sinful, earthly children of the sinful, earthly Adam were utterly destitute. Although now the work of redemption is greater than the work of creation, yet is it not more difficult to believe that the Lord will make our natural body a spiritual body, according to the likeness of His perfected spiritual body, than it is to believe that He made our natural body from a clump of earth?—Ver. 49. The true Christophori, or Christ-bearers, are Christians, here, in faith; there, in sight.—Ver. 50. The flesh and blood of the lost may and will rise, not to the inheritance of the kingdom, but to suffer the pain of eternal fire. But, in order that flesh and blood may rise to the inheritance of the kingdom, the present form of flesh and blood must be done away; first, through spiritual regeneration in baptism, and then through the physical change in the grave, in order that a spiritual flesh and blood may spring therefrom, according to the fashion of the flesh and blood of Christ.—The Christian burial is the blessing of the body to be redeemed from corruption (Rom. viii. 23).

[Robertson:—Vv. 46–49. *The natural precedes the spiritual.* I. The universality of this law, as seen: 1. In the order of creation; 2. In the progress of the Jewish nation; 3. In the progress of the human race. II. The spiritual instances of this law: 1. Our natural affections precede our spiritual; 2. The moral precedes the spiritual. III. The stages through which we pass: 1. Through temptation; 2. Through sorrow].

CHAP. XV. 51–58.

51 Behold, I shew [tell, λέγω] you a mystery; We shall not all sleep [We all shall not
52 sleep, πάντες οὐ κοιμηθ.[1]], but we shall all be changed.[1] In a moment [an atom, ἀτόμῳ],
in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the
53 dead shall be raised[2] incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible
54 must put on incorruption, and this mortal *must* put on immortality. So [But, δὲ],
when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption,[3] and this mortal shall have put
on immortality,[3] then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is [was,
55 κατεπόθη] swallowed up in victory. O death, where *is* thy sting?[4] O grave [death,
56 θάνατε], where *is* thy victory?[4] [But, δὲ] The sting of death *is* sin; and the strength
57 of sin *is* the law. But thanks *be* to God, which giveth us the victory[4] through our
58 Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable,
always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know [knowing, εἰδότες]
that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.

[1 Ver. 51.—The *Rec.* is satisfactorily authenticated, [*πάντες μέν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα*]. The origin of the other readings is easily explained from the apparent difficulty of this. *Lachmann* [and *Stanley*] have *πάντες* [*μέν*] *κοιμηθησόμεθα, οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγ.* Others have *πάντες μὲν ἀναστησόμεθα, οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγ.* [The *μέν* has in its favor A. C. (2d. hand), D. (2d and 3d hand), E. F. G. K. L. Sinait., Vulg., later Syr., Copt., and a few eccles. writers, but against it B. C. (1st hand), D. (1st hand), the Syr. (Pesch.), Aeth., and Orig. *Jerome* testifies that in his day all the Latins had *omnes quidem resurgemus*, but that the Greeks were divided between *omnes dormiemus*, and *non omnes dormiemus*. *Augustine* also mentions that both Greeks and Latins were divided about it. It was very likely to have originated in an attempted conformity with the subsequent δὲ. For placing the οὐ before *κοιμηθ.*, so that it may qualify that word, and not after, with the comma before it, so that it may quality ἀλλαγ., we have B. D. (2d and 3d hand), E. K. L., almost all the cursives, with the Goth., Syr., (both), Copt., Aeth., Arab. versions, and many of the best Greek and Latin writers. Among the other MSS. there is an almost inextricable confusion, suggesting that they are not reliable. They appear to have sprung from the idea that otherwise Paul would assert (contrary to fact) that he, and those to whom he wrote, were not to die. See all the readings discussed elaborately in *Reiche* and *Tischendorf*.—C. P. W.]

[2 Ver. 52.—*Lachmann* has *ἀναστήσονται*, but the evidence for that reading is not quite convincing. [It is sustained by A. D. E. F. G., 2 cursives, Orig. (one ms.), Chrys. (one ms.), Damasc., Theophyl. (marg.); but B. C. K. L. M., Sinait., several copies of the Latin, Vulg. (*resurgunt*), Orig. (5 times), Dialog., Chrys. (one ms.), Cyr., Theodt., have *ἐγερθήσονται*.—C. P. W.]

[3 Ver 54.—The whole sentence *τὸ φθαρτὸν τ. ἐνδύσ. ἀφθαρσ. καὶ* is omitted in C. (1st hand), Sinait., (1st hand), 2 cursives, the Vulg., Goth., Copt., Aeth. (both), Marcion (in Epiph.), Athan., Iren. (Lat.), Hilar., Aug. (once), Ambrst., Fulg., Oros., Bede. By A., the Arm., version, and some unimportant MSS., it is inserted after *τὸ θνητ. τ. ἐνδύς. ἀθαν.*; D. (1st hand, not in the Lat. 1st hand), entirely omits this latter sentence. Doubtless by homœoteleuton.—C. P. W.]

[4 Ver. 55.—The *κέντρον* and *νῖκος* are arranged in the reverse order by a number of good MSS. [B. C. J. M. Sinait. (1st hand). Vulg., Copt. Aeth., Arm., Slav., Eus., Athan., Didym., Cyr., Damasc., Iren. (Lat.), Tert., Jer., Ambr.] This was done probably, to make the sentence conform to the Septuagint. Such, too, was doubtless the origin of the substitution of ᾅδη for the second *θάνατε* [in A. (2d hand), K. L. M. Sinait., (3d hand), several cursives, the Goth., Syr. (both), Orig., Athan. (once), Cyr., Epiph. For *θάνατε* twice we have B. C. D. E. F. G. I., 2 cursives, the Ital., Vulg., Copt., Aeth., Arm., Euseb., Athan. (once), Nyss., Iren. (Lat.), Tertul., Cypr., Ambr., August. *Wordsworth*, gives as a reason for the change of ᾅδη into *θάνατε*, that the primitive Christians, who would not be surprised at a personification of *θάνατος*, would have been shocked at such a bold apostrophe as the Apostle here derived from his Hebrew Scriptures to Hades, on the ground that it would countenance the heathen notion of a personal deity so named.—C. P. W.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 51. He now proceeds to reveal to them something of the process of the resurrection. And what he has to say is introduced in a manner solemn, and calculated to awaken attention. —**Behold,**—The word points to an object presented for inward contemplation, and at the same time extraordinary, *q. d.*, 'behold, look my words full in the face—they contain a truth which we are slow to recognize, but which is true notwithstanding.' The thing to be announced he calls—**a mystery**—not simply something hitherto unknown to the reader, but something ascertained only through a divine revelation, or the illumination of the Spirit (iv. 1; xiii. 2).—**tell I unto you:**—This mystery was, that those who are alive at the coming of the Lord will experience a change that shall fit them for participating in the kingdom of God, just as those would who arose from the dead; hence, that that which was said in ver. 49 was applicable also to them. The same truth is set forth in 1 Thes. xv. 1–17, save that the idea of a change, which, in the latter text, is only presupposed, is, in our passage, definitely brought to view. In both places he gives his readers to understand that the disclosure made rested upon revelation (1 Thes. iv. 15, "by the word of the Lord").—The received text of our passage has, from the earliest time, created difficulty.* It

*[Calvin remarks: "There is here no difference in the Greek MSS. [which is true, so far as those he had to deal with went], but in the Latin versions there are three different readings. The first is, We shall, indeed, all die, but we

seems to assert that the Apostle expected, not death, but a sudden change both for himself and for all his cotemporaries—a thing not reconcilable with actual events. Hence, *οὐ* has been put after *κοιμηθήσόμεθα*, connecting it with the following verb; [so Stanley, who renders: "we shall all sleep, but we shall not all be changed"] (besides, some put *οὖν* before *κοιμηθ*, which is, perhaps, only a trace of the original position of *οὐ*); but this reading would be unsuitable by reason of the more exactly defining statement of time, immediately following in ver. 52, which could only be joined to a positive clause. [It would hardly do to say, 'we shall not all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye,' *etc.* It was perhaps with a view of obviating this difficulty that the reading *ἀναστησόμεθα*, *we shall arise*, [found in D., and adopted by the vulgate], was introduced; but which even in this way betrays its non-authenticity, and, besides, is less sustained. In the case of the received text, *πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθήσόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαχησόμεθα*,—there still arises, however, the objection, that the apostle could not assert concerning himself and *all* his readers, or all Christians of his time that they would not "sleep," but would rather all "be changed," [as is implied here by the position of the negative *οὐ*, which bears directly upon the verb, and not upon the adjective *πάντες all*—making it mean, 'all of us shall not sleep']. Hence, a trajection of the negative is here assumed, *πάντες οὐ*, standing for *οὐ πάντες*, and the clause taken to be equivalent to *οὐ πάντες κοιμηθ.*, meaning *not all of us* shall sleep;' and *ἀλλαγησόμεθα* is interpreted in a broader sense, as including the idea of rising from the dead, which is opposed by the stricter signification of the term, and by the more exact intimation given in ver. 52, where it is said that the dead also shall rise. Nor yet can the above-mentioned trajection of the negative be justified on the ground of giving the word *πάντες*, *all*, a more emphatic position, or from Numb. xxiii. 13; Josh. xi. 13 or Sir. xvii. 30 (where it does *not* occur); and, besides, the assumption of a various range of meaning for *ἀλλαγησόμεθα* in such close succession has something arbitrary in it. The same is true also of the expedient of putting *οὐ κοιμηθ. not sleep*, in a parenthesis, *q. d.*, 'we all (shall, indeed, not die, but yet) all shall be changed. [So Hodge, who, as above, broadens the scope of the verb rendered 'changed,' so as to denote not simply the transformation of the living, but also the reinvestiture of the dead, thus making it apply to all Christians generally. Stanley is singularly confused here, following Lachmann in his text, and rendering "we shall all sleep; but we shall not all be changed;' yet, in his note, giving a decided preference for the Rec. Text, and rendering it, "We shall, all of us, not die, but be changed." In the latter he follows Meyer and Winer (*Gr. Gram.* Pt. iii. § 61, 4 f.) who insist that the only translation consistent with Greek is as Kling gives it in his version—**We shall all not sleep, but we shall be changed,**—The intention of the apostle is to answer a question, which would naturally occur to some in view of the declaration that "flesh and blood could not inherit the kingdom of God." If this were so, it might be asked, what would become of the living? While the dead would rise with new bodies, what would become of them who were expecting to survive till the advent. These are the parties whom he now has solely in his eye, and since the great crisis was supposed to be near at hand, he speaks here in the first person, and says 'we.']. The difficulty in regard to *πάντες, all*, is relieved by the supposition that he had in mind the *sum total* of the survivors (among whom he also reckoned himself), to whom alone the whole context relates. But that the words *μὲν δὲ* should stand in connection with the same emphatically repeated word *πάντες, all*, when they appear to relate to the contrast between 'not sleeping' and 'being changed,' is entirely in accordance with Greek usage (comp. Passow upon the words II. i. 176, b, above). They had better remain untranslated.—By 'being changed' he indicates the immediate transition from the earthly into the heavenly body, without the intervening process of death and the resurrection. This is to take place—**In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye,**—Both these expressions indicate the same thing, and set forth, in a most striking manner, the instantaneousness of the transition, excluding the possibility of death coming in between. *ἄτομον*, an indivisible point of time. In this change a prevenient qualification, a preparation for this glorification, by the operation of the Spirit of Christ, is indeed not excluded; it is only asserted that this glorification would take place suddenly.—A second particular relating to the time of this change, is expressed by the words—**at the last trump:**—*ἐν τῇ ἐσχ. σάλπ.*; *ἐν* is used as expressive of the time *in* which the last trumpet sounds, as in 1 Thes. iv. 16, where it is said of the Lord that He will descend from Heaven *ἐν σάλπιγγι θεοῦ*, "in the trumpet of God;" whereupon the dead will rise. [For this use of *ἐν*, see Jelf. *Gr. Gram.* § 622, 2. fin.]. The word *σαλπίζειν* is used to denote the trumpet blast accompanying the Theophanies, and resounding over the whole region of their manifestation, arousing and shaking all things there (comp. ex. xix. 16; Isa. xxvii. 13; Zech. ix. 14). The last trumpet refers to that great Theophany, or Christophany, by which all the revelations of God in this dispensation will be brought to their close. That this will coincide with the seventh trumpet (Rev. xi. 15), is, by no means, improbable; because, there also John is speaking of the end of the world-power, and the coming in of the kingdom of God and of Christ—an event with which that here mentioned must synchronize. From this, however, we are not to conclude that Paul had in mind the seven trumpets of the Apocalypse, of which he supposed this to be the last; "for it is hardly proper to ascribe the peculiarity of John's vision to the apostle Paul, as though the doctrine of the latter were moulded by the former." BURGER.—But in no case are we to

shall not all be changed. The second is, We shall, indeed, all rise again, but we shall not all be changed. [This is the reading of the Vulgate followed by Wickliffe and the Rheim's version.] The third is, We shall not, indeed, all sleep, but we shall all be changed." This diversity he ascribes to the fact, "that some readers, who are not the most discerning, dissatisfied with the true reading, ventured to conjecture a reading which was more approved by them"].

suppose any allusion here to the seven trumpets, according to which the Rabbis were wont to exhibit the seven stages of the resurrection—the last announcing the instant when the dead were to stand upon their feet—since the apostle furnishes not the remotest hint of the kind. Moreover, to interpret the trumpet sound of those commotions and revolutions which were to introduce and accompany the judgment; or, as Olshausen does, of a powerful all-shaking operation of the Spirit; or, of an all-agitating *κέλευσμα, command*, or *νεῦμα, nod*, of God (Theoph.); or indefinitely of some sign that the judgment is to be held, is arbitrary. The trumpet blast, elsewhere spoken of as the signal for battle, (comp. xiv. 7), or for assembling, or for judgment, here comes as the signal for the great act of the all-victorious king, who will call his people out from among the quick and the dead into the glory of His heavenly life, and so shall gather them about himself. But Neander says: "We shall not be able to take the statement of the trumpet literally It denotes the call to the last act of Divine omnipotence."—**for the trumpet shall sound,**—*σαλπίσει* is impersonal, *it shall sound*, like *ὑει, it rains*, and the like. It is unnecessary to suppose any definite subject here, whether God, or Christ (comp. "the trump of God," 1 Thes. iv. 16; and "the Lord God shall blow the trumpet," Zech. ix. 14), or an angel (comp. Rev. viii. 2).—The events following upon the sound of the trumpet are introduced by *καὶ*; first, the resurrection of the dead according to 1 Thes. iv. 16, "the dead in Christ shall rise first" (comp. above ver. 23), and that, too, in a state of incorruption (comp. ver. 42).—**and the dead shall be raised incorruptible**;—*then*, the change of the living, which, as is shown from what follows, is also a transition into a state of incorruption. [This is in exact accordance with 1 Thes. iv. 15. "Those who are alive when Christ comes shall not prevent," *i. e.*, take the precedence of, "them which are asleep"]. But to take the term "we" as a sort of generalization, by which he did not intend literally to denote himself and his cotemporaries, but only those living at the time of the Advent, and who belonged to an entirely different period, and so, as equivalent to 'we Christians,' *i. e.*, those who shall then be alive [as Hodge and others], is entirely arbitrary. It is unquestionable that the apostle, although opposed to all fanciful expectations and designations of time (2 Thes. 11), regarded the second Advent as near, and hoped to survive to it; nor does what is said in chap. vi. 14, at all conflict with this (see above).—The event thus predicted is confirmed by a reference to the *necessity* of this change, pointing back to ver. 50.—**For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.**—The epithets "corruptible" and "mortal" relate to the human body in its present state; but they are not to be distinguished, as though the former applied to the dead and the latter to the living (Bengel); for that which he designates as a mystery and has just made known, and that whereupon, therefore, the emphasis lies, is, that "*we* shall be *changed*." Hence, he is speaking mainly of the living. To "put on" (*ἐνδύσασθαι*) a figure borrowed from clothing (comp. ver. 49; 2 Cor. v. 3, "not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon"). The maintenance of a personal identity, with a change in the quality of the vesture, is here unmistakably implied; according to de Wette, the figure is one of an inward purification (Luke xxvi. 49; Rom. xiii. 14; Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10); according to Osiander of adornment and manifestation of the change—both doubtful. The aorist infinitive indicates the instantaneousness of the process. The repetition of the verb gives emphasis, and preserves the symmetry of the sentence.

VERS. 54–57. He here announces in a solemn manner, enhanced by the literal repetition of what he has just said, that this event will consummate the victory over the last enemy, and in it will be fulfilled the prophecy which predicts the cessation of all death at that time. ["The argument closes in a burst of almost poetical fervor, (as in the corresponding passage, Rom. viii. 31)." STANLEY].—**And when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality,**—["a repetition in a triumphant spirit, of the description of the glorious change." ALFORD].—**then shall come to pass**—*γενήσεται* here expresses the thought elsewhere conveyed by *πληροῦσθαι, τελεῖσθαι*.—**the saying that is written,**—The declaration is found in Isa. xxv. 8, in a passage announcing the final consummation of God's kingdom, and is cited, not according to the LXX., but according to the original Hebrew, except that בִּלַּע הַמָּוֶת, *he will destroy death*, is turned into the passive "is swallowed up;" and לָנֶצַח is translated as elsewhere in several passages in the LXX., *e. g.*, Amos i. 11; viii. 8, *εἰς νῖκος, into victory*; while it properly means *entirely, altogether* (comp. Hupfeld on Ps. xiii. 2), which also suits the passage in Isa. (others: "altogether")—**Death is swallowed up into victory.**—*κατεπόθη* the same idea that is expressed in *καταργεῖται* (ver. 26). "It is a remarkable expression, denoting the swallowing up of the all-swallower." (Vitringa).—*Εἰς νῖκος* can here be interpreted neither as equivalent to 'forever,' nor yet to 'entirely;' nor can we take it as an adverb, 'victoriously' (Flacius); but it indicates the result of being swallowed up—"into victory," *i. e.*, so that victory is gained, and the enemy is overcome. To this the following triumphal song is well appended. An argument may be urged against Osiander's local interpretation of *εἰς*, (by which victory is personified and represented as a ravenous beast, as though the expression meant 'swallowed up in the jaws of victory'), from the want of the article, as also from *τὸ νῖκος* of ver. 55. Inasmuch as in this whole context death must mean physical death, the doctrine of the restoration of all things, as suggested by Olshausen, has here no support.—The reference to the prophecy fulfilled at the resurrection culminates in a triumphal song, in uttering which, the Apostle seems transported in spirit to the moment of that grand consummation.—**Where,**—*ποῦ*, i. 20; Rom. iii. 27.—**thy sting.**—By *κέντρον* we are not to understand *a goad*, which

death may be supposed to use in tilling his field, since without sin he could have no power over us [Billr. and Scholt.]; nor yet as something which calls out the power of death over us, awakes its slumbering might to tyrannize over us (Olsh.); but death is here figured as a venomous beast, armed with a poisonous, deadly sting—a scorpion, for example, [or a serpent like a viper in allusion to Gen. iii., and Numb. xxi.]—**O Death!**—In this direct address the personification of death comes out more forcibly than in ver. 54.—**Where thy victory, O Death?**—In this clause the Rec. Text has ᾅδη, *Hades*, the kingdom of the dead, instead of θάνατε repeated. By "victory," in this case, we would understand the detention in Hades of those who had departed to it; and this would be destroyed if Hades were compelled to give up the dead in a resurrection. But the reading ᾅδη is perhaps a correction made in accordance with the LXX. version of Hosea xiii. 14. This passage undoubtedly floated before the mind of the Apostle, and apparently in the form in which it appears in the LXX. in so far as we translate the passage, "From the power of Sheol will I ransom them; from death will I deliver them," thus: "O death, I will be thy plagues; O Grave, I will be thy destruction." But אֶהְיֶ֫ [translated *I* in our version] may be also=אַיֵּה, as in Hos. xiii. 10, [where it occurs in the sense of ποῦ, *where*,] (comp. Fürst, *Handwörterbuch*, s. v., אֶהְיֶ֫, i. 30). But instead of דְּבָרֶיךָ, *thy plagues* (plural of דֶּבֶר=the *mille viæ leti*, the *thousand ways of death*), others appear to have read דַּרְכֶּךָ, *thy sting*, (Fürst, s. v., דֶּבֶר); and קָטָבֶךָ may be translated *thy overthrow, viz.*, that which thou workest; in which case it is=τὸ νῖκος σου, *thy victory*, (comp. Schmieder on Hosea xiii. 14). This prophecy opens for us a bright view into the last glorious epoch, like as Isa. xxv. 8; and the thought mounts from the state of not dying, implied in the loss of death's sting, to that of resurrection from the dead (Meyer Ed. 3). If we now unite this passage in Isa. to the citation from Hosea, which is not inadmissible, then we have here a combination of texts as in Rom. xi. 8, and elsewhere. [Hodge says the Apostle does not quote Hosea, but expresses an analogous idea in analogous terms].—To this triumphal song there is appended, first, a short explanation respecting the sting of death, which serves to confirm the statement that death is swallowed up (ver. 56). "It affords," says Meyer, "a firm doctrinal basis for the certainty of victory over death, furnished in the Gospel system."—**The sting of death is sin**;—The parallel here between κέντρον and δύναμις might seem to indicate the propriety of taking the former in the sense above given, *viz.*, that of a goad, implying that that which set death in motion, and rendered it active, is sin. But there is no necessity for this; and the connection with ver. 55, where "sting" being parallel with "victory," cannot denote that by which death is goaded, does not allow of it. The meaning is, rather, that death, like a scorpion, has a sting, a fatal power imparted to it by means of sin (comp. vi. 23; v. 12). But in relation to sin he adds—**and the strength of sin is the law.**—This has been understood, either of the sin-awakening, and the sin-strengthening power of the law in the sense of Rom. vii. 7 ff.; or of its condemning power (2 Cor. iii. 6 ff.; chap. ix.); or both ideas have here been combined (Osiander). The first interpretation is the correct one. As death has no sting, no fatal power, when sin is done away, and therefore is destroyed, *as death;* so sin has no power, is become weak and nullified, when the law is removed. The law is indeed the revelation of the Divine will in the form of a command or prohibition, which both presupposes, and calls out the opposition of man against God. So long as this stands in authority, sin, and accordingly death, has power. And here the question arises, Does the Apostle intend to *infer* from the nullification of the power of death at that period, that then sin and the law are done away? Or does he *presuppose* this as a matter evident of itself, and from it draw a conclusion in support of the destruction of death, and for the resurrection? Or does he mean to indicate that sin and the law stand in the way of this consummation? The following verse most readily connects itself with the last supposition; since here God is praised as the one who, through Jesus Christ, ensures a victory over every thing which obstructs the grand consummation; or, more exactly, the victory over death, of which mention has been before made; since in communion with Him we are delivered from the law, and, together with this, from the power of sin, and hence also from death (Rom. viii. 1). Thus is this complete victory exhibited to us in connection with the redemption secured by Christ, which is nothing less than a deliverance from law and sin; and the whole is referred back to God, the Author of our redemption, with ascriptions of thanksgiving.—**But thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.**—The present participle τῷ διδόντι, *he giving us*, may be taken as a vivid representation of the future in the form of the present, showing the absolute certainty of the thing; or it may denote the simple fact considered by itself apart from all idea of time; or, finally, it may represent God to us as the One who continually gives us the victory by taking away the condemnation of the law, and so destroying the power of sin in a life of faith, which is nothing less than a fellowship with Christ, who is the end of the law, and the destroyer of sin's power. ["This He is: 1. Because He has fulfilled the demands of the law. It has no power to condemn those who are clothed in His righteousness. "There is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus." (Rom. viii. 1). Christ, by His death, hath "destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and delivered them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb. ii. 14, 15). That is, in virtue of the death of Christ, by which the demands of justice are satisfied, Satan, the great executioner of divine justice, has no longer the right or power to detain. If, therefore, it be the law which gives sin its reality and

strength, and if sin gives death its sting, He who satisfies the law destroys the strength of sin, and consequently the sting of death. It is thus that Christ deprives death of all its power to injure His people. It is for them disarmed and rendered as harmless as an infant. 2. But Christ not only gives us this victory through His justifying righteousness, but also by His almighty power, He new creates the soul after the image of God; and, what is here principally intended, He repairs all the evils which death had inflicted. He rescues our bodies from the grave, and fashions them like unto His glorious body, even by that "power whereby He is able to subdue all things unto Himself" (Phil. iii. 21). HODGE].

VER. 58. He concludes with an earnest exhortation to stedfastness and to advancement in Christian activity. And this which he introduces with an endearing epithet—**My beloved brethren,**—he joins first to a thankful allusion to the God who gives us the victory through Jesus Christ; and thus the whole exposition comes at last to its close. This is evident also from the corroborative clause. —**wherefore**—since God gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.—**be ye stedfast unmovable,**—suffer not yourselves to be shaken from the foundation of your faith and hope by any person or thing. "'Εδραῖοι, *stedfast*,—'do not turn yourselves from the faith of resurrection;' ἀμετακίνητοι, *unmovable*,—'be not led away by others.'" BENGEL.—To this still another quality is annexed.—**always abounding in the work of the Lord,**—This is not to be taken as subordinating what precedes, as Meyer, who interprets: "so that ye distinguish yourselves in furthering the work of the Lord by your stedfastness in the Christian faith and life;" but it is still another feature of good conduct resulting from the conviction spoken of in ver. 57, *viz.*, excelling in activity for the cause of Christ. By ἔργον τοῦ κυρίου we are not to understand, either Christ's work in a preëminent sense, *i. e.*, the church (as the Romanists); nor yet a divine and blessed life (de Wette); but the work which Christ Himself undertook in obedience to the Father's commission, and which He has commanded His followers to carry forward. In this are comprised both the proclamation and spread of the Gospel and the furtherance of the common weal by the reformation of individuals and of society. "It is something in which every Christian should coöperate through word and work in his own sphere." BURGER. To such activity he encourages them by a general assurance of success.—**knowing that your labor is not in vain in the Lord.**—By κόπος he means an activity full of effort, involving burdens and self-denials for the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom. All this were vain and fruitless if our salvation were not to be consummated in triumph, if no victory over death and no resurrection were to be hoped for. But since this hope is sure, we know that our efforts will not fail of their goal,—that the glorious end will be reached at last which will compensate us for all our toil. The phrase "in the Lord" belongs, not to the subject (Meyer), but to the predicate, or rather to the whole clause. The profitableness of our labor is established in Christ. In fellowship with Him is its objects surely attained.

[Obs. 1. In order to appreciate the force of the Apostle's reasoning throughout this whole chapter, it will be necessary to connect it with that general scheme of historical development in which his great argument moves. In speaking of the "other world," or "the world to come," it is common to understand by these expressions some mysterious realm existing outside of, or apart from the material world into which we are introduced by death, and where departed spirits are supposed to be now living. Not unfrequently are these terms used interchangeably with "eternity." On such an interpretation, it is not easy to see why the Apostle should make a future happy existence so contingent upon the *resurrection;* or, indeed, what necessity there is for a new body, if in our disembodied state we are so completely introduced into fellowship with Christ, and the glories of heaven. Nor can we discover a reason why the resurrection should not take place with every individual immediately after death, according to the theory of Bush and the Swedenborgians. To keep the soul, that would "not be unclothed but clothed upon," waiting for centuries before it can assume its new vesture, seems almost like an arbritrary and needless appointment. But the difficulty here presented is all removed when we come to reflect that the term translated "world" (αἰων) is not a designation of *space*, denoting any particular realm in which people live, but of *time*. It properly means an *age*—a distinct cycle of years through which certain great transactions similar in kind are carried on to their consummation, and which is to be followed by another of a different kind. Now it is through a series of these ages, or aeons, that Paul considers the work of the world's redemption to be progressively carried on, all separated by certain great crises. The "present age" is that period which dating from the Fall is to last until the second coming of Christ. At this point the "future age" will begin to date, and this will be the age of redemption completed—the age of the Messiah's Kingdom and Glory. And the expression for 'eternity' is generally in the plural—'ages', or 'ages upon ages,' to signify the ceaseless procession of time, under which conception eternity was ordinarily represented.

From this exposition will be seen the impropriety of speaking of souls at death passing at once into "the other" or "future world" or age. That future world or age has not yet come in; and no one can be said to enter it until Christ appears to set up His Kingdom. It is then only that the earth will be in readiness for the reception of the risen saints. And inasmuch as the glory which they are waiting for is to be found here, it will be seen why a resurrection is necessary,—why they want a body at all, and a glorified body, since it is in this as their organ that they will be fitted to dwell in a glorified earth and enjoy the felicity of that age. According to Paul's theory, man is not to be separated from this lower creation of which he forms a part and of which he is the lord. The world was viewed by him as one complete whole, termed in Rom. viii "the creature" (κτίσις) which as it had

been involved in the curse of the Fall was also to be restored in its completeness as the theatre of the Redeemer's glory. But the time of its restoration could not occur, until all the redeemed of earth were brought in and the number of the elect completed. It is then that the Redeemer will appear to set up His Kingdom and around Him the whole church will be glorified together, none "preventing," *i. e.*, anticipating the other in the fruition of future glory.

On such a scheme we discover a foundation for the Apostle's argument which identifies a blessed immortality, with the fact of a future resurrection, and seemingly ignores the possibility of an existence in some purely spiritual state, such as Pagan philosophy dreams of. The process of redemption underlying this scheme of history has been well represented by Fairbairn (*Hermeneutical Manual*, p. 367) under four successive stages and developments indicated by four fundamental gospel terms. "We see it beginning in the region of the inner man—in the awakening of a sense of guilt and danger, with earnest strivings after amendment (*μετάνοια, repentance*); then, through the operation of the grace of God, it discovers itself in a regenerated frame of spirit, the possession of an essentially new spiritual condition (*παλιγγενεσία, regeneration*) this once found, proceeds by continual advances, and fresh efforts to higher and higher degrees of spiritual renovation (*ἀνακαίνωσις, renewing*), while according to the gracious plan and wise disposal of God, the internal links itself to the external, the renovation of soul paves the way for the purification of nature, until, the work of grace being finished, and the number of the elect completed, the bodies also of the saints shall be transformed, and the whole material creation shall become a fit habitation for redeemed and glorified saints (*ἀποκατάστασις, restoration*). What a large and divine-like grasp in this regenerative scheme! How unlike the littleness and superficiality of man! How clearly bespeaking the profound insight and far-reaching wisdom of God! And this not merely in its ultimate results, but in the method also and order of its procedure! In beginning with the inner man, and laying the chief stress on a regenerated heart, it takes possession of the fountain head of evil, and rectifies that which most of all requires the operation of renewing agency. As in the moral sphere, the evil had its commencement, so in the same sphere are the roots planted of all the renovation, that is to develop itself in the history of the Kingdom. And the spiritual work once properly accomplished, all that remains to be done shall follow in due time; Satan shall be finally cast out; and on the ruins of his usurped dominion, the glories of the new creation shall shine forth in their eternal lustre."

For a list of works on this whole subject of the nature and destiny of the soul, the reader may consult the appendix to the *History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, by Alger, where nearly five thousand works on this engrossing theme are enumerated and described by Ezra Abbot. Among the best of the moderns are DELITZSCH, *Psychologie*, 2. Ed.; BLEEK, *Seelenlehre;* HEARD, on the *Tripartite nature of man*. Consult also articles in *Bib. Sacra*, xvii. 303; xiii. p. 159].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The risen saint's retrospect and triumph. From the heights of a salvation completed the spirit looks back, in thought, on the dangers and difficulties through which it is to pass, and then, in contrast, to the deliverance provided for it in its several essential particulars; and such a review awakens it anew to the praise of God's grace which through the power of Christ removed all obstacles, and gave it that victory in which it is to obtain the fulfilment of all the divine promises. But from this also there springs the earnest determination to remain stedfast in the maintenance of the grace conferred, and constantly to excel in furthering the great word of salvation in the joyful confidence that every sincere effort will result in securing at last a perfect communion with Christ who in His own person has overcome all obstacles and invites His followers to share in His victory.

The attainment of our salvation proceeds through three inseparably connected stages—the doing away: 1. of the law; 2. of sin; 3. of death. The *law* is done away (so far as it calls out and intensifies an opposition to God), through the revelation of the perfect love of God, who sent His only-begotten Son, the holy and righteous One, to take upon himself and endure the curse of the law, or to become sin and a curse for us, and so to redeem us from curse and from judgment, and to secure our justification. Thus, sin is forgiven; we are accepted in the beloved; and a loving child-like communion is established which involves a participation in the divine glory. Through the manifestation of this love, the law is changed from being a summary of stringent exactions and prohibitions enforced by fearful threatenings, into a proclamation of the will of a Father now reconciled to us in Christ, and who is thus recognized as meaning kindness in every requirement, who forbids nothing but what is injurious, enjoins nothing but what is necessary and beneficial, obliges us to suffer nothing but what is subservient to our best good, and disciplines us because He loves us.—By this means, also, the power of *sin* is broken, and instead thereof a disposition to love awakened, which grows ever stronger and stronger, masters more and more perfectly all opposing tendencies and impulses, and brings the whole life with all its organs and powers more resolutely and undividedly, more willingly and joyfully, into the service of God's holy love, and thus promotes the sanctification of the whole man.—By this same means also *death* is robbed of its sting. For believers who pursue after holiness, death appears no longer as an extinction of life causing pain and fear, and making us dreary and desolate; but as an entrance into the rest of Christ, which leads to a glorious renewal of life (comp. Jno. viii. 51; xi. 25 ff.; Rom. vi. 8 ff.; viii. 11, 38 ff.), in which our perfect victory over death, and, together with this, the consummation of our redemption, is made gloriously manifest.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—Ver. 51. HED.: Who then will fear the last great day! To become whole at once, is this a plague? In an instant mortal will be swallowed up of life.—At the resurrection men will have indeed new, yet not other bodies; their own, only changed.—Ver. 53. What after all is beauty of body, and the finest garments; all must molder;—the resurrection will, for the first time, clothe us in beautiful and lasting array.—Ver. 54 f. There are three *it is finished:* 1. at the creation, — for then all was very good; 2. at the redemption—achieved through the blood of Christ; and that was better; 3. at our sanctification and the eternal joy and glory which follow thereupon; which is the best of all. Then our mouth will be full of laughter and our tongue full of praise.—Death lies prostrate, and has now no more power. Life leaps aloft and exclaims: 'Thus subdued, where, O Death, art thou now? and where that sting wherewith thou didst give men their deadly wound?'—Believers are now delivered from all dying. Wondrous triumph!—Ver. 57. Through His perfect obedience and atoning work Christ has rendered satisfaction for our sins, and conquered death. Of this fact His victorious resurrection is a witness. This victory becomes ours through faith, and gives us the power to overcome sin and death likewise. This will be made manifest when Christ has raised our bodies to glory.—No one can confidently expect this victory but he who can say, 'my faith also has overcome the world both within and without me' (1 John v. 4 f.).—What can be more comforting to a Christian than that there should be granted him such a victory over physical death through Christ—that from being the punishment of sin it should become to him a blessing, a happy exit from all misery, and a joyful entrance into glory, and so, a triumph?—Ver. 58. So long as we do not seek to become steadfast in Christianity, to be well grounded in faith, upon the Rock Christ, and to be immoveable against all the storms of temptation, so long will all labor in the practice of Christianity be, for the most part, useless. Indeed, not so much as earnest labor, as idleness and sleepy existence.

BERLENB. BIBEL:—If we do not put on Jesus Christ and the new man from day to day, then the corruptible and the new incorruptible humanity of the glorified Saviour will not be so speedily fused together. He who would share in this much wished for change must have his heart changed here.—The art of transformation God alone understands. What happens now is only preparatory. Hence, no one must regard such divine operations and purifications as a burden.—Ver. 54. The victory of Christ will then first be fulfilled *in us* when the corruptible shall have put on incorruption (regeneration in a complete sense Matt. xix. 28). This victory has already taken place; but it must be fulfilled in all for whom it has been achieved separately and actually, both in this world and in the next. It will be actually begun in each one, when, in his soul, sin and its wages, death, have been subdued in victory over sin, through Christ's new resurrection power, and, on the other hand, an innocent divine life has been begotten in us.—Ver. 55. A consolation which is now concealed from our eyes, in order that we may walk by faith. Death must be disarmed of its means of hurt if we can appropriate this language.—Ver. 56. This he introduces after his song of triumph in order that we may not jubilate after too wild a sort. If the sting of death is to be entirely renounced, sin itself must be once for all entirely annihilated.—The power of sin shows itself in the torments of conscience and in its urging men against their will and better resolutions to do what they know to be wrong. This power, especially that of accusation and condemnation, which every penitent experiences at his conversion is given to sin by the law, when it shows to him what he has merited from God, in all his thoughts, and words, and deeds. And although now such a person earnestly resolve to deliver himself from sin and begin to guard himself against his old habits, and to strive against his evil inclinations, he will nevertheless not often succeed. The law of sin in the members strives against the spirit, so that we do not that which we gladly would.—Ver. 57. God gives us victory, one after the other. If we at any time have already overcome any lust, this happened not from any power of nature, but of grace which has been secured through our Lord Jesus Christ. He who has this grace strong in him may boast in the Lord and in the power of His might.—What boots it, though we daily console ourselves with all these sayings respecting Christ's victory, and are yet not daily obedient to him?—Our enemies are not overcome for us in any such way that they need not also be overcome in us through the power of Christ.—Ver. 58. Firm and immoveable shall we become, if we earnestly hold to the centre.—Striving, watching, praying, the work of faith and the labor of love—this is what will preserve God to us. Let us only be found diligent therein.—The work is ours in respect to its exercises; it is not ours in respect to its origin.

RIEGER:—Ver. 51 ff. Every divine truth furnishes its own contribution to faith, partly, in preparing the heart for it; partly, in actually awakening it; partly, in promoting its growth; partly, in furthering its activity and fruitfulness; and partly, in leading it on to its glorious end.—Ver. 54 ff. God's work cannot remain unfinished. The patient waiting of believers, and the sighing of God's creatures will not remain unheard. But for this, we must give God time.—The power of hope brought to light we have to enjoy in the extremities of death; but the song of victory: *O, Death, where is thy sting?* will chiefly be sung amid the joys of the resurrection. There is no encouragement in the scriptures for a haughty contempt of death. Even in the New Testament, all comfort in reference to it, is derived from communion with Christ, and from that fellowship in love, in which death can effect no break nor separation.—Ver. 56. Faith bows itself beneath the judgment of God; seizes the shield of the hope of salvation; and everywhere shows that it has more to do with God, and His honor, and the sanctification of His name and the fulfilment of His work, and that it is enough for us that with all this, God has intimately in-

woven our salvation also. The sting, by which Death can do us the most hurt, is sin, or the sentence, that death through sin has come into this world, and is now its wages. And the law on its awakening in the conscience, first shows this enemy in its full strength. Do not, however, try to avoid it on this account. He who shrinks from entering into the pain and anguish occasioned by the law, will be deficient in consolation and joyful thanksgiving to God. To become free from the fear of death at a bound, would to many a one seem right; but the victory given us through Christ, has its stages. We are called out of sin into grace, die unto the law in its power, come into subjection to Christ Jesus and the rule of His Spirit, learn thereby how there is no condemnation for those who are in Christ, and also what is revealed to our hope even for this mortal body. Therefore (ver. 58), he who has so learned to know sin and grace, death and life, and discovers in himself the germ of eternal life through the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, can stand fast against all inward fickleness, be immovable against external temptations, and avoid all weariness, and instead, rather abound more and more in the work of the Lord, faith in whom is the spring of every thing else.

HEUBNER:—Ver. 54 f. The Christian experiences indeed the natural dread of death, but not its inward terrors. Through Christ he becomes stronger than nature. Death has for him no more terror, because it brings to him no destruction of being, no judgment, no pain and punishment. Such a song of triumph no wisdom of this world can strike up. Only the fact of redemption tunes us to such peans.—Ver. 56. That which makes death so fearful is the consciousness of sin, and the fear of damnation. But sin is terrible on account of the holy law of God. This law shows us at once its guilt and its curse.—Ver. 57. With this song of praise the Christian celebrates the victory over these great enemies, Death, Sin and Satan. These enemies Christ has already overcome, and celebrated His triumph in the unseen world (Col. ii. 15). Without his aid, no one could overcome these mighty enemies. This victory is not our merit, but a grace given us by God through Christ. The atonement, and the hope of eternal life are closely connected. Everything which Christ has is ours, and this should be our daily medicine.—Ver. 58. The work of our Lord is, *a.* what works in us; *b.* what we bring to pass in His strength. No pure, humble work is ever in vain. The Lord's work succeeds, and he does not suffer his followers' work to fail.

W. F. BESSER:—Ver. 55. For him whom hell no more frights with its torments there is a victory over hell also at the last day, when Christ will be revealed as the Man who has the keys of death and of hell. Whence now have we the right, and derive we the courage to sing such a song of triumph as we feel welling up even in this our mortal body? It stands not in our power to avoid the sting of death; but what is impossible with us has been made possible by God in Christ.—Ver. 58. In order to become stedfast through faith in the hope of the Gospel, and to stand immovable in the citadel of Apostolic doctrine we should seek the aid of the Holy Ghost. But in the Christian life there is no firm endurance without constant watchfulness. If we would abound in the work of the Lord, we must allow the work of His great love to operate in us, and stand in faithful co-operation with that love, in order that every one according to his gift and office, may devote himself to the edification of the church, with the word of truth and with the labor of love (ch. xii. 14). He who works in the Lord, and directs his eye to the day of harvest says with Paul: "*I die daily*," and quiets his heart in patience, being joyful in hope.

GEROCK:—Faith's song of triumph at the grave of the risen: "O, Death, where is thy sting?" Thy sting whereby thou, *a.* robbest me me of my dearest (ver. 52); *b.* and threatenest my own body (ver. 51); *c.* and frightenest my poor soul (ver. 56); *d.* and destroyest the work of my hands (ver. 58).

LUTHER:—"Thanks be unto God," *etc.* This may we also sing, and so keep perpetual Easter, that we may extol and praise God for such a victory, which was not achieved through us, nor won in fight (for it is too high and great), but has been graciously given to us of God—who pitieth our sorrows out of which none could help us, and sent unto us His son, and let Him undertake the conflict. Sin, Death and Hell has He overcome, and given unto us the victory, so that we may say: 'It is our victory,' so that we may accept it with earnestness, and not give God the lie, neither be found ungrateful for it, but maintain it with firm faith in our hearts, and strengthen ourselves therein, and always sing of this victory in Christ, and go on, joyful therein until we see Him also in our own body. To this, may God help us through His own dear Son, and to Him be all glory and praise forever and ever. Amen!"

[*Sermons.* — MANNING: — Ver. 51. *The Commemoration of the faithful departed.* — NEWTON: Ver. 51. *The general resurrection.* I. The mystery. 1. Beyond the reach of fallen man to discover without a revelation from God. 2. Still unintelligible without a further revelation through the influence of the Spirit. II. What to be expected—universal changes. III. Suddenness of event—in a moment. IV. The grand preceding signal—the trumpet sound. Improvement. 1. A joyful day to believers. 2. In view of it what manner of men ought we to be.—Ver. 54. *Death swallowed up in victory.* How predicable of Christians. I. They were once dead in law—but forgiven. II. Once dead in sin—but quickened. III. Once under the tyranny of Satan—but made conquerors over him. IV. Once subject to woes and sufferings—but sorrow and sighing are turned to joy and gladness. V. Once reaped the bitter fruits of sin—but grace triumphs over every evil.—Vv. 55–57.—*Triumph over death and the grave.* I. Death armed with a powerful sting. 1. What the sting is. 2. How sharpened by the law. II. Death disarmed by the death of Christ. III. The doxology—emphatic in every word. 1. Thanks to God—His work. 2. Who giveth us the victory—a victory indeed. 3. Through Jesus Christ. This song best sung when the whole redeemed are collected together.—HOWE:—Ver. 54. *The Christian's*

triumph over death. I. The explication of its rational import. 1. The import—God's general determination to put a perpetual end to death. *a.* Death as here spoken of supposes a certain limited subject, *viz.:* such as are Christ's. *b.* It extends to the whole of that subject—the inner and the outward man. *c.* Presupposes a war. *d.* Where this war ends not in victory on the one side, it ends in victory on the other. 2. The reasonableness of the import. *a.* God's glory requires it. *b.* The felicity of the redeemed requires it. II. The use of the doctrine. 1. If asserted to be believed. 2. Full of comfort; *a.* in reference to departed friends; *b.* in reference to our own death. III. A monition to us since spoken only of some and not of all. IV. This doctrine should cause us to abstain from rash censures of providence that God lets death reign over so great a part of His creation for so long a time. JOHN LOGAN:—VV. 55–57. *The Christian's victory over death.* Christ sets us free: I. From the doubts and fears that are apt to perplex the mind from the uncertainty in which a future state is involved. II. From the apprehensions of wrath proceeding from the consciousness of sin. III. From the fears that arise in the mind upon the awful transition from this world to the next. SPURGEON:—VV. 56–57. *Thoughts on the last battle.* I. The sting of death—Sin. 1. Because it brought death into the world. 2. Because it is that which shall make death most terrible. 3. If sin in the retrospect be the sting of death, what must sin in the prospect be? II. The strength of sin—the Law. 1. In this respect that the law being spiritual it is quite impossible for us to be without sin. 2. It will not abate one tittle of its stern demands. 3. For every transgression it will exact a punishment. III. The victory of faith. 1. Christ has taken away the strength of sin in that He has removed the law. 2. In that, He has completely satisfied it by His perfect obedience. 3. By having brought life and immortality to light through the resurrection.

XVII.

INSTRUCTIONS RESPECTING THE COLLECTIONS FOR THE SAINTS IN JERUSALEM; INTIMATIONS OF HIS INTENDED VISIT AND OF THE TREATMENT DUE TO HIS FRIENDS AND HELPERS; FINALLY GREETINGS AND PARTING WISHES WITH EARNEST EXHORTATIONS.

CHAPTER XVI.

Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to [arranged
2 throughout. διέταξα] the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the [every, κατὰ
μίαν] first *day* of the week[1] let every one of you lay by him in store, as *God* hath
prospered him [whatsoever has gone well with him, ὅ τι ἂν εὐοδῶται], that there be no
3 gatherings when I come. And when I come [am arrived, παραγένωμαι], whomsoever
ye shall approve by *your* letters, [*om.* by *your* letters] them will I send [with letters] to
4 bring your liberality unto Jerusalem. And [But, δὲ] if it be meet that I go [worth
5 my going, ἄξιον τοῦ κἀμὲ πορεύεσθαι] also, they shall go with me. Now I will come
unto you, when I shall pass through Macedonia: For I do pass through Macedonia.
6 And it may be that I will abide, yea, and winter with you [in order, ἵνα], that ye may
bring me on my journey [send me forward, προπέμψητε, *om.* on my journey] whither-
7 soever I go. For I will not [I do not wish to, οὐ θέλω] see you now by the way; but[2]
I trust [for I hope, ἐλπίζω γὰρ] to tarry a while with you, if the Lord permit [shall
8 have permitted me, ἐπιτρέψῃ].[3] But I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost.
9 For a great door and effectual is [has been, ἀνέῳγε] opened unto me, and *there are*
10 many adversaries. Now [But, δὲ] if Timotheus come, see that he may be with you
11 without fear: for he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also *do*. Let no man there-
fore despise him: but conduct him forth [send him forward] in peace, [in order, ἵνα]
12 that he may come unto me: for I look for him with the brethren. [But] As touch-
ing *our* [the] brother Apollos, I greatly[4] desired him [besought him much, πολλὰ
παρεκάλεσα] to come unto you with the brethren: but his will was not at all to come at
13 this time; but he will come when he shall have convenient time. Watch ye, stand
14 fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong. Let all your things [every thing you
15 do] be done with charity [in love, ἐν ἀγάπῃ]. [But] I beseech you, brethren, (ye
know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and *that* they have

16 addicted themselves to the ministry [the service] of the saints,) That ye [also, καί]
submit yourselves [be subject, ὑποτάσσησθε] unto such, and to every one that helpeth
17 with *us*, and laboureth. I am glad of the coming [But I rejoice at the presence, χαίρω
δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ παρουσίᾳ] of Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus: for that which was
lacking on your part [the want of you, τὸ ὑμέτερον[5] ὑστέρημα] they[6] have [*om.* have,
18 ἀνεπλήρωσαν] supplied. For they have [*om.* have, ἀνέπαυσαν] refreshed my spirit
19 and yours: therefore acknowledge ye them that are such. The churches of Asia salute
you. Aquila and Priscilla[7] [Prisca, Πρίσκα] salute[8] you much in the Lord, with the
20 church [congregation, ἐκκλησίᾳ] that is in their house. All the brethren greet you.
21 Greet ye one another with a holy kiss. The salutation of *me* Paul with my
22 own hand. If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ [*om.* Jesus Christ],[9] let him
23 be Anathema, Maranatha. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ[10] *be* with you.
24 My love *be* with you all in Christ Jesus. Amen [*om.* Amen].[11]

¶ The first *epistle* to the Corinthians was written from Philippi by Stephanas, and Fortunatus, and Achaicus, and Timotheus. [*om. this whole subscription.*][12]

[1] Ver. 2.—The *Rec.* has σαββάτων, but it is feebly attested, and was probably derived from Matth. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 2; Luke xxiv. 1. [The singular σαββάτου has been adopted by *Griesbach*, *Lachmann* and *Tischendorf*, on the authority of A. B. C. D. E. F. G. I., Sinait., the Ital. and Vulg. versions, Chrys. and the Latin writers. The plural has the support of K. L., many cursives, the Goth. and Copt. versions, Theodt. and Damasc.—C. P. W.].

[2] Ver. 7.—For the second γάρ, the *Rec.* has δέ, but with inferior evidence in its behalf.

[3] Ver. 7.—The *Rec.* has ἐπιτρέπῃ, but in opposition to the best MSS., and derived from Heb. vi. 3. [*Lachm.*, *Tischendorf* and *Alford* favor ἐπιτρέψῃ after A. B. C. I., Sinait., Vulg. [*permiserit*], Chrys., Theophyl.; but the present is given in D. E. F. G. K. *et al.*, as Alford suggests because "the force of the aorist was not perceived."—C. P. W.].

[4] Ver. 12.—Before πολλά, the words δηλῶ ὑμῖν ὅτι are inserted by D. E. F. G., Sinait. several Latin MSS., the Vulg. Goth. and the Lat. writers.—C. P. W.].

[5] Ver. 17.—The *Rec.* has ὑμῶν instead of ὑμέτερον, but against much preponderating evidence; comp. Phil. ii. 30. [For ὑμῶν we have A. K. L., Sinait., a number of cursives, with Chrys., Theodt. and Damasc.; but for ὑμέτερον B. C. D. E. F. G., 17, *et al.*—C. P. W.].

[6] Ver. 17.—The *Rec.* has οὗτοι, [with B. C. K. L., Sinait., many cursives, Theodt. and Damasc.] instead of αὐτοὶ [with A. D. E. F. G., Vulg. Syr. (Pesch.) Chrys., Œcum., Ambrst., Pelag.]; but it is not so well authenticated.

[7] Ver. 19.—The *Rec.* has πρίσκιλλα and it is well sustained. Even *Lachm.* in his *ed. major* has adopted it. [But πρίσκα is preferred by *Tischendorf*, *Kling*, on the authority of B. M., Sinait., 17, three of the best MSS. of the Vulg., the Copt. and Goth. versions, and Pelag. This form appears on the authority of all the uncial and cursives (except one) in Rom. xvi. 3; and 2 Tim. iv. 19; and the other (πρίσκιλλα), on unvarying authority in Acts xviii. 2, 18, 26. From the Acts it appears to have passed into some MSS. of Paul's Epistles. *Lachm.* (in the earlier editions), *Bloomfield*, *Alford*, *Wordsworth* and *Stanley* prefer the diminutive form, with A. C. D. E. F. G. K. L., *et al.*—C. P. W.].

[8] Ver. 19.—The *Rec.* has ἀσπάζονται, and *Lachmann* has adopted it, but it is probably an attempt to correct the text. [It has in its favor, B. F. G. L., and numerous cursives, versions and fathers; but against it C. D. E. K., Sinait., and the Gothic and Theodt.—C. P. W.].

[9] Ver. 22.—The *Rec.* after κύριον adds Ἰησοῦν χριστόν, but in opposition to the best MSS. [A. B. C. (1st hand) M. Sinait. (1st hand), 4 cursives, Aeth. (both) Cyr. Chrys. (mosc.). These words are inserted in C. (3d hand), D. E. F. G. K. L., Sinait., (3d hand), Ital. Vulg., later Syr., Copt., and Goth. versions, and some Fathers. Some of these (including K. L., the Vulg. Chrys. Theophyl.) insert ἡμῶν before Ἰησ. Χρ.—C. P. W.].

[10] Ver. 23.—The *Rec.* and *Lachmann* have Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, and they are sustained by weighty testimony, [A. C. D. E. F. G. K. L, Sinait. (3d hand), many cursives, 4 Latin MSS. the Vulg. Copt. and Syr. (both), Chrys. Ambrst. Many of these (including A. L. 20 cursives, the Vulg. Copt. and Syr. and Fathers) insert ἡμῶν after κυρίου. Some (including B. Sinait. (1st hand) 10 cursives, Goth. Theodt.) add only Ἰησοῦ after κυρίου.—C. P. W.].

[11] Ver. 24.—The *Rec.* has ἀμήν, after important authorities: [A. C. D. E. K. L., Sinait., with the majority of cursives, versions and writers, *Tischendorf* (and Dr. *Clarke* decidedly) cancel it, and it is bracketed by *Bloomfield*, *Alford*, *Conybeare* and *Stanley*].

[Subscription.—The most ancient and best MSS. (A. B. C. Sinait.) have simply ΠΟΡΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ ᾱ; to which F. G. prefix ἐτελέσθη; D adds ἐπληρώθη; some MSS. of the Vulg. add immediately after ᾱ, *explicit*. No subscription of any kind is found in M. and the Vulgate. The *Rec.* has πρὸς κορ. πρώτη ἐγράφη ἀπὸ φιλίππων διὰ στεφανᾶ κ. φουρτουνάτου κ. ἀχαϊκοῦ κ. τιμοθέου, on the authority of K. L., 7 cursives, Syr. (later), Arab. (later), and Damasc.; two other cursives have the same, substituting ἐφεσοῦ for φιλ; and Theodt. the same, omitting τιμ. B. (2d hand) and Chrys. (com.) have γράφη ἀπὸ ἐφεσόν, some others adding τῆς ἀσίας and others substituting this for ἐφεσοῦ. E., a few cursives, Slav. Theodt. (spurious) Œcum. have ἐγράφη ἀπὸ φιλίππων, to which D. (2d hand) and the Syr. (Pesch.) adds Μακεδονίας. The Copt. says: *e Philippa, ut dixerunt quidam; verum potius videtur secundum ipsius apostoli indicium scripta esse ex Asia.*—C. P. W.].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1-4. ["The conclusion of this Epistle, as of that to the Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, and 2 Timothy, is taken up with matters more or less personal and secular. Of these the first is the collection amongst the Gentile churches for the poorer Christians in Judea. From whatever cause, there was at this period much poverty in Palestine, compared with the other eastern provinces of the Roman Empire. The chief allusions contained in the apostolical Epistles, to the duties of the rich towards the poor, are those which we find in connection with the contribution here mentioned. And in the Epistle of St. James and that to the Hebrews, both addressed, if not to Judea, at least to Jewish communities. And with this agrees the great stress laid in the Gospels on the duty of alms-giving. We learn also, from the account of the last struggle for independence in Josephus, how deeply the feelings of the poor were embittered against the rich in Jerusalem, so as to give to the intestine factions of that time something of the character of a social war. This was, in part, occasioned by the greater density of population in Palestine, compared with the thinly inhabited tracts of Greece and Asia Minor; in part by the strongly marked distinction of rich and poor, which had been handed down to the Jews from the earlier periods of their history, where we are familiar with it from the denunciations of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Nehemiah. The Christians, besides, were, as a general rule, from the poorer classes (Jas. ii. 5), and would be subject to persecutions

and difficulties, on account of their religion (Heb. x. 24). From the mention of the poor as a distinct class in the Christian church, in Acts ix. 36, and in the passages relating to the contribution now in question, it would seem that the community of property at Jerusalem must have either declined or failed of its object; and may have even contributed to occasion the great poverty which we thus find prevailing in the period of twenty or thirty years after its first mention. So pressing was the necessity at the time when St. Paul first parted from the church of Jerusalem, that an express stipulation was made in behalf of this very point (Gal. ii. 10). 'To remember the poor,' was the one link by which the Apostle of the Gentiles was still bound to the churches of Judea. This pledge was given, probably, before his second journey. But it was not till his third and last journey that the preparations were made for the great contribution of which he now speaks. From this passage, confirmed indirectly by Gal. ii. 10; vi. 10, it would appear that he had first given orders for the collection in the churches of Galatia. From 2 Cor. viii. 10; ix. 2, it also appears that the orders here given to the Corinthians had been received by them a year before the time of the Second Epistle, and therefore some months before this Epistle." STANLEY].

Now concerning the collection for the saints.—These words may either be connected with those immediately following, so as to be rendered, 'as I gave order concerning the collection,' *etc.* (comp. xii. 1; viii. 1; 2 Cor. ix. 1); or be taken absolutely, as in ver. 12, and vii. 1. ["The *περὶ δὲ, now concerning*, rather serves to introduce the new subject than to form any constructional part of the sentence." ALFORD. "Observe the beauty of the connection with what has gone before. The Apostle had just been preaching consolation to the faithful, from the certainty of a glorious resurrection of the body; and in accordance with our Lord's declarations concerning works of mercy (Matt. xxv. 34–46) he had taken occasion from that doctrine to enforce the duty of laboring stedfastly in the Lord in deeds of piety and charity, in order to a blessed immortality. He now applies that Christian doctrine and duty to a particular work, in which he himself was then engaged, and in which he desired to engage the Corinthians." WORDSWORTH]. The entire form of the introduction, as well as the article before *λογίας, the collection*, indicates that he had spoken before in regard to the matter, and the Corinthians had, perhaps, inquired how they were to carry it forward. The word *λογία* no where else occurs in Scripture, ["and seems to have been Hellenistical and idiotical, it being rarely found in the classical writers." BLOOMFIELD]. The design of the collection is indicated by the preposition *εἰς*. The saints were the poor Christians in Jerusalem (ver. 3; Rom. xv. 26; comp. Acts xxiv. 17). The mother church had been impoverished in part by the community of goods that took place soon after Pentecost, and in part by persecutions, and perhaps also 'by contributions for the mission work among the dispersed' (Osiander); and the support of it was an act of filial piety, calculated also to promote a brotherly union between the Jewish and Gentile Christians. The supposition that Paul wished to quiet the opposition of the Jewish Christians, who had been aroused against him, by this work of love (Cath.), is to be rejected as contrary to that simplicity of purpose manifest in this Epistle.—**as I gave order to the churches of Galatia,** —This order was issued probably during his residence among the Galatians (Acts xviii. 23); or it may have emanated from him at Ephesus. [Nothing of the sort appears in the Epistle to the Galatians; the allusion to it there (ii. 10) being only incidental]. The mention here of this order, thereby indicating what the Galatians were doing, was simply for the purpose of stimulating one church by the example of another. As Bengel remarks, "To the Corinthians he proposes the example of the Galatians; to the Macedonians, the example of the Corinthians; to the Romans that of the Corinthians and Macedonians (2 Cor. ix. 2; Rom. xv. 26). Great is the power of example."—**even so do ye also.**—*ποιήσατε*—The aorist here imparts urgency to the exhortation. The thing is to be done at once; "*bis dat, qui cito dat,*" *who gives quickly, gives twice.*—Next comes the specific direction as to what they were to do.—**Upon the first (day) of the week**—*κατὰ μίαν σαββάτου, lit.* "upon one of the Sabbath." *σάββατον*, a designation for the week, occurring also in Luke xviii. 12. *μία, one*, is for *πρώτη, first*; a Hebraism, אֶחָד בַּשַּׁבָּת (Lightfoot on Matt. xxviii. 1). "This passage is important as the first in which there occurs a clear trace of a distinction put upon the first day of the week, as our Lord's resurrection day. Yet we cannot find here any special observance of the day, as Osiander does." NEANDER. Inasmuch as he says nothing of laying by in the *church assembly*, it does not follow from what is here said, that the churches convened on that day. But the passage certainly implies that this day of the resurrection of our Lord was for the Christians a holy day, out of which all other observances of the sort naturally developed themselves. [Comp. Jno. xx. 19, 26; Acts xx. 7; Rev. i. 10.]—**let each one of you lay up by himself,**—*παρ' ἑαυτῷ, at home* (comp. *πρὸς ἑαυτὸν* Luke xxiv. 12); [like the French *chez soi* (ROB. *Lex.* under *παυά*), or the German *bei sich selbst* (as Luther's version gives it). The phrase is therefore conclusive against the prevailing opinion that the collection was taken up in the church. It was an individual and private affair. "This is confirmed by the exhortation in allusion to the same subject, in 2 Cor. ix. 7, 'Every man, according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver.'"* STANLEY]. —**treasuring up**—From the fact that some-

* [Hodge, however, objects to this, "that the whole expression is thus obscure and awkward. 'Let every one at home place, treasuring up what he has to give.' The words mean *to lay by himself.* The direction is nothing more definite than *let him place by himself, i. e.*, let him take to himself what he means to give. What he was to do with it, or where he was to deposit it, is not said. The word *θησαυρίζων* means *putting into the treasury*, or *hoarding up*, and is perfectly consistent with the assumption that the place of deposit was some common, and not every man's house." This is well argued in behalf of the public solemn observance of the Lord's day; but we can no more change the meaning of *παρ' ἑαυτῷ* than we can the parallel phrases in the other languages. They are the idiomatic expressions for 'at home,' and honestly require that we should so interpret. This is the rendering which even the ancient Syriac version gives it].

thing was laid aside every Sunday, there would naturally result an accumulation, θησαυρός, hence the part. θησαυρίζων, [rendered in the E. V. "in store."].—**whatever he has been prospered in,**—ὁ, τι ἂν εὐωδῶται; [ὁ, τι is for καθ' ὁ, or καθῶς, *according as*, or, *in respect to whatever*. The addition of ἂν gives it a general and potential character; εὐωδεῖσθαι, lit. 'to be set forward on a journey']; hence, 'what he has gained by the success of business.' This he regards as a *divine blessing*, which he would have redound to the benefit of their needy brethren [as may be seen from the use of the passive implying the reception of some good from a source too obvious to require mention]. The object of this gradual accumulation was, as he says,—**in order that there may be no gatherings when I come.**—By this preliminary work, the whole business of collection would be lightened, the voluntariness of the contribution be preserved, a greater amount perhaps collected, and time gained. [The order of the Greek would indicate an emphasis not observed in the English translation, 'in order that when I come, THEN there may be no collections made,' as though he wanted the time of his next visit for something more important. The taking up of the collection, though a very important part of his business, was still only incidental to the far greater one of preaching the Gospel. Hodge draws another argument from this, in favor of the position that this passage is proof of an early observance of the Lord's day for worship. "But if every man had his money laid by at home, the collection would be still to be made. The probability is, therefore, Paul intended to direct the Corinthians to make a collection every Lord's day for the poor, when they met for worship." There is some force in this. But must not this be interpreted in consistency with the settled meaning of παρ' ἑαυτῷ, and it be supposed to mean, as Barnes says, "that there should be no trouble in collecting the small sums; that it should all be prepared; and all persons be ready to hand over to him what he had laid by?" Or, while the "laying by" was to be at home weekly, may not "the treasuring up" refer to the depositing of the sum in the church treasury at some time previous to Paul's arrival, so that it should be there ready for him. This seems the fairest method of interpretation].—**And when I have arrived**— He here goes on to mention some further arrangements respecting the guardianship of the collection, [as it were to pledge in advance the utmost care of what might be bestowed, and to preclude any allegations on the part of his enemies of any personal interest in the matter].—**whomsoever ye may approve**—(οὓς ἐάν, vi. 18). δοκιμάσητε, 'approve after suitable examination.' ["The Corinthians themselves were to choose their agents, probably to prevent the possibility of misappropriation, as others had been chosen for a like purpose by the other churches. See 2 Cor. viii. 18–20. 'And we have sent with him the brother—avoiding this that no man should blame us in this abundance which is administered by us.'" STANLEY]. Thus all suspicion would be obviated.—**by letters, them will I send**—δι' ἐπιστολῶν is not to be joined with what precedes [as in E. V. and by Beza, Calvin, and Chrys.] (*quos Hierosolymitanis per epistolas commendaveritis*), but with what follows. It is prefixed by way of emphasis; also perhaps in allusion to the other possible alternative mentioned in the next verse, which was already in mind. These letters would be for the purpose of accrediting the messengers, and commending them and their object to friends at Jerusalem. ["Hence, we see how common Paul's practice was of writing epistles. And who knows how many private letters of his, not addressed to churches, have been lost? The only letter of the kind, which remains to us (except the Pastoral Epistles), *viz.*, that to Philemon, owes its preservation perhaps to the mere circumstance that it is at the same time addressed *to the church in the house* of Philemon (ver. 2)." MEYER].—**to convey your favor.**—χάριν, used by metonymy for your 'charity,' or 'token of love.' (Plato: εὐεργεσία ἐκούσιος); likewise in 2 Cor. viii. 4, 6, 19. To this he adds another proposal, conditioned upon the magnitude of the collection, as making the thing worth while.—**But if it should be worth my going also,**—*i. e.*, 'the collection, or its gross amount be large enough to warrant my taking such a journey in person;' for only this would justify his participating in the thing. He says this from a just sense of his dignity as an apostle; and it by no means conflicts with a real humility. ["A just estimate of one's self is not pride." BENGEL]. To ascribe his readiness to accompany the gift to a desire, either to look after its distribution, or to secure for himself by means of it a kind reception, is altogether gratuitous. He intimates nothing of the sort. But it were reasonable to suppose that he took this as a delicate way of stimulating them to make the collection as large as possible. That he actually carried out this purpose, may be seen from Rom. xv. 25; comp. Acts xxi. (although nothing is said here of the collection).

VERS. 5–9. Taking up his declaration in ver. 3, about being present with them, he here explains himself more fully in regard to his purpose, especially as to the time of his visit. His earlier plan, which he did not carry out (2 Cor. i. 23), was, as we see from 2 Cor. i. 15, a very different one. [It was to go to Macedonia by way of Corinth, and then to return to them at Corinth. This he had made known to them either by the lost Epistle, or by an oral message. But now he tacitly drops this, (thereby exposing himself to a charge of levity of purpose, 2 Cor. i. 17 ff.), and proceeds to state another, reversing the order of his going, *to* Corinth *round by way of* Macedonia]. That here announced he did execute (comp. 2 Cor. ii. 13; viii. 1; ix. 2, 4; ii. 1; xii. 14; xiii. 1). [Here we find him already in Macedonia, when the 2 Epistle to them was written; and in Acts xx. 1 ff. there is an account of his journey].—**Now I will come to you when I have passed through Macedonia**;—[And this he was to do without stopping by the way, as may be seen in the next sentence, which is not to be read, as it often is, parenthetically, as though repeating in a positive manner what had been just mentioned as a condition of time].—**For I shall pass through Macedonia.**—διέρχομαι is here present for

the future; [and it must be read in its strictest sense, *q. d.*, 'I am going right through, as] it stands in contrast with the παραμενῶ of the next clause as indicated by δέ.—**But with you,**—[πρὸς ὑμᾶς comes first, because designed to express the antithesis to Μακεδονίαν].—**it may be,**—τυχόν shows his determination was not settled. He takes into account circumstances which might possibly prevent his doing as he desired.—**I shall tarry, or even pass the winter,**—As his language in speaking of his plan breathes an affectionate and winning spirit, so he goes on in what follows, where the position of the words is expressive of feeling.—**in order that ye**—in preference to every other church,—**may send me forward whithersoever I may go.**—In this way he shows how very close to his heart they stood. It was a custom, as may be learned from many passages, (Rom. xv. 24; Acts xv. 3; xvii. 15; 3 Jno. 6), for members of the Church to show their respect and love by accompanying the ministers that went from them, a little way on their journey, probably by a deputation chosen from their number. οὐ [with a verb of motion], for ὅποι, Luke x. 1. [The adverb of rest is joined with a verb of motion in a pregnant way, to signify the place of rest after the motion is accomplished. See Jelf. *Gr. Gram.*, § 647, 6, 3, a. προπέμπειν, *to send forward*, a common expression for denoting that helpful attendance on departing guests which was wont to be done in token of regard].—**For I am not willing at this time to see you by the way;**—*i. e.*, 'only make you a flying visit. Inasmuch as ἄρτι does not stand before οὐ θέλω, it is evident he is not here speaking of any change of plan in regard to his journey, as though his previous wish had been to see them only in passing. And since it reads ἄρτι and not πάλιν, there is nothing to warrant the inference that he made a brief earlier visit. The reason of the determination just expressed he next gives.—**for I hope to tarry a while with you,**—An expectation which the appearance of things, as they then were, seemed to warrant. πρὸς ὑμᾶς=παρ' ὑμῖν, as in ver. 6; comp. 11, 3.—**if the Lord permit.**—An expression of that pious feeling which always led him to realize his dependence on the will of the Lord in whatsoever he undertook. [Comp. Jas. iv. 15. "For that ye ought to say, if the Lord will, we shall live, and do this, or that"—a condition which the early Christians were wont to append to all expressions of their determination in reference to anything future, in the deep consciousness that all events were under the direction of that God to whose will it was their purpose ever to submit. With finite creatures no resolution can or ought to be absolute. Every act is conditioned on Him who is the sole absolute Sovereign]. He now states his plans still further.—**But I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost.**—[In this revelation of his intentions Chrysostom detects an indication of his confidence and affection toward the Corinthians]. There is no reason to infer from Acts xx. 1, as Osiander does, that he left Ephesus earlier than the time mentioned in consequence of the uproar occasioned by Demetrius. Two reasons are assigned for his tarrying.—**For a door has been opened before me,**—By the open door (comp. 2 Cor. ii. 12; Col. iv. 3; Rev. iii. 8), he signifies the opportunity that was given him for laboring in the cause of Christ.—**large**—By this he indicates the extent of the opportunity before him. It was a wide field,—**and effectual**—By this he denotes the intensive aspect of it, or perhaps also the influence which his activity seemed destined to exert (Meyer). He here passes out from the figure to the real aspects of the case, and that, too, not in a logically consistent manner. Hence the reading ἐναργής (also in Philem. 6) which appears in the Latin authorities, and so the Vulgate has *evidens* [and the Rheims version, *evident*]. The meaning is, that there was a rich opportunity for labor, and that, too, of the most abundant and energetic sort. And is there not an intimation here also of the power of divine grace in opening the door (Osiander)? A second reason for lingering at Ephesus is,—**and there (are) many adversaries.**—The great success of the Apostle provoked strong opposition against Him. This only stimulated the Apostle, who felt himself strong in the Lord, to remain rather than to leave. [Besides, his presence was the more needful for the strength and support of the infant church, which he had gathered]. Neander, however, thinks that no motive is here assigned for a longer stay, but only that the Apostle intended to have the Corinthians infer from it that matters were not going so very comfortably with him, and that he was obliged to struggle with many obstacles. ["The opponents of the Gospel varied very much in character in different places. Those in Ephesus were principally men interested in the worship of Diana. The pressure of the heathen seemed to have driven the Jews and Christians to make common cause (Acts xix. 22). Whereas, in Corinth Paul's most bitter opposers were judaizers." Hodge].

Vers. 10, 11. **Now if Timothy come,**—Timothy's visit to Corinth was to precede his own (comp. iv. 17). He, together with Erastus, had contemplated making a visitorial journey first to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22). Him, therefore, he here commends to their friendly and respectful reception, and to their peaceful furtherance of him on his way. Instead of, "*if* he come," he might have written '*when* he comes,' thereby simply indicating the time of his arrival; but in using the conditional form, he expresses some doubt in reference to his coming, in consequence of the uncertainties of the journey. ["And though Paul had sent him forward thither, yet he had many churches in Macedonia to visit by the way." Bloomfield].—**see**—βλέπειν, *to look to something*, is generally followed by εἰς or πρός; but here by a clause beginning with ἵνα, signifying intention.—**that he may be with you without fear:**—This request refers not to protection from unbelievers, still less is it a warning against hostile attacks from opponents (Mosheim); but it is aimed rather at the haughty, overbearing conduct of proud partisan leaders, and their followers. He may also have had in mind Timothy's timid nature. This request is supported by a reference to the high calling of Timothy.—**for he worketh the work of the Lord,**—ἔργον τοῦ κυρίου, **as**

in xv. 58; it may mean either the work in which the Lord himself is engaged, or that which He has prescribed.—**as I also do.**—By this he expresses either a similarity of office, or that Timothy evinced the same zeal and fidelity to the cause of Christ which he also felt (Osiander). The first explanation would perhaps be the more correct. [Hodge combines them both]. Hereupon follows a more definite injunction.—**Let no man therefore despise him:**—whether it be on account of his youth (Tim. iv. 12), or on account of his natural modesty (Burger, refering to 2 Tim. i. 6, 7), or out of party zeal because he came from Paul.—**but send him on** —[In regard to the manner of sending on, see above, ver. 6].—**in peace,**—These words are not to be connected with what follows (Flatt). They do not mean, simply, in safety and in good condition, but still more, 'without annoyance,' 'with good understanding and kindly affection.' And the object of this is,—**that he may come to me:**—And the reason for his coming to him, and not going elsewhere is,—**for I am waiting for him with the brethren.**—These brethren were not with the waiting Apostle, but with Timothy, who must have had other companions besides Erastus (comp. ver. 12). It was common to send several (Meyer).

Ver. 12. — **As touching our brother Apollos,**—περὶ Ἀπολλώ, stands absolutely as ver. 1. Each of the new topics of this Epistle being introduced by περί. In reference to Apollos see Int. No. 2; and also, i. 12; iii. 5 ff.; iv. 6 ff. That which he said in regard to the coming of Timothy prompts him to give information now respecting Apollos, because perhaps, of a wish that had been expressed in regard to him by the Corinthians.—**I greatly exhorted him to come to you**—He here wards off in advance all suspicion in regard to any reluctance of his own about the visit of Apollos at Corinth, and gives them to understand his perfect confidence in him, and the brotherly relations which they mutually sustained, [notwithstanding the party strife that was waged under their names at Corinth. So far was he from desiring him to stay on this account, that he was urgent he should go; it may be in the hope that he might contribute something towards settling the difficulties. And here we have another illustration of the nobility of Paul's spirit, his entire freedom from all petty jealousy and the loving confidence which he reposed in his fellow-workers]. Apollos must have been at this time at Ephesus.—ἵνα denotes not only the purport, but also the aim of his exhortation to Apollos. **with the brethren:**—These brethren are the ones mentioned in ver. 11. ["Besides the mission of Timothy there was another later mission despatched at the time of his writing this Epistle with the view partly of carrying the Epistle and enforcing the observance of its contents, partly of urging upon the church the necessity of completing their contribution before the Apostle's arrival (2 Cor. viii. 6; xii. 18). This mission was composed of Titus and two other brethren (2 Cor. viii. 18, 22, 23), whose names are not mentioned; Titus having been chosen for this, as Timothy for the other, probably from his greater energy and firmness of character. That the mission thus described is the one to which he here alludes can hardly be doubted. The words "exhort" and "brother" are used in the same emphatic and recognized sense in both passages; and as the mission there spoken of was previous to his writing the second Epistle, it can be referred to no occasion so obviously as that which is here described. These accordingly are "the brethren" who would, as he expected, find or wait for Timothy at Corinth, and return with him. It would seem, however, that the Apostle's original wish had been, that the head of this mission should have been not Titus, but Apollos. Apollos, since his visit to Corinth (Acts xviii. 27, comp. with 1 Cor. iii. 6) must have returned to Ephesus; and he, both from the distinction which he enjoyed in the opinion of his fellow Christians, and from his previous acquaintance with the church at Corinth, would have been a natural person to send on such a mission. It is a slight confirmation of the identity of this mission with that of Titus, that the only later occasion on which the name of Apollos occurs in the New Testament is in the Epistle to Titus, iii. 13, where they are spoken of as living together." Stanley].—**but (his) will was not at all to come at this time;**—Some here take the word "will," which stands without further designation, to mean 'the will of God,' appealing for support to the inconvenience mentioned in the next clause, and to the analogy of Rom. xii. 28; but the context clearly shows the will of Apollos to have been meant. Here, too, ἵνα is not to be taken in the strict telic sense, but it simply indicates a degree of determination in the resolve taken. The reason of the unwillingness of Apollos to go to Corinth may have lain, partly, in his fear of encouraging the factions at Corinth, and, partly, in other duties which he regarded as more pressing. The latter seems to be indicated in the next clause.—**but he will come when he shall have convenient time.**—εὐκαιρεῖν, a word of later Greek, meaning *to have opportunity, leisure,* or *occasion,* for anything. Here, it refers, not to the removal of difficulties at Corinth, as though it meant, 'when you have become united again'—but to other circumstances and engagements which were then holding him back.

Vers. 13–14.—**Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, act like men, be strong.**—Hastening now to the close, he aims to impress upon his readers briefly and earnestly the duty of devoting themselves to the service of the Lord—whether he or Apollos were present to observe them, or not. This exhortation—called out; as Burger thinks, by the mention of Apollos, whose name might serve to awaken the recollection of matters already rebuked (i.–iii.)—revolves around two main points, faith and love. *Stedfastness* in the faith essentially presupposes *watchfulness*—that Christian circumspection which keeps on the look-out for all attacks of treacherous foes, both from without and from within, abandons itself to no false security, and fortifies itself against temptation from whatsoever source (comp. x. 12). And this *watchfulness* is even associated with a wakeful, courageous, *manly attitude,* and with a summoning up of *strength* to resist the might of every foe. These two qualities are no less an

evidence of faith, than they are the *conditions* of a true steadfastness. The expressions used, all imply the figure of a spiritual combat in which they are supposed to be engaged. The "standing" (*στήκειν*) here does not denote a standing in readiness for the fight, but a standing firm in it, and not suffering one's self to be forced aside from that faith which is the basis of the Christian life—the fixed attitude of the warrior in the ranks or at his post (comp. xv. 1, 58).—*ἀνδρίζεσθαι, to be manly, in deportment and action*, occurs only here in the New Testament; elsewhere in the Classics and LXX. Josh. i. 61; 1 Macc. ii. 64.—*κραταιοῦσθε, be strong* (comp. Eph. iii. 16. "Be strong in might through his spirit in the inward man"); in the older Greek, the word for this was *κρατύνεσθαι*. The word is suggestive of conflicts with open enemies, such as Jews and Heathen and also, of persecutions endured on account of the faith (Osiander).—**Let all your things be done in love.** After what he has said already, on the duty of love he needed only to express himself briefly on this point in concluding. The allusion is primarily to their divisions and strifes, *q. d.*, 'in all you do, instead of being governed by a selfish partisanship, suffer yourselves to be actuated by a love which looks to the well being of the brotherhood' (comp. xiii. 1, 11; xi. 18; viii. 1; x. 24, 33). ["He says, 'watch ye,' as though they were sleeping; 'stand fast,' as though they were wavering; 'be manly and strong,' as though they were effeminate and delicate; '*let all* your things be done in love,' as though they were at strife." CHRYS.]

VERS. 15–18. After the above concluding exhortation he turns to speak of some personal matters. And first he enjoins a respectful behavior towards certain prominent members of the church and one in particular.—**And I beseech you, brethren,**—The particular point of his exhortation is introduced by *ἵνα* in the 16th verse; and what follows must be treated as a parenthesis, referring to what was already known by them and formed the motive for their complying with his request.—**ye know,**—*οἴδατε*; this cannot be a part of his exhortation, for the simple reason that it cannot be shown to be the imperative form for *ἴστε*.—**the house of Stephanas that it is the first fruits of Achaia,**—*i. e.*, the first in that province who were brought to the faith (comp. Rom. xvi. 5, where the words "unto Christ" are added). From i. 16 we learn that Paul himself baptized this family. It was the first sheaf of a great spiritual harvest in Corinth, indeed in that whole region; hence a family most readily disposed toward the Gospel, and from which no doubt a saving influence emanated. As it distinguished itself in respect to faith, so also in respect to love.—**and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.**—The plural here occurs, because the term "house" is a collective noun. By "ministry" we are not to understand any official action such as is carried on in the capacity of a presbyter, for which indeed such first fruits were as a general thing preëminently fitted. There is nothing in the following verb "submit yourselves" to constrain us to this supposition, as though the meaning here were that the Corinthians should subject themselves to these persons just as other churches submit themselves to their rulers; rather the injunction here—**That ye submit yourselves unto such**—corresponds to what has just been said of the household of Stephanas: 'as these had addicted themselves unto the ministry for the saints—a thing which involved a sort of submission so also do ye devote yourselves to them.' In what way this ministry had been exercised is uncertain; probably in services of love to individuals such as the poor, the sick, in hospitality towards brethren visiting from abroad, and in the undertaking of various responsibilities in behalf of the church, as for example, the journey of Stephenas to Ephesus for the purpose of seeing Paul. The word *ὑποτάσσεσθαι* denotes not simply the showing of respect in general but like *obsequi*, following a person's advice or opinion, conducting in accordance with their wishes. ["Nothing is more natural than submission to the good." HODGE]. By the expression *τοῖς, τοιούτοις* he brings to view more prominently the excellent qualities of the parties referred to, *q. d.*, 'to persons of like excellence with these.' That it does not refer to a class is evident from the clause appended,—**and to every one that helpeth with us and laboreth.**—It is debated to what the *συν, with*, in *συνεργοῦντι* is to be referred. There is nothing in the context to justify our referring it to God. Rather we are led to refer it to the apostle, and, next, to those just mentioned. The participle *κοπιῶντι* implies that this coöperation was an earnest and laborious one. ["Those who serve should be served." HODGE]. He enforces his injunction in relation to the family of Stephanas by mentioning what he and the Corinthian brethren with him, Fortunatus and Achaicus, had done for himself, thereby enhancing their respect for these worthy men.—**I am glad of the coming of Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus:**—These men had been sent as a deputation to him from Corinth, and had brought the letter alluded to in vii. 1. In regard to them we can determine nothing more definitely. Whether it was the same Stephanas of whose family he had just spoken (as is probable), or a son of his; and whether the two others belonged to this family or not; and whether this Fortunatus was the same as the one mentioned in the first Epistle of Clemens to the Corinthians or another of the same name, is all uncertain. The reason of his joy at their presence was,—**because your want they have supplied.**—For a like expression see Phil. ii. 30. But what are we to understand by the expression *τὸ ὑμέτερον ὑστέρημα, your want?* It would be inconsistent with the whole spirit of this paragraph to suppose the Apostle to imply a bitter charge against them by translating the words, [as in the E. V.] "that which was lacking on your part," as though they had failed in suitable tokens of love, or the like. It is better to take *ὑμέτερον* as the objective genitive (comp. xv. 31), and translate 'the want of you,' *i. e.*, your absence. This it is which was in part made up by the presence of these brethren. This is more fully explained in what follows—**For they have refreshed my spirit and**

yours:—*ἀναπαύειν*, lit. *to cause to rest, to relieve from care or trouble*, and in general, *to refresh* (2 Cor. vii. 13; Matt xi. 28; Philem. vii. 20). But how far did they refresh *his* spirit, and that of the *Corinthians?* The latter certainly, does not refer to any earlier services of love which these men had shown to the Corinthians; and just as little, to the assurances of love from the apostle which they carried back with them; since this was not contemporaneous with their refreshment of his spirit: hence, also, not to the influence which the information and assurances they had conveyed to him had had upon the shaping of this Epistle. The point is best explained upon the ground of a fellowship between the apostle and the church (comp 2 Cor. 11, 3), *q. d.*, 'while they refreshed me, they also refreshed you.' The quieting of his spirit by the information they had brought and by their personal presence which served to exhibit anew the love of the church toward him and awaken in him the hope of their improvement, must also have been beneficial for them; and the consciousness of a fellowship thereby renewed and strengthened must have proved exceedingly refreshing alike for them and for him (comp. Osiander and Meyer ed. 3, who remarks, "that their interview with the Apostle must have been refreshing to the feelings of the whole church, inasmuch as they had come to him as *representatives* of the whole church." As they through their presence had provided for Paul a sweet refreshment they had also done it for the church, which, by their means, had come into communion with him and was indebted to them for this refreshment, which must have been felt by it in the consciousness of this communion. ["However understood it is one of the examples of urbanity with which this Apostle's writings abound." HODGE]. To this he adds the exhortation—**therefore acknowledge ye them that are such.**—*ἐπιγινώσκειν* does not mean precisely *to highly value*, but *to rightly recognize, viz.:* in their true worth and according to their deserts, from which indeed esteem naturally follows. The reason for this is the thing of which he has just spoken—their services and the refreshment which had been administered by them both to himself and the church.

VERS. 19, 20. He presents a three-fold greeting whereby Christian fellowship is expressed and confirmed.—**The churches of Asia salute you.**—Asia is here to be understood, either in the narrowest sense as designating Ionia and the region round about Ephesus; or suitably to Roman usage then current, as applying to the whole region of Asia Minor bordering on the western coast, including Caria, Lydia, Mysia (*Asia proconsularis*). Since a regular intercourse was maintained between Ephesus and those regions, and since the apostle stood in living relations to the churches here planted, both by personal visits and by means of brethren visiting him from thence, it is probable that they sent greetings by him to the Corinthian church on his giving them information respecting it and announcing his intention of writing. Next comes a greeting from that excellent Christian couple who formerly tarried with him at Corinth, and were intimately connected with the Christian church there, but who had left and come to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 2, 26). The greeting here is a hearty one, and founded upon a Christian fellowship.—**Aquilla and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord,**—As bound together by faith in a common Lord, they here send the benedictions of a fervent love.—**and the Church that is in their house,**—*i. e.*, not simply their numerous household, but that portion of the Ephesian church which was wont to assemble under their roof. Owing to the lack of accommodations, the larger churches, like those of Ephesus and Rome were obliged to divide, and meet in several rooms furnished by the more wealthy members.—**All the brethren greet you.**—*i. e.*, the Ephesian Christians collectively, apart from those just mentioned specifically. The fellowship thus extended from church to church, he next insists on their maintaining among themselves.—**Greet ye one another with an holy kiss.**—["This was the conventional token of Christian affection. In the East the kiss was a sign either of friendship among equals, or of reverence and submission on the part of an inferior. The people kissed the images of their gods and the hands of princes." HODGE]. This token the apostle would have them give to each other immediately upon their hearing the Epistle, as a pledge of their freshly awakened brotherly love, and in connection with the assurances of love conveyed to them in the salutations from abroad.—*ἀσπάζεσθαι, to manifest a cordial love*, especially at times of meeting and parting. "A holy kiss" means the token of Christian fellowship and holy love, as contrasted with that prompted by natural or impure affections. The expression occurs also in Rom. xvi. 16; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 Pet. v. 14. In the century following Christians were wont to welcome each other after prayers and at the love feasts and before the communion of the Lord's Supper, men greeting men, and women women, as brethren and sisters. "The kiss which they were to give," as Bengel observes, "was one in which all discord and dissention must be swallowed up."

VERS. 21–24. **The salutation of (me) Paul with mine own hand.**—As Paul commonly wrote by an amanuensis, he was accustomed to write with his own hand the concluding sentences of his Epistle by way of authenticating them (2 Thess. iii. 17; Col. iv. 18). Accordingly he here appends his own greeting with his own hand in token of the genuineness of the Epistle. "*The* salutation," as it were the main one—the greeting *par eminence.* Next follows, in the first place, an earnest word of warning, written still undoubtedly with his own hand.—**If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ,**—He here excludes all formal Christians from any part in his salutation and blessing. Since his language does not apply to those who are not Christians professedly, and nothing can be said about positive hatred to the Lord among Christians, the expression "love not" cannot be interpreted as equivalent to *hate;* but it is to be understood of decayed affection, which betrayed itself in party strife, as well as in fostering other carnal tendencies; and in doubting or denying different portions of Christian truth. "Wherefore does the Apostle

speak thus here? Because in his view love to Christ is the very soul of the entire Christian life; and the Corinthians needed to be specially reminded of this love; for their divisions originated in the fact that the love of Christ did not sufficiently unite them." NEANDER. *φιλεῖν* means *to love* with a peculiar intensity of affection, and the word is used by Paul only in this place in relation to Christ. (John designates by it, chap. v. 20, the love of the Father to the Son, and also the believer's love to Jesus, xvi. 27; xxi. 15, 17). In Eph. vi. 24, Paul employs the word *ἀγαπᾶν*, which is the term common with him to denote the love of God and Christ, and also our love to God, and to the brethren, and to wives. While the latter word which properly means *to highly esteem*, is never used to express a sensuous, passionate affection, *φιλεῖν* is found in this sense, yet rarely however. It here means *to value highly, to regard in the light of a dear friend*, a token of which regard was a kiss, *φίλημα*, which probably suggested the use of *φιλεῖν*. Short and sharp is the denunciation pronounced.—**let him be Anathema,**—Not simply, 'let him be expelled from the church, but let him be devoted to God's wrath and judgment,'—let him become a curse, accursed. The word *ἀνάθεμα* correspond to the Hebrew חֵרֶם, *a ban, i. e.*, one put under the ban—irrevocably devoted to destruction—to be given up to God without power of redemption, which, if the thing were animated, involved a putting to death (comp. xii. 3; Gal. i. 8, and Meyer on Rom. ix. 3). This imprecation or malediction is confirmed by an allusion to the judgment which will introduce it. — **Maranatha.** — Syriac for "our Lord comes (מָרָנָא אֲתָא); "not, 'he has come,' so that obstinate hatred and conflict with him are all useless" (Jerome). Why Paul here employs the Syriac can only be conjectured. It can hardly be said that it was for a stronger confirmation of the genuineness of his Epistle by the use of Hebrew letters; such extraordinary confirmation when his Epistle was to be in charge of trusted friends, is wholly superfluous. Or was it because this formula was one current among the Jews as expressing their strongest ban? MEYER says, "perhaps it conveyed an important reminiscence to his readers from the period of his residence at Corinth; or it was only the thought of the moment to give a more solemn character to his declaration." BISPING says: "perhaps Maranatha was the mysterious password of the early Christians (comp. Rev. xx. 22)." For other improbable conjectures see Meyer and Osiander. Luther's Maharam Motha, meaning *maledictus ad mortem*, is a groundless alteration. Heubner says: "that Luther appended this as the Hebrew formula for excommunication." [By translating the expression into Greek, *ὁ κύριος ἔρχεται*, we are at once reminded of the epithet *ὁ ἐρχομένος, the coming One*, as applied to the Messiah in Matth. xi. 3; Luke xvii. 19, 20; John vi. 14; xi. 27; and also as constantly recurring in Revelation, where the coming of Christ forms the refrain of the whole book, and where at the close John winds up the canon of Scripture with a reference to the solemn fact, "He that testifieth of these things, saith, Behold I come quickly. Amen. Come, Lord Jesus." Here in fact is the key-note of the Apostle's constant mood. In all the changes of thought and feeling we hear it ever returning; and what is more natural than that in uttering it, he should use the very terms in which the thought was always ringing through his soul? They had acquired with him the character of a solemn formula, for which nothing else could be substituted]. After this severe exclusion of the unworthy there follows a benediction.—**The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ (be) with you.**—As to be anathema from Christ is everlasting perdition so His favor is eternal life. The prayer here is therefore a prayer for all good. To this he adds assurance of his own love as felt toward all in Christ Jesus.—**My love be with you all in Christ Jesus.**—As in the previous clause *εἴη* is to be supplied, so here we must insert *ἐστίν, is*, as a positive declaration of what he actually cherished toward them. *Μετ' ὑμῶν, with you*, a designation of communion with them, or of the presence of his spirit in the midst of them, *q. d.*, 'is among you all'—a harmonizing, reconciling expression used in view of his strong rebukes and of their partisan distrust. "The expression forms a striking contrast to the strifes and divisions among the Corinthians which the Apostle here is resolved to ignore." NEANDER. [The closing word in the Rec., "Amen," was an after-addition. It being originally a word of response, the Apostle could not well have appended it to his own production. The adoption of it falls in with the current inconsistent usage of closing one's own prayer with an Amen—a thing which ought to be left to the congregation at large. But though the word forms no part of the Epistle, it still fitly comes in at the end to express the cordial, emphatic assent which every Christian heart must feel constrained to utter as he finishes an epistle so replete with Divine Wisdom and Love issuing from one of the noblest spirits that ever wrought on earth in the cause of Heaven, with whom it has been good to hold communion. Yes, let the Amen stand the abiding testimony of the faith of the Church in the teachings of the greatest of the apostles; and the whole world come at last to say as they read verse after verse, chapter after chapter, epistle after epistle, in accent strong and clear, AMEN].

The subscription is later. The statement of the letter being sent from Philippi arose from a misunderstanding of what is said in ver. 5 about his passing through Macedonia.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. [*Christian Beneficence.* 1. *Its source.* It follows as the natural exercise of that divine love which is shed abroad in the heart by the Spirit, and which likens us to that Redeemer who freely gave Himself up for us all, and demands of us that we give as freely as we have received. 2. *Its scope.* It goes beyond—yea, ignores—all natural limitations of family, or neighborhood, or country, or nationality, and is governed simply by the providential calls made on it and by the opportunities opened to it. Christianity breaks

down all barriers, obliterates all distinctions between Jew and Gentile, and brings the whole race into a sympathy that makes us regardful of the welfare of our fellow-men wherever found. In the text we have the first instance of this broad charity ever known—Gentile Christians in Greece, contributing to supply the destitution of Jewish Christians at Jerusalem. It was the commencement of a work of charity which is destined to spread with the church, and will go on increasing in vigor and intensity, just in proportion as the Spirit of Christ prevails in the hearts of believers. 3. It should be *systematic*, forming a part of the Christian's duty as regularly as his prayers and worship. Inasmuch as the demands for it are constant, and the discipline of it is ever needful to the character as a counteractive to our natural selfishness and for the development of charity, it is only by *habitual* practice that the ends contemplated in it can be properly answered. The time prescribed for it by the apostle is the first day of the week—the day commemorative of our Lord's resurrection and victory, and the day of the church's joy, and gladness, and praise. And surely no time can be more fitting for the exercise of our grateful charity than this; for it serves to remind us in an especial manner of God's redeeming grace, and, so, of the love which we ourselves, have experienced. In fact, alms-giving ought to be made a part of our Sabbath worship, coming in there as a tribute, not so much of kindness towards the needy and the destitute, as of thanksgiving and honor unto the God of our salvation. It thus becomes a matter not of impulse, performed under the influence of emotions excited by special appeals, but of principle, resting upon established grounds, and furnishing a reliable foundation on which to carry forward the great work of the church. 4. *Its measure.* "According as God hath prospered"—so writes the apostle, prescribing no fixed proportion as under the ancient dispensation, but leaving it with every man to determine with himself what the amount shall be. The right use of the liberty of judgment here granted is a part of the Christian's probation; and the manner in which he improves it will serve to show his sense of obligation to the God that has prospered him, and the strength of his love. The beauty and the worth of Christian charity are seen in its voluntariness, and also, in its freedom from all parade. Hence, the requisition of the apostle "let each one lay up by himself," in the privacy of his own home, settling the matter with quiet reflection amid the abundance of those blessings which constitute the sum of his domestic happiness. It is there that he can best ascertain how much he owes to his Lord].

2. *Conditions of success in Christian life.* If the Christian life is to be successful it must, on one hand, abide immovably fixed on the foundations of faith, ever keeping in view the temptations to which it is exposed, not allowing itself to be turned aside from known truth, and resisting every assault with manly courage and mighty resistance. On the other hand, it must give love the sway in every particular, so that the same person who, in one case, shows himself a courageous hero in the fight of faith and powerful to prostrate every foe, shall in others, prove himself a willing servant and subject himself to the wishes of others—being a lion in conflict, and a lamb in tenderness and patience, the image of him who is at the same time the Lion and the Lamb (Rev. v. 5, 6).

3. *Mutual concurrence in the Church.* In a true churchly life it so happens that the more we exercise our love in serving others, the more will those who are thus served be disposed to submit to us. Such love makes the recipients of it, not haughty, but lowly in spirit. The fact that others do for them, constrains them, and inspires them with zeal to requite the service shown, and to respond to the slightest wishes of their benefactors. Counsel and exhortation coming from such a source, even though it be in the form of a request, appear to them as sacred commands. In such rivalry of humility lies the wonderful harmony of the Christian church life.

4. *The fervor of a true zeal.* The more ardent our love for the Lord, and the more profound our regard for souls, the more fervidly will our zeal burn for Him, that He should be loved by all as He deserves—that no soul shall be wanting in affection for him, and that none suffer his love for Him to grow cold. And however severe may be our zeal in its indignation against those in whom love dies out by reason of the prevalence of sinful affections, prompting us to rebuke them with words of burning condemnation, yet all this will be nothing less than a sincere, ardent love for the souls themselves, which urges a person on to ascertain whether he cannot in some way bring them back to reflection, so that the flame which has died out may be kindled afresh and made to burn with new brightness on the altar of the heart.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—Ver. 1. 'Pious and poor often go together.'—We ought indeed to enlist ourselves in behalf of all that suffer, without always inquiring whether they are worthy; but worthy ones, such as true members of Christ, ought to be regarded in preference to others, especially as the dear Saviour has given us so precious a promise in reference to them (Matt. xxv. 35). Who would deny his Saviour such a service of love?—One church ought readily to follow another in good and praise-worthy conduct (1 Thess. ii. 14).—Ver. 2. There is none so poor but he may find some one poorer, towards whom he can show the works of love and compassion (Mark. xii. 42; 1 Kings xvii. 10 ff.), and thus cultivate the grace of charity. HED.: — Ver. 3. Paul cares, writes and entreats for the poor; and should it be a disgrace to imitate Him?—Ver. 4. We should grudge no labor bestowed for refreshing the pious poor, since we do it to Christ.—Ver. 5. Although the servants of the church have at this day no command to go about the world as the Apostle did, it is nevertheless necessary that the state of the churches should be investigated at times by those who are appointed for the purpose, in order to improve what may be improved (2. Chron. xvii. 7 ff).—Ver. 6. The church should care for its true servants that they come not into peril of their life, since one such is a great trea-

sure.—Ver. 7. We should subject our plans and purposes to the will of God, and either carry them out or abandon them according to His pleasure (Jer. x. 23; Jas. iv. 15). When in populous regions the whole counsel of God is powerfully proclaimed by earnest preachers, and such proclamation is enforced by their own holy walk, and God opens to them a door for the conversion of many souls, Satan commonly stirs himself up against them in his instruments. But by this means the open door is still more widened; since opposition provokes inquiry and observation, and this begets conviction (Phil. i. 12).—Ver. 9. A true servant must not shrink from foes. He who is astonished and offended at oppositions and persecutions, forgets that he is a servant of the crucified.—We should prefer the honor of God and the good of our neighbor, to our own advantage and convenience; for love seeks not its own.—Ver. 10 f. Faithful hearers deal faithfully with their preachers, and do not despise them when young, if learned and pious. Christians seek after, honor and love one another.—The crude multitude are astonished at this and cannot endure it.—Ver. 12. It is well for preachers to visit their hearers separately, as opportunities occur, and converse with them for their best good.—Ver. 13. Circumspection, faith and manly energy go well together. Faith as the chief thing occupies the middle place; and as it requires a careful circumspection, so does it also involve, and at the same time beget strength—the strength of the spirit.—A Christian is a soldier who is surrounded by foes. He must watch if he would not be surprised.—He must not abandon the post of faith, but strive on manfully and strengthen himself, and fill up the gaps after each attack in order to hold out against a new one.—Ver. 14. Love imparts to our actions their proper adaptations and right profit among men, as faith gives them their due weight (Gal. v. 6). Ver. 15 f. Divine Providence has raised up many gallant men who have made themselves of great service to the church; and this fact should be recognized with gratitude, while we hearken to, and follow such.—Ver. 17 f. The best satisfaction of a true preacher is the faith and love of his hearers.—Ver. 19. Christian churches should maintain friendship and communion with each other, edifying and precious in the sight of God (Col. iv. 15; Acts xv. 23).—Ver. 20. What else is a true greeting but the wishing well to another? Christians ought to desire and invoke all manner of good for each other.—Why should a kiss, the token of a pure spiritual and divine love, be made the token of a carnal, unchaste and devilish love? (Prov. vii. 13).—Ver. 22. Amen! yea cursed be he, who loveth not Thee. Oh thou friend of my soul! Take heed to thyself, thou poor creature! Paul's zeal is discriminating and has shown its power in countless instances. But what thou, O Lord, blessest, is, and remains blessed.—Since most persons persist in a state of prevailing worldliness and selfishness, inconsistent with the love of Jesus, we can easily see how many there are whom this imprecation will hit.—Ver. 23. Grace! grace! To this everything comes at last in the restoration of sinners, as being absolutely necessary for the forgiveness of sins and the recovery of fallen nature.—Ver. 24. He is a true, dear man, in whom love dwells; he loves and is loved. Well for him! he will eat the fruits of love in eternity.

Berlenburger Bibel:—Ver. 2. An illustration of that wise moderation which belongs to Christianity everywhere. A reckless zeal never prospers. The case may be pressing, but the method of meeting it must be unconstrained.—Ver. 4 f. Christians are ready for all manner of business; but they are no rovers who drive their traffic with their religion.—Ver. 6. What is done in faith through love, though apparently small, is in the sight of God a great thing.—Ver. 7. True Christians watch for the Lord's hour.—Ver. 9. Resistance sharpens the zeal of God's servants. When adversaries are many the spirit becomes more eager to preach the word, and hopes to find a yet more open door. God's word will be confirmed by the cross.—But there are two kinds of opposition: 1. When many receive the word with joy, others appear who resist the word and the good done—a sure sign that advantage has been gained. Then ought we to increase in courage as difficulties present themselves. 2. But when no one profits by the word, and will not so much as hear it, then must we take it elsewhere, and not desecrate it, by casting it before the unthankful.—Ver. 10 f. It is not well for Christians not to be free with each other.—Ver. 12. Christians are ready for everything, but they do not act blindly.—Ver. 13. Watchfulness is the ground upon which all the rest is built. We must perpetually take heed to our own hearts; otherwise it will not be possible for us to stand and maintain our attitude as men.—Ver. 14. There is many a one who aims to be manly, but does not do it in love. Love is free, and seeks the good of a neighbor. Even the best and greatest duties toward God and our neighbor, if not prompted by love, are, in God's sight, nothing worth—Love is the salt without which everything which we have and do is tasteless.—Ver. 15 f. The most eminent must devote themselves to the service of the poor. But such persons are not to be abused, and to be regarded as common pursuivants; but they ought to be gratefully recognized and honored.—Ver. 19. Greeting serves for a genial bond of love.—Ver. 22. Who is there that loves Jesus so that he aims to please Him and to follow Him and to become like Him, and think of Him constantly and occupies himself with Him! Oh, how many fall under Paul's ban!—*The Lord cometh!* Let Him judge; He will know how to avenge Himself on His unthankful servant, because he is absent people think themselves safe.—Ver. 23. This wish is hedged about by the previous warning, and such a warning must grace and love have, on account of our perilous condition.—Ver. 24. From this we see that the rebukes given have been a work of pious affection. Oh, what a bond is this! (John xvii. 22–26).

Rieger:—Ver. 1 ff. To be obliged to seek assistance, and to receive favor from others, makes us of little account; but when persons, in such condition, are saints of God, and we know that God constrains His dearest children and most assured heirs of salvation to perform their pilgrimage under such circumstances, this awakens consideration.—Imitation in such cases must not

be on the score of shame, but it must be grounded on love in the heart; yet good examples do their part in exciting to good works (Heb. x. 24).—The word "beneficence" reminds one of the wise constitution of God, who allows His gifts to run through other hands, and gives to us that we may have to give to such as are needy, and does not Himself supply the wants of the needy, in order that others may have the opportunity of testifying through these of their faith, and hope, and love.—Ver. 12. We must carry nothing by force, nor interfere too much with the ways of others.—Ver. 13 f. The word '*watch*' belongs among the master-pieces of the Holy Ghost, since with this one word he enjoins the perpetual attention of the Christian to his whole duty, and so can awaken and arouse him to so great a degree.—To abide in the saving knowledge of God and of Christ and in constant trust toward God through Christ, expresses the whole of the Christian state.—All a Christian's strength, magnanimity, zeal and earnestness, must be regulated by that love which seeks the honor of God, and the salvation of our neighbor.—Ver. 18. Even the most honest laborers and helpers of the truth may become so involved under disparaging trials, and be so overwhelmed with slanders, as to require that something be spoken in their behalf. —Ver. 22. Love to Christ is the chief source from which the communion of saints derives its true form and character.—Ver. 23. A holy dread of the curse is sweetened by a cordial address to the believing friends of Christ. Grace helps us out of many sins; strengthens us against many a fall; sets dislocated members; removes difficulties; disconcerts Satan's plans; stops scandals; maintains love in its course amid all varieties of gifts, until, through grace, we are made meet for that Kingdom, wherein the manifoldness of gifts and benefits in all the saints shall be a subject of eternal wonder and praise. Amen!

Heubner:—Ver. 2. Christian thrift collects together its spare money for others. To the Christian nothing is too small which has a value for love.—Ver. 9. God only can open an entrance into the heart.—Where goodness prospers, wickedness is aroused.—Ver. 13. The conditions of growth in Christianity: 1. Watchfulness and prayer; 2. Stedfastness in the faith; 3. A decided, manly strength of will and independence, which, without regard to another's will, does what is known to be good and right, and stands by it; 4. And, with all this, love.—Ver. 22. A want of love—coldness, indifference, makes a person unworthy of Christian fellowship. The Lord comes to judgment over such lukewarm souls.

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 12. From this we may learn that Christian office-bearers of the right sort do not rule over those subject to them arbitrarily, as over servants; but exhort them as brethren, and respect their counter views when they are Christian.—Ver. 20. The Christian greeting draws those who are greeted into Christ. —Ver. 22. This word of condemnation stands written as a holy threatening for us all. That word of God, which is able to implant in our souls the love of the Lord Jesus Christ, is read by each one of us, either for a blessing or a curse.

[Calvin:—Ver. 15. If we wish to secure the welfare of the church, let us always take care that honor be conferred upon the good; let their counsels have the greatest weight; let others give way to them, and allow themselves to be governed by their prudence. This Paul does in this instance, when admonishing the Corinthians, to show respect to the house of Stephanas].

[Robertson:—Vv. 1, 2. A Jewish object supported by Gentile subscriptions!—a new thing in this world. To scattered races and divided peoples, to separate castes and ancient enmities, Christ was the magnet that united all.—Benumbed and paralyzed till then, the frame of humanity was made to throb with a common life. Hitherto men were combined by war and trade—now by religion and love.—In God's counsels sorrow draws out good. Pain and sorrow are mysteries. Inexplicable often, why we are afflicted; but sometimes the vail is withdrawn, and we see the reason clearly.—Charity must be systematic—a matter of principle; to give from impulse, often a mere luxury, costs but little,—whereas a true Christian economy involves self-denial—an abridging of pleasure to give to God. —Men do not give as God has prospered them, because they do not give *systematically*. It is a fact, the more we have the less we give. System is easier with little than with much. The man of thousands squanders, and his indulgences, grown into necessities, leave him little to spare. —Vv. 10–24. With Paul personal considerations were not lost in general philanthropy. He put value on the courtesies of life. There are minds which are indifferent to such things, and fancy themselves above them. But love is dependent on forms—courtesy of etiquette guards and protects courtesy of heart.—Ver. 12. "As touching our brother Apollos,"—mark the perfect absence of all mean jealousy in St. Paul's mind. This is magnanimity and true delicacy of heart. Vv. 13, 14. If you think Christianity a feeble, soft thing, ill-adapted to call out the manlier features of character, read here, "Quit you like men." (Abridged)].

[*Sermon.* — Jon. Edwards: — Vv. 1, 2. *The perpetuity and change of the Sabbath. Complete works*, vol. iv., p. 615 ff.].

The plan announced in previous volumes required that the English authorized version should be the basis of our exposition. The present translator sympathizes with the desire so extensively felt that general confidence in that version should not be impaired. He maintains with its warmest admirers that the actual necessities of orthodoxy and godly living have not yet sufficiently called for a revision of that version for common use. And yet the more one loves the precise words which the Holy Ghost has given to the church, the more anxious will he be to receive nothing in their place. The truest friends of inspiration and of divine truth, are those who will endure as little imperfection as possible both in what we call the original text, and in the translation we give to our children and our fellow-Christians. They will not be satisfied with the freedom of our Bibles from fatal errors, but they will be anxious to present God's word in the purest form possible for spiritual edification. Every shade of revealed truth will be precious to such as long for the whole mind of Jesus.

In a work intended principally for those who aim at a high degree of Scriptural knowledge, the first object must therefore be to obtain an accurate, original text. The Translator, with his earlier associates, believes that the recently awakened and rapidly increasing interest in sacred criticism demands a tolerably full statement of the reasons on which the more important critical conclusions are founded. Special manuals on this subject are not as common in this country as in Germany. He has therefore usually added to the author's general statements the documentary evidence which may be adduced to sustain them. Since Dr. Kling published his commentary, some works have appeared which must also modify some of his conclusions. Among these may be mentioned especially the much enlarged *seventh edition of the New Testament*, and the *Codex Sinaiticus*, with the various readings of the *Vaticanus*, which TISCHENDORF has published; the collations of the *Sinaiticus*, with the text of Robert Stephens in 1550, by the Rev. F. H. SCRIVENER; and the numerous collections of DEAN ALFORD in the fifth edition of his Greek Testament. Not only has the Translator made use of these, so as to supply a few new readings, and to change some former decisions of our author, but he has carefully verified many statements by a reference to the Codices in his own possession (A. B. D. Sinait.), the Vulgate, and the Greek, and the Latin fathers. He regrets that the works on which TISCHENDORF (N. Test., 8th edit., and a new version of the *Vaticanus*), TREGELLES, and ELLICOTT are now employed, have not yet reached that portion of the New Testament to which the present commentary relates. Eminent English examples would have warranted a much fuller list of various readings, but only such have been inserted as were thought obviously to affect the force or beauty of the original.

The next object would be to present as perfect an English translation of the original text as possible. In the present work, this has hardly been attempted. It would have seemed inconsistent with the use to be made of the authorized version. He has therefore contented himself with inserting in that version some of the most important emendations required by the critical notes. We have, however, thrown into **black letter** type in the midst of the exegetical notes an almost continuous new translation. In a few instances we have here used paraphrastic rather than literal renderings, and often have sacrificed the elegance which a common version would have required, that the objects of the commentary might be more perfectly secured. The insertion of this translation has sometimes necessitated a slight alteration of the author's sentences.

In the Exegetical department he has usually been satisfied with the judicious, condensed, and often admirably expressed comments of the author on all subjects embraced by his design. On other points the Translator's object has been to supply what the author took for granted in the studies of his readers, but which hardly exists among our hard-worked clergy with their

scanty libraries. The more extended notices of particular words or passages, which would have broken too much upon the course and proportions of the author's comments, have been thrown into notes in the margin. As our readers will perceive, special importance has been attached, to the grammatical forms and the uniformity of meaning to be given to each word. The last thirty years have done much to give precision to the language of the New Testament. It has been found to be very far from the indefinite and vague thing which older interpreters sometimes represented it to be. No longer will it do to say that the apostles used one case of a noun, one tense or mood of a verb, or one particle, for another; or that the position of the words at the beginning, middle or end of a sentence is a matter of indifference. The more scientific principle must doubtless prevail, that they used words with a uniform signification, and placed them in the position which emphasis and truth required, so that no change in these particulars could be made without perverting the writer's meaning. Many of the Greek and Latin words and sentences have been translated, so that even the merely English reader will not find it difficult to follow the author's comments.

In the Doctrinal and Homiletical departments he was tempted to make considerable changes, and was only restrained by the nature of his position as a translator. They do these things so differently in Germany, that if their work might sometimes instruct us by contrast, it seems too far removed from our track of thought essentially to aid us. He commenced with marking many passages for omission, and with substituting an equal amount of extracts from our English and American divines, but he soon discovered that he was going beyond his proper limits. He has therefore seldom attempted to curtail our author's extracts, and has contented himself with the addition of a few doctrinal inferences bearing upon the literature of the day, and a single series of expository hints which the habits of some of our churches happily demand.

CARLISLE, July 4, 1867.

C. P. WING.

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

§ 1. ITS GENUINENESS AND INTEGRITY.

[The external evidence in behalf of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is incontestible, and has never been assailed by the most unfriendly criticism. It reaches as far back as the generation immediately after the Apostles themselves. From the peculiar character of the Epistle, we should not expect to find it quoted as frequently as some other portions of the New Testament, and yet it is easy to select abundant testimony to satisfy us of its authenticity. Clement of Rome (A. D. 91–101), in his Epistles to the same Corinthians, assumes the existence and peculiar contents of Paul's two Epistles, and in his Epistles *ad Virgines* (in Syriac and Latin, Ep. I. cap. xii.) he quotes the exclamation (2 Cor. xi. 29): *Quis infirmatur, et ego non infirmor, etc.*, and in cap. xiii., fin., the words (2 Cor. viii. 21): *providentes bona, non solum coram Deo, etc.*, and in Ep. ii. cap. iii. fin., the two passages (2 Cor. vi. 3 and v. 11): *Nemini dantes ullam offensionem, etc.*, and *Scientes ergo timorem Domini*, etc. Polycarp (A. D. 169), in his Ep. *ad Philipp.* § 6, uses the words (2 Cor. viii. 21): *προνοοῦντες ἀεὶ τοῦ καλου ἐνώπιον θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων.* Athenagoras of Athens (A. D. 177), in his treatise *De resurr. mort.* § 18 (*Migne. Patrol.* T. VI. p. 1012), says: *εὔδηλον παντὶ τὸ λειπόμενον, ὅτι δεῖ κατὰ τὸν Ἀπόστολον τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο καὶ διασκεδαστὸν ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, ἵνα, ζωοποιηθέντων ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρωθέντων, καὶ πάλιν ἑνωθέντων τῶν κεχωρισμένων, ἢ καὶ πάντη διαλελυμένων, ἕκαστος κομίσηται δικαίως ἃ διὰ τοῦ σώματος ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὰ εἴτε κακά.* Irenæus of Lyons (A. D. 177–202), in his treatise *Contra Hær.* Lib. II. cap. xxx. § 7 quotes and comments upon Paul's account of his rapture to the third heaven (2 Cor. xii. 2 f.); in Lib. III. cap. vii. § 1. he mentions our Epistle by name (*in secunda ad Corinthios*), and comments extensively upon the expression: *in quibus Deus sæculi hujus excæcavit mentes infidelium;* in Lib. IV. cap. xxvi. § 4 he says: *Οὕτω Παῦλος * * Κάπελογεῖτο ορινθίοις· οὐ γὰρ ἐσμεν ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ, καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ. * * καὶ μετ' ὀλιγὰ· οὐδένα ἠδικήσαμεν καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς* (2 Cor. ii. 17); in Lib. V. cap. v. § 1: *Δικαίοις γὰρ ἀνθρώποις, καὶ πνευματοφόροις ἡτοιμάσθη ὁ Παράδεισος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ Παῦλος ἀπόστολος εἰσκομισθεὶς ἤκουσεν ἀῤῥητα ῥήματα, ὡς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ παρόντι* (2 Cor. xii. 2); in Lib. V. cap. xiii. § 3: *Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο φήσιν· Ἵνα καταποθνῇ τὸ θνητὸν ὑπὸ τῆς ζωῆς. Ὁ δὲ κατεργασάμενος ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο θέος, ὁ καὶ δοὺς ἡμῖν τὸν ἀῤῥαβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος* (2 Cor. v. 4, 5, and i. 22); and in Lib. V. cap. xiii. § 4, he quotes 2 Cor. iv. 10, and iii. 3, and in Lib. IV. cap. xxix. § 1 he quotes again 2 Cor. iv. 4. Clement of Alexandria (A. D. 191–202) quotes from our Epistle not less than twenty different times, as *e. g.*, in *Pædag.* Lib. X. cap. vi. he refers to Paul's rapture in the third heavens; in Lib. II. cap. viii. he cites in full 2 Cor. ii. 14–16, and a few sentences afterwards 2 Cor. v. 7; in *Strom.* Lib. III. capp. xii and xiv. he quotes what Paul says of Satan's beguiling Eve; in Lib. IV. cap. vii. Paul's description of the weapons of his spiritual warfare; in Lib. IV. cap. xvi. what *ὁ Ἀπόστολος—εἴρηκεν ἐν τῇ δευτέρα πρὸς κορινθίους*, etc. (citing the whole of 2 Cor. i. 12, and ii. 14, and a few sentences after 2 Cor. iii. 14). See also *Pœdag.* Lib. III. cap. iii. (2 Cor. xiii. 5), cap. xi. (2 Cor. viii. 21 f.), *Strom.* Lib. I. cap. i. (2 Cor. vi. 4, 10, 11), cap. xi. (2 Cor. i. 9 f.), Lib. II. cap. xix. (2 Cor. viii. 12 f.), Lib. III. cap. i. (2 Cor. xi. 13, 15), cap. xi. (2 Cor. vii. 1), Lib. IV.

cap. xx. fin. (2 Cor. xi. 23), cap. xxi. (2 Cor. iv. 7–9; vi. 3–7, 16–19, vii. 1, 9–11), cap. xxvi. (2 Cor. v. 1–3, 7–8, 9). Tertullian of Carthage (A. D. 190–220), frequently quotes our Epistle, as in *Pudic.* cap. xiii.: *Revera enim suspicantur apostolum Paulum, in secunda ad Corinthios, eidem fornicatori veniam dedisse, quem in prima dedendum Satanæ interitum carnis pronunciarit impium patris de matrimonio hæredem; quasi quæ ipsam postea stylum verterit scribens: Si quis autem contristant, non me contristavit,* etc. (as in 2 Cor. ii. 5–11).—With respect also to the internal evidence for the Pauline origin of our Epistle, there can be no question. Every part of it breathes the very purpose and spirit of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, his peculiar position with reference to the Mosaic Institute (chap. iii.), his joyfulness amid extreme labors, perils and distresses (chapp. iv. and xi.), his views of reconciliation by Christ and the preaching of it (chap v.), his delicacy in the treatment of erring brethren (chapp. vii. and viii.), his refusal to build on the foundation of others (chap. x.), and his estimate of his infirmities and revelations of the Lord (chap. xii.). Probably no portion of the New Testament exhibits the peculiar character of the writer, even when under Divine inspiration, better than this. Dr. Paley, in his *Horæ Paulinæ*, has here found unusually rich materials for his work, of exhibiting undesigned coincidences with the history in Acts, and with Paul's other Epistles.]

It is only with reference to the *unity* of our Epistle, that some doubts have been raised. The earliest of these were advanced by Semler, who makes the first eight chapters [with Rom. xvi.], and chap. xiii. 11–13 constitute one Epistle; the tenth and as far as ver. 10 of the last chapter a second; and chap. ix. [a small circular Epistle, addressed not to the Corinthians, but to the Christians of Achaia]. Weber, near the same time, contended that there were only two distinct Epistles, *viz.*: the first composed of the first nine chapters with chap. xiii. 11–13, and the second composed of the remainder of our present Epistle. At a later period, von Greeve, of the Netherlands, made the first Epistle consist of the first eight chapters with chap. xiii. 11–13, and the second of the remainder of our present Epistle. [Quite recently C. H. Weisse (*Philos. Dogm.* Vol I. p. 145) maintains, with much confidence, that our Epistle is composed of three distinct circular Epistles directed at different times to the Corinthian Church, of which the first and main part of the present Epistle (chapp. i. vii. with xiii. 11–13) was the latest; and that these were put together in their present form by some other hand (perhaps Timothy's, and possibly with the Apostle's own approbation and direction)]. These views are, to some extent, in opposition to the best critical authorities, and, even where they have some plausible grounds for their support, will not bear a thorough investigation. [They are derived from the conceded fact that two or three subjects of a very different character are discussed, and that a spirit of an almost opposite nature pervades the different parts of the Epistle. So obvious are these that even Wieseler (*Chron. d Apostelgesch.* § 357 f.) felt constrained to recognize *a chronological division* of the Epistle, and to suppose that the first part as far as chap. vii. 1, was written under the depression which the Apostle felt before the arrival of Titus, and that the remaining portion was composed under the excitement which the joyful tidings then received produced upon his mind]. But we discover no decisive evidence of such a new commencement at chap. vii. 2, nor is it probable that the triumphant passage which occurs in chap. ii. 14 would have been written under depression. The abrupt transition from the first to the second verse of chap. vii., and the slight connection between the thirteenth and fourteenth verses of the sixth chapter, by no means justify the assumption that the Apostle inserted the intervening passage (vi. 14; vii. 1) "in consequence of the sudden occurrence of these thoughts to his mind." But we regard the opinion which Schræder has advanced, that this passage is unworthy of the enlarged spirit of the Apostle to the Gentiles, and must have been added by some later hand; and the similar one which Ewald has advocated, that this paragraph was an extract from an Epistle of some unknown Apostolic writer, but was hardly worthy of the profound and generous spirit of Paul, as the offspring of an arbitrary and peculiar prejudice. Even if the connection between the different parts of our Epistle were more indistinct, and the transitions from the one to the other were much more abrupt than they actually are (comp. Osiander *Einl.* § 7), they ought to awaken no surprise in an Epistle [composed in the midst of a journey, under overwhelming cares and circumstances of extraordinary vicissitude, by a writer of more than common sympathies, and with reference to classes of persons so different as were the sincere but erring brethren at Corinth and

their corrupt and schismatical seducers. And yet, notwithstanding the varieties of subject and tone which are found in our Epistle, the whole is pervaded by a single purpose and spirit, the object of which was to heal the divisions which had commenced and threatened such serious consequences in the church, and to establish believers there in their former confidence in Paul. We discover nothing but the various actings of the same mind in its necessary changes, while contemplating what it loves and what it abhors; and the very fact that some passages in our Epistle have been fitted into their connections with so little an appearance of design, indicates that they were the natural outpouring of a spontaneous but conflicting emotion].

§ 2. TIME AND PLACE OF ITS COMPOSITION.

That the Second Epistle must have been written soon after the First is evident (comp. Osiander, *Einl.* § 3) from its entire spirit and contents, from the course and condition of things at Corinth, and from the anxious suspense which the writer shows with regard to events immediately anticipated. [In that first Epistle (chap. xvi. 8) he had announced that it was his intention to remain at Ephesus until Pentecost, but (chap. xvi. 5) that he expected soon to reach Corinth by way of Macedonia, and to spend the winter there. His actual departure from Ephesus may have been hastened by the insurrection against him there, but we know that he tarried for a short time at Troas on his journey to Macedonia. From his extreme anxiety to meet Titus (2 Cor. ii. 12) he did not tarry as long as he had intended at Troas, but he pressed forward to Macedonia. There he must have continued long enough before he wrote the Second Epistle to ascertain the mind of the churches in that region, and partially at least to make the collection (viii. 1–5). Then it was that he wrote our Epistle, and soon after went to Corinth where he abode three months (Acts xx. 3), and then returned so as to be in Macedonia at Easter on his way to Jerusalem at Pentecost. It is evident from these facts that our Second Epistle must have been written when he was in Macedonia, some time during the summer or autumn after he left Ephesus. But the *year* on which he wrote is not quite certain. Whatever be the year on which the First Epistle was written (either A. D. 57 or 58, see Introd. to the First Epistle) it is plain that the Second was written only a few months later. Even if it must be assigned to a different year (comp. 2 Cor. viii. 10, and ix. 2), we are not obliged to suppose the intervention of a whole twelvemonth between the two (Osiander p. 23).] We are not, however, quite sure that the precise *place* was Philippi [as the Vatican and most of the later MSS. with the old Syriac version, assert. That the bearers were Titus and his associates, is apparently substantiated by chap. viii. 23, and ix. 3, 5; Ellicott in *Smith's Dict.* Art. Corinthians, II. Epist.].

§ 3. OCCASION AND DESIGN OF THE SECOND EPISTLE.

About the time the First Epistle had been despatched, the Apostle was induced probably by the representations of some mentioned in 1 Cor. xvi. 17, to send Timothy, who was going to Macedonia and Achaia, to the Corinthian Church, in order to revive in them "the remembrance of his ways in Christ" (1 Cor. iv. 17), and to induce them to follow out his policy. But as our Epistle contains no reference to Timothy's visit or to its results at Corinth, nor to any account through him of the effects of Paul's First Epistle, some have concluded that he must have been either interrupted in his journey, or recalled by the Apostle himself. Such a reference, however, ought not to have been very confidently expected in an Epistle where Timothy was associated as a writer. Certainly if Paul had recalled a messenger whose coming had been so distinctly announced, we should suppose he would have felt called upon to justify such a proceeding against the objections of his opponents. We conclude, therefore, that he had received through Timothy some account of the state of the Corinthian Church, and that these had produced disquietude in his mind (chap. ii. 12; vii. 5 ff.), especially when he found that Timothy had been obliged to cut short his visit there, and to hasten to meet Paul at Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 11). It was not until the return of Titus, whom he had sent after Timothy (perhaps after Timothy's return) and after he had sent off his First Epistle (according to de Wette and others from solicitude about the impression that Epistle had produced), that he could hear any thing to quiet his apprehensions. This must have been the more painful and protracted, inasmuch as Titus had tarried beyond the expected time in order to make arrangements for the collection (2 Cor. viii. 6).

Between the First and Second Epistle, Bleek and others have supposed that the Apostle was induced by the unfavorable account through Timothy to write and send by the hands of Titus another Epistle, and that this was the occasion for the anxiety with which he looked for Titus' return. We see no occasion for such a supposition, inasmuch as there had been quite enough in his First Epistle (chap. iii. 2 ff.; iv. 8, 18 ff.; v. 1 ff.; vi. 8, xi. 17; ii. 16, iv. 1 ff.; ix. 14, 18; xv. 8, 10), to give occasion for excusing his apparent severity toward them and his boasting of himself (comp. in opposition to Bleek, an Art. in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 625 ff; *Mueller, de tribus P. iten.* p. 34 ff.; *Würm, Tub Zeitschr.* 1833, I. 66 ff.; *Wieseler, Chron. d. apost. Zeit.* p. 368 ff.; *Baur Paulus*, p. 327 ff. [Comp. § 6].

To bring the Corinthians more completely to a proper state of mind, and that on his anticipated visit he might have no reason for severity but unite with them in joyful and sincere thanksgivings to God, the Apostle now wrote them a Second Epistle. In this he endeavors, in the *First Part*, to present before them their true relations to him and to his office, by reminding them of their common sufferings, consolations and prayers (chap. i. 3 ff.), by removing from himself all appearance of insincerity, duplicity and instability, and by showing that the change in his plans respecting his journey which had exposed him to such imputations, sprung from a desire to spare them unnecessary pain (chap. i. 12 ff.). He assures them that the severity which had characterized some portions of his First Epistle, had no other origin than his love to them, and he now comes to a friendly understanding with them with reference to his main design to produce in them the state of mind which they had actually attained (chap. ii. 1-11). He then reminds them that his work was acceptable to God both in them that perished and in them that were saved (chap. ii. 3 ff.), and that they themselves had witnessed his sincerity in handling the word of God and the effects of his labors at Corinth, he extols the glory of his office, brings to their recollection the honesty and purity of conduct with which he had performed the duties of that office among them, and contrasts both the office and his conduct with the legal services of the Old Testament dispensation. He accounts for the different results of his preaching, by ascribing the one to the blinding influence of Satan and the other to the illuminating power of God (chap. iv. 1–4, 6), assures them that both his present afflictions and his future glory would redound to the divine honor and their benefit, and takes occasion in passing to set in its true light the general bearing of present afflictions and infirmities upon the heavenly state (chap. iv. 7 ff.; v. 1, ff.). He then directs their thoughts to the connection between his hope of future glory and his continual efforts to please the Lord; and this brings him to another avowal of the sincerity with which he had performed his official duties. This he traces to the essential nature of the scheme of salvation, whose excellence leads him to admonish them with great earnestness not to receive the grace of God in vain, but to appropriate to themselves all its benefits (chap. v. 9; vi. 10.) Having demanded, therefore, of them a reciprocation of his overflowing love and confidence, he urges them to renounce all fellowship with every form of idolatry, and gives utterance to his joy over the final effects of his former Epistle though it had at first so much disturbed them (chap. vi. 11; vii. 16). The confidence they had thus reposed in him he endeavors to confirm; and he begins in the *Second Part* of his Epistle to interest them in the collections he was then making; and endeavors to awaken in them a spirit of emulation by reminding them of what other churches had done. He does not, however, leave this point without presenting before them higher motives, and pointing them to the benefits which beneficence would surely bring. In the midst of these exhortations he takes occasion to explain his own proceedings with reference to these collections (chap. viii. and ix.).

In the early and more apologetic portion of his Epistle he had given some attention to polemical questions as they came across his track of thought, but in the *Third Part*, he devotes to these a more special discussion. Even here, however, he mingles with his assaults upon his opponents, earnest admonitions of those who had listened to such teachers and occasionally defends his personal and official conduct (chap. x. et seq.). With some severe reproof for immoralities yet remaining in the church (chap. xii. 20; xiii. 6), he subsides into a milder and more hopeful tone, and concludes with cordial encouragements and an all-comprehensive Benediction (chap. xiii. 7 ff.).

From this general view of the contents of our Epistle, its *Design* becomes quite evident. Every thing was directed to the restoration and confirmation of the Apostle's authority which had been so bitterly and obstinately assailed, and the removal of all hinderances to his efforts for their welfare. The majority being won over to his side, the way was open to bring back to obedience those among the people who still opposed him. To do this he was obliged to clear away the prejudices which had been raised against him, and to discover the insincerity and perverseness of those who had seduced them. These were evidently *Judaizers* (comp. chap. xi. 22). It is still a matter of controversy whether they belonged to the Petrine or to the Christ party. Against those who maintain that they belonged to the former (Meyer and others), it has truly been objected (Osiander), that our Epistle never hints at Peter as the head of their party, and even the phrase τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων (chap. xi. 5, and xii. 11) cannot refer to our Lord's Apostles. That they belonged to the latter party is also argued from the fact that the idea of the Christ party seems to be implied in chap. x. 7, that a rejection of *all* apostolic authority seems hinted at in the words τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων, and that a number of indications are given that they had departed from the commonly received doctrine with respect to the person of Jesus (chap. xi. 12; ii. 17). They seem, however, to have been especially distinguished for their opposition to Paul's apostolic authority, and for their zeal in behalf of the Jewish law and for Christianity as a merely legal system (comp. Osiander § 4).

§ 4. STYLE.

["The contrast between the First and Second Epistle is in no respect more obvious than in its style. Not only are the subjects perpetually varied and the characters rapidly shifting, but the manner and spirit of the writer are remarkably diverse. Consolation and rebuke, gentleness and severity, earnestness and irony succeed one another at brief intervals and unexpectedly." ALFORD. MEYER remarks: "The excitement and interchange of the affections and probably also the haste under which Paul wrote the Epistle, certainly render the expressions often obscure and the constructions difficult; but they serve only to exalt our admiration of the great oratorical delicacy, art and power with which this outpouring of Paul's spirit, especially interesting as a self-defence, flows and streams onward, till its billows finally overflow the whole opposition of his adversaries." ERASMUS remarks also, that "the difficulty of grasping the precise mind of this divine rhetorician far exceeds that which is felt in comprehending that of ordinary poets and orators; that he is so full of turns and delicate allusions, that one is constantly at a loss to know what he is doing, whither he is driving, and what he is opposing. So skilful are his arts that you can hardly believe he is at different times the same man. Now he boils up like a limpid spring, suddenly he rolls away with a great noise like a mighty torrent bearing all before it, and then he flows gently along, or expands like a placid lake over all the land. Sometimes he quite loses himself as it were in the sand, but all at once he breaks out at some unexpected point."—*Paraph.*, p. 58. "Though this Epistle is, perhaps, the least methodical of Paul's writings, it is among the most interesting, as it brings out the man most distinctly before the reader, and reveals his intimate relations to the people among whom he labored."—HODGE.]

§ 5. ITS CONTENTS AND IMPORTANCE.

[The interest of the Second, even more than that of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, is principally historical. From the peculiar circumstances which called it forth, the Apostle was led to dwell much upon what was personal to himself and to those whom he addressed. We have nowhere else so clear an insight into the character and life of an apostle, and it is remarkable that while no other portion of Paul's life could have been more active and eventful, we have scarcely any notice of the period which here comes before us, except what is contained in our Epistle. Many circumstances here supplied seem indispensable to the understanding of what is related in the Acts and the other Epistles (comp. Paley in *Hor. Paul.*). We are especially here shown the high moral and religious spirit of the Apostle, his self-sacrificing devotion to the welfare of his converts, and the honorable principles which governed his conduct towards his fellow-laborers. All this, however, is mingled, as usual in his writings, with evangelical maxims

and doctrines of a general nature, which make our Epistle of no small importance to theological science; and certainly no portion of the Epistles has supplied richer materials for homiletic use. Among the historical notices of great value may be mentioned Paul's abounding consolations under severe afflictions, his probable visit and letter to the Corinthians of which we have no other account, and the narrative of his ecstasy and revelations. Important doctrinal statements are also given respecting the testimony of conscience (i. 12–14), the power of the Church in cases of discipline (ii. 3–8), the contrast between the Christian and the Mosaic dispensations (iii. 8–18), the prospect of a building of God, a house not made with hands, in the heavens (v. 1–8), the objects of the death of Christ and the nature of the reconciliation effected by Him (v. 14–21; viii. 9), the duty of separation from the world (vi. 14–18), the nature of godly sorrow and repentance (vii. 8–11), the true method of charitable contributions (viii. 1; ix. 15), the limits and nature of inspiration (viii. 8, 10), and the signs of a Divine Apostleship (xii. 12)—On this whole subject, however,] we may adopt the animated representation of Osiander (*Einl.* § 5). Having given us his view of the contents of the Epistle, he proceeds to point out, first, the admirable psychological order and psychagogical [persuasive] method which the Apostle must have had in his mind, and then the ample range of subjects through which the discussion of an occasional topic leads him, the excitement which his immediate relations to his readers awakened, the grouping together of special and general, of temporal and eternal, of historical and didactic subjects; the animated introduction of historical incidents, and the felicitous blending together of his own official and private affairs; the gradual combination of these with the interests of the Church, and the affairs of each congregation with those of the general Church, and of all these with the cause of Christ. We have then an admirable picture of the Apostolic office, standing out so prominently in the Epistle as to control every part, sometimes in the representation of the Apostle himself, wisely, lovingly and energetically performing the hardest services in the most trying situations; but sometimes also in profound theoretic statements of its essential nature (chap. iii., iv.). We are then presented with a beautiful and thorough confirmation and completion of some discussions which had been only broached in his First Epistle (chap. iii., iv., xii. 5), as, *e. g.*, the power of the keys, there to bind, here to loose; the object, influence, institution, trials, consolations, distresses, helps, toils and fruits, dignities and burdens, of his office. In the midst of these discussions, however, he is very naturally led to a consideration of the doctrine of the cross (iv. 6), of the power of the Divine Word (chap. ii.), of the law and the Gospel (iii. 4), of the resurrection, of reconciliation and justification (v.), of regeneration (v. 6), of repentance (vii. 10 f), and of Christian beneficence (collections), every thing and every subject is contemplated only as it is related to Christ; and He is the measure of all things. Profound analogies and demonstrations, as well as typical illustrations, are taken from the work of creation (iv. 6), and from the Jewish dispensation and its ministers (iii. 7 ff), and his arguments are confirmed by examples and testimonies from the Jewish Scriptures (vi. 16 ff; viii. 15; ix. 7, 9). In the principal passages, we have sometimes startling illustrations for the development of his subject, derived from sacred history, from nature, and from common life (iii. 3; xi. 3; ix. 6, 10); more frequent solemn affirmations for the confirmation of his assertions than he is accustomed to give (i. 18, 23; xi. 31; xii. 2) produced by the fervency of his zeal and his absolute certainty with respect to what he was saying and the falsehoods against which he was contending. We have every vicissitude of feeling, deep depression and high exhilaration, humble prostration and lofty enthusiasm, painful apprehensions and satisfying consolations, *etc.*, all apparently united by a very slight thread of association, but really forming a harmonious work of art in the most perfect unity of truth and love. Finally, with respect to *language*, we recognize the influence not only of the limited knowledge and movements of the age, but of the intense mental agitations of that period; and yet with all its harshness, rigidity and broken sentences, our Epistle is an admirable mirror of the Apostle's actual state of mind, filled as it was and made eloquent by the Spirit of God. Truths of the utmost importance are communicated in a style of eminent, though frequently anomalous, beauty (comp. Meyer, *Einl.* p. 5).

[§ 6. THE APOSTLE'S VISITS, AND LOST LETTER TO THE CORINTHIANS.

Two questions, necessarily raised in the interpretation of our Epistle, seem to demand consideration in this Introduction. The First relates to *the number of visits* which the Apostle made to Corinth. "It seems distinctly implied in chap. xii. 14; xiii. 1, 2, that he had been there twice before the time at which he was writing. St. Luke, however, only mentions one visit prior to that time (Acts xviii. 1, sq.), for the visit recorded in Acts xx. 2, 3, was confessedly subsequent. If, with Grotius and others, we assume that in chap. xiii. 14 τρίτον belongs to ἑτοίμως ἔχω and not to ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, we still have in chap. xiii. 1, the definite words τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι, which seem totally to preclude any other meaning than this—that the Apostle had visited them twice before, and was now on the eve of going to them a third time. The ordinary subterfuge that ἔρχομαι is here equivalent to ἑτοίμως ἔχω ἐλθεῖν (so actually A. and the Arabic (Erp.), and Coptic versions), is grammatically indefensible, and would never have been thought of, if the narrative of the Acts had not seemed to require it. We must assume, then, that the Apostle made a visit to Corinth which St. Luke was not moved to record, and which, from its probably short duration, might easily have been omitted in a narrative which is more a general history of the Church in the lives of its chief teachers, than a chronicle of annalistic detail. So Chrysostom and his followers, Oecumenius and Theophylact, and, in recent times, Mueller (*de tribus Pauli itin.*), Auger (*Rat. temp.* p. 70 sq.), Wieseler (*Chronol.* p. 239), and the majority of modern critics. It has formed a further subject of inquiry whether, on this supposition, the visit to Corinth is to be regarded only as the return there from a somewhat lengthened excursion during the eighteen months' stay at that city (Auger), or whether it is to be referred to the period of the three years' residence at Ephesus. The latter has most supporters, and seems certainly more natural" (Ellicott, in *Smith's Dict. of the Bib.*). On the other hand, it must be conceded that Paul's expressions in chap. i. 15 and xiii. 2, seem to imply that he had been there but once, and can only be explained on the supposition that his visit was so short and sad (chap. ii. 1), that it was not brought into consideration (comp. Wordsworth on ii. 1 and xiii. 1).

The Second question relates to the *number of letters* which Paul wrote to the Corinthian Church. We can hardly hope to attain a certain answer to this question; and so far as reference is had to one supposed to have been written before our extant First, and referred to in 1 Cor. v. 9, we have nothing at present to do. Our only inquiry is, whether the numerous allusions in the Second Epistle to a letter which he speaks of by way of eminence as "*the* Epistle," was not one sent at some time between the First and Second, but now lost? Neander (*Planting and Training*, Philada., 1844, p. 156), contends that it was, and that it was sent by the hands of Titus. He thinks that Paul would not have sent Titus on such an errand without some words of explanation however few; and that in this Epistle, so brief and so temporary in its interest as not to be thought worthy of preservation, the Apostle used expressions of severity which caused intense anxiety as soon as it was gone. On this supposition he explains much of the language of the Epistle (which seems to him so strong as to be extravagant, on any other supposition), respecting his severity and his solicitude regarding its effects (2 Cor. vii. 8, 12, etc.). He also thinks that, Timothy having failed to reach Corinth, and reports having come to Paul of the unhappy state of the Corinthians, Titus was sent to supply the place of Timothy and to do something to recover them, and Paul himself declined going at that time lest he should have to proceed to extremity. Either the incestuous person had proved rebellious and was raising parties there, or persons had come from abroad who had conducted toward the Apostle with great insolence. Paul wrote words of stern rebuke, not for his cause who had done wrong, nor for his cause who had suffered wrong (either himself or the father of the incestuous person), but for their good (vii. 12). With Neander agree also Olshausen, Credner, J. L. Davies (in Smith's Dict., art. Paul). Alford says: "It *may* have been so," but many (Kling and others) think that more decided allusions to such an Epistle might have been expected had it existed and been of so much importance in Paul's mind.]

THE

SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.

1. *Apostolic Address and Greeting.*

CHAPTER I. 1–2.

PAUL, an Apostle of Jesus Christ [Christ Jesus][1] by the will of God, and Timothy
our [the] brother unto the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints
2 which are in all Achaia. Grace *be* to you and peace, from God our Father, and *from* the Lord Jesus Christ.

[1] Ver. 1.—The collocation of the words: Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ has better authority in its favor here than it has in 1 Cor. i. 1, but Paul appears uniformly to have put Χριστοῦ before Ἰησοῦ immediately after ἀπόστολος or δοῦλος, in accordance with the natural train of thought: the messenger of the Messiah, the divinely commissioned King.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Comp. on 1 Cor. i. 1 ff. The salutation in vs. 2 is precisely like that in the former Epistle. The address in vs. 1 is briefer: ἀπόστολος is without κλητός, and ἐκκλεσία with only a local definition. Timothy has the same position which Sosthenes had there, and it is evident that he must have returned to the Apostle from his mission to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10 f. Comp. Introd.). The persons addressed are designated with more particularity than in 1 Cor. i. 2, as "all the saints which are in all Achaia." From their being addressed as τοῖς ἁγίοις, and not as ἐκκλησίαι (as in Gal. ii. 2, comp. Eph. i. 1) it does not necessarily follow that they were only isolated individuals, or small companies without a distinct ecclesiastical organization. And yet we should have no greater certainty in maintaining the contrary. [Alford suggests that the word "*saints*" is used rather than "*churches*" as in Gal. i. 2, because the matters principally to be discussed in the Epistle concerned only the Corinthians as a church, and those living in the province generally merely as individual saints]. In either case they were all connected with the Church of Corinth as the mother-church. With respect to the name Achaia, the common usage of the time as it is seen in Acts xix. 21, and especially the phrase ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ, abundantly warrants us in assuming that it is here used in its most extensive meaning.*—Moreover, this expression does not justify us in concluding (with Neander) that our Epistle was encyclical in its object, for the entire scope of its contents would be opposed to such a view, and we should be obliged to infer that all Christians throughout the province [including those at Athens, Cenchreæ, and perhaps Sicyon, Argos, *etc.*] were involved in the censures directed against the mother-church (comp. Osiander, Introd. § 3).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

(See on 1 Cor. i. 1–3).

* [At some time between the conquest of Greece by the Romans and the reign of Augustus (B. C. 169–147), the whole region south of Thessaly and Epirus, nearly co-extensive with the modern kingdom of Greece, became a single province of the Empire under the name of Achaia. After the strong expression of the pro-consul's, and the Gentiles' disapprobation of the accusations made against Paul (Acts xviii.), he appears to have labored freely and with such success in the whole province of Achaia, that a number of churches were established in it (comp. 1 Thess. i. 8; 2 Thess. i. 4). SMITH'S *Dict. art. Achaia*, CONYB. AND HOWSON, vol. 1, p. 416, chap. xii. A. R. FAUSSET in *Port. Com.*, vol. 2, p. 316. If, however, we recollect the general contents and aim of this Epistle, we may well doubt (with Osiander) whether we ought not here to take the word Achaia in the narrower sense which it sometimes even then bore and which is almost certain in 1 Cor. xvi. 15 (comp. Acts xviii. 1.)]

INTRODUCTION.

2. *Thanks for Divine consolations under his tribulations; the blessings conferred upon him thereby for the better discharge of his official duties, and the fellowship between him and his readers* (vv. 3–11).

3 Blessed *be* God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and
4 the God of all comfort; Who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able
to comfort them which are in any trouble by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are
5 comforted of God. For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation
6 [comfort] also aboundeth by Christ. And whether we be afflicted, *it is* for your consolation [comfort] and salvation, [or whether we be comforted, *it is* for your comfort] which is effectual in the enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer: [*om.* or whether we be comforted, it is for your consolation and salvation]: and our hope
7 of you is steadfast,[1] knowing that as[2] ye are partakers of the sufferings, so *shall ye be*
8 [are ye] also of the consolation [comfort]. For we would not, brethren, have you ignorant of[3] our trouble which came to us[4] in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure,[5]
9 above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life. But we [ourselves] had the
sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which
10 raiseth the dead: Who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver:[6] in whom
11 we trust that he will yet deliver *us:* ye also helping together by prayer for us, that for the gift *bestowed* upon us by the means of many persons thanks may be given by many on our behalf.[7]

[1] Ver. 7.—The Rec. altogether without authority makes καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν follow immediately the second παρακλ. καὶ σωτηρίας. Bengel, Griesbach and Meyer let τῆς ἐνεργ.—ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν follow immediately after the second παρακλήσεως. Lachmann and Tischendorf, (whom Osiander follows) place τῆς ἐνεργουμένης—ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν directly after the first παρακλ. καὶ σωτηρίας, though Lachmann includes [καὶ σωτηρίας] in brackets as suspected. See exeget. notes. [The reading of the Rec. has generally been ascribed to Erasmus who, in his 2nd edit. of the Greek Test., must have obtained it by combining several Latin versions with some Greek MSS., since no single Greek MS. has been found which gives exactly his reading. Having been received from him by Beza (in his 3rd, 4th and 5th editions), and by the Elzevir, it passed into our early German and English versions. Of course, it has no documentary authority. The reading of Bengel and Griesbach was that which Erasmus and Beza had adopted in their first editions, and it is sustained by A. C. M. Sinait., and other less important uncial MSS. together with the Syr., Copt., Aeth., Arm., and a number of the Vulg. and Old Italic versions. The reading of Lachmann and Tischendorf (7th ed.) has been adopted by de Wette, Olshausen, Bloomfield, Alford, Osiander, Conybeare, Wordsworth, Stanley and Hodge, and is sustained by B. D. E. F. G. K. and L., by numerous cursives, the Syro-Phylox., and the Gothic versions, and by Chrysost., Theodt., Damasc., Theophyl., Œcum. (though some of these insert καὶ σωτηρίας before τῆς ἐνεργουμένης, *etc.*). Meyer thinks that Griesbach's was the original form of the text, but that the copyist easily passed from the first to the second παρακλήσεως, omitting all between them, and that an emendation was then attempted by introducing the omitted words later in the sentence. Bloomfield's conjecture is much more natural and scientific, *viz.*, that Lachmann's reading being more difficult was more likely to have been amended, to avoid the interruption of the antithesis between εἴτε θλιβόμεθα, *etc* and εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα, *etc.*, by the clause καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς—ὑμῶν, and that those who transposed the clause τῆς ἐνεργ.—πάσχομεν, make the Apostle absurdly assert that his readers would be consoled by enduring the same sufferings with himself, instead of saying that his affliction and consolation were calculated to profit them. Stanley suggests, that in this whole section the force of the thoughts depends on rendering παρακαλεῖν, and its derivatives, by the same corresponding words in English. We, therefore, use the word "*comfort*" throughout].

[2] Ver. 7.—The ὥσπερ of the Rec. is not as well sustained [as ὡς, which has in its favor A. B. C D. E. Sinait., *et al.*, and as Tisch. observes: "*ὥσπερ substitutum videtur ut planius esset cum ἐστε, etc., non arctius cum κοινωνοί conjungendum esse.*"].

[3] Ver. 8.—For the first ὑπὲρ Lachm. reads περὶ, and he is sustained by A. C. D. E. F. G. Sinait., *et al.*, and followed by Meyer and Stanley, but Tischendorf, Bloomfield, Wordsworth and Alford retain ὑπέρ as the more difficult reading. [See Webster's Synt. and Synn. of the Gr. Test., p. 172].

[4] Ver. 8.—Lachm., following the preponderance of authorities, throws out ἡμῖν from the text. [It is rejected as a superfluous gloss to γενομένης by Meyer and Alford, Wordsworth and Stanley according to A. B. C. D. F. G. and Sinait., but it is retained by Tischendorf and Bloomfield, and is suspected by Griesbach].

[5] Ver. 8.—On the authority of A. B. C. [Sinait.], *et al.*, Lachmann puts ὑπὲρ (some put παρὰ) δύναμιν before ἐβαρήθημεν. [Alford and Stanley (as usual) agree with Lachm., but Tischendorf, Bloomfield and Wordsworth, sustained by a few uncials and a number of the best versions and fathers, agree with the Receptus].

[6] Ver. 10.—B. C. [and Sinait.] have καὶ ῥύσεται. Others omit it. It is probably a change of the ῥύσεται by a mistake for the form in the following clause, and then it would naturally be thrown out as superfluous, or be left out through oversight [Tisch., Meyer, Bloomf. and Words. have καὶ ῥύεται, Lachm. and Stanley have καὶ ῥύσεται, but in brackets: and Alford contends that these last words would not be superfluous, since they would look "to the *immediate* future, while καὶ ῥύσεται would look to the continuance of help in distant and uncertain time"].

[7] Ver. 11.—The Var. ὑμῶν is not sufficiently sustained, [and yet it is adopted by Tischendorf (7th ed.) and Reiche, and has the authority of the revised Vat., the Sinait., Clarom. (2d cor.), *et al.*, and no small support of versions and Fathers].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

This ascription of praise and thanksgiving differs from others of a different character (Eph. i. 3 ff.; 1 Pet. i. 3 ff.), in those respects in which our Epistle is peculiar. It gives special prominence to what was personal to the writer, and what pertained to his individual fellowship with his readers. We are not, however, to seek in it for a direct and studied design to gain the esteem of his opponents, by excusing his delay in coming to Corinth by way of *captatio benevolentiæ*, or to bring his readers to see that the love which formerly burned in his heart was still glowing there. It was rather the spontaneous effusion of a father's love toward a church which he had been compelled so severely to reprove, and which he still felt bound to address with some severity; and an earnest effort to awaken in them a hearty reciprocation of his affection. It is, however, possible that it contains an incidental and indirect parrying of the insinuation that his sufferings might be an indication of the divine displeasure (Osiander).

Ver. 3 *a*. **Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.**—The meaning of the word *Blessed* (*εὐλογητός*) is not: God is worthy of praise, with *ἐστίν* understood, but: Blessed, or Praised be God, with *εἴη* understood. The word is not unfrequently used in the Sept. as a rendering for בָּרוּךְ. *The God and Father* signifies, He who is both God and Father (1 Cor. xv. 24). *Τὸν κυρίου ἡμῶν, etc.*, is governed by *πατήρ* alone, although in other passages the dependence of Christ the Lord upon *ὁ θεός* is obviously expressed (Comp Eph. i. 17; John xx. 17).—In addition to the more general idea in *ὁ θεός* (the God), the Apostle wished to remind them, as in Eph. i. 3, and Rom. xv. 6, of the more special source of that fellowship which exists between God and believers (v. 2). Neander: "It is quite in accordance with Paul's usual manner to express, first God's general relation to the religious spirit by the name of *ὁ θεός*, and then the special relation in which God stands to the Christian by the phrase, *The Father of our Lord.*" This is followed by a more detailed specification of what God had done, and what he had himself experienced: **the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort** (ver. 3 *b*). These genitives (*τῶν οἰκτ.* and *πάσης παρακ.*) intimate that God was the source from which both the mercies and every comfort must proceed, or, more probably, we have in *οἰκτιρμῶν* (as in Rom. xii. 1, where the word is equivalent to רַחֲמִים) the genitive of the attribute, as in *κύριος τῆς δόξης* (1 Cor. ii. 8), equivalent to *ὁ πατὴρ οἰκτίρμων*, and in *πάσης παρακλήσεως* the genitive of the effect. From the *mercies* proceeds the *comfort*, inasmuch as he becomes, of course, *the God of all comfort* by being the *Father of mercies.*—In such a connection (comp. v. 4) *παράκλησις* signifies that kind, tranquilizing, animating encouragement one needs in the midst of sufferings (comp. the use of *παρακαλεῖν* in Isa. xl. 1, as the rendering of נַחֲמוּ, and also in chap. vii. 6).—This consolation was procured by the Holy Spirit's influence upon the heart by means of the word of God, special providences (deliverances, *etc.*) and human ministrations (comp. ch. vii. 6).—[We here meet with an application to God in general of the idea of the παράκλησις, which in John's writings is commonly ascribed to Christ and to the Holy Spirit. The whole work of the Paraclete or Comforter (Consoler) is accomplished by an application of the entire work and consequences of redemption to the believer. Comp. Stanley; also Wordsworth on Jno. xiv. 16; and Braun on 1 Jno. ii. 1; Hare on the Comforter]. Its extent and copiousness is expressed by *πάσης* (*all*), since it is thus related to all kinds and degrees of trouble (v. 4). What he here ascribes to God in general he asserts in v. 4, that he and his fellow-laborers had enjoyed not only at special seasons, but at all times. **Who is comforting us in all our afflictions** (ver. 4 *a*). The present *who is comforting* implies especially that these consolations were repeated and continued without interruption. In *ἡμᾶς* he referred more particularly to himself, but not to the exclusion of his companions in labor and suffering, and certainly he meant more than would have been implied by the use of the first person singular (comp Meyer and de Wette). The preposition *ἐπί* introduces either the things by means of which (=*ἐν*), or (better), those with respect to which he was consoled [Jelf. Gr. Gram. § 634, 1 *a*]. Afflictions of every kind, and as a whole (comp. *θλῖψις* in 1 Cor. vii. 28), are included under the phrase, *in all our afflictions.* He thus recognizes what had been the divine aim in conducting him through such an experience. As he had been made to feel his need of divine consolations, so the enjoyment of those consolations was of great benefit to him; **that we may be able to comfort those who are in any affliction by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted by God** (ver. 4 *b*).—The idea is not merely that others would be encouraged by the example of patience and constancy which those divine consolations had enabled him to present, but rather that his experience had qualified him to assist those who were in any kind of trouble, by imparting to them the same consolations. He could now point them to the answers which his own prayers had received, to the rational foundation of a Christian's confidence and hopes, and to the promises and tender assurances God had given to His people. Neander: "There was, in fact, no way of making a deeper impression upon others than by testifying to them in this manner what he had realized in his actual experience." In *ἥς* we have a remarkable instance of relative attraction, the irregularity of which can be obviated only by referring to the construction of *παρακαλεῖν παράκλησιν* (see Winer's Idioms, § 14, 1, p. 136). We have a similar instance in Eph. iv. 1 (and i. 7, according to the readings of Lachm. and Griesb.).

Ver. 5. **For as the sufferings of Christ abound toward us, even so through Christ our consolation also abounds.**—A reason is here assigned for what had been asserted in the preceding verse (*ὅτι* being equivalent to *γάρ*). But to what part of v. 4 does this reason refer? Osiander regards it as an explanation of the way in which it is said in the final sentence that he had been qualified to console others in their sufferings. But no reference is made to this until the sixth verse. The true answer probably is, that the Apostle is here endeavoring to place in a clearer light the main thought which he had brought out in v. 4 with respect to his experience of divine consolation, and which he had expressed in the two phrases, *who is comforting*, and *where-*

with we are comforted by God, and that thus he was naturally led back to the thanksgiving he had offered in the third verse. He describes the degree of consolation as commensurate with the distress. The distress itself he proceeds more particularly to characterize as *the sufferings of Christ*. This expression may mean sufferings endured either for Christ's sake, or by Christ Himself, or by Christ in His members. The words themselves will hardly bear the first of these interpretations: the idea conveyed in the third is not very clearly consistent with the doctrine of the New Testament; and we may regard the second as essentially correct. Those sufferings of Christ which are shared by His servants, and in which they may have fellowship with Him (Phil. iii. 10; Col. i. 24, *etc.*; Matth. xx. 22; Heb. xiii. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 13), are such as they endure while struggling with the world and its rulers, and such as are inflicted on them for the cause of God (for righteousness' sake). "Whoever suffers such things endures the same kind of evils with those which Christ underwent" (Meyer). The idea of these *sufferings of Christ* is further extended by Neander: "We must concede that all those sufferings which the believer endures in the spirit of Christ, of whatever nature they may be, may very properly be looked upon as a part of his following of Christ."—To these *sufferings* the *consolation through Christ* is said to correspond. Those who enter into the fellowship of Christ's sufferings will experience His *sympathy*, and through this a degree of consolation proportioned to their sufferings. Such as suffer *with* Christ (Rom. viii. 17), will receive divine consolation *through* Christ. Both are said to overflow (*περισσεύει*), to be always realized in abundance. This, however, does not imply that the measure of these sufferings was greater than that which Christ endured (analogous to the "*greater works*" mentioned in John xiv. 12). The depth and delicacy of the Apostle's piety are admirably exhibited in his mention of divine consolations, at the same time and with an equal degree of prominence. Comp. Bengel: ["The words and their order are sweetly interchanged: *παθήματα· παράκλησις*, sufferings; consolation—the former are numerous; the latter is but one, and yet exceeds the former. In this very Epistle, as compared with the former, is shed forth a far greater amount of consolation for the Corinthians, and of course the whole inner man was more perfectly renewed, and increased more and more"].

VER. 6*a*. **But whether we are afflicted, it is for your comfort and salvation, or whether we are comforted it is for your comfort;**—The Apostle now proceeds to apply what he had just said to those whom he was addressing. His afflictions and his consolations would be alike productive of good in their behalf. In the two inferential or minor propositions of the sixth verse, the verb of the preceding sentence must be supplied, or briefly: "*this was*," *etc.* Ὑπέρ has here the sense of: *for the advantage, for the interest, in behalf of*, of any one—**which is effectual in the enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer** (ver. 6 *b*.).—Irrespective of the different readings of this passage, we may at once mention as settled points: 1. That *τῆς ἐνεργουμένης* (*which are effectual*) is to be construed, as in every other part of Paul's writings, as an active and not a passive participle (comp. Rom. vii. 5; Gal. v. 6; Eph. iii. 20; Col. i. 29; 1 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 7). 2. That *εἰδότες* (*knowing*) refers to the knowledge which Paul, not the Corinthians, possessed. 3. That *τῶν αὐτῶν* (*the same*) does not imply that their sufferings were literally the same, as if he were speaking merely of their sympathy; for *καὶ ἡμεῖς* (*we also*) would be directly opposed to such an interpretation, and *ἐν ὑπομονῇ* (*in the enduring*) would hardly seem appropriate to it. The words imply simply that their sufferings were of a kind similar to *the sufferings of Christ* (v. 5). If we receive the strongly attested reading which Lachmann and Tischendorf have preferred, and especially if we construe *τῆς ἐνεργουμένης* with a passive signification, the participial sentence will present us with the explanatory definition of the minor term of the previous proposition which is so much needed, and without which that proposition seems rather strange and indeterminate with respect to the part of v. 4 to which it should be applied. In this case also *εἰδότες* is connected very appropriately, and without an anacoluthon with the *παρακαλούμεθα* of v. 4 which is to be supplied before *εἰδότες* here; and finally, the several members of the sentence appear to possess a more perfect congruity, inasmuch as the first acquires a more extensive definition by means of *τῆς ἐνεργουμένης, etc.*, and the second by means of *εἰδότες, etc.* These advantages, however, are to some extent only apparent; since the connection of *εἰδότες* with *παρακαλουμεθα* cannot be logically justified (since it could be followed only by *ὅτι*). On the other hand, its connection with *καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν βεβαία* would be grammatically natural (comp. Meyer) and logically correct. For the *ἐλπὶς* refers here not to its ultimate object, *i. e.*, the *eternal glory*, but to the more immediate consolation which he anticipated, when they should enter upon the same kind of sufferings with those he was enduring, and which he was assured they would endure with *ὑπομονῇ*, *i. e.*, with steadfastness and perseverance (comp. Rom. v. 3).—By accepting the reading which Bengel, Griesbach and Meyer have defended, and which is sustained by equally strong documentary and more probable internal evidence, we should have in *τῆς ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας*, a resumption of the subject of the design of his afflictions in v. 4 (*εἰς τὸ δύνασθ., etc., i. e.*), "that we may be instrumental in promoting your consolation and salvation." The reference here would therefore be to the Apostle's instrumentality in this respect, and to his qualification therefor by an experience of suffering. Certainly such a view has more in its favor than that which maintains that Paul's afflictions were beneficial only to the degree in which they promoted the cause of that Gospel on which their whole consolation and salvation depended. The meaning might possibly be that the Apostle's afflictions were of advantage to the Corinthians, on the ground that they made a profitable use of them, inasmuch as they might be encouraged and strengthened, by his example of faith and steadfastness, to persevere like him unto final salvation. Or, with still greater simplicity, we may suppose that the Corinthians would be sustained under their afflictions, for the Gospel's sake, by seeing that their spiritual father had endured similar afflictions; and hence by seeing that these were so far from indicating that God was displeased with them, they

rather implied that they were truly the Lord's servants, and belonged to Him whom the world hated. This last, we believe, will be found the most correct interpretation of this passage. That which was so effectual for their consolation was equally effectual for their salvation, inasmuch as it strengthened them for that endurance to which the promise of salvation was annexed (Matth. xxiv. 18; comp. Jas. i. 12). In the second member of the sentence *καὶ σωτηρίας* does not probably belong to the original text. Were it genuine we should be thereby informed that this **salvation** also was, when the Apostle wrote, working in the endurance of sufferings, because the hope of salvation gave them power to persevere under them. We may explain **it is for your comfort**—either by a reference to ver. 4, and making it allude to the consoling influence of the Apostle, or by giving it a meaning like that of the first member of the sentence, *viz.*, that the Corinthians were sustained and encouraged, in the midst of their sufferings, by seeing how the Apostle was comforted under similar sufferings.—In the sentence: **And our hope of you is steadfast**, the words, *of you* belong not exclusively either to the subject or to the predicate, but to both of them. In ver. 7 the word **partakers** must imply not merely a sympathy with, but an actual participation in, the outward (objective) sufferings. It relates however not to Christ (as in Phil. iii. 10) nor to believers in general, but as the connection shows, to the Apostle himself. They were his companions, not only in suffering, but in consolation. NEANDER: "If the Apostle is here speaking of what is essential to Christian fellowship, he could hardly have presumed, that the great body of the congregation were in the exercise of it; but he must have spoken of what ought to be, and of what he would fain hope was, the fact, rather than of what he knew to be a reality."

VERS. 8–11. *Particular peril through which he had passed.*—The Apostle had spoken in the previous verses of his trials and consolations only in general terms; he now proceeds to give them some details (*γάρ*) with reference to his most recent experience. [STANLEY: "The moment he begins to address the Corinthians (directly), two feelings arise in his mind, and cross each other in almost equal proportions. The first is an overwhelming sense of gratitude for his deliverance from his distress; and the second is the keen sense which breathes through both the Epistles, but especially through the Second, of his unity of heart and soul with his Corinthian converts. This identity of feeling between the Apostle and them, must be borne in mind throughout. It accounts for a large portion of the peculiarities of the Apostle's style; the double self which creates as it were a double current of feeling and thought, now taking the form of passionate sympathy, now of anxiety, now of caution and prudence; the plural number which he employs in this Epistle even more frequently than elsewhere for himself, as if including his readers also."] **For we would not have you ignorant**: comp. on I Cor. x. 1; as in II. Thess. ii. 1, *ὑπέρ* has here the sense of: concerning, or with respect to. The more fluent *περί* was substituted as a correction at an early period and is found even in A. C D. [Sinait.] et al. The particular affliction which the Apostle had in view, cannot now be determined. The context (ver. 4f.) is decidedly against any reference of these words to some severe sickness (Rückert, Bisping, [Alford, Stanley]). The tumult raised by Demetrius at Ephesus produced no immediate danger to his person, inasmuch as he was persuaded by his friends not to appear in public (Acts xix. 30). We are informed of no serious disturbances before or after that event. The general expression, **in Asia** (1 Cor. xvi. 19), seems to favor a reference to some incident in another place. The most probable suggestion is that he was alluding to the efforts of his many adversaries to lay wait for and ensnare him (1 Cor. xvi. 9). The details had probably been made known to the Corinthians by oral accounts (through Titus). The point on which he here insists, and which he presents in strong terms, is the greatness of his affliction. The essential idea is contained in the phrase, **we were pressed out of measure beyond strength.** The word *βαρεῖσθαι* includes within its meaning the feeling of oppression and distress produced by any kind of affliction and persecution (comp. chap. xi. 26). The specifications contained in the expressions, out of measure, and beyond strength, may either be coördinated so that the first of them shall present the objective side of the affair, *i. e.*, the exceedingly great load which weighs one down out of all measure; and the latter the subjective side, *i. e.*, that which surpasses all his power of endurance; or the first of these may be taken as a more particular definition either of *ὑπὲρ δύναμιν*, as is intimated by the position of the phrase before *ἐβαρήθημεν* in some copies (according to Lachmann's reading, sustained by A. B. C. [Sinait] et al.), or of *ἐβαρήθημεν ὑπὲρ δύναμιν*, as certainly deserves the preference if the words be arranged according to the well sustained ordinary reading. The omission of the conjunction (asyndeton) is no argument against the coördination of the phrases, for we may (with Osiander) regard the second as a climactic expression, *q. d.*, "an exceedingly great burden, yea, surpassing all my power of endurance." Such an expression would not necessarily be in conflict with 1 Cor. x. 13 (comp. xii. 9). In saying: **despaired of life**, the Apostle meant that he was completely at his wits' end, and that he saw no way by which his life could be saved. It is only in another and an absolute sense that he denies, in chap. iv. 8, that he was ever in despair. He intensifies the same idea in ver. 9, in a positive form and in an independent sentence. *Ἀλλὰ* indicates a negative: not only saw we no method by which our lives could be saved, but we had in our own hearts the conviction that we had been condemned to death; *i. e.*, we were satisfied that the time had come when we were to die. *Ἀπόκριμα* is not precisely equivalent to *κατάκριμα* (a sentence of death), but it signifies an authoritative sentence, a decree, or an answer [the substance of the decision, the *ψῆφον* (Chrys.) the vote or judgment which our affairs spoke forth]. To the question whether we should escape death, we could ourselves return nothing but a negative answer. The idea expressed in *αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* is: no way of escape seemed open to us with our lives, for we had adjudged our own selves to death,

and we were sure that nothing but death awaited us. Τοῦ θανάτου denotes the object of the ἀπόκριμα. [The historical perfect ἐσχήκαμεν instead of the aorist ἐσχομεν, indicates, the continuance of the feeling: "*We have had*" this consciousness, and have it still, as a permanent state of mind. comp. Wordsworth.] It is not precisely said in any part of the context, that this was a *divine* sentence; and yet the whole state of mind and the distinct expectation of death is probably so far to be referred to God, that it was the special design of God to produce the confidence mentioned in the next clause:—**that we should not trust in men**, &c.—The consciousness of perfect helplessness, and of an entire surrender to the power of death, took away every motive or trace of confidence in himself, in his own power or skill, and prepared him to throw himself exclusively **upon the God who raiseth the dead.**—The raising of the dead is here spoken of, because it is one of the highest exhibitions of divine power, and because it was something perpetually accomplished and characteristic of God, and not merely something to be done in future (comp. Rom. iv. 17). And yet the literal and general resurrection may have been indefinitely before the Apostle's mind, as the model and pledge of a temporal deliverance from certain death (Osiander, Meyer). Such an epithet also very well corresponds with the subject on which he was about to discourse.—**Who delivered us from so great a death** (ver. 10).—The Apostle appeals to his own actual experience to prove that such a confidence was well grounded, and that God had been such a deliverer to him. Τηλικούτος primarily signifies: *so old or so young*, and then: *so great*. [By its lengthened form it seems, as it were, to picture forth the continuity and accumulation of the extreme perils. Osiander.]. He conceived of himself as in such danger, that he was completely embraced by a deadly power, whose violence and terror is indicated by such a word. The reference is back to ver. 9. In ῥύεσθαι ἐκ he describes his forcible rescue from this power as if from the wrath of death. Καὶ ῥύεται implies by its present form that the machinations of his enemies had not yet ceased, and he implies that he expected similar perils in his future course; but from them all he was firmly convinced that God would continue to deliver him: —**in whom also we trust** (ἠλπίκαμεν 1 Cor. xv. 19; John v. 45), **that He will yet deliver us.**—The perils here alluded to were similar to those recorded in Acts xx. 3. The enemies who thus pursued him with their wiles were the Asiatic Jews, [whose influence and hatred against him as the greatest enemy of their national customs, extended even to Macedonia (comp. Meyer)], and never ceased until they had nearly accomplished their purpose at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 27 ff).—For the sake of the great work he had been sent to accomplish, he was anxious to be delivered from these evils; and though he never shrunk from any peril he considered necessary to be encountered, he made use of every possible precaution to secure his safety (Acts xx. 3; xxi. 13). As in another Epistle he earnestly pleads with the Roman Christians that they would intercede in his behalf, with reference probably to these same perils; so in this place he exhibits his confidence in the intercessions of his Corinthian brethren (ver. 11).—**Ye also helping together by prayer for us.**—His hope of future deliverance was intimately connected with the assurance that they would coöperate with him and with others in prayer for that object. This may not have been precisely the sole condition on which he expected divine assistance, and yet he seems to have regarded it as the medium through which a real assistance might be expected (comp. Phil. i. 19; Rom. xv. 30 ff). He had no doubt that God would be pleased with, and answer those intercessions, which were offered under a divine influence with faith and love. The σύν has reference to an association in prayer, either with himself or with others in his behalf. The latter view is favored by the καί, (also) and is probably the correct one, since the relation to the Apostle is pointed out rather by ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, which cannot be drawn into connection with δεήσει by a hyperbaton without a needless harshness of construction. [Chrysostom: "He neither ascribes the whole of the good work to them, lest he should lift them up, nor yet deprives them of all share in it, that he might encourage them and animate their zeal, and bring them together one to another."]

Having thus given prominence to this aspect of the fellowship between him and the Corinthians, he now directs their attention to the ultimate design of God in delivering him by such means:—**that thanks may be given**, &c.—The χάρισμα, the deliverance so graciously bestowed by God, ought to be followed by thanksgiving. Εὐχαριστηθῇ may indeed be translated: to get thanks (comp. Passow and de Wette). With τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς, (in the sense of: what is for our part), corresponds ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν: for our sake, or for our good, inasmuch as the payment of a debt of gratitude will result in further benefits. But what would then be the sense of ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων and διὰ πολλῶν? Do both of them refer to persons, or is the second to be taken as a neuter in the sense of: *prolize, with many words?* This last would seem very feeble and unsuitable to the intimate relation of the one phrase to the other. But neither can ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων signify: from many considerations, nor in many respects. There remain, however, several ways in which the words may be connected: 1. Ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων may be joined with τὸ—χάρισμα, under the supposition of a hyperbaton equivalent to τὸ ἐκ, and διὰ πολλῶν may be joined with εὐχαριστηθῇ [*q. d.* that for the gift bestowed upon us by many persons, thanks may be rendered through many on our behalf]. In this case, διὰ would not have precisely the same meaning as ὑπό, but those rendering thanks would be looked upon as representatives or organs of the Apostle.—Osiander. 2. Ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων may be joined with εὐχαριστηθῇ and διὰ πολλῶν with χάρισμα, [*q. d.* that for the gift bestowed upon us through many, thanks may be rendered by many persons on our behalf]. In this case the want of the article (τὸ διὰ) would certainly be remarkable, but would not be inconsistent with the analogy of other places. 3. Both may be connected with εὐχαριστηθῇ, but in different relations. The same persons may be understood as referred to in both phrases, but in ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων they are regarded as the persons from whom the thanksgiving proceeds, and

in *διὰ πολλῶν* they are spoken of as the medium or occasion for the thanksgiving, because the deliverance had been effected through their intercessions (Meyer), [*q. d.* that for the gift bestowed upon us, thanks may be rendered through many, by many persons on our behalf]. If we adopt this last interpretation, it cannot but seem desirable, that at least a *καὶ* had been thrown in before *διὰ πολλῶν*, for without it the whole expression appears too elliptical and unmeaning. On the whole we prefer the second method, which connects *διὰ πολλῶν* with *τὸ χάρισμα* even without the article, to the always harsh hyperbaton which the first method renders necessary. According to later usage, *πρόσωπον* had the sense of: *person;* properly, the man, *quatenus aliquam personam obtinet.* Here it means: *qui partes των εὐχαριστούντων agunt* (Meyer). [The delicacy and beauty of the prominent and related phrases: *ἐκ πολλῶν*, and *διὰ πολλῶν*, *εἰς ἡμᾶς* and *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, *χάρισμα* and *εὐχαριστηθῇ*, should not be overlooked (Osiander). On all these deliverances and thanksgivings the Apostle says he had set and was setting his hope (*ἠλπίκαμεν*, the perfect expressing the continuance and permanence of the *ἐλπίς*, and *εἰς* marking the direction of the hope, with perhaps some faint (locative) notion of union or communion with the object of it). Ellicott on I Tim. iv. 10.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

Christians enjoy a threefold fellowship, in suffering, in consolation and in prayer; but this only proves that their life of faith and love is essentially one in Christ. Their life is derived from what Christ has suffered for them. This is the source of all their peace and strength, and this brings them into affectionate communion with him, so that his cause becomes their own. Just as he took on himself the load of their guilt, they appropriate to themselves the cause of righteousness, of God and of his kingdom for which he contended and suffered, and share in all his struggles and sufferings. It is their highest joy and glory to endure reproach and persecution for his name's sake. And as this fellowship and unity with him is common to them all, the suffering of any one of them for the common cause is shared also by each: they all wrestle in prayer for him, and they all become sharers in his consolation and joy. They will look upon the assistance vouchsafed to him as a gracious answer to their united intercessions, and of course they will unite with him in thankful ascriptions of praise.

There is a wonderful power in this fellowship. It is not merely the highest realization and brightest exhibition of God's great scheme of mercy, but it glorifies his power by binding heaven and earth in one great communion. Whatever sufferings are encountered within the Christian fold, they must necessarily tend to the common welfare. Mighty results, too, will be accomplished in answer to their united prayers, yea, these do for them "exceeding abundantly, above all that they can ask or think." They may, while in the flesh, be not unfrequently weighed down by infirmities, be misunderstood by one another, and have grounds for mutual offence, but as long as this threefold chain maintains its power, all real discord must finally be removed and all things must work together for their good.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Luther, ver. 8: Paul sometimes exhibits a courage which fears nothing, and despises all danger and agony. But, again, we find this same man, so full of the Holy Ghost, speaking and acting as if he had no spirit at all. The same faith which at one time is great and strong, and full of confidence and joy, is at another small and feeble.—Such are the changes which occur in the life of all the saints, that all may learn to trust not in themselves, but in God alone.

Melanchthon, Vv. 3, 4: Three things make a theologian: *oratio, meditatio, tentatio.*

Starke, ver. 3, (Spener): The holiest part of divine worship is praise; and every Christian should have his heart so pervaded by recollections of God's merciful dealings, that his mouth shall be always pouring forth ascriptions of praise. Our heavenly Father has shown himself the God of all consolation by making all consolation possible through his Son, and by sending forth the Holy Spirit as a Comforter, to offer us and bestow upon us Christ's infinite righteousness.—God is not only merciful, but "the Father of mercies," yea, mercy itself. Where, then, but in him can we find the best consolation when we are disappointed and in trouble? Never, then, should we be at a loss where to find true rest and all-sufficient consolations.—He has a comfort for every one of our numerous afflictions, and he only demands that we should appreciate the riches of his mercy, and freely use it for our consolation.—Ver. 4: It has always been a part of the mystery of the cross to which man's reason never gets reconciled, that God's people should be harmless, and yet suffer persecution; and that they should do good, and yet suffer evil. But true light from above enables us to see that from the nature of things it could not be otherwise, and that the members must inevitably share the lot of the great Head.—We should never be satisfied with a personal experience of support under trials. The cross was laid upon us, that we might learn also to sympathize with others, and show others by our example where to find the surest support in seasons of calamity. We should, therefore, observe what affords us consolation under our varied crosses, and carefully preserve it as we would a thoroughly tried medicine; for a time may come when we shall need it not only for ourselves, but for others (Luke xxii. 32).—Though God is the original and proper Source of consolation, and tenderly sympathizes with his people, as a mother with her child (Isa. lxvi. 13), he frequently makes use of human instruments, especially faithful preachers and experienced Christians, for the comfort of such as are in distress.—A good shepherd can receive nothing which he will not turn to the advantage of his flock.—The truest kind of consolation is that which not only sustains, but sanctifies the sufferer, and fills his heart and mouth with praise (Ps. cxix. 32).—Ver. 5: It is in itself a great consolation to know that our sufferings, are Christ's

sufferings, and that he regards as his own whatever befalls his members.—Our cup of anguish is never more overflowing than our cup of consolation; for by a proper use of the means of grace our sufferings become proportionally tokens of our adoption and of our everlasting life (Rom. viii. 16f. Phil. i. 19).—Vv. 6, 7: When called to suffer severely, be comforted; for if you will look at those godly men who in ancient times were thrown into the furnace of tribulation, you will find that they were abundantly refreshed from above. Doubt not that the Lord will, in like manner, comfort and relieve you! If He counts us worthy to suffer for Christ's sake, and enables us to obey Him and to be patient, we may be sure that He will sustain us and keep us unto the end. When we feel the burden pressing, relief is surely coming.—Vv. 8, 9: Hedinger: God often allows his people to suffer, but only to inflame and stimulate their faith and prayers. He lets them sink where no human arm can reach them, that when they are delivered they may praise Him and not themselves.—He who gives a great blessing may reasonably be relied upon for a smaller: if God has promised to raise the dead, we may surely trust Him in any temporal calamity (Isa. lix. 1).—Vv. 10, 11: If we have twice and thrice been in trouble and found deliverance, let us take heart and courage for the future; for the same God yet lives, and will not leave us (1 Sam. xvii. 37; Deut. vii. 18f.; Job v. 19). He has, however, determined that his help shall be given in answer to prayer and intercession; not merely that we may learn our helplessness and dependence upon Him, but that our faith and love may be exercised, and we may be constrained to praise Him (Ps. l. 15).—If we have known and sympathized with those who are in danger and distress, and have heartily interceded with God for them, we shall more heartily render thanks for their deliverance when our intercessions have been graciously answered.

Berl. Bible, Ver. 3: To know God as the God of the afflicted is called knowing him truly. Such a name is appropriate to him in relation to such beings as ourselves, and he must bear it unless he is ashamed to be called our God. Great will be the joy of those who know Him in this character. Whoever has learned to praise Him has an all-sufficient treasure, and no one knows Him as he is revealed in his word, who has not learned to receive Him in the midst of distresses and temptations. These are the best laboratories in which God can dispense his grace, and even those who are without will soon experience the benefit of the new power with which we shall address them.—Ver. 5: Who would shrink from suffering, if he knew the proportionate comfort with which it is accompanied, and which he must lose, if he should be excused from bearing the cross? Alas! no wonder that so few ever taste the sweetness of the cross when so few know what it is to have the mind of Christ! If we have no consolation, we naturally struggle against our afflictions, but, until we are quiet and poor in spirit, how can we hear the inward voice of the Comforter?—Vv. 6, 7. It is no small consolation to know that we share in the sufferings which come upon even the most approved of Christ's members (1 Pet. v. 9; Rev. i. 9).—Heavenly consolations abound to those whose consciences are thoroughly awakened, who hunger and thirst after them, and who have been emptied of the world.—Vv. 8, 9: The Lord sometimes allows his people to be so overwhelmed with sorrows, that created strength is completely overcome, and even those who have borne their burdens with vigor despair even of life; and yet so great are divine consolations that the cross loses all its heaviness, and divine strength is manifested in their weakness. Even the best of them are allowed to experience such trials inasmuch as these spring not from defect in purpose, but from infirmity of nature, that they may learn to build their hopes on God alone. When they have made shipwreck of all things, they are compelled to cling to Him as their last anchor, and to fix their thoughts upon no less a power, even in Him, than that which raises the dead.—Vv. 10, 11: As we successively enter upon our seasons of trial, we may say to one another, "It is my turn to-day; to-morrow it will be yours." We should therefore pray one for another.—"Here is the faith and patience of the saints." In such a community of loving fellowship, when any member receives a blessing, there are many to lift up their faces in thanksgiving; for every gift is common to them all.—Unbelief beholds only the divine curse upon every one who bears a cross, but true faith says of them, "It is well; it is well!"

Rieger, Ver. 3 ff.: The names of God, as they are revealed in the Scriptures, are each an impregnable fortress, where we may always reverently and confidently find refuge. The highest glories of the Deity become a comfort to us when they are brought down to our lowliness.—Our great High Priest was tempted in all points as we are, that he might have a true sympathy with his people. We need not think it strange, therefore, that every one ordained to the evangelical priesthood should be conducted through every variety of condition, that he may have a fellow feeling for every class of his fellow men. Those only can impart comfort who are experienced in the ways of God, are familiar with the word of God, and are zealous for the honor of God. All others are sure to miss those very consolations which are most sustaining to those whom God's sword has pierced.—Ver. 5: Troubles for Christ's sake and for the gospel's sake are Christ's own sufferings. Our Lord looks upon them as inflicted upon his own person, and as likening us to Himself.—Vv. 6, 7: To share in a brother's suffering, brings us nearer to his heart, than any external intercourse.—Vv. 8, 9: We often flatter ourselves that we or others are of importance, and we promise ourselves and undertake much in reliance upon our strength, but when we begin to despair of life, all such flowerets and blossoms will fall away, and nothing will remain for us but the main trunk of a solid confidence in the living God. This will at such times only grow stronger, and we shall feel that it is all we need.—Vv. 10, 11: Many a path which begins in suffering and weeping terminates in thanksgivings and praises. The Lord grant us many such experiences, and if our way has already been darkened by sorrows, may its end be brightened with praises and everlasting life!

Heubner, Ver. 3: The God of the Bible is one who sympathizes as a father with his children,

especially with those who are struggling with difficulties; and never will he allow them to want ample resources for consolation and strength. He will, however, convince them that he is the source of their truest life, and that every thing else is an illusion, and will leave us in a deeper night.—Ver. 4: Of all persons in the world, the minister of Christ should know what true consolation and a cheerful spirit is. Only those who have comfort can impart it. A *theologus non tentatus*, a minister without an experience of personal trials in religion, lacks an important qualification for his work. The more affliction, the more power he has; and the moment he enters the furnace of affliction, he has a virtual announcement from the Lord, that somo great work is before him, and that God is preparing him for higher usefulness. The soldier who is allowed to remain continually around the camp-fire will never learn true bravery.—Vv. 6, 7: A minister's afflictions deepen the impression of his discourses. The admonitions of a veteran general have a power which no young captain can ever have.

W. F. Besser, Vers. 3, 4: The fruit of praise which is borne by our troubles is always sweet. Then, when the Redeemed of the Lord are comforted, they praise the Lord for his goodness, *etc.* Ps. cvii. 8, 15, 21, 31. Our merciful God and Father in Christ reserves his choicest comforts for his afflicted children, that with the tenderness of a mother (Isa. lxvi. 13) he may cause them to persevere under every sorrow and conflict with sin and Satan, and, finally, that he may redeem them from the affliction itself.—Ver. 5: The unity between Christ and his members is so perfect that the Apostle gives the name of Christ to the whole Church (1 Cor. xii. 12). The Church's sufferings, then, are Christ's in a double sense; for not only does it actually suffer as its Lord's bride and companion, in opposition to a Christ-hating world (Rom. viii. 17; Gal. vi. 17; Phil. iii. 10), but Christ accepts of those sufferings as if they were literally his own. Many, indeed, experience distress and calamity who know nothing of Christian suffering, and of course nothing of Christian consolation, but the truly believing heart knows how to rejoice in the Lord when all human consolation and joy are impossible (Phil. iv. 4).—Ver. 6: The fires of persecution which the devil kindles can never consume the church, but only confirm its faith and patience. God's people have a common partnership both in consolations and sufferings, and in the Scriptures, as Hunnius says, they have a great storehouse of comfort, as they read how apostles and prophets found comfort for themselves, and learned how to comfort their companions in tribulation.—Ver. 9: The true end of faith is unwavering confidence in God, and when she has her own way all self-confidence must be renounced.—God's almighty power and cordial love of life is shown in his raising even the dead to life (Rom. iv. 17; Heb. xi. 17). He will of course deliver his people when he pleases from death.—Ver. 11: The Spirit freely helpeth our infirmities when we pray, and especially when in the spirit of our common priesthood (Matt. xviii. 19) we intercede unitedly for those who particularly entreat us to plead for them.—So precious a thing is thanksgiving, and especially united thanksgiving, that the Apostle makes the ultimate object of God in granting our prayers to be the obtaining of our thanks.

[In this whole passage we have, I. *A Christian's afflictions.*—These may be 1. very severe, "above measure" (ver. 8), a "sentence of death" (ver. 9), and "so great a death" (ver. 10). 2. They are always under divine allotment, ("that we should not trust," *etc.*, ver. 9). II. *Their beneficial uses*, as a school of experience, for promoting, 1. *Comfort.* This is, from God as their proper source (ver. 3), proportioned to the affliction (ver. 5) and to increase our usefulness (vv. 4, 6); 2. *Confidence*, by throwing us upon our consciences (ver. 12), by driving us from ourselves to the living God (ver. 9), by imparting hope for the future (ver. 10), and by strengthening our hopes for others (ver. 7); 3. *Sympathy* inasmuch as they open our hearts to our brethren (ver. 8), lead all to prayer and thanksgiving for one another (ver. 11) and to mutual joy in the day of the Lord Jesus. Comp. F. W. Robertson's Lect. on Corr. Lect. xxxiv.]

III.—THE APOSTLE'S VINDICATION OF HIS CONDUCT IN GENERAL, AND OF HIS EPISTLES AND JOURNEYS IN PARTICULAR (Vv. 12–24).

Chapter I. 12–24.

12 For our rejoicing [glorying] is this, the testimony of our[1] conscience, that in simplicity [holiness][2] and godly[3] sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward.
13 For we write none other things unto you, than[4] what ye read or acknowledge;
14 and I trust ye shall acknowledge even[5] to the end; as also ye have acknowledged us in part, that we are your rejoicing [glorying], even as ye also *are* ours in the day of
15 the Lord[6] Jesus. And in this confidence I was minded to come unto you before[7] [be-
16 fore unto you], that ye might have[8] a second benefit; and to pass[9] by you into Macedonia, and to come again out of Macedonia unto you, and of you to be brought on my

17 way toward Judea. When I therefore was thus minded,[10] did I use lightness? or the
things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that with me there should be
18 yea, yea, and nay, nay? But *as* God *is* true [faithful], our word toward you was [is][11]
19 not yea and nay.[7] For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by
us, *even* by me and Silvanus and Timotheus, was not yea and nay, but in him was yea.
20 For all the promises of God in him *are* yea, and in him[12] Amen [For how many
soever may be the promises of God, in Him is the yea; wherefore also through him is
21 the Amen], unto the glory of God by us. Now he which stablisheth us with you in
22 Christ, and hath anointed us, *is* God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest
23 of the Spirit in our hearts. Moreover [But] I call God for a record [witness] upon
my soul, that [it was] to spare you [that] I came not as yet [no more] unto Corinth.
24 Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy: for by
faith ye stand.

[1 Ver. 12.—Instead of the 2d ἡμῶν, Alford and Scrivener (in Wordsworth) say that Cod. Sinait., in the ed. by Tisch. of 1863 has ὑμῶν by the first hand and ἡμῶν by the second. In the edit. of 1865 by Tisch. no notice is taken of any variation here.]

[2 Rec. has ἁπλότητι instead of ἁγιότητι, and it is strongly sustained [by D. E. F. G. L. Sin. (cor.[2]), the Latt. Syr. Vulg. and Goth. vss. Chrys., Theodt., Jerom., Ambrosiast. Theophyl. and Oecum. Tisch. has restored it in his later ed. and says: "*Probabilius est* ἁγιότητι *utpote quod esset multo plus quam* ἁπλότητι, *aliena manu inlatum quam sublatum esse.*" Paul uses it more commonly especially in 2 Cor.]. And yet ἁγιότητι is adopted by Lachmann [Alford and Stanley] after A. B. C. K. M. [Sinait. (cor.[1]), the Copt. and Arm. vss., Clem., Orig., Damasc. and Didymus]. It is a more uncommon word, and so (some have argued) less likely to be inserted, and is used nowhere else except in Heb. xi. 10 and II Macc. xv. 2.

[3 Many recent editors (Tisch., Bloomf., Alf., Stanl., Wordsw.) insert τοῦ before the first θεοῦ after A. B. C. D. E. Sin., with a number of vss. and Fathers. Bloomfield thinks that internal evidence is also strongly in its favor].

[4 Ver. 13.—The reading of the Rec. is satisfactorily attested. There are no sufficient critical authorities for the omission of either ἀλλ' or ἤ or ἃ.

[5 According to the best authorities, καὶ before ἕως should be omitted.

[6 Ver. 14.—The last ἡμῶν is an addition by a later hand. [Sinait., and B. et al. have it. Alford inserts it, Bloomf. and Wordsw. omit it, and Stanley brackets it as suspicious.]

[7 Ver. 15.—The best authorities put πρότερον before ἐλθεῖν; Rec. puts it before ἵνα. [Tisch. and Wordsw. read: πρότ. ἐλθ. πρὸς ὑμᾶς: Bloomf. retains the Rec. but inserts τὸ before πρότερον; Lachm., Meyer, Alf., Stanl. and Kling read: πρότ. πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν; Sinait. omits πρότερον altogether, and reads: ἐβουλ. πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν.]

[8 For ἐχητε, Alford has σχῆτε with B. C. and Sin., but Tisch. thinks that the latter was conformed to the tense of ἐβουλόμην.]

[9 Ver. 16.—Rec. has διελθεῖν; Lachmann, with good authorities, has ἀπελθεῖν. The former was possibly derived from I Cor. xvi. 5. [Tisch. thinks that "διελθεῖν was disliked by some transcribers because the διὰ seemed sufficiently implied in δι' ὑμῶν; hence ἀπελθεῖν or ἐλθεῖν (which is found also in many MSS.), seemed more appropriate. Comp. Rom. xv. 28, where no one has taken the liberty of changing ἀπελεύσομαι δι' ὑμῶν."]

[10 Ver. 17.—Rec. has βουλευόμενος with many authorities, in some respects, of great weight. The original reading was probably βουλόμενος (Lach. after A. B. C. [Sin.] et al.) The other was probably a correction from the following sentence. [With quite equal plausibility Tisch. suggests that "the ἐβουλόμην of the previous sentence was more likely to have induced a change than the subsequent βουλεύομαι."]

[11 Ver. 18.—The weight of evidence is decidedly in favor of ἔστιν instead of ἐγένετο in the Rec., which was probably an accommodation to the following verse. [Alford thinks it a correction to suit the *supposed* reference to the *past*. But Bloomf. thinks that ἔστιν is quite as likely to be a correction to suit what the critics thought a *required* reference to the *present*, not recollecting that the imperfect is often used to designate *habitual action*, so as to be nearly equivalent to the present. He also adds, as a confirmation of this view, that one ancient MS. (Cod. C.) has ἔστι instead of ἐγένετο in ver. 9, where it is manifestly a critical alteration. The authorities, however, in favor of ἔστιν (A. B. C. D. F. Sin., &c.) are altogether satisfactory.]

[12 Ver. 20.—Rec. has καὶ ἐν αὐτῳ; Lachm., after the oldest MSS. [A. B. C. F. G. Sin., Vulg., Goth., Copt. Damasc. &c.], has διὸ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ. Meyer thinks that διὸ has accidentally been left out (a number of MSS. have καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ); and that the words were then conformed to those just preceding. [De Wette thinks that Lachmann's reading originated in Theodoret's comment: οὐ δὴ χάριν καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὸν τῆς εὐχαριστίας αὐτῷ προσφέρομεν ὕμνον; but it is not certain from this what must have been the text on which Theodt. commented (see note to Migne's Theodt., p. 383). Alford concedes that the weight of external authority is with Lachm., but thinks that in that case ἡμῶν must mean ἡμῶν καὶ ὑμῶν, which without notice it could hardly do.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

In that which the Apostle has thus far said we may notice an apologetical element. He had spoken of those troubles which his Judaizing opponents represented as a token of the divine displeasure. He had implied that these were so far from being such a token and a reason for the withdrawal of confidence from him, that they were rather an indication of his fellowship with Christ and a reasonable ground for an affectionate communion between him and the church. But in whatever way we regard the preceding verses, the Apostle's vindication of himself evidently commences with this section, though it is in intimate connection with what he had just taken for granted, *viz.*, that they were sufficiently interested in him to assist him by their intercessions. He now gives them to understand that he was justified in such an assumption, for he was not unworthy of their sympathies and their prayers. Such is the connection which we infer from the γάρ.

Ver. 12. **For our rejoicing is this.**—The word καύχησις, as it is used in 1 Cor. xv. 31, and frequently in this Epistle, is not equivalent to καύχημα: that of which one makes his boast, for it signifies rather the act of boasting, the external expression of joyful confidence. It here relates to the whole moral conduct of the Apostle, as Bengel has it: even in seasons of adversity and in his conduct towards his opponents. The inward feeling of which it is the outward expression is **the testimony of our conscience**, to which it is emphatically directed by αὕτη. The word συνείδησις (here rendered *conscience*) is

found also in 1 Cor. viii. 7; x. 25 *et al.* It is here closely connected with the objective sentence:—**that in holiness and godly sincerity, we have had our conversation in the world.***—'Αναστρεφέσθαι occurs here and in Eph. ii. 3; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. xii. 18; 1 Pet. i. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 18. In the Sept. of Prov. xx. 7, it is used as a rendering for הִתְהַלֵּךְ, and signifies the conduct, the way in which one acts. By *ἐν* is indicated the path in which the movement takes place, and which determines and directs the mode of action referred to. If we accept of *ἁγιότης* as the true reading, the idea will be that of a religious purity, arising from an unreserved surrender of the heart to God. On account of the numerous and independent critical authorities in its favor, and because *ἁγιότης* has too general a meaning in connection with *εἰλικρίνεια*, and might have been suggested by *τοῦ θεοῦ*, *etc.*, Osiander gives the preference to *ἁπλότης*, signifying a freedom from all irrelevant and private views, *i. e.*, a plain single mind. *Εἰλικρίνεια τοῦ θεοῦ, godly sincerity*, is either a purity like that which is in God, or one which comes from him or is wrought by him in those who submit themselves to him. *Τοῦ θεοῦ* designates the source and the consequent resemblance. The idea of being acceptable to God necessarily follows from this, but it is not strictly contained in the expression. Still less does it signify what is demanded by God, and least of all what is superior, as if it were merely a superlative. The subjoined antithetic definition of the same idea:—**not in carnal wisdom, but in the grace of God,**—more precisely explains what is meant by *ἐν ἁγιότης*. The *σοφία σαρκικὴ* (1 Cor. i. 20 *σοφ. τοῦ κόσμου;* 1 Cor. ii. 5 *σοφ. ἀνθρώπων;* 1 Cor. ii. 6 *τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*) forms in this passage a contrast on the one hand, to the *holiness and godly sincerity*, and the *εἰλικρίνεια τοῦ θεοῦ*, and on the other, to the *grace of God*. This last phrase signifies God's free grace; in which, however, is included a surrender and communication of his own infinite self with all the blessings of salvation; just as the *holiness* and the *sincerity* had involved a power which moved and directed the Apostle from within himself.—In contrast with this divine disposition, is presented that impure fleshly wisdom which belongs to our sensuous and selfish nature, and which inclines us to pursue our own enjoyment, profit, honor or applause, and hence leads us off into inconsistent courses of conduct. Osiander thinks that here is also an allusion to that theoretical kind of *σοφία* (1 Cor. i. 3) which made use of the various artificial methods supplied by the Rhetoric and Logic of that period to gain influence over the minds of men. [Theophylact: "words of stirring eloquence, and twistings of sophistries."] But evidently a more practical kind of worldly wisdom was then uppermost in the Apostle's mind.—The sphere of the conversation is the world, which, according to Meyer, is the profane portion of men, inasmuch as the Apostle's object was to make his holy walk more prominent by the contrast. We may certainly regard the non-christian element in society as intended, in distinction from the churches, which were represented here by the Corinthians (*πρὸς ὑμᾶς*). *Περισσοτέρως* (more abundantly) has reference to a higher degree, and not to a higher quality. *Πρὸς ὑμᾶς* has the sense of: in intercourse with you, and it is therefore equivalent to, *with you;* Neander: "with reference to you. We may conclude from this verse that his opponents had charged him with practising a spurious kind of worldly wisdom, which indicated a lack of uprightness of heart." —W. F. Besser: "Not as if his Christian intercourse with them had been characterized by any thing extraordinary, or beyond what he had shown in other places. He intended simply to say: "If there are any to whom I have not been manifest as a single-hearted and sincere minister of Christ, surely it cannot be you (1 Cor. ix. 2), for where in all the world have I been more completely known than among you?"

Vers. 13, 14. **For we write none other things unto you**—He now confirms his avowal that he had been sincere in his treatment of them, so far as relates to his Epistles. He probably has reference to the suspicions which his opponents had awakened, that his language meant something very different from that which they seemed to mean to an unsuspicious reader.—The full and well attested reading: *ἀλλ' ἢ ἀ*, equivalent to *ἤ ἀ* or *ἀλλ' ἅ*, is a blending together of two constructions: *οὐκ ἄλλ'—ἤ* and *οὐκ ἄλλα—ἀλλὰ* (comp. Meyer) [Jelf. Gram. § 773. Obs. 1–3]. —**But we are writing**;—He here refers (as in 1 Cor. v. 11) to that which he was then writing, and to the meaning which it properly conveyed: we have no other meaning in what we have written than what you yourselves read, and what is the literal signification of the language before the eye of the reader.—**No other things unto you than what ye read, or indeed acknowledge.**—The words *or acknowledge*, refer to what they had known, in other ways, of what he then meant. There is no need of an

[* The word *συνείδησις*, signifies etymologically, a man's knowledge of or conversation with himself. Hugo de St. Victor says: *Quando cor se noscit, appellatur conscientia; quando præter se alia noscit, appellatur scientia.* It refers, however, only to that part of our self-consciousness which is practical, moral and religious, *viz.*: to what ought or ought not to be done. Thus far it is only what Antoninus (Florentinus) called *συντήρησις*, *i. e.*, careful watching or observation, "the phylactery, or keeper of the records," and hence a witness with a faithful testimony, as in the text. Beyond this, it is, as in Rom. ii. 15, a judge of that which is right or wrong in these records, as the facts are understood. Finally, it rewards or punishes by the pleasure or pain which its decisions produce, as in the text it was Paul's rejoicing. Origen includes all this when he calls *συνεῖδ.* "a pedagogue to admonish the soul of better things, to chastise her for her faults and to reprove her." The Schoolmen turned these three Scriptural functions into a syllogism. The inspired writers make faith indispensable to a good conscience, to give us right views of our relations, and so of our duties and sins. They sometimes speak of one being judged by another man's conscience, inasmuch as the decisions we have passed upon our own conduct may be applied to another's. Bp. Jer. Taylor's Ductor Dub. B. I. Chap. 1; Schenkel, Art. Gewissen in Hertzog's Encyc.; McCosh, Div. Gov. III. 1. 4; Chalmers, Mor. Phil. Chap. V.; Rothe, Theol. Eth. I. § 147.] [Tyndale renders *ἁπλότης*: "singleness," on which Trench remarks (Synn. 2d Ser. p. 23) that it would be impossible to improve it. Its literal meaning is: *simplex, einfaltig*, one-folded. Suicer: "*animus alienus a versutia, fraude, simulatione, dolo malo, et studio nocendi alitis.*" Bengel defines *εἰλικρινεία*, "sincerity, without the admixture of any foreign quality." Trench (Synn. 2d Ser. p. 172) and Ellicott (Phil. I. 20) prefer Stallbaum's derivation from *εἴλη* and *κρίνω*, according to which it means: "that which is cleansed by much rolling and shaking to and fro in a sieve:"—"not that which is proved by being held up to the sunlight, but the purged, the winnowed, the unmingled."]

artificial distinction between ἀναγινώσκειν in the sense of *recognoscere*, and ἐπιγινώσκειν in the sense of *agnoscere* (Calvin), a distinction which is, moreover, opposed to the uniform usage of ἀναγινώσκειν in the New Testament.*—In the succeeding clause another object of discussion is introduced. It is to be derived not from the preceding ἀ, as if it were equivalent to all that the Apostle in his sincerity had performed and suffered among them (Osiander), but it comes before us in the form of a distinct proposition, viz.: **that we are your rejoicing.** This sentence grammatically depends upon ἐπιγνώσεσθε [as that which they should continue to acknowledge unto the end], and not upon the intervening clause with which it might be connected according to the sense. The words might indeed be taken as a causal sentence, giving a reason for what is said in the previous clause (comp. Osiander), but the logical connection would certainly be less forcible.—The phrase, **unto the end**, means, as in 1 Cor. i. 8, and Heb. iii. 6, the absolute end of all things, and not merely the Apostle's close of life. **In part**, in the intermediate clause, expresses a limitation, not in opposition to *unto the end*, nor with respect to the recognition itself, as if equivalent to: in some degree; but with respect to the persons recognizing, implying that only a part of the Church recognized him in his true character. This is the only view which accords with the facts. A reproach would not have been here appropriate. Καύχημα occurs in 1 Cor. v. 6 and ix. 15f. **In the day of the Lord Jesus**, belongs to the principal proposition, but requires also to be joined to the incidental clause. He meant to express his confidence that they would steadfastly acknowledge that he was indeed the object of their glorying, and would continue to be so even to the last day, when teachers and churches shall stand before the great Chief Shepherd, and when all events and the way in which they have been brought about shall be open to inspection. He had no doubt that they would point with joyful triumph to him as the one through whom they and so many others had been brought to Christ, and to all the enjoyments and honors which have been derived from him, as the one to whom they owed their spiritual life with all its benefits and dignities; just as he on his side even then pointed to them as the honorable fruit of his labors (Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 1s; i. 8; Phil. ii. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 19).

Vv. 15–20. Having thus drawn their hearts to a firmer confidence in him and to withstand more successfully the influence of his opponents, the Apostle now proceeds to repel the charge of inconsistency and fickleness which had been made against him because he had changed the plan of his journey in coming to them.—**And in this confidence I was minded before to come unto you.**—Most recent commentators refer the πεποίθησις (confidence, trust) to what has been expressed in ἐλπίζω, &c.; as if he was intending to say that under the influence of this confidence in their steadfast recognition of his true relation to them, he had at first formed the design to pay them a visit, &c.—Some would draw the πρότερον into immediate connection with ἐβουλόμην [*q. d.* I was before minded], but not only would this be incoherent in itself, since he was yet desirous of this thing, but it would also be unsuitable to δευτέραν χάριν.—The position of the words πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν, by which ὑμας is more properly contrasted with Macedonia, is attested by good authorities.—This had been the Apostle's original intention, but it had been given up as early as when he wrote his first Epistle. Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 5. This alteration of his plan had become known to the Corinthians either by letter or by personal conversation, and it had been represented to them as an evidence of his general fickleness of character. Hence the propriety of this defence of himself. **That ye might have a second benefit.**—He here refers to what had been the object of his original plan.—Every visit he might make to them would be the occasion of many blessings, and would manifest the divine favor toward them. Had he visited them a second time, his presence with them would have been a second grace. Such had been his aim when he formed that earlier plan, the only motive of which they might see in the confidence he had just expressed. And now when he declares that that confidence always animated him and had prompted such a friendly purpose, he implies that no thought of a misconstruction of his motives could have crossed his mind when he changed his plan. Χάρις (grace or favor) has not the same meaning with χαρά, (as some would have the original read, signifying *joy*, or a new delight which his visit would give), nor does it signify an exhibition of human favor, but it is equivalent to χάρισμα πνευματικόν (a spiritual gift) in Rom i. 11 (comp. xv. 29). The meaning of δευτέραν is not the same here as that of διπλῆν would have been. We need not suppose that his first residence in Corinth, or his first Epistle is referred to as the *first grace*, for the context (ver. 16) shows evidently what he had in view, and this seems inconsistent with the otherwise probable hypothesis that πρότερον implies that the Apostle had been at Corinth since his first residence there. In ver. 16 we have more definite information regarding this earlier plan, and light is thrown also upon what is meant by their receiving a second benefit, but we are not therefore to conclude that this latter expression stands out of its proper place.—With respect to his being sent on his way, consult 1 Cor. xvi. 6.—Τοῦτο, in ver. 17, has reference to the earlier plan which had been spoken of in ver. 15f. He is meeting the objection which had been raised against him on account of

[* There is a peculiar play upon the Greek words ἀνα- and ἐπι-γινώσκετε which is well brought out by Chrysostom: ἀναγινώσκοντες γὰρ ἐπιγινώσκετε, ὅτι ἃ σύνιστε ἡμὶν ἐν τοὶς ἔργοις, ταῦτα καὶ ἐν τοὶς γράμμασι λέγομεν· καὶ οὐκ ἐναντο - ται ὑμῶν ἡ μαρτυρία ταὶς ἐπιστολαὶς, ἀλλὰ συνᾴδει τῇ ἀνα- γνώσει ἡ γνώσις, ἣν προλαβόντες εἴχετε περὶ ἡμῶν. "For as ye read ye acknowledge that we write the very things which ye are conscious that we are in our conduct; and this your testimony is not contradicted by what we write but what ye previously knew of us corresponds with what ye read." Migne's Chrys., Vol. X., p. 405. The idea of the Apostle is: we have no esoteric meaning, no meaning at one time which we have not always, none in speaking or acting which we have not in these Epistles, none indeed which you will not find in the confessions you are in the habit of reading publicly in your meetings. Conybeare thinks that Paul was referring to some insinuations that he wrote to some private individuals in a different strain from that of his public letters. Bengel and Hodge think that ἐπιγνώσις is more than ἀναγνώσις, inasmuch as the former combines the ideas of recognition and complete knowledge. Comp. chap. iii. 2, and 1 Cor. xiii 12; for not only the force of the words γινώσκω and ἐπιγν, but also the use of the Aorist for the present.]

his change of purpose. The amount of this objection was, that he could not have reflected sufficiently upon his plan and the way in which he was to accomplish it, and so that he became guilty of light-mindedness; or that if he had really intended to visit them, he either could not have been very strenuous in carrying out his purpose, and so had changed his mind without sufficient reasons, or he had not much regard to his promise. That such an objection had been made to him, in fact, is not to be inferred, perhaps, from the article *τῇ*, as if this referred to the particular lightness which had been imputed to him, for this may also be pointed to the levity which would generally be suspected in such cases.—**Did I use lightness.**—Ἐλαφρία (lightness) is found nowhere else in the New Testament, although the adjective occurs twice (chap. iv. 17 and Matth. xi. 30), but not with an ethical signification. Χρῆσθαι, when used with reference to moral states or qualities, means to have a hand in, to be occupied with, to enter upon, some business, and is equivalent to: behaving or conducting one's self in a certain manner. Ἆρα, in an interrogative sentence, implies that the inquirer will wait for an answer (well, really! indeed! comp. [Jelf. Gr. Gram., § 873, 2.] Passow I., 377), and hence indicates necessarily no logical deduction (a consequence from this state of things). The second question,—**or the things which I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh?**—is either coördinated with the first (in which case *ἤ* is equivalent to *aut*), or subordinated to it (*ἤ* having the force of *an*), and implying that the contrary would lead to an absurdity: "if, then, you would not charge me with levity, you must suppose that I form my purposes according to the flesh" (Meyer). This subordination would agree very well with the explanation which refers ἐχρησάμην to the purpose itself; but the coördination would suit best the interpretation which refers that word rather to the carrying out of the purpose, and introduces here the additional point respecting the improper spirit shown in the formation of the purpose. And yet this last is probably the more correct meaning. Κατὰ σάρκα, however, refers to that which determines the mind when it is coming to a decision, or it is the same as to say that the conclusion was reached in the way in which the σάρξ usually determines us, *i. e.*, in a carnal manner. The real meaning would be essentially the same on either interpretation. The opposite of this is: κατὰ πνεῦμα. Where the spirit controls a man in all his conduct, the sole object of his consultations and conclusions is the honor, the kingdom and the will of God, but where the σάρξ, (*i. e.*, the nature of man, when it is confined to the pursuit of external and selfish objects), controls his decisions, nothing will be regarded but outward relations, selfish inclinations, personal interests, or something to accommodate, please, profit, or flatter himself.—A spiritual mind always makes a man decided, consistent, true to himself, and uniform in all his conduct; but a carnal mind makes him uncertain in all his ways, and involves him in many contradictory courses. This necessary result, the Apostle presents as if it were the object of the person's design or aim, ἵνα ᾖ, &c. If we follow the correct reading ναὶ ναὶ—οὐ οὔ (the Vulgate and some other verss. have simply να—ου), the second ναὶ and οὔ might belong to the predicate: that the yea with me should be yea, and the nay should be nay (comp. James v. 12); and the whole might refer to an obstinate and presumptuous course of conduct, in which a man adheres to his determination, and resolves that his yea shall remain yea, and his nay shall continue nay. The idea would thus be that he will never change his mind, whether he had resolved upon a yea or a nay, a promise or a refusal, a doing or a declining to do something. But, according to the context, the objection the Apostle was here meeting was not so much to his consistent obstinacy as to his inconsistent fickleness. The double form of ναί, ναί and οὔ, οὔ is merely to give additional force to the simple form in ver. 18, as in Matth. v. 37. The predicate is either, should be with us also, nay, nay; *i. e.* the yea, yea, may become with us nay, nay; that is, the purpose or the promise may change about into just the opposite according to convenience; or (better) merely should be with us; in which case καὶ has the ordinary sense of, *and:*—**that there should be with me the yea, yea, and the nay, nay.**—[Chrysostom forcibly gives the objection which is met by the Apostle in this passage (vv. 18–22) thus: "If when you promised to come to us, you failed to do so, and your yea is not yea, nor your nay nay; but what you say now you change afterwards, as you have done in regard to your coming to us, woe to us lest this also should be the case with your preaching! In order, therefore, that they might not think thus, he assures them that *God* was faithful, and that His word to them was not yea and nay; for in his preaching such changes could not happen, but only in his travels and journeyings.] Their objection must then have been that the Apostle had both these intentions together and at the same time, and hence that he could not be depended upon, was equivocal, self-contradictory, and took back at one time what he had just before promised (not as Olshausen arbitrarily assumes, that truth and falsehood were blended together).—Very different from all this was the actual conduct of the Apostle toward them, based as it was upon motives of the highest love and wisdom, ver. 23.—**As God is faithful, our word towards you is not yea and nay:**—He here proceeds in the first place to meet the objection in a very solemn but lively manner (ver. 18), introducing his assertion with a δέ (which, however, has not the force of μᾶλλον δέ, as if he would give a still further denial to the question). Πιστὸς δὲ ὁ θεός, ὅτι, &c., may here be taken either as saying that God's fidelity was the reason he ventured to assert such a consistency for himself, *i. e.* he asserted such things of himself *because* God was faithful—God is faithful in this (εἰς τοῦτο), and this fact makes it impossible that we should speak in this uncertain manner among you (Meyer)—or, as a solemn protestation: as surely as God is true, our word toward you, *etc.* de Wette, Osiander). The former seems harsh, and is not grammatically confirmed by a reference to John ix. 17, where ὅτι has the force of: because, since. Πιστὸς ὁ θεός may be a form of solemn affirmation as well as ἐστιν ἀλήθεια χριστοῦ ἐν ἐμοί in chap. xi. 10, and it goes probably on

the assumption that God was a witness. Comp. Rom. i. 9; Phil. i. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 5. He thus brings forward the fidelity (reliableness) of God as a security for the reliableness of his own λόγος. But what does he mean by this λόγος? Does it refer to his promise to visit them, or to his discourses generally, *i. e.* to everything he had said to them in any way? or finally does it refer to his doctrines and public instructions (κήρυγμα)?* We are decidedly in favor of the last for the reason assigned in the next verse, in which the Apostle maintains that his instructions must be perfectly reliable because they consisted of truths which were incontrovertible and irresistible. NEANDER: "Every way in which he held intercourse with the Corinthians, his instructions as a whole." But such an assertion of the credibility of his teaching should have an influence also to ward off those accusations which had been made against those decisions which related to his official work (such as his apostolical journeys), just as these latter had created a prejudice against his teachings.

For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by us (VER. 19).—["In place of the preaching he here puts Him who was preached (metonomy); and says that the doctrine concerning the Son of God which he and Silvanus and Timotheus had preached contained no discrepancies, nor did they at one time preach this and at another time that, but they brought forward always the same doctrine." THEODORET]. Τοῦ θεοῦ, according to the true reading, precedes γάρ, and thus becomes emphatic, in order to give prominence to the Divine part of the subject of their preaching. It evidently has reference to what had been said in ver. 18, respecting ὁ θεός. Κηρυχθείς relates to the preaching by which they had been at first brought to believe in Christ. He describes this as the common testimony of the three organs of Divine revelation who had been associated at that time (Acts xviii. 5). It should not, however, be supposed that the Christ thus preached signifies the same thing as the preaching of Christ, for then γάρ would serve only to introduce an explanation or further exposition of what had been said in ver. 18. Comp. ver. 20. [In describing "the Son of God, Jesus Christ," the epithets are accumulated "to express the greatness of Him whom they preached, and so to aggravate the impossibility of His connection with any littleness or levity." STANLEY]. Of Him, as he had been preached among the Corinthians, the Apostle says: **he was not made yea and nay, but has been made yea in him**; *i. e.*, He has proved Himself among you as among others, not an untruthful, untrustworthy and ambiguous personage, saying yea and nay at the same time; but one in whom an everlasting yea, a pure, steadfast affirmation might always be found (comp. Heb. xiii. 8; Rev. iii. 14). "The whole Old Testament revelation has proved to be true by means of the Christ who has been preached among you. And yet, what is thus true of the objective Christ, must be applied with equal truth to the word preached respecting him." NEANDER. [The verb here used, γέγονεν, signifies not mere existence, but a transition from one state, or character, or condition, to another (Webster's Synn. of the Gr. Test., p. 199). Being in the perfect tense, it implies that the change spoken of is not only completed, but that the result of it is conceived of as permanent (Winer, § 41, 4). It hath *become* yea, and it *remains* yea in Him forever. My plans and purposes may change, but the subject of my preaching remains the same under every mutation of its preachers].

The more particular declaration and reason assigned in the next verse shows that what had just been asserted had reference to the experience, not merely of the Corinthians, (who had been spoken of in the phrase, preached among you), but of Christians in general; **For however numerous may be the promises of God** (in the Old Testament), **in Him is the yea**, (*i. e.*, the affirmation of them, ver. 20); inasmuch as they are actually fulfilled in Him, or He secures their fulfilment in the future. By means of His person and work, the certainty of all God's promises has been practically confirmed (comp. Rom. xv. 8; Jno. i. 17; Acts iii. 21). To this external confirmation in Christ, corresponds the **Amen**, which is not added merely to strengthen the yea (as the Rec. would make it), but it expresses the unanimous assent which believers yield to the objective truth, the confession they make with respect to the actual fulfilment everywhere taking place at the time, with an allusion also to the Amen which the primitive Christians were in the habit of responding in their public assemblies. Even this confession is by means of Christ, for inasmuch as the fulfilment itself takes place in Him, the confession must be drawn from believers by Him through our means to the glory of God. Or: all God's promises are yea in Christ's person and work, *i. c.*, in His name, as it is proclaimed in the Gospel, and are Amen in the Church which confesses His name (Besser). —The words δι' ἡμῶν [through or by means of us] might possibly be referred to believers in general, but the context more naturally connects them with those only, who are Christ's ministers; and the Amen is either the joyful and believing testimony of such ministers, or (more correctly and more strictly conformed to the usage with respect to ἀμήν), the public expression of confidence which all believers gave. The phrase **to the glory of God by us** is in apposition with that which precedes it, and signifies, that which glorifies God by our means, *i. e.*, when we who proclaim the Gospel are the instruments of producing the confidence thus expressed (Meyer).—The article is placed before ναί and ἀμήν in ver. 20, because the yea has here acquired a definite position with respect to the ἐπαγγελίαι. There is no necessity of supplying a subject for the affirmation in this *yea* (as *e. g.* in ἀλλὰ ναὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γέγονεν), nor of understanding by it that which

* [Wordsworth remarks that Paul "does not say (ver. 15), that it was his settled *purpose* βούλευμα, nor yet his θέλημα or *will*, to visit them. See Matth. i. 19, where ἐβουλήθη signifies only: *was minded*, and Philem. 13, where ἐβουλόμην signifies: *it was my wish*, where the wish was finally controlled and overruled by the will. He does not say he wrote that he was *resolved* to pass by them into Macedonia but only that he was *wishing* (imperf.) to do so. In v. 17, there is a contrast between βούλομαι and βουλεύομαι, and his defence is, that instead of being lightminded, his wishes were controlled by his will, which was regulated by right reason and the will of God, so that his βουλήματα were clearly subject to his βουλεύματα."]

He (*i. e.*, Christ) has affirmed (the preceding yea), but it is itself the subject. [Bengel: Christ preached, *i. e.*, our preaching of Christ became *yea* in Christ Himself]. [Obviously, then, the Apostle would argue, there could be no variableness in the subject (λόγος) of His preaching, since God who gave it was faithful, and Christ who is its substance is the same in all ages, however the promises respecting Him might vary. The whole revelation of Christ, whether in Old Testament writing or in the preaching of the Apostle and his companions, had been one everlasting *affirmation* from God to men like a mighty yea poured forth from heaven through all generations. He was then, had been, and ever would be the same (Ex. iii. 14; Jno. viii. 58). Even in the *experience* of those to whom the Apostle was writing, this was manifest, for they were accustomed in all their assemblies to join with believers of every age and country in responding their hearty Amen to the instructions and worship of the Church. Thus the earth's Amen responded to heaven's yea in Christ]. In ver. 20, ἐπαγγελίαι refers to the promises not of the New, but of the Old Testament, such as the Apostle speaks of in Gal. iii. 16 ff. and Rom. iv. 13; to the promise of salvation in all its clear details, and not merely to that of the Holy Spirit.—Even with the reading given in the Recep.: καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἀμήν (retained by Osiander, with Tischendorf and Reiche), we need no other explanation than that we have just given. We shall not need to refer the yea to the God who promises and the Amen to the Christ in whom the promises are fulfilled (Beza); nor to regard the Amen as an expression of what is complete truth, *i. e.*, an idea expressed in two languages (as in the case of Abba, Father), with reference to both Jewish and Gentile Christians; nor yet to make the Amen God's seal to man's Amen, *i. e.*, to the confidence they thus expressed (?) (Osiander). Even on the supposition that the Amen refers to the subjective confidence of believers, it would not be inconsistent with the Apostle's aim to set forth the complete objective certainty of the Divine promises, secured as they were in all their strength through Christ, and so forming a basis on which he could claim confidence for himself. That internal confidence which the Corinthians had yielded to his preaching, and which they had openly confessed, was a sufficient proof of his trustworthiness as an Apostle. NEANDER: "In this way he met in the most effectual manner the suspicions which his opponents had cast upon his instructions, by appealing to the experience which the Corinthians had received of the power of Divine grace through Christ upon their hearts." But after all the arguments which have been urged against the reading, διὸ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ, we do not regard them as of sufficient weight to induce us to set it aside, or to give us entire confidence in that of the Recepta. [The sense of the two readings is somewhat different. By Lachmann's reading (preferred by Calvin and most of the ancient expositors), it is asserted, that, however various God's promises might be, their yea was in Christ, and hence that the Amen which expresses human experience must be in Him also. According to this, not only do the promises receive their confirmation in Christ, but we experience and assent to their truth. By the common reading the Apostle simply asserts, that the promises had received their verification, (their yea and Amen), in Christ. Certainly the tenor of the Apostle's argument is most strengthened by the former reading].

VER. 21, 22. [One thought still lingers in the Apostle's mind, which he must express before he returns to his personal defence (comp. Stanley)]. The firm faith which Christ had effected, and which had brought such glory to God by means of the preaching of the Gospel, he now traces back to its ultimate author (ver. 20).—**Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God.**—In the first place he represents God as firmly establishing, so far as related to Christ (1 Cor. i. 6), not only those who preached the Gospel, but those who had been brought by them to the Christian faith. The former he had enabled to preach Christ in such a way as to deserve and to secure the confidence of their fellow-men; and the latter he had induced to exercise a steadfast faith, and to hold forth an unshaken confession of the truth. In the next place he presents God as anointing the Apostle and his assistants; that is, as bestowing upon them that spiritual inspiration which was needful for their duties. [There is certainly nothing in the mere language or grammatical construction which intimates that he associated all Christians with these inspired teachers in the enjoyment of these blessings. In the confirmation (βεβαιῶν), indeed, he expressly includes the Corinthians to whom he was writing, and this is spoken of as an event which was then (present participle) taking place. But with an almost evident design he extends this participation to none of the remaining facts (the anointing, the sealing and the earnest of the Spirit), which are represented as having taken place (aorist participles) once for all at an earlier period (probably when the Apostles and the other teachers were consecrated to their public offices, and when, of course, the Corinthians were unconverted). As we know that miraculous gifts had been conferred upon the Corinthians, a special reason may have existed for applying the confirmation alone to them (σὺν ὑμῖν). And yet it must be conceded, that nothing in the *nature* of either of these benefits, so far as they are known to us, would necessarily limit their application to any class of believers. Even if the unction in 1 John ii. 20, 27 be explained of a miraculous endowment, it would be difficult to give such an interpretation to Eph. i. 13 f. Dr. Hodge also calls attention to the fact, that when an *official* anointing is spoken of in the New Testament, it is only in relation to Christ and never with reference to the Apostles or other preachers, whereas all believers are said to receive the more ordinary unction of the Holy Spirit. The ancient expositors (Chrysostom, Theodoret and Ambrosiaster) attached much importance to this passage as a special description of the privileges of all believers as the anointed prophets, priests and kings of God. On the whole, although we must grant that the Apostle has expressly limited the anointing, the sealing and the earnest of the Spirit to himself and his fellow-laborers in their official capacity, and the

confirmation to them and the Corinthians, we see nothing in the endowments themselves or in the analogy of similar passages, which should prevent us from giving these expressions a much more extensive application, since they refer to those spiritual benefits which are promised to all Christians as well as their public teachers.] With respect to the anointing (*κρίσας*), comp. Jno. ii. 20–27, where the unction of believers (*κρίσμα*) is spoken of; and Luke iv. 18; Acts iv. 27; x. 38; Heb. i. 9. Preachers of the Gospel should be imitators of Christ, and this they can be only as they partake of the Divine Spirit (official grace).—The *δὲ* indicates that an additional subject is introduced, for it is here metabatic (or transitional), and not adversative. The phrase *εἰς Χριστόν* has in this place the sense of: in respect to Christ, or, in the direction of Christ, and not of: within or in Christ. The former signification is undoubtedly the simplest, but the representation of the Apostle requires that we should conceive of the union with Christ as a continuous and progressive one, and it may be doubted whether *εἰς* will bear such an interpretation. *Σὺν ὑμῖν* (with you) is used here, not merely to conciliate the good will of the readers (Meyer, Osiander), but it enters much more essentially into the course of the argument. W. F. Besser:—"He takes the Corinthians themselves for his witnesses, from their own experience, that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ makes the course of His people sure by the Holy Spirit." —It would be altogether inappropriate and even contradictory to the spirit of the text to suppose that the Apostle had here a collateral reference to those who affected to regard him as a reed shaken by the wind (Rückert).—In the second and in the next succeeding *ἡμᾶς* the Apostle does not include his readers with himself, for in the previous part of the sentence he had expressly distinguished *ἡμᾶς* from them, and had made it refer exclusively to himself and his fellow-laborers.—The anointing refers not merely to the original vocation but to the subsequent spiritual endowment of the persons spoken of. The expression [paronomasia] intimates that there was a resemblance between the anointed ones and Him who was in a preëminent sense the Anointed One. Neander: "As it was customary to transfer every predicate of the Old Testament Theocracy, in a spiritual sense, to Christianity, we have the chrism which was used in the consecration of priests and kings applied to the spiritual consecration of the Christian by the presence of the Holy Spirit in his heart. The reference is to the consecration of all believers to the general priesthood."—It is rather an overstraining of the word when it is made (Bengel) to imply a communication both of strength and of fragrancy (chap. ii. 15); or, in addition to this, the clear and accurate discernment of truth, which was sometimes given from above, and which made its recipients inaccessible to all forms of error and falsehood (comp. 1 Jno. ii. 27); or some *character indelibilis* in the evangelical sense, a permanent Divine endowment by which one became holier and more inviolable, on account of some special prerogative or dignity which he acquired as the Lord's anointed (Osiander; comp. Ps. cv. 15); or, finally, the quality imparted in the three-fold office, *i. e.*, the refreshing and cheering influence (Ps. xl. 15), which all Christians receive when they are made prophets, priests and kings unto God, and are strengthened for their conflicts with the world, sin and Satan (anointing of the athletae). Ver. 21 can be correctly construed only as an independent sentence, of which ver. 22 was designed to give an additional explanation. If we take ver. 21 as the subject and ver. 22 as the predicate, so that the idea should be: God who stablishes and hath anointed us hath also sealed us, the *βεβαιῶν*, which now forms the connecting link with the preceding passage, ceases to be the principal and becomes a merely incidental thought.—In ver. 22 the phrase—**Who also hath sealed us**—has reference to the Christian character of all those who had been ordained to the office of teaching, and points out the true source of those peculiar endowments which qualified them for their work. The sealing (*σφραγίζεσθαι*) signifies in general the act by which a man designates something as his property. Here, as in Eph. i. 13; iv. 30, it signifies that Divine assurance of adoption which is effected by the communication and inward witness of the Holy Spirit. Osiander describes it as the complete consecration of one to the service and fellowship of the Lord and his uninterrupted continuance therein (comp. Rev. vii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 10). The phrase—**and hath given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts**—is here added epexegetically, for in this communication of the Spirit lies the true power of the sealing. The whole phrase is a brachylogy [a concise expression] in which the act and its result are taken together; for it is implied that the Spirit is in such a way given that he abides in the heart.—*Ἀρραβών* is properly the earnest-money, *e. g.*, in a bargain, when some part of the price agreed upon is paid beforehand, in token that the contract is ratified and that the purchaser is bound for the payment of the whole. It is therefore a pledge or security.* If we take the genitive (*τοῦ πνεύματος*) partitively, the sense will be, that a communication of the Spirit is begun, and that the portion given is a pledge that the communication will be completed hereafter. If we follow the analogy

[* The original word here used (and which is found in the New Testament only here, and in 2 Cor. v. 5, and Eph. i. 14) is one of the few Hebrew words which passed into the Greek and Latin languages. As the founders of ancient commerce in the West, the Phenicians introduced it among the Greeks (*ἀρραβών*), from whom it passed into Italy (arrhabo, arrha), Gaul (Fr. arrhes), and even England (Earl's, or more properly, Arle's money). The Sept. use the same Greek word for עֵרָבוֹן in Gen. xxxviii. 17, 18, 20, and yet it appears to have had a meaning in Greek somewhat distinguishable from that which it bore either in Hebrew or in other languages. In these it had the general signification of *pledge* (Gen. xxxviii. 17 ff.), *surety* (Prov. xvii. 18), and even *hostages*, (2 Kings xiv. 14). The Greek derivative seems to have been restrained to signify only the *deposit* or *part payment* (Hesych. *πρόδρομα*) which the purchaser made to the vender on taking possession of his property (Suidas, Lexicon). It was therefore identical in kind with the payment which was due, whereas other kinds of pledges might be something of a totally different nature. Blackstone notices the legal significance of an earnest, as a payment which places the buyer and the seller in a position to enforce the carrying out of the contract. (Comm. ii. 30). Comp. also Robertson (Lect. XXXV.), who points out that "Baptism is a *pledge of* heaven—'a sign and seal'—while the Spirit of truth is an *earnest* of heaven, and heaven begun." Smith's and Kitto's Dictt. Art. Earnest; Robinson's Heb. Lexicon].

of chap. v. 5, we must regard the communication of the Spirit as the proper warrant for expecting a complete salvation, the actual inheritance (the κληρονομία). The Spirit therefore should be looked upon as the earnest of the whole salvation; properly speaking, the earnest is, or consists of, the Holy Spirit, and the genitive here is one of apposition [Winer, Gr. d. N. T. § 48, 2]. Comp. on this subject Rom. viii. 2, 10–11, 15–17. It seems altogether too contracted a view of this passage to make all that is here said refer exclusively to the testimony which the Spirit bore in the hearts of the original preachers of the Gospel to the truth of their official character. [The expressions more properly relate to the complete assurance which they possessed that they were, both as believers and as preachers of the truth, under the direction of an infallible Divine Spirit.]

Vers. 23, 24. In the two preceding verses, the Apostle had set forth the firm basis God had given for the confidence his hearers might repose in him, and in consequence of which he had been so abundantly authenticated both as an Apostle and a Christian. This had prepared the way for the appeal to God which he now makes with an irresistible power:—**Moreover I call God for a witness against my soul.**—This is a solemn affirmation respecting his failure to visit Corinth according to his previous intention and the reasons which kept him from going. Instead of the general *us*, he now uses the singular *I*, because he is about to speak of personal matters in which no one but himself was involved. The prominence of the ἐγώ is increased by its close connection with δὲ (comp. Osiander: ["As God had placed a divine seal upon him and his word, according to ver. 22, so he now seals his own word with the name of God."]) Ἐπί has its peculiar sense of *against*, Meyer makes it mean *for* (comp. 2 Maccab. ii. 37), but here it means *in respect to;* Neander: *over my soul.* The former sense is more appropriate to the nature of a solemn affirmation or oath (comp. Josh. xxiv. 22), The sense is: "If what I now say is untrue, may God appear as a witness against my soul, and may I fall under his condemnation."—The condition was necessarily implied and hence was not expressed. The phrase, my soul (τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχήν) does not apply to the inmost spirit, that which the Apostle always regarded as especially akin to, and conscious of, God, and which he therefore places here in this sacred relation to the Omniscient God (Osiander). According to Beck (*Seelenl.* § 2) the soul is that in which the life is found, and hence is always named as the subject when a preservation, deliverance, peril or loss of life is spoken of.—This solemn asseveration was justifiable on moral grounds, because his credit as an Apostle had been called in question, and with this was essentially connected the honor of Christ who had sent him, and the cause of God which he represented at Corinth. In like manner, Gal. i. 20; Rom. ix. 1 f, and other places. W. F. Besser: Even Augustine, in his day, refers to this solemn oath of the Apostle, to prove that our Lord could not have intended in his Sermon on the Mount (Matth. v. 34) to prohibit every kind of swearing, but only those oaths which were useless and were an unhallowed profanation of God's name, and hence were arbitrary and uncalled for. In this place Paul made use of an oath, as Christ did (Matth. xxvi. 64), when the honor of God called for it.—Οὐκέτι implies that he had been in Corinth before he wrote his First Epistle (comp. Meyer). [Our A. V. translates οὐκέτι as if it were=οὐπω; Tyndale, more correctly: "not eny moare;" Conybeare: "I gave up my purpose;" Alford: "No more, *i. e.*, after the first time." Paul does not deny that he had as yet been at Corinth, but only explains why he had not gone there at the time, and on the journey, of which he was speaking. It seems probable from this whole passage (vers. 15–23) that Paul had paid no visit to Corinth between the sending of the First and Second Epistles. See Introd. § 6.]. The reason he had not gone directly to Corinth, according to his earlier intention, but had visited the Macedonian churches first and had contented himself with writing to the Corinthians, is expressed in φειδόμενος ὑμῶν:—**that I came not to Corinth any more, in order that I might spare you.**—He had hoped that they would be induced by that Epistle to return to their right mind and would be so completely restored to their proper relation to him, that he would not be obliged to treat them with a rod of severity (1 Cor. iv. 21). He was not, however, even then without anxiety on this point (chap. xii. 20 f; xiii. 1 ff.)—**Not that we have dominion over your faith** (ver. 24).—He here anticipates and meets any misconstruction which might be put upon what he had just said about sparing them (φειδόμενος), and he obviates the appearance of domineering which some might find in it.—Οὐχ ὅτι is equivalent to saying: I say not that *etc.* (a common brachylogy), *i. e.*, "the words φειδόμενος ὑμῶν are not intended to imply," *etc.*—Κυριεύομεν is not here to be so connected with ὑμῶν as to make ἕνεκα necessary to be understood before τῆς πίστεως [as if he had meant: over you with respect to your faith]; nor is τῆς πίστεως to be considered as equivalent to τῶν πιστευόντων: them that believe. His object was to say that when he spoke of sparing them, he meant not to use his apostolic authority in a lordly way to control their faith, their inward religious life, and their spiritual action with respect to Christian truth. All this he knew must be the result of a free surrender, and a voluntary determination, of their own minds, not merely at first, but ever afterwards, on each renewed act of faith. A positive expression of his meaning is given in the words:—**but are helpers of your joy.**—'Your joy, your "rejoicing in the Lord," can thrive and maintain its existence only by your putting forth all the energies of your faith in the work of progressive sanctification, in abstaining from all selfish and fleshly desires, and in the perfecting yourselves in love and a positive likeness to Christ.' In this way not only would their faith be proved, but their hearts would be filled with Christian cheerfulness, and they would become conscious of a genuine and established spiritual life. In all this he had endeavored to assist them by the exercise of discipline, by earnest admonitions, by a strict adherence to the upright course which a genuine love demanded, and by strenuously persevering in the path of duty, whatever censures he might find it needful to inflict on

them for their remaining inconsistencies. [As inspired men the Apostles had power to prescribe what *ought* to be believed, the objective truth on which all right faith is grounded, but they claimed no other authority over men's subjective faith. "He claimed no right to control their spiritual convictions, but only their outward conduct, and hence he might speak of having spared them only in respect of external discipline" (Erasmus' Paraphrase). Thus careful was he to recognize the right of private judgment even under the spiritual jurisdiction of inspired men. The reason he gives is, that Christians were steadfast only when they exercise a free faith in God alone, without the attempted constraint of human authority.] The σύν in συνεργοί refers neither to God nor to Christ, nor to his companions in office, as if he had said that he worked in common with them, but to his readers for whose welfare he was concerned, and whose activity in their own behalf was presupposed. That he was here speaking of nothing but a co-operation with them in promoting their joy (in this sense) and not directly of faith, is confirmed by the final clause:—**for by faith ye stand,**—or rather, in respect to faith ye are steadfast. The Dative here shows wherein or in what respect they were steadfast (comp. Gal. v. 3), and does not point out [as our English A. V. makes it] the reason, or the efficient cause of their steadfastness. [See, however, Winer, *Gr. d. N. T.*, § 31, 3].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. How pure the relationship between ministers and their congregations, when the eye of the former is kept steadfastly upon the day of Jesus Christ, and when the latter attend strictly to the doctrine preached to them. The thought that we are both to appear together before the great Shepherd to whom we all belong, who has united us together, and who perfectly knows all that we do to one another, will have the effect, 1) to repress in those who have been intrusted with the pastoral office all motives unworthy of fellowship with God, to render them indifferent to the empty honors of the world and to fleshly indulgences, and to make them long with purer and more intense desire for the salvation of souls, to whom they might be able in the last day to point with satisfaction as those whom they had been instrumental in leading to, and confirming in, the way of life; and 2) to induce the people to make such a profitable use of their instructions and admonitions, to grow in grace, to free themselves from every thing which will not bear the light of the last day, and to abound in the fruits of righteousness, that their ministers may perform their duties with joy and not with grief, and finally be able to point to them as to a thriving and fruitful field which will not dishonor either the great Master or the under shepherds. —But the formation and continuance of this relation must depend very much upon the character of the instruction which is given. When a people are supplied only with opinions derived from the preacher's own heart or the teachings of men, they can never know with confidence where they stand or the true foundation of their hopes. But when they are supplied with the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ in the ever consistent words of the Apostles and prophets, and with those promises of God which, however ancient, are perpetually fulfilled and confirmed before their eyes and in their own experience, they will always know where to look for direction, will be established in the truth, and will acquire a confidence which no insinuations or calumnies can shake. As his course will never be ambiguous, they will not be obliged to be on their guard against every thing which proceeds from him, his words will be received in their natural signification, and if at any time suspicions are raised against him, they will confidently anticipate from him a satisfactory explanation.

2. The proper relation of a pastor to his people is not that of a lord over his subjects. It is no part of his business to interfere directly with their external social relations, to lord it over their private judgments in respect to God and the Divine word, or to hold them in a state of slavish dependence upon himself. A hierarchy is an apostasy from the mind and spirit of the Apostles. These felt that their office was most honored when they became helpers of their people's joy, extended a helping hand to such as were weak and struggling, and enabled these to walk securely along the way of righteousness. Their object was to render believers more and more capable of using God's word and grace for themselves, and to become increasingly skilful and zealous in good works. Their official power depended not upon external accompaniments, but upon the amount of assistance and coöperation they could afford to those around them. It was the power of love and a participation in the sufficiency of God. Of such a hierarchy, those who love to have dominion over men's faith present only a miserable caricature, and an apish device of Satan, who endeavors thus haughtily and violently to recover what our Lord and those who have our Lord's Spirit have gained by works of humanity and love. Such ministers boast themselves only in that God who establishes them with all true believers in one great fellowship with Christ, calls them and qualifies them for their office, and bestows on them the Spirit which witnesses to their adoption and is an inward pledge of their eternal glory.

[3. "The joys of a Christian on earth are of the same nature with the joys of heaven. They are an earnest, a part of that which he is to enjoy forever. There will be no other heaven than that which would be constituted by the expanded joys of a Christian. Of course, he who has not such a character, such principles, and such joys, as, if fairly developed, would constitute heaven, is not a Christian." BARNES.]

[4. "If the inspired Apostles recognized not only their subjection to the word of God, but also the right of the people to judge whether their teachings were in accordance with the supreme standard, it is most evident that no Church authority can make any thing contrary to Scripture obligatory on believers, and that the ultimate right to decide whether ecclesiastical decisions are in accordance with the word of God, rests with the people. In other words, Paul recognizes even in reference to himself the

right of private judgment. He allowed any man to pronounce him anathema if he did not preach the Gospel as it had been revealed and authenticated to the Church." HODGE.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE, VER. 12: HEDINGER:—What an excellent pillow for the soul is a good conscience! Well may we seek for it, purify it, and keep it! An indispensable means to this, is never to neglect the duties of our stations.—With a good conscience, simplicity and sincerity are cardinal virtues by which, no less than by faith, all virtuous conduct is ennobled.—He who has the witness of a good conscience, thereby lives continually at the bar of that omniscient Judge, who tries the reins and the heart. (Rom. ix. 1). Nothing tranquilizes a man under manifold sufferings, like the consciousness that he brought not his troubles on himself; but even when he is conscious of some defects, the grace of God will sustain him if he is engaged in a good cause; and is suffering, not on account of those defects, but for Christ's sake.—Ver. 13. A Christian's speech should never be ambiguous or distorted (Ps. xxv. 21; John i. 47).—The great matter is, to be faithful even to the end; but it is a sad thing to be perhaps faithful to-day, and to-morrow to be like salt which has lost its savor (Matth. v. 13), relapsing into entire worldliness (Heb. x. 38f.). —Ver. 14. Many despise and hate the preacher who is faithful, and yet fancy that they love God, but the time is coming when the preacher will be honored, and they will be put to shame (Luke xix. 16)!—Happy is it when the minister and his people have reason for mutual glorying, but alas! when he is obliged to labor in the midst of perpetual sighings (Heb. xiii. 17)!—Ver. 16. Even when we have the sincerest and best intentions, our whole conduct may be misinterpreted and ascribed to base motives. But go thy way, perverse world; thou shalt yet see and confess the truth, though perhaps too late!—Ver. 19. The Church has now many builders; oh, if all would build on the same plan and would hold up the Lord Jesus Christ in the same way! But with some it is yea, and with others it is nay; some pull down what others build up.—Ver. 20. Jesus Christ is the seal and the realization of all God's promises and predictions. In him we have the manifestation of God.—Ver. 21. To be called the Lord's anointed, and yet not have the Lord's anointing, is to have a name to live while we are dead.—A genuine Christian stands upon a firm footing, and has no reason to doubt, much less to despair, that God will enable him to hold out faithful to the end; for the Holy Spirit which dwells within him, is the pledge of his establishment, anointing and sealing by the Father.—The Holy Spirit is the precious love token* which God gives his people that Christ may be glorified in them, and to shed abroad the love of God in their hearts, diffusing in them a peace (Rom. v. 5) which assures them of an inheritance of similar blessedness in the world to come.—Ver. 23. On important occasions, when the honor of God and the welfare of our neighbor is concerned, we are warranted in taking a solemn oath (Deut. vi. 13).—Ver. 24. Faith cannot be forced. Fetters and chains are the instruments which antichrist uses for instructing his followers and for ensuring his decisions in the hall of judgment.—Nothing can exceed the joy which true Christians derive from the pledge God gives them of their glorious inheritance by sealing them for it. All true servants of the gospel are helpers of this joy, and never will imagine themselves the people's lords (1 Pet. iii. 3).—Those who truly stand in the faith will also withstand the enemy (1 Pet. v. 8f.). But let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall (1 Cor. x. 12; Rom. xi. 20).

BERLENBURG BIBLE, VER. 12:—A minister of Christ must look mainly to the approbation of his own conscience, for he will be obliged to live as if he cared nothing for the opinions of worldly men.—All things in this case have a mutual dependence; the simplicity of the dove is united with the prudence of the righteous, and with an understanding so purified from above that it will receive or endure nothing corrupt or incongruous in its nature. The eyes are turned always toward God as He is in Christ, and the whole conduct is regulated by the Divine will. This is walking by faith. In it the believer will not be disposed to get up intrigues, and will have no occasion for doubt or fear. Like charity (1 Cor. xiii. 4) he has none of the serpent's spirit, and he keeps constant hold on God. He walks in the light, and he has no corrupt by-ends, for his eye is single. Did we all walk thus we might traverse the world without injury.—Ver. 13 ff. No reproof is so severe as the words and the example of consistent Christians. The faithful minister will, therefore, be always in conflict with men. We need never expect to be without some root of bitterness and suspicion.—Ver. 17. The distinction between those whom God leads, and those who walk according to their own counsel, may be seen in the steadfastness with which the former keep, and the fickleness with which the latter change, their resolutions. The stability of the Christian depends upon the immutability of that Divine Spirit who leads him, and who will allow of no Yea and Nay in Him. Those who have not that Spirit will be subject continually to change, resolving sometimes upon one thing and sometimes upon another, but constant to nothing.—Ver. 19. In Christ and His gospel there are no contradictions. What He is in himself, He will manifest himself to be in us, ever the same. Such will he prove himself to be in all those temptations which we sinners must endure with patience.—Ver. 20. God's promises are all connected with Christ. Those then who heartily lay hold of Christ can easily overcome and make their way through all possible offences. —Ver. 21. Our eye should be fixed not so much upon the instruments God uses, as upon the work He accomplishes by them.—Ver. 22. By the sealing which God gives us, we become so assured of His promises and of the salvation effected by Christ and revealed in the gospel, that no creature can separate us from Him.—Ver. 24. Whoever imposes burdens upon the necks and

[* Maalschatz, is the gift which is presented to the bride at her betrothal, by her affianced spouse, as a pledge that he will at some future time bring her to his home].

endeavors to have dominion over the faith and consciences of God's people, thereby puts himself in the place of Christ and becomes an antichrist.

Rieger, Vers. 12–16:—The reproach of the cross has always something oppressive and crushing to a man. Then those who see him will write upon his cross all manner of superscriptions. But then it is that we may make our boast and stand erect with a right royal and divine spirit. This is not self-exaltation, but in our troubles glorying in the Lord. Such a faith which glories in fellowship with Christ and in His righteousness alone, arms us against the accusations of conscience, and yet so purifies conscience itself that it will allow of nothing which would interrupt our fellowship with a God of light. It will make us diligent to maintain a good conscience along with our faith, that its friendly testimony may be our rejoicing under the unfriendly judgments of men.—The man who faithfully performs the work assigned him by Providence, and never corrupts himself with sinister and selfish views, may be said to act with simplicity and sincerity. As it is in the divine government, every thing here proceeds from a single principle. The Christian may be severely tried, but he will always be an object of divine complacency. Confidence in himself will sometimes beguile a man into expedients of a worldly nature, into subtle schemes and strenuous endeavors to obtain relief, but a true confidence in the living God will support him all along his course with the assurance that grace will be sufficient for his day, and that all things shall work together for his good. He will have no need of concealments, corrections of former errors, double meanings to his words, and forced explanations of what he has done, but his honest meaning is what every one would easiest understand it to be.—Ver. 17 ff. Nothing can be nobler than the common fellowship of all Christians in the gospel, but nothing can be more disgusting than a perversion of it to promote objects of a worldly nature. The purer a man's intentions are, the more unsuspecting will he be, and the more freely will he adjust his course to new circumstances. While, on the one hand, a worldly spirit in its eagerness to maintain its influence over men, will not unfrequently persevere with fatal obstinacy in the course it has once chosen, a light mind, on the other, changes its purposes without reasons. A proper regard for the guiding hand of God will preserve us from both extremes.—Even in his primary principles no one should presume that he can attain by himself infallible truth. God will, however, faithfully see to it that we have enough in his word to rest upon. The Gospel is no mere plaything, which asserts at one time what it denies at another, and which approves at one time what it condemns at another; but as it proceeds from an unchangeable source, it presents always the same warrant for faith.—Ver. 20. The whole mystery of God and of Christ has been contrived, so far as we are concerned, with the special object of giving us promises amply sufficient to afford us perfect peace; but all these promises find their fulfilment in Christ and in the accomplishment of this divine mystery. It is by the work of redemption that God has preserved His own name from dishonor and vindicated His glory in creation; and when He sends forth men to preach His Gospel, it is that they may make known the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.—Ver. 21 f. Christ the Son of God has arranged all things in such a way as to promote His Father's glory; but the Father, as the true Husbandman, watches over each branch in Christ, that it shall be purified and bring forth more fruit. He is the source of all the assurance and certainty, and of all the joy and constancy, which as Christians and ministers, we can possess.—Ver. 22. A father sometimes averts his eyes from that which may cause too much shame on the part of a well-disposed child.—Ver. 24. Matters of faith and of ecclesiastical order must not be subject to men's caprices, and changed according to the convenience of kings or subjects. (Matth. xx. 25, 26).

Heubner, Ver. 12.—The only condition on which we can claim the intercession of our fellow Christians or speak in our own behalf, is the possession of a pure conscience. This can exist only where there is a simplicity which has but one aim and one desire, *i. e.*, to please God, a divine sincerity or purity of purpose which renounces all selfish and extraneous objects, and an uprightness which can bear the divine inspection.—Ver. 13. The Christian is always consistent with himself.—Ver. 15. The honorable, conscientious man can present himself even before his enemies with cheerfulness.—Ver. 17. The Christian should be prudent and conscientious when he promises, that he may never engage to do more than he can perform.—An honest man is consistent with himself even when he changes his plans, for in all his changes he has no selfish ends.—Ver. 19. Christ himself is an example of a witness, absolutely faithful, upright and reliable (Rev. iii. 14).—What can impose a stronger obligation to speak the truth, than to be the messenger of such a faithful and true witness? Those who have constant intercourse with Christ, and in whom Christ dwells, must surely be expected to have something of His truthfulness and fidelity.—Ver. 20. Christ has honored God's veracity. Every one, then, who brings another to Christ, contributes something to the glory of God's veracity.—Ver. 21f. Stability of character is a grace which belongs to those who are upright and pious in heart, to those who humbly and firmly maintain confidence in God.—It is the anointing of the Spirit which makes us Christians.—Like every other creature, the Christian has his distinctive signature (mark). The Spirit, the pledge of divine grace and of adoption, is the invisible stamp which every one must bear.—Ver. 24. The Apostles would not for a moment have dominion over men's faith, how much less should those who act only as their representatives? Every Christian should be led by the Spirit freely through the divine word.—The Apostles imparted to others nothing but Christ's own word, and the Spirit had to confirm it in their hearts.

W. F. Besser, Ver. 12. A Christian may have confidence in the testimony of his conscience, for the eye of his conscience is directed by the Holy Ghost to the clear and faithful glass of the divine

will in the heart. (Rom. ix. 1).—Ver. 13. The Scriptures evidently teach us that holy men of God have not concealed their thoughts among the written letters, but plainly expressed them in intelligible words.—Ver. 18. How could we know God's faithfulness and veracity, if not by means of what prophets and Apostles have told us? Through their writings which are not yea and nay, but are in their essential nature only a single word, the Church is a pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim. iii. 15), the faithful witness of a faithful God, and the spotless Bride of the spotless Lamb.—Ver. 19. Christ is not a reed shaken with the wind, but a rock. From the mouth of our Lord Jesus Christ, no poor sinner ever heard a yea of promise at the same time with a nay of denial. Just as He was when He stood among His disciples and said (Jno. xiv. 6): I am the truth, so is He to-day, and will be forever; the preached Christ identical with the preacher Christ.—Jesus Christ the Son of God is the substance of all prophetic and apostolic announcements, the very heart and kernel of the whole word of God; He who has come in the flesh is undoubtedly the one who was promised in the word of prophecy.—Ver. 24. Faith cannot be extorted by force or by authority.

[F. W. Robertson, ver. 12:—The testimony of conscience. Paul is here speaking, not of the faultlessness of his personal character, but of his ministry—not of the blamelessness even of this, but of its success; he had been earnest and straightforward in his work, and his worst enemies could not prove him insincere. This sincerity excluded, 1) all subtle manœuvering and indirect modes of teaching, which, in the end, seldom succeed. Such straightforwardness is more than a match at last for all the involved windings of deceit; 2) all teaching on the ground of mere authority. The truth he taught commended itself to men's consciences, and made them feel a flash which kindled all into light at once. Of his words men said, not, 'How can that be proved?' but, 'It is the truth of God, and needs no proof.'—Ver. 15–22. Paul defends himself from the charge that he had trifled with his word, on the broad ground that, as a spiritual Christian, he could not do so. It would have been acting according to the flesh, whereas he was in Christ; and Christ was the Christian's yea, the living truth, and so his life. To be veracious was therefore simply the result of a true life: the life being true, the words and sentiments must be veracious. To be established in Christ, anointed, is to be free from self and selfish motives. A blow is therefore struck at the root of all instability. The course of such a man, like that of the sun, can be calculated. Observe, too, that all this arose, not from his Apostleship, but from the Christianity, which the Corinthians shared with him. It was the gift of the Spirit, which was "God's seal" to mark him for God's own, and an "earnest" which assured him of his future glory. The true are His, and none else are blessed. We need not ask, therefore: Will the true, pure, loving, holy man be saved? for he *is* saved, he *has* heaven, it is in him now. He has a part of his inheritance now, and he is soon to possess the whole].

IV.—MORE PARTICULAR EXPLANATIONS OF HIS REASONS FOR NOT VISITING THEM; THAT HE MIGHT SPARE THEM AND HIMSELF NEEDLESS PAIN. DIRECTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THOSE WHO HAD ESPECIALLY CAUSED TROUBLE.

Chapter II. 1–11.

1 But I determined this with [for] myself, that I would not come again to you in hea-
2 viness [in sorrow come again to you].[1] For if I make you sorry, who is he then[2] that
3 maketh me glad, but the same which is made sorry by me? And I wrote this same
[*om.* unto you[3]], lest when I came I should have sorrow from them of whom I ought
4 to rejoice; having confidence in you all, that my joy is *the joy* of you all. For out of
much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears; not that ye
should be grieved [have sorrow], but that ye might know the love which I have more
5 abundantly unto you. But if any have caused grief [sorrow], he hath not grieved
[caused sorrow to] me, but in part, (that I may not overcharge [him]) you all.
6 Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which *was inflicted* of many.
7 So that contrariwise ye *ought rather* [*om.* rather[4]] to forgive *him* and comfort *him*,
8 lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow. Wherefore I
9 beseech you that ye would confirm *your* love toward him. For to this end also did I
10 write, that I might know the proof of you whether[5] ye be obedient in all things. To
whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive also[6]: for if I forgave any thing, to whom
[whatever] I forgave it [*om.* it], for your sakes forgave I it, in the person [presence]
11 of Christ; lest Satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his
devices.

[1] Ver. 1.—The arrangement of the words, should be, according to the best MSS.: ἐν λύπῃ ἐλθεῖν. The Rec. on less (Meyer: "almost no") authority has ἐλθεῖν ἐν λύπῃ. The best authorities also put πρὸς ὑμᾶς before ἐλθεῖν. Tisch. still adheres to: ἐν λύπῃ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, and he is sustained by D. E. F. G. the Ital. Vulg. Syr. and Goth. vss., Chrys. and Theophyl. and most of the Lat. fathers. Nearly every recent critic has adopted the order: ἐν λύπῃ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. [There appears to be no sufficient reason why λύπη and λυπεῖν should not be rendered into English uniformly by the same generic words, as is contended for by Stanley (p. XXI.) and the editors of the Bible Union. In the eight times in which these words occur in our section, our A. V. has the different English words "in heaviness," "sorrow," grief, etc.]

[2] Ver. 2.—The best authorities have no ἐστιν after τίς. It was added by a later hand. [Only Bloomfield, among later critics, defends it both on documentary and internal evidence. He contends that the idiom and the interrogative use of καὶ demands a verb or its equivalent.]

[3] Ver. 3.—The best authorities have also cancelled ὑμῖν after ἔγραψα [but Bloomfield defends it as less likely to have been interpolated where it is found, than to have fallen out where it is wanting.]

[4] Ver. 7.—In the best MSS. μᾶλλον is wanting, and in others it stands after ὑμᾶς. It is a gloss upon τοὐναντίον. [And yet it is found in C. K. L. and Sinait. the Vulg. the Peschito Syr. Chrys. Theodt. Damasc. Theophyl. Oecum. and other MSS.; and it is inserted by Tisch., Stanley, and Meyer. The latter thinks it was omitted on account of its apparent superfluity.]

[5] Ver. 9.—Lachmann following A. B. has ἤ instead of εἰ. The εἰ might easily have fallen out before εἰς (both are wanting in one MS. [of the 11th cent.]) and was then supplied in various ways. (One MS. [also of the 11th cent.] has ὡς.)

[6] Ver. 10.—The best authorities have ὁ κεχάρισμαι, εἴ τι κεχάρισμαι. Rec. has εἴ τι κεχάρισμαι, ᾧ κεχάρισμαι. Meyer thinks that εἴ τι κεχάρ. was left out on account of the occurrence of κεχάρ. twice (in several MSS. it is found wanting), and then that it was reinserted in different positions.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VERS. 1–4. Having given the reason which had prevented his visit to the Corinthians (*viz.*: that he might spare them, φειδόμενος ὑμῶν, chap. i. 23), the Apostle now proceeds to inform them that one reason for thus sparing them was for his own sake.—**But I determined this for my own sake.**—The δέ indicates simply an advance in the course of the argument. Κρίνειν is here used as it is in 1 Cor. ii. 2; vii. 37 [in the sense of: to determine, to form a decision]. The meaning of ἐμαυτῷ is not here [as in the Luth. and all the Eng. versions]: *with myself*, for then the words should have been παρ' ἐμαυτῷ; but it is rather the *dat. commodi*: for my own sake; "a thoughtful, affectionate turn of expression" MEYER. Τοῦτο is emphatic and anticipates that which immediately follows, and which is ep-exegetical or explanatory of it (comp. Rom. xiv. 13 et. al.—**That I would not again come to you in sorrow**).—The πάλιν belongs to the whole phrase: in sorrow come to you, and not merely to the verb *to come* independently of the words *in sorrow*. Critics have been led to this violent removal of the word from its natural connection by their unwillingness to concede that the Apostle had made a second journey to Corinth before writing this Epistle (comp. chap. i. 15). NEANDER: "Paul intended to say that he would not a *second* time in sorrow come to them. But when had he been with them the *first* time in sorrow? Such a phrase could hardly be applicable to his first residence at Corinth. We must therefore believe that Paul had been a second time in that city, and that many sad things had then taken place there. We shall be obliged to accept of Bleek's explanation, that Paul had made one journey to Corinth not only before the Epistle to the Corinthians, which stands first in our canon, but another before writing our Epistle, which must have been actually first written, but which has been lost." [Comp. what is said of this second visit in the Introd., § 6]. We must also conclude from what follows, in the second verse, **"for if I make you sorrowful"**—that the sorrow here referred to must have been a sorrow of the Corinthians and not of the Apostle himself nor one shared by both parties. To come in sorrow, then, was to bring with him that which should cause sorrow (comp. Rom. xv. 29, and ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἐλθεῖν, 1 Cor. iv. 21).*—**Who is he then that maketh me glad but the same who is made sorry by me?**—The καί in the beginning of the apodosis or the concluding clause of ver. 2, is remarkable; and the connection of this sentence with the protasis which precedes it is not easy to be determined. Many have therefore concluded that we have here an aposiopesis, and that the Apostle, led off by his strong emotion, suddenly breaks off from his previous sentence and commences here a new interrogative sentence. The sense then would be: he could not think of giving them pain, for that would be ungrateful and unkind, since he would thus give pain to those who were giving him joy. In such a case, however, the expression ought to have been: καὶ τίς ὁ λυπούμενος ἐξ ἐμοῦ, εἰ μὴ ὁ εὐφραίνων με: who is he then that is made sorrowful by me, but the one who makes me glad? We not unfrequently meet with καί before the concluding clause (apodosis) of a conditional proposition in the works of the epic poets, in order to indicate that both transactions mentioned take place at precisely the same time (comp. Passow, *sub voce* καί, p. 1539 *a.* [Jelf, § 759, 2]). It might be translated [as in our Eng. vers.], *then*, and the sense would be: there would be then no one to make me glad, *etc.* He intends to say that both things could not be at the same time, that he could not be making them sad while they were making him glad. The absurdity of expecting that they would then make him joyful is made still more evident by the phrase, εἰ μὴ ὁ λυπούμενος ἐξ ἐμοῦ: "he must be the very one who is made sad by me." If I, your spiritual father, make you sorrowful, I thus deprive myself of the joy which

[* Although our author's construction of λύπη actively (: *causing* grief) is sanctioned by a number of ancient (especially Chrysostom) and modern critics, it is certainly not the natural meaning of the word, and is utterly inappropriate in the remainder of this section, and in other parts of Paul's writings. We much prefer that of the majority of interpreters, which makes the sense of vers. 2 and 3 to be: "I determined not to come to you again in sorrow; and therefore I refrained from visiting you at a time in which I should have been obliged to inflict on you a chastisement which would have been painful to me. I therefore then wrote an admonition to you, that ye might correct the evil, and that when I should actually come to you I might have joy in you. In this way, though my *letter* caused some sorrow, it was like the process of healing which finally gives joy to both patient and physician, and did not subject me to a *personal* intercourse of sorrow. For ye are the only sources of my joy when I come in person to Corinth, and if ye are thrown into permanent sorrow, who will there be to give me any satisfaction? See our interpretation further defended in Hodge's *Com.*].

you, my children, afford me; and I must be destitute of it entirely, for I cannot expect joy from one who has been saddened by me, The singular *ὁ λυπόυμενος* is rendered necessary not only by the *τίς*, but by the abstract form in which the matter is put. The reference is not to the case of the incestuous person (1 Cor. v. 1). Ἐγώ is contrasted with *ὑμᾶς*, but it is not otherwise emphatic, and contains no allusion to some other persons who might be occasioning them sorrow. The ἐκ in *ἐξ ἐμοῦ* indicates the person who was to be the source of sorrow, and the phrase is equivalent to *ὑπ' ἐμοῦ*.—**I put in writing this same thing**, *etc.*—In this verse *ἔγραψα* refers to the first Epistle, and not to the one he was writing (comp. vv. 4–9). It stands at the commencement of the sentence that it might be emphatic, and it is contrasted with *ἐλθών*. But is *τοῦτο αὐτό* equivalent to *εἰς τοῦτο αὐτό*, as in 2 Pet. i. 5, and frequently in the classical authors; or is it the objective accusative to *ἔγραψα*? The first would be the easier interpretation, but such a construction occurs nowhere else in Paul's writings (in ver. 9 it is *εἰς τοῦτο*). The *τοῦτο αὐτο* refers to that which forms the theme and object of this section, *μὴ ἐν λύπῃ ἐλθεῖν* (ver. 7), and respecting which he had already written in 1 Cor. iv. 21. (Osiander). The reference to what had been said in 1 Cor. iv. 21 does not seem very properly indicated, even if we suppose that the following censures have reference to the incestuous person. On the other hand it seems very natural for him to make this reference to the censures contained in his first Epistle (especially those in chap. v.), as matters in which they had a painful interest and which might grieve them, and to assure them that he now wished to avoid a repetition of this unpleasant experience when he should be present with them, and that his course in that matter had sprung from the confidence he had in them all. He therefore goes on to remind them of the frame of mind in which, and the object with which, he had then written (ver. 4). Meyer thus explains it: "This matter (so well known to you that I need not particularize it) I have *written* and not deferred to speak of until I should be present with you, in order that I might not," *etc.*—**That when I came I should not receive** (suffer) **sorrow from those who ought to give me joy.**—Ἀφ' *ὧν* is not exactly as if he had written *ἀπό τούτων οἷς* or *ἐφ' οἷς*, but—from those who ought to be the source of my joy. Ἔδει has reference to the relation of a spiritual father which he sustained toward them.—**For I had confidence in you all, that my joy was the joy of you all.**—In most other places *πεποιθώς* is followed by an *ἐπί* with a dative, but here, as in Matth. xxvii. 43, and 2 Thess. iii. 4, it is followed by an *ἐπί* with an accusative, indicating that the confidence extended to them and beyond them. The Apostle would thus make them see that he had written the sharp reproofs contained in his first Epistle not from a disposition distrustfully to draw back from them, but with an assured confidence that they were really and in heart so attached to him that his joy would be the joy of them all. He felt assured that they would, after his written admonition, arrange every difficulty which had troubled him, so that there would be no necessity for any oral reproofs which would be as painful to him as to them. His love rose entirely above those parties which had apparently become so prominent in the Church, and especially above that portion which had turned away from him; and in the spirit "which believeth all things" (1 Cor. xxii. 7), he had fastened upon the then latent power of filial affection, which he was satisfied would soon be strong enough to overcome every hinderance in their hearts (comp. Meyer and the admirable remarks of Osiander). Hence the phrases *ἐπι πάντας ὑμᾶς* and *πάντων ὑμῶν* [the first expressing his confidence in them, and the latter their confidence in him]. In ver. 4 he mentions first of all the spirit which had actuated him when he wrote to them:—**For I wrote unto you under great tribulation and oppression of heart, with many tears.**—Καρδίας is dependent upon both the preceding nouns. Συνοχή is stronger than θλῖψις, and signifies restriction, oppression, anguish, as in Luke xxi. 25; and *συνέχομαι* in Luke xii. 50. The greatness of the inward suffering is made still more evident in *διὰ πολλῶν δακρύων*, from which it appears to have broken forth "with many tears." Neander:—The *διά* designates the accompanying circumstances (comp. Acts xx. 19, 31). Stanley:—Ἐκ and *δια*, "*out of* the heart, *through* tears." The connection with ver. 3, indicated by the *γάρ*, is explained by Meyer and Osiander to be, that the Apostle might present the evidence of the confidence he had reposed in them: for if, in writing that Epistle, I had not had this confidence, the Epistle itself would not have been to me the occasion of so much anxiety and so many tears. It was precisely because he had had this confidence, and yet was under the necessity of writing, that the whole thing was so exceedingly painful; and yet it would probably be simpler to refer the remark primarily to the main sentence in ver. 3. His object in writing to them was, *ἵνα μὴ ἐλθὼν λύπην ἔχω* (*σχῶ*), *etc.* His great anxiety when he wrote was to be spared this affliction when he should visit them. Among the things which had influenced him when writing thus with so much solicitude, he now proceeds more expressly to mention the love which had already been hinted at in *πεποίθώς*, *etc.*—**Not that ye might be made sorrowful, but that ye might know**, *etc.*—His object had then been not to make them sorrowful, but rather by writing to them to let them see how deep was his affection for them. There is nothing in this *οὐχ ἵνα λυπηθῆτε* inconsistent with what is said in chap. vii. 8 ff., for even there the *λυπεῖν* is not presented as the final aim of the Apostle, but simply as a means indispensable to their recovery.—**The love which I have more abundantly toward you.**—Τὴν *ἀγάπην* is put at the commencement of the clause that it may be emphatic. Περισσοτέρως is certainly comparative, and yet his love was not compared with his sorrow, as if in consequence of this, or in connection with this, it became proportionably intense, or with his zeal, as if that zeal became more glowing as his love was greater; but his love to the Corinthians was compared with his love to other churches. It was analogous to the special love which parents bear to those children who are objects of peculiar hope

and therefore of peculiar care, or who for any reason stand in need of special attention. What he here says of the spirit which had induced him to write to them, does not seem quite applicable to our present Epistle, in which great calmness and perspicuity are predominant. Some have therefore contended that another Epistle must have been meant. Rückert, however, supposes that "the Apostle had deliberately and prudently put such restraints upon his spirit at that time that his style of writing was no true exhibition of his feelings." We see no necessity for such an expedient, which seems so inconsistent with the Apostle's general character, for it is the very spirit of holy love to put restraint upon its own action that the object of its affection may receive no detriment. (Comp. Meyer and Osiander).

VERS. 5–11. *Digression with respect to the incestuous person.* The expressions he had used respecting the *λύπη*, the *λυπεῖν* and *λυπεῖσθαι*, naturally led him to speak of the difficulty which had been the occasion of most of his sorrow, and of the severe censures he had been obliged to inflict, *i. e.*, of the incestuous scandal. Neander, on the other hand, asks: "Why was Paul under any necessity of vindicating himself for his anxiety respecting the incestuous person? The matter wears a very different aspect, if we suppose that in the meantime another case had come up, and that some one had made his appearance, who insolently defied Paul's Apostolical authority, and was likely in this way to produce a division in the Church. Every thing may be naturally explained if we assume that another Epistle had been sent by Titus, in which such a state of affairs had been the topic of discussion." Ewald concludes from vers. 5–11; chap. vii. 2, 12,; iii. 1; i. 13, 23, that after a brief and unexpected visit of the Apostle at Corinth, some distinguished individual had made use of every circumstance which could be turned to his disadvantage, and that this calumniator had charged him especially with duplicity in his public discourses and with an attempt to acquire notoriety, power and pecuniary profit among the people. [Comp. Introd. § 6]. The spirit of his address is gentle, in consistency with all the previous proceedings in the case, and the conciliatory strain in which he was writing. As a revocation of the extreme penalty was not excluded by what he had said in 1 Cor. v. 5, 13, provided the offender should be brought to repentance, the Apostolical authority would not be endangered by his restoration. The fifth verse is connected, not with the third (Olshausen), but with the fourth verse, where he had said that it was not his design to grieve them.—**But if any** (among you) **have caused grief, he hath not grieved me** (ver. 5).—Not only is the offence not specifically named, but the terms used to describe it are of the mildest signification, and the *εἴ τις* is purposely made indefinite, though without necessarily implying that the persons were unknown. There is no contradiction with ver. 4 when he says: he hath not caused sorrow in me, for by those words he means to say, that it had not been merely a personal (*ἐμὲ*) grief. He wishes it to be regarded as a calamity to the whole congregation. (*οὐκ-ἀλλά* therefore is not equivalent to *οὐ μόνον—ἀλλὰ καί*). Hence *πάντας ὑμᾶς* stands in contrast with *ἐμέ*. The idea of *λελύπηκεν πάντας ὑμᾶς* is softened still more by the addition of *ἀπὸ μέρους*: partially, to some extent; an allusion to what he afterwards expresses in ver. 6 by *ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων, viz.*: that although some of them had taken part in the public condemnation of the criminals with too little seriousness, they could not, after all, be unaffected by its unhappy results. The clause: that I may not overcharge, has reference only to the having caused grief; and the relative *αὐτον* (him) must be understood as its object [*i. e.*, **but in part (that I may not overcharge him) you all**].—This is a fine turn, for he thus says: in so saying I would impose no intolerable burden upon him, as if he were one who had injured you more than *ἀπὸ μέρους*, in full measure. The word *ἐπιβαρεῖν* has the sense of: to load, to overburden, as in 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8; Bengel: *ne addam onus gravato;* not exactly in the sense of: to say too much, or to express himself harshly. Not only because it violently separates the words *you all*, but on account of the tone of irony or even of keen reproach implied in it, we regard as altogether unsuitable the interpretation which makes the Apostle say: but partially, that I may not throw the burden on all [*i. e.*, may not accuse or grieve you]. Finally, the interpretation which makes the Apostle say: he hath not grieved me (properly speaking, or alone), only in part (for he has grieved you also), that I may not lay upon you all the burden or reproach, as if you were all equally indifferent to the offence; has against it the fact that the *ἐμέ* which is there so emphatic has no suitable contrast, and it would have been necessary to say: *εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ μέρους*. This last objection would also lie against making the words mean: but by way of general participation, *ut membrum ecclesiæ, etc.* Neander completes the object of this final sentence thus: "that I may not make the matter too important."* In accordance with the mild expression in ver. 5, the Apostle explains his views still further in ver. 6 regarding the proceedings against the offending person.—**Sufficient unto such a one** [one who has such a spirit as this offender now shows] **is this very punishment which has been inflicted by the many** (ver. 6).—The *ἱκανόν* stands at the head of the sentence for the sake of emphasis, and is designed to say that nothing

[* To understand the author's criticisms we need to have the several ways in which this passage has been punctuated and rendered distinctly before us. All that are important may be reduced to three: 1. That of Chrysostom, and advocated generally, especially by de Wette, Meyer, Osiander, Bloomfield, Neander, Alford, Stanley and Hodge, *viz.*: Εἰ δέ τις λελύπ., οὐκ ἐμὲ λελυπ., ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ μέρους (*ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβαρῶ*) *πάντας ὑμᾶς*, *i. e.*, If any have caused grief, he hath grieved not me, but more or less (that I be not too heavy on him) all of you. Theophylact says: the Apostle skilfully brings them all in as partakers of the injury, that he may have them partakers in the absolution." 2. That of Theodoret, the Vulgate, Luther's translation, and the A. V., and advocated by Bengel and Wordsworth, *viz.*: ἀλλ' ἀπὸ μέρους, (*ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβαρῶ πάντας ὑμᾶς*), *i. e.*, He hath not grieved me, (*i. e.*, not so much me personally), but in part, (*i. e.*, only as a part of the whole Church, and hence on account of the share I have in your griefs), that I may not lay the load of guilt on all of you. 3. That of Mosheim, Olshausen, Billroth and Conybeare, *viz.*: ἀλλ' ἀπὸ μέρους (*ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβαρῶ πάντας*) *ὑμᾶς*, *i. e.*, he hath not grieved me, but in part (that I may not accuse all) you. Billroth: "Whether he has caused grief to me is not a matter for present consideration: it is not I that must suffer for him, but you, at least a part of you, for I will not be unjust and charge you all with having been indifferent concerning his offence."]

farther was needed by way of punishment. It is used substantively like ἀρκετόν in Math. vi. 34, and means that which is satisfactory. The Catholic interpretation makes it refer to the sufficiently long continuance of the excommunication. Both the context (ver. 5, ἀπὸ μέρους, ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβαρῶ and ver. 7 ff.), and the ἱκανόν lead us to suppose that unlike the same words in 1 Cor. v. 5, τῷ τοιούτῳ is designed to intimate that the offender had begun to exhibit some signs of penitence. Ἐπιτιμία signifies, not threatening, but punishment, and in this place at least it implies that this consisted in very decided censures (Ecclus. ii. 10, where it means punishment generally). Αὕτη has reference to something well known to the Corinthians. The πλείονες by whom the punishment had been inflicted could not have been the eldership, but the majority of the Church at Corinth. Probably the action had been the more severe, possibly amounting to a withdrawal of fellowship with the offender, in consideration of the fact that an antipauline minority refused to take part in his punishment. The πλείονων shows that the excommunication could not have been complete (1 Cor. v. 3 ff.), and so that ἱκανόν could not have referred merely to the time in which that had continued. But it would be utterly inconsistent with the honesty of Paul's character to suppose with Rückert and Baur that he was here arresting the proceedings, after they had been commenced, from mere policy, to avoid a rupture with his opponents; and that he was now therefore affecting to be satisfied with the measures which the majority had adopted. The only motive he had for the milder proceeding which he now advises, was simply that which he himself afterwards avowed, *viz.*, that the thorough repentance of the offender had rendered severer measures unnecessary. It would have been altogether unapostolic, not to say unchristian, to drive such a one to despair. The whole object of discipline—that which had been aimed at in the punishment inflicted by the majority—had been attained. (comp. on 1 Cor. v. and Osiander and Meyer on our passage). As the result of these proceedings, on the one hand, the large majority had shown their cordial disapproval of the offence, the honor of the Church had been vindicated, and their non-participation in the sin and so their purity had been made evident; and on the other, a penitent spirit had been called forth in the bosom of the sinner himself (comp. ver. 7). These things constitute a sufficient reason for an entire change of proceeding, *viz.*, for his forgiveness.—**So that on the contrary ye ought rather to be kind to him and to comfort him** (ver. 7).—The ὥστε here implies that what he was about to say, was the essential and necessary result of the ἱκανόν, and it includes the idea of an obligation on their part. Still there is no necessity of supplying a δεῖν, as if the Apostle would say: it is sufficient to show on the contrary your favor (to him); or: so that ye may show, on the contrary, kindness. [Winer's Gr. N. T., § 45, 2d note]. Τοὐναντίον refers to ἐπιτιμία, but χαρίσασθαι does not imply exactly to give up or to remit the punishment, for it means properly to show favor or kindness. In the present case, however, this must, by its own nature, have involved a forgiveness of the injury done to the congregation, as the word is often used by Paul sometimes with (ἀδικίαν, chap. xii. 13; παραπτώματα Col. ii. 13), and sometimes without (Eph. iv. 32 and Col. iii. 13) the mention of the object. Παρακαλέσαι denotes here the friendly intercourse and consolation which would correspond with χαρίσασθαι. This is still further enforced by the Apostle when he points out what would be the consequence if this kind treatment were neglected: **lest, perhaps, such a one should be swallowed up with an excess of sorrow.**—The περισσοτέρα λύπῃ expresses the greatly increased sorrow which would be the effect of a continuance or an aggravation of the punishment. Of course it is here presumed that a high degree of punishment had already been inflicted, for otherwise all increase of it would not drive the sufferer to despair. It is to this, the renunciation of all hope of salvation and of all efforts to attain eternal life, and so the utter ruin of the man himself, that the swallowing up has reference, and not directly to his apostacy from the faith (being devoured by the Prince of this world), nor to death by his own hands, and still less to his sickness or death. The sorrow is compared to a wild beast (comp. 1 Pet. v. 8). By the words: such a one, (ὁ τοιοῦτος), he designates the man as an object of sympathy. As the result of the ἱκανὸν—ὥστε χαρίσασθαι ὑμᾶς, and the apprehension he had given as a reason for it, the Apostle now urges his exhortation.—**Wherefore I exhort you to make good** [substantiate by action] **your love toward him** (ver. 8).—Κυροῦν (as in Gal. iii. 15) signifies to establish in a valid manner and by a formal decision, so that the man might be solemnly restored to the communion of the Church. To suppose that the Apostle was here merely going through the form of approving of a decision which the Church had already made, and which would have been valid without his authority (Rückert); is not necessarily implied in the language, and would imply a worldly policy, of which we have no reason to think him capable. In ver. 9 he probably meets a possible or actual objection against the directions contained in his former Epistle, for he there informs his readers what had been his object in writing so severely.—**For to this end I also wrote, that I might know the proof of you.**—He means to say that his present request or admonition (ver. 8) was not only reasonable, but entirely consistent with what he had before written. In his earlier Epistle his purpose had been to ascertain their δοκιμή, *i. e.*, **whether ye are obedient in all things.**—It was not, therefore, a main point with him in what he then had said, to carry his apostolical authority to its utmost limits. Or more simply: inasmuch as the punishment which the majority had imposed was not very severe, I propose that ye should now bring your love to bear upon him, for the whole object of my former Epistle, which was to find out whether you would be true and obedient, has been attained by the punishment which the majority have inflicted. [In these words it is not meant that the direct object of his writing had been simply to put the matter to the test whether they would obey him, any more than when God sends afflictions on men that the entire object is

to prove them and to know all that is in their hearts, but simply that his great and final aim was thus virtually accomplished (Billroth)]. The *καί* belongs not to *εἰς τοῦτο* (as if he had written *καὶ γάρ*); its object is not to indicate that his aim in his former Epistle was the same with that of his present request, but to suggest a contrast between his writing (*ἔγραψα*), and what he had arranged (orally) by deputies. The effect of the *καὶ* is thus to give prominence to *ἔγραψα*. The whole context also shows that *ἔγραψα* must have reference to the former and not to the present Epistle. His object was to say that he was anxious to prove whether they would cheerfully comply with his directions in all things, the present mild, as well as the former severer requirements. Εἰς *πάντα*: in relation to all things, even those rigorous measures which might be somewhat difficult of execution. Δοκιμή here as in Rom. v. 4, and Phil. ii. 22, means the goodness, or approved quality; *i. e.* whether they would turn out to be upright Christians, his genuine children in Christ, and obedient to their father in all things (comp. 1 Cor. xi. 2; and Col. iii. 20). [Trench, Synn., 2d Ser. § 24, Ellicott on Phil. i. 10; ii. 22].—Having made this reference to his earlier Epistle, the object of which had now been attained in the course of the recent disciplinary proceedings, the Apostle proceeds (*δέ* of progress) to a further recommendation of the course implied in *κυρῶσαι ἀγάπην*, by assuring them that he was willing to be united with them in their public act of forgiveness (ver. 10). This idea he expresses at first thus briefly.—**Now to whom ye forgive anything, I** *forgive it* **also.**—*κἀγώ* (sc. *χαρίζομαι*). He afterwards, however, strengthens the thought in the causal sentence—**for if I have forgiven anything, whatever I forgave for your sakes I forgive it in the presence of Christ, lest, etc.**—According to the common interpretation, he confirms the Κἀγώ (*χαρίζομαι*) by saying that whatever he had forgiven, he had forgiven it entirely on their account. Κεχάρισμαι is, on any interpretation, to be supplied in connection with *δι' ὑμᾶς*. It is not, however, precisely implied that he was induced to do this at their request, for nothing is said of their actual intercession. He wishes in this way to show them that his love was directed to the highest good of the whole congregation. For after every thing necessary to maintain holy order, and the injured honor of the Church had been accomplished, and all necessity for further severity had been removed by the cordial repentance of the offender, his affection for them prompted him to heal the breach which had troubled them by forgiving the sinner, and to recover a member who had been temporarily sundered from them. Thus the confidence of the Church would be raised, and their former love would be revived *etc.* By the phrase: If I have forgiven anything: he intimates, that in the present instance he leaves it rather doubtful to what extent he had received any injury (ver. 5). He does not say, "if I have anything to forgive," but simply, "if anything ought to be said in general of my having forgiven any one." There was no need of repeating the *ἐγώ* here, for it has been already made sufficiently prominent in the *καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ*. The addition of *ἐν προσώπῳ* suggests a still deeper reason why he had delayed his journey. He had been induced to do so in the presence of Christ; from regard to Him who was the Author of all reconciliation to God, to whom he owed his own forgiveness as a sinner, and who had intrusted to him the duty of preaching reconciliation to men (the *διακονία δικαιοσύνης* opp. *κατακρίσεως*, comp. chap. v. 18 ff.; iii. 9; Eph. iv. 32; 1 Tim. i. 15). This is not a solemn affirmation or oath (for Paul nowhere else swore by Christ), but simply a strong assertion of his uprightness. It merely showed how he had either had Christ and Christ's cause before his mind in this affair, had acted *tanquam inspectore Christo* or had virtually done all in the name or in the commission of Christ; though if this had been strictly intended he would probably have used the phrase *ἐν ὀνόματι*. In the Sept. the phrase here used is employed as a rendering for לִפְנֵי, Prov. viii. 30. If we take the words in the sense first given, we have conveyed to some extent, the idea which Meyer and Rückert find in *ὃ κεχάρισμαι*. They take the words in a passive sense: that which has been forgiven to me (a construction analagous to *ὃ πεπίστευμαι*). We meet with the word in this sense in the classical writers, but in the New Testament, at least in Paul's writings (Gal. iii. 18) and in the Acts (xxvii. 24) it is always used in the active sense. *Δι' ὑμᾶς* would then signify that the pardon which had been bestowed upon him had been for the advantage of the Gentile, and especially the Corinthian Christians, inasmuch as his forgiveness had been the occasion of bringing them to salvation. In this case, when Paul introduced the words *ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ*, he wished to remind them not only that Christ was a witness of his forbearance, but that he was himself nothing but a pardoned sinner before God. Εἴ *τι κεχάρισμαι* would then be an expression of his humble recollection of the great guilt which continually oppressed him and made him a perpetual suitor for pardon (Meyer). In favor of this general interpretation may be urged the *καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ*, which certainly creates a difficulty in the way of the ordinary explanation, inasmuch as it seems to lay a special emphasis upon the perf: *κεχάρισμαι*, rather than upon the *ἐγώ*, which otherwise seems so prominent. Osiander endeavors to remove this difficulty by suggesting that Paul aims to represent his own act of forgiveness (*ἐγώ*) as something quite distinct from and independent of that which they were to exercise, and that he here passes from their forgiveness, as one which was then in process and incomplete, to his own, which was complete and already certain (*ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ*). But is not this rather a concealment than a removal of the difficulty? Having previously taken it for granted that they were disposed to forgive, and having conceded to them the initiative in the affair, in the full confidence that they continued of the same mind, and in order that their act might be complete having given to them his own authorization and consent (*κἀγώ*), what call was there for the following sentence as a reason and confirmation of the same thing (*καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ*)? Then if we take the clause passively, how can we explain the doubt implied in *εἴ τι κεχάρισμαι*, when everywhere else we find Paul expressing

himself so confidently as to his own forgiveness? But if Meyer's interpretation must therefore be regarded as unsatisfactory, we are still less prepared to regard Paul as here referring to some opponents who had denied his forgiveness through Christ. Even if we allow of his explanation of δι' ὑμᾶς, and urge nothing further in opposition to ἐν προσώπῳ on the ground that it is a mode of expression altogether unusual with Paul on such a subject (everywhere else the phrase is ἐν Χριστῷ, or διὰ χριστοῦ), we must certainly regard the way in which Meyer endeavors to connect it with ἵνα μὴ πλεονεκτηθῶμεν (ver. 11) as altogether too artificial. The idea would then be that it had been God's will that Paul should be pardoned in the presence of Christ [—"God is said to forgive for Christ's sake, and Christ is said to forgive, but Christ is never represented as the mere witness or spectator of our forgiveness"—HODGE], simply for the sake of the Corinthians, that they might be aroused to resist the wiles of Satan, *i. e.*, that they might not be tempted to act inconsistently with the design of God and of Christ by refusing to pardon the offender, and so overwhelming him with an excess of sorrow (ver. 7). The way in which Rückert connects this clause (ἵνα μὴ πλεονεκτ.) with the first half of ver. 10, *i. e.*, by passing over the whole last part of ver. 10, is even yet more violent. Osiander has probably hit upon the correct explanation, although the train of thought needs to be more particularly developed, when a slight modification of his view will become indispensable. The Corinthians had no reason to doubt that he would unite with them in their act of forgiveness, for he had already forgiven the man for their sake (the remainder as above).* But that he might present in a clearer light the importance of their granting, or of the man's possessing, this forgiveness, the Apostle adds (ver. 11), **lest Satan should get an advantage of us** (of you and me)—*i. e.* lest the great adversary of God's Church should get an advantage at our expense. Should any person be driven to despair by our long continued severity, not only would they themselves be lost to us and be gained by Satan, but in the Church itself we should be exposed to increased bitterness and alienation on the part of the members, and many would become estranged from an Apostle who seemed inclined to such extreme measures. NEANDER:—"If the utmost severity should be exercised, it would be used for an occasion for all kinds of evil in the congregation."—Inasmuch as Paul here speaks throughout not of Divine forgiveness, but only of his own and the Church's forgiveness; and inasmuch as neither Paul nor the Church could have pardoned an offence like that of incest, Neander has here found an argument for his opinion that some member of the Church had risen up against the Apostle personally (and of course against the whole Church). On this interpretation also the objections which Rückert and Baur have derived from vv. 5–10 against the character of Paul and against a belief in miracles sink into insignificance. The necessity of being on their guard against such overreaching arts is pointed out in the brief causal or final sentence **—for we are not ignorant of his devices** (thoughts, schemes).—The νοήματα of Satan are those thoughts or plots which he directs to the injury of Christ's cause, to the recovery of those who had been wrested by grace from his grasp (1 Peter v. 8), to the creation of dissensions, *etc.* ["The personality and agency of the adversary can hardly be recognized in plainer terms than in both these passages."—ALFORD.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

It is a mark of admirable wisdom in one who exercises authority in the Church to be able to distinguish clearly between God's purposes and Satan's devices, that he may so proceed as to promote the one and give no advantage to the other. God's thoughts are thoughts of peace, and their aim is to deliver and to cure the souls of men. But the means by which he seeks to accomplish His benevolent designs seem not unfrequently severe, for His medicines are sometimes very bitter. It is often necessary to be harsh, and to decline all ordinary considerations of delicacy. And yet the severity should not be allowed to exceed the proper limits which love prescribes. If the demands of justice are satisfied, if the honor of God and of His Church have been vindicated, if a sense of sin and true repentance have been awakened, if guilt has been openly confessed, and a desire for forgiveness and restoration has been decidedly expressed, it is time to exercise gentleness and to restore the offender, and to open to him a heart of love and to extend toward him the hand of support. In this way the government and discipline of a congregation is directed to the same end with Christ's own purposes, and are the means of fulfilling His designs. Satan's arts, on the other hand, are all with a view to thwart God's plans of mercy, to unsettle the peace of a Church, to destroy faith, hope and love in the hearts of its members, to turn away as many as possible from the Lord and from His grace, and, in a word, to produce general corruption. Every one gives his aid to these arts, who for any reason, from defective zeal, from selfish convenience, the fear of men, or party spirit, takes so little notice of sins and offences, or resists them with so little earnestness, that full opportunity is given to the diffusion of the corrupting leaven. But quite as

*[Paul, in this case, assumes that man had been sinned against by this offender, and so man might forgive for this offence. He denies that he alone would either feel aggrieved (ἀπὸ μέρους) or grant pardon. He refuses to absolve the man until the Church had acted. He was ready, however, to forgive *any one* (ᾧ) or *any thing* (ὅ the better reading), when the Church had forgiven. If *they* had forgiven (and he speaks of this as if it were past, χαρίζεσθε, open perf.), *he* had done so (and for their sakes), if they had *not* forgiven, he had *not* (he makes his action hypothetical on theirs, εἴ τι κεχάρισμαι, Hodge), and yet he seems to regard his action as equally indispensable to the completeness of theirs. If ἐν προσώπῳ χριστοῦ be translated "in the name," or "by the authority of Christ," the Apostle acted as Christ's representative; but if, as is more likely, it means "in Christ's presence, as if Christ were looking on" (Stanley), Paul assumes that he was acting for the Church and himself, so far as each had been sinned against. From this we get the Apostle's true idea of absolution. First, there was repentance and Divine forgiveness, then confession in some way so as to satisfy the congregation, and finally, the forgiveness and formal announcement (absolution) on the part of the Church or its representatives. Nothing is said of "ecclesiastical satisfactions" in the Roman sense. Comp. W. F. Besser, Bibelstunden; and F. W. Robertson, Ser. V., 3d series, Lect. 37th, 4th series.]

great advantage is given to Satan's schemes, when the proper limit of severity is exceeded, when discipline is carried to an extreme, when no forgiveness is exercised, and in order to maintain apparent firmness and consistency, every offence is rigidly dealt with, without regard to consequences. It is always bad policy to allow any occasion for suspecting that we are selfishly maintaining our own authority by recklessly pressing forward to an extreme. By such means the hearts of many will be embittered or driven to despair, and increased division and irritation will be sure to ensue. Satan, too, will thus accomplish what he most wishes. That which had the semblance of prudence and holy earnestness, turns out to be foolishness and a severity very unlike that of heaven. The result is that God's plans of mercy are dishonored, and the character and influence of those who pursued such a mistaken policy is seriously impaired.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Luther, Ver. 7:—It is much harder to comfort a troubled conscience than to raise the dead.—While, therefore, ministers ought doubtless to reprove and punish with some severity those who have fallen into sin, they ought by all means to comfort and restore those whom they discover to be penitent and anxious to reform; especially when we remember that God spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, and that His mercy had been made to exceed all our sins, that those who have fallen may not be swallowed up by too much sorrow.

Starke, Ver. 1:—A pastor who has the salvation of his people supremely at heart will be careful to show great indulgence to the weak, to avoid every needless occasion for punishment, and to do nothing likely to produce ill-will or injury to any one, without the prospect of a greater ultimate benefit. Eccles. xx. 1; xxii. 6.—Ver. 3. A true minister of Christ rejoices over nothing so much as the spiritual prosperity of his people, and nothing will trouble him more than their spiritual declension. In like manner, an honest and upright hearer may be known, by the joy which his minister feels and the praises which his minister renders to God, on his account, and by the readiness with which he removes by a speedy amendment all occasion of disquietude which he may have given to the heart of his pastor (Heb. xiii. 17; Rom. xvi. 19). The real motive for carnal zeal in the infliction of punishment is hatred, and we need not be surprised to find those who possess it, restless in disposition and followed by continual opposition. True spiritual zeal, on the other hand, may be equally earnest, but it will be moved and pervaded by love, it will be always calm, and it will remain loving and beloved unto the end.—Hedinger:—How much sorrow and how many tears Paul gave to the case of one offender! how many hast thou bestowed upon the many wandering and lost ones of thy flock? The Lord have mercy on the poor sheep of such a shepherd!—ver. 7. Unseasonable comfort is like a new piece of cloth upon an old garment (Matth. ix. 16), but excessive severity will probably throw the sinner into despair and drive him further away. Much wisdom is needed to apply both law and Gospel in an appropriate manner.—God alone can forgive sin (Ps. cxxx. 4); the Church can only point out the conditions on which God forgives, administer consolation to the penitent, and absolve those who confess their faults in the presence of such as have been scandalized by their offences.—Ver. 8. Hedinger:—The penitent should be received to full public favor, and never afterward upbraided for his offence. Our Lord Himself never broke a bruised reed nor quenched the smoking flax (Isa. xlii. 3).—Ver. 11. Satan is exceedingly crafty, and watches every opportunity to do an injury (Eph. vi. 11). We should therefore be always forecasting how we may deprive him of every such opportunity (Acts xx. 28).

Berlenb. Bible, Ver. 1:—Our absence on certain occasions may be as important as our presence on others.—Ver. 4. It ought to touch our hearts to be told: I wrote this unto you with many tears; and we should instantly inquire: Have I really given occasion for this?—We should never hesitate to lay hold of and deliver those who have fallen into error before it is too late, and yet we must not expect that they will readily regard our reproofs as kind and loving acts.—Ver. 7. Our love to our neighbor should be like our Lord's, whose long suffering is our salvation. He can hold the balance so accurately that the sinner is allowed to sink neither into despair nor into false security.—Ver. 8. How seldom do we meet with that loving spirit which shrinks not from the fallen, but goes to them, and seeks to save even the lost. Such a one, however, knows how to lay the iron so gently on the wound that the patient bears even a deep incision.

Rieger, Vers. 1, 2. Suspicion can sometimes enter the heart so deeply, that it can give off a web of dark thoughts for many years. It is better to crush the heads of such serpents as soon as possible.—Many are too tenacious of their own freedom. They follow simply their own convenience and advantage without reference to the consciences or the suspicions of their brethren; while others freely exercise their right of judgment upon everything they see, and when they find nothing to censure in the outward conduct, they fasten upon some trifling thing to be impeached in the inward spirit. Thus the hearts of men are thrown continually further and further apart, and there can be no such thing in life or death as mutual confidence or assistance. Those who are grieved for the affliction of Joseph (Amos vi. 6), will feel disposed to save as much as possible the reputation of a servant of Christ whose character is suffering.—Nothing can more cheer us under the trials of our work, than to find that those afflictions which spring from a man's own or others' faults, have become the seed of a saving repentance.—Vv. 3, 4. It is never well when those who watch for souls are compelled to labor in the midst of perpetual sighs and discouragements. On the other hand, when they are cheerful, their joy will be the joy of all, and every plant of grace will be revived.—In the kingdom of Christ truth should never be spoken with a simpering and trifling manner, but an imperious and a lordly style of address is quite as inappropriate. Those dis-

courses, whose object is to reprove others and to bring offenders to repentance, should be the offspring of the preacher's own sorrow, and be brought forth with much anguish of soul. He must himself know what it is to confess his sins before the Lord with many tears.—Love makes us zealous, and zeal will admonish and reprove our best friends and brethren—Ver. 5 ff. Precious fruit of the righteousness revealed in the Gospel! While we justify the condemnation of the sin, we sympathize with, and long to save the sinner! When the conscience of a child of God has been awakened, and his heart has been softened by discipline, he should have not only a gradual restoration of individual love, but an assurance of the common fellowship he once enjoyed.—What a difference there is between dealing with a sin which is concealed, justified or praised, and one which is recognized, confessed, and already put away with godly sorrow. —Ver. 11. Satan has always further trials and temptations for those who have no meekness or tenderness of heart. Ministers must continually take precautions against these.—Lord, how many things are done on our account by our enemies, and by Thee as our Advocate, of which we have no conception! Thy faithfulness alone can save us!

Heubner, Vers. 1–4:—Painful as it may be, we are often bound to grieve others, that we may do them good. We must not always be giving sweet meats.—The highest enjoyments of a minister are those which he feels with reference to his people. Between him and them there should be the most intimate communion.— A faithful pastor should have a very tender heart, and he must know what it is to weep in solitude over his people. Such tears have their source in the spirit of God. None but faithful shepherds know what such distress is; for those corruptions which allow him no peace, make the hireling indifferent and cold.—Ver. 5. Public scandals are a disgrace which the whole congregation should deeply feel. And yet how little of this public spirit is there in most of our communities.—Ver. 6. There is great power when many are united to remove offences. The discipline which needs no outward force is the most effective.—Ver. 7. The moment we perceive that an offender has submitted to his punishment, and become penitent, we should change our conduct toward him.—The discipline of the Church should always be directed to the reformation, and not to the mere punishment of the offender. Whatever makes him worse, is opposed to its true object.—Ver. 8. The same spirit which once caused sorrow, now comforts.—Ver. 9. A genuine Christian spirit may always be known from its readiness to comply with Apostolic direction. —Ver. 10. Ministers should never disregard the united voice of their people. Its utterances are a great consolation when they speak forgiveness to those who have fallen.—Ver. 11. It is the business of the Wicked One to injure, and, if possible, break up the spiritual association of God's people (the Church). He therefore tempts them, sometimes, to be slack, but sometimes to be excessively severe in discipline, and thus to drive souls into despair. Force, intolerance and persecution, have been his favorite arts by which to rend and destroy the Church; and unfortunately ecclesiastical history is principally occupied with accounts of them.—The Christian should never forget that this evil spirit knows of no rest, and he should ever be on his guard against Satanic wiles. Those who have been enlightened from above, are not ignorant of these devices, and know well how to thwart such schemes. Only those who are short-sighted and simple will look upon warnings against them as vain fancies, and hence be taken by surprise.

W. F. Besser, Ver. 4. A mother's love will be seen in the most delicate attentions to her invalid child, and no better test of a shepherd's love can be given than when he hastens with especial earnestness after the sheep which has gone astray.—Ver. 10. The rock on which all true comfort is founded, when we are absolved from our offences, is the great truth, that whoever the public minister may be, the absolution is not man's but God's.

[Here is an example of the difficult duty and right of blame, or of correcting our fellowmen. I. Every one has something of this kind to do. A more than common share of it falls upon ministers and those in public stations, but there are occasions when every one is called to it. Society should not be turned into an arena of distrust, where each one is zealously watching over others' conduct, nor yet should it be one of cold indifference towards each others' sufferings and welfare. Where another's faults are forced upon our attention, it may be our duty to attempt their correction, 1. for the offender's own sake (vv. 6–8); 2. for society's sake (ver. 4); and 3. even for our own sake (ver. 1), since we may be misunderstood if we show no interest in the case. II. But much depends upon the way in which it is performed; as, 1. by the right person; 2. at the right time (Paul declined even to be present at one time); 3. by the right means (by a visit or by Epistle); 4. in the right spirit (not from love of censuring, love of dominion, personal pique or jealousy, but from love to the offender and to Christ's cause.—We have here (vv. 6–11): I. The Christian idea of punishment; When it should be inflicted? 1, when the good of the offender demands it, for even if he has forfeited all rights, he has claims upon our benevolence; 2, when society is threatened with injury, and 3, when a righteous indignation at crime calls for an expression. When it should be dispensed with or remitted? When the ends of punishment are secured, 1, by the private sufferings or repentance of the offender, 2, by his partial punishment, which corrects the offender and vindicates public sentiment. II. The Christian idea of absolution: Man's declaration of God's forgiveness—man speaking in God's stead; 1, its use to save from remorse and despair; 2, its representative character (ver. 10). After Robertson and Lisco].

V. AN ADDITIONAL EXPRESSION OF HIS FORMER ANXIETY RESPECTING THEM (ver. 12 f.), BUT OF HIS JOYFUL ELEVATION OF MIND WHEN HE HEARD FROM THEM BY TITUS, ver. 14 ff.

CHAPTER II. 12–17.

12 Furthermore when I came to Troas [the Troad] to *preach* Christ's gospel[1], and a
13 door was opened to me of [in] the Lord, I had no rest in my spirit because I found[2]
not Titus my brother; but taking my leave of them, I went from them into Macedo-
14 nia. Now [But] thanks *be* unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ,
15 and maketh manifest the savour of his knowledge by us in every place. For we are
unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved and in them that perish:
16 To the one *we are* the savour of[3] death unto death; and to the other the savour of[3]
17 life unto life. And who *is* sufficient for these things? For we are not as many,[4]
which corrupt the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as of God, as in the sight of
God[5] speak we in Christ.

[1 Ver. 12.—Instead of εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον the two kindred codd. F. G. and Damasc. have διὰ τὸ εὐαγγ., and the Italic and Vulg. verss. and the Lat. fathers have *propter evang.* Two other affiliated codd. D. E. have διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. Most of our Old English verss. have "for Christ's gospel's sake."]

[2 Ver. 13.—In place of τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν, Sin. has τοῦ μὴ εὑρ. (though the 3d cor. has τῷ μὴ εὑρ.). It also has Μακαιδονίαν (as throughout the New Testament, except chap. ix. 2, and 1 Thess. iv. 10)].

[3 Ver. 16.—Rec. omits ἐκ before both θανάτου and ζωῆς. And yet the word has the best authorities [A. B. C. Sin. et al.] in its favor, and was probably thrown out on account of its difficult construction. [It does not appear in D. E. F. G. K. L., and the omission is confirmed by the Vulg., Syr., Goth. and Aeth. verss., and by very many of the ancient interpretors. All the more recent critics, except Reiche and Wordsworth, insert it.]

[4 Ver. 17.—The reading λοιποί instead of πολλοί has the best authorities [A. B. C. K. Sin. et al.] against it. [Πολλοί was probably thought too strong an expression. But Didymus of Alex. (A. D. 370) takes much pains to justify the Apostle in the use of πολλοί in this passage. See note on p. 41.]

[5 Ver. 17.—Rec. has κατενώπιον, and it is strongly sustained by authority; but Lachmann following the best MSS. gives us κατέναντι (without τοῦ). [Alford and Bloomfield think the article was left out to correspond with the previous ἐκ θεοῦ, but that the Apostle's solemn assertion here needs it. It is however omitted in A. B. C. D. Sin. and 12 cursives.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VERS. 12, 13. *The Apostle's anxiety for intelligence from Corinth.*—**But having come to the Troad to preach Christ's Gospel.**—The δέ implies that the former subject is here resumed after the digression. (vv. 5–11). That which follows is not to be connected with ver. 11 (οὐ γὰρ—ἀγνοοῦμεν) so as to make δὲ equivalent to ἀλλά, for that would not correspond with the tenor of the discourse. Nor is it to be referred back to chap. i. 16, nor to chap. i. 23, but to chap. ii. 4. In this latter passage he had spoken of the anguish with which he had written his first Epistle, and he here says that when he was going from Ephesus to Macedonia he could not throw off his anxiety for the Corinthians. [He had not intended to make a direct journey to Corinth, but to make a missionary tour in the interest of Christ's Gospel (εἰς τὸ εὐαγ. τ. Χριστοῦ), Tyndale: for Christ's Gospel's sake]. Though he had doubtless intended to preach the Gospel at Troas, he now lost the opportunity on account of his solicitude for the Corinthians.—[The Troad was the region of the country, of which Troas was the principal city.* The article, which was generally used in the New Testament with names of countries (Jelf. § 450 5), Stanley thinks may possibly indicate that only the country of the Troad was meant here. It can hardly be possible that Paul did not visit the city. The same expression (εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα) is used in Acts xx. 6. Paul had been there once before (Acts xvi. 8), and he was there a longer time on his return from Greece to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 6–13), and once after the close of the Apostolic history. (2 Tim. iv. 13). It was the usual port at which those passing from Greece to Asia landed. A church must have been established there at least on Paul's second visit. [comp. the word ἀποταξάμενος with Acts xx. 6 ff.)]. He had tarried there with the express design of preaching the Gospel of salvation. Τοῦ χριστοῦ is the genitive of the object: NEANDER: "the Gospel which proceeded from Christ." He intends to say that with such a design he would have felt bound to remain for some time, inasmuch as he found there a fair prospect of an unusual success in his work.—**And a door was opened to me in the Lord.**—(comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 9). The καί also is equivalent to καίπερ. Ἐν κυρίῳ has the same meaning as Χριστῷ, and it is added to define more particularly, the sphere or element of activity for which an occasion had then been presented; the department in which a door had

[* The city was called by its original founder, Antigonia Troas, and by Lysimachus, who much improved it, Alexandria Troas, frequently simply Alexandria. It was on the great Roman road, by which it had an extensive trade into the interior and the South. It was a Roman colony, with the *jus Italicum*, or right of Roman citizenship, and was much favored by the Romans, from a conceit that their ancestors came from Troy, the site of which was close by. Gibbon says that Constantine once thought of making it the seat of his empire. Its modern name, Eski Stamboul (Old Constantinople), seems to commemorate this thought. Conybeare and Howson's *Life of St. Paul*, Vol. I. p. 279–81, and Howson in *Smith's Dict.*]

been opened for him, and not the Agent by whose power the door had been opened.—**I had no rest in my spirit when I found not Titus my brother.**—Ἔσχηκα is used here, as in chap. i. 9, and frequently in an aoristic sense (Meyer: as was the frequent practice of the Greek orators in order to bring the past before the mind with greater vividness). Ἄνεσις (used also in chap. vii. 5; viii. 13) means properly relaxation or relief, and it is here contrasted with the intense strain which had been put upon his feelings, by his solicitude on their account. He could not perform his ordinary duties as in other places, until this anxiety should be removed. The meaning of τῷ πνεύματι in this connection is: for my mind. (*dat. comm.*). The expression is more suggestive than τῇ ψυχῇ μου would have been. (comp. Beck, *Seelenl.* p. 45). The Apostle means to say that it was "one of those violent assaults upon his vital energies which come upon us in certain states of the mind and body when we have been acted upon for a long time by terrors and a want of rest, *etc.*—those powerful agitations which affect the very seat of life." In τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν κ. τ. λ. he gives the reason for οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἄνεσιν. [Winer, Gr. § 45, 5.] He had expected to meet at Troas, or at least in Macedonia, his assistant Titus, to let him know what effect his first Epistle had produced at Corinth. Not finding Titus, his anxiety was so great that he could remain there no longer, but he hastened to Macedonia, where we know Titus soon met him (chap. vii. 6 ff.)—**But taking leave of them I went forth into Macedonia.**—Ἀποτάσσεσθαι τινι is an Alexandrian form of expression for ἀσπάζεσθαι, and occurs also in Luke ix. 61, and Acts xvii. 18–21. It signifies to separate one's self, to take leave of some one. [The expression is peculiar, however, since it is taken from the effort usually made by those taking their departure, to put every thing in order, and to give their last directions. (Osiander)]. Αὐτοῖς has reference to the people, and especially to believers in Troas.*

VERS. 14–17. ["All that follows, until the writer returns to his historical statement in chap. vii. 5, is on the subject of the Christian or rather Apostolical ministry as exemplified in Paul's special relations to the Corinthian Church. This apparent digression is really the main topic of the Epistle. It was the Apostle's object to set forth and maintain the importance of his office and work and his personal claim to spiritual authority. This object is kept in view throughout, and after the instructions in matters of business which follow the recurrence of the mention of Titus (chap. vii. 5), it is continuously and openly pursued to the end of the Epistle." WEBSTER and WILKINSON.].—**But thanks be unto God, who always causes us to triumph in Christ.**—By a sudden transition the Apostle now turns aside to render thanks to God, not for the results of his visit at Troas, where he could not have remained long enough to accomplish any thing worthy of being thus mentioned; but either for the accounts brought from Corinth by Titus, of which he makes no express mention until chap. vii. 6; or for the blessing upon his Apostolic labors during his journey, especially in Macedonia (Osiander). The context rather favors the first of these, since thanks seem quite appropriate after his liberation from the distress and uneasiness of which he had given such a picture (Meyer). That he makes no direct mention of this, and expresses himself only in general terms, is accounted for by the fact that he was anxious to make no unpleasant impression by a more obvious allusion to the state of things at Corinth at this point of his discourse. The view which seems best to correspond with both the context and the form of expression, would seem to be, that he had been much delighted with the good account from Corinth, to which he had slightly alluded in ver. 6 (ἐπιτιμία ἡ ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων), and he now pours forth his thanks for the triumph of which he *always and everywhere* was a partaker. The favorable turn of affairs at Corinth and the accomplishment of his main objects there were of course involved in the πάντοτε and the ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, but they are so concealed in the general expression that nothing offensive would be noticed in his triumphal exultation. It is questionable whether θριαμβεύοντι is to be taken according to the usage of the word in other places (also in Col. ii. 15), in the sense of *triumphat* (*de nobis*), or according to the analogy of βασιλεύειν, 1 Sam. viii. 22; μαθητεύειν, Matth. xxviii. 19, and some other words, in the transitive sense of *triumphare facit*. As the result of the first method, Meyer presents the idea of the passage thus: who never ceases to exhibit us (the Apostolic teachers) in all the world as those whom He has overcome. God had overcome them in their conversion, and He was continually triumphing in the results which they as His servants were accomplishing in His kingdom, and especially in the happy results of his first Epistle at Corinth. With Paul, such an idea would naturally be expressed when he remembered with sorrow his earlier persecution of the Church, and it would accord with his humble desire to give God the honor of all that he had done. Although this explanation is rather artificial, it has better ground for itself than others, which represent this leading about in triumph as fulfilled when they journeyed from place to place according to the good pleasure and will of God (Wetstein); or as a triumphal exhibition of them, not as conquered persons, but as servants taking part in God's triumph; or as a Divine triumph over Paul by showing the folly of all his cares and anxieties when all things came to a fortunate result; or as a leading him about in triumph in the persecutions he was made to endure. On the whole we feel compelled to decide in favor of the transitive signification of the word, which makes Paul a leader appointed by God to struggle in

[* Stanley suggests a vivid picture of Paul in this anxious state of mind, "on the wooded shores of that classic region under the heights of Ida." All associations connected with its ancient history had but "slight effect upon the mind of the Apostle," which was either upon the open door to preach Christ's Gospel, or "vainly expecting the white sail of the ship which was to bring back his friend from Corinth." If the love of Christ had not dispossessed Paul's heart of every other interest, such scenes would have had a peculiar charm for him. See also Conyb. and Howson, *Introduction*, Vol. I. p. 16 and p. 362. Such conflicting emotions and changes of purpose are not inconsistent with Paul's being under the guidance of the Holy Ghost (Webster and Wilkinson), inasmuch as that divine agent works out his own guidance of wisdom by means of, and in consistency with, the purely human feelings of the subject.]

the spiritual conflict, and by the success of his preaching and the confusion of all his opponents making him a uniform conqueror before the world. (Comp. Osiander).* Ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ defines the sphere in which the victory and the triumph takes place. This is Christ, in whose service they are employed and whose Gospel they preached with such triumphant success. What is here intended by θριαμβεύειν will be made more evident under the figure of the succeeding metaphor:—**and maketh manifest the savour of His knowledge by us in every place.**—In this sentence αὐτοῦ has reference, not to God, as has sometimes been concluded on account of chap. x. 5, but to Christ on account of ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ and ἐυωδία Χριστοῦ in ver. 15. This knowledge of Christ is set forth under the figure of an odor which God diffused in every place by the ministry of the Apostles. Such a figure well illustrates the pungent nature of this knowledge, the facility with which it is usually diffused, and perhaps also the refreshment it affords. NEANDER: "ὀσμή signifies any thing which has a pungent odor, an essence; it may correspond with the later Jewish בֹּשֶׂם which is just as applicable to a refreshing aromatic essence as to a fatal poison." It is hardly probable that the Apostle was led to use this figure by the idea of a triumph in which the air was filled sometimes with the fragrance of incense (Meyer, comp. Osiander). Still less did he intend to remind us of the custom of anointing with oil. Even the idea of the fragrance given forth in the sacrifices seems inappropriate, since God himself is represented as active in diffusing it (φανεροῦντι). As an illustration of an internal experience the figure of an odor would seem no more appropriate than something presented to the sight. Τῆς γνώσεως is in apposition with τῆς ὀσμῆς. Ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ corresponds with πάντοτε. God is evidently the one who "always caused him and his fellow-laborers to triumph in Christ, and made manifest the savor of his knowledge by them in every place," for Paul represents them as the instruments by which God acted (δι' ἡμῶν), and the promulgators of this knowledge. He also describes them as acceptable to God, and so not to be depreciated, though the result of their labors was sometimes the reverse of what they aimed at. This acceptableness in God's sight is expressed in the words—**For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ**—in which the figure of a sacrifice (Eph. v. 2; Phil. iv. 18; Levit. i. 9–17) probably begins to be discernible. Those who possess and diffuse the knowledge of Christ are a sweet savor unto God, not because they are properly prepared or offered to God, but because they are themselves filled by Him and made to diffuse the savor of Christ. For the sake of emphasis Christ is mentioned first, and is represented as the substance of the sacrifice, *i. e.*, a service consecrated to God and pleasing in His sight. BENGEL says: "The savor of Christ is made to pervade us as that of aromatics pervade garments."—**In them that are saved and in them that perish,** introduces the sphere in which they were moving or the object of their preaching. The correlatives of σωζόμενοι and ἀπολλύμενοι (comp. on 1 Cor. i. 18) are πιστεύοντες and ἄπιστοι. The whole idea became more impressive by this reference to the final destiny of each, when the redeemed shall be saved and the lost shall be cast away. He speaks further of the effect of this ὀσμή upon both these classes in ver. 16. He there commences with those last mentioned.—**To the one indeed we are an odour arising from death and tending to death.**—(οἷς μὲν—οἷς δὲ, are equivalent to what was in the later usage τοῖς μὲν—τοῖς δέ). The point at which the influence commences, or the source from which it springs, is indicated by ἐκ, and the end toward which it tends, or the effect produced by it, is pointed out by εἰς. It begins in death and must lead to and terminate in death. In like manner the expression—**to the other we are the odor arising from life and tending to life.**—In the words *from death* and *from life*, we have death (θάνατος) and life (ζωή) set forth as the principle or power in which corruption or salvation has its origin, and in the words *unto death* and *unto life* (εἰς θάνατον, εἰς ζωήν) we have the corresponding result which each of these powers produces. But neither in ἐκ θανάτου nor in ἐκ ζωῆς is it exactly intended that Christ is in such a sense the efficient agent, that in ἐκ θανάτου He is the direct source of death (Meyer). The idea rather is, that those who presented Christ, or made known His Gospel to their fellow-men, are to one class

[* The word θριαμβεύοντι has been explained in: (1), a neuter sense, *triumphare de nobis*, to triumph over us: (2), a transitive sense, *triumphare nos*, to lead us in triumph: (3), a causative sense, *triumphantes nos facere*, to make us triumph. Ancient Greek usage among the classics is probably uniform in favor of the first, and the only other instance in the N. T. where the word is used (Col. ii. 15) looks in the same direction. But though it is adopted in the Vulgate, and is given as the first definition by several Latin expositors, it seems hard to make good sense with such a meaning in our passage, where the idea certainly is not that of a subdued and captive enemy led about in humiliation and finally to death. Even with this idea eliminated, and remembering that Paul sometimes speaks of himself as a subdued and willing captive to Christ, we never find him thus speaking of himself with others (plural). His object here seems rather to be, to show how he and his companions, and not merely Christ, were triumphing. If this makes us inclined to favor the second signification, with Calvin (in his comments, not in his translation), Bengel, de Wette and Wordsworth, we are met by the fact that neither early nor late Greek usage is in favor of such a construction. Some Greek fathers, indeed, whose opinions on a question of N. T. language or Roman usage is entitled to great consideration, give it this meaning. Though their definitions favor No. 1, they usually interpret it simply of a triumph over afflictions and persecutions, and leading the Apostles about the world in a triumphant victory over every kind of endurance. Thus *Chrysostom* (and after him substantially *Theophyl.* and *Oecum.*): τῷ πᾶσι ποιοῦντι περιφανεῖς, "Who maketh us conspicuous to all;" and *Theodoret:* σοφῶς τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς πρυτανεύων, τῇδε κἀκεῖσε περιάγει, δήλους ἡμᾶς ἅπασιν ἀποφαίνων, "Who manages all our affairs in wisdom, leading us about so as to make us manifest to all;" *Damasc.:* ὁ γὰρ θρίαμβος, τοῦτό ἐστι, τὸ πᾶσι γενέσθαι περιφανῆ, "For evidently he has triumphed, who has been made illustrious and conspicuous to all men." If, however, we depart from the simple No. 1, we must prefer No. 3, which has some ancient authority in its favor. Thus *Jerome* (comm.): *Deum per Apostolos triumphare in Christo, victores illos facere in fide Christi;* and *Ambrose: Triumphare facit nos per Christum, vel in nobis ipse triumphat.* In Alexandrian usage (Sept. and N. T.) neuter verbs often acquired a causative meaning (see Winer, Idd. § 40, n. 2, and many instances in Alford and Meyer). This gives an idea suitable to the connection. It was adopted by Luther, Beza and Grotius, and is defended by Osiander, Neander and Hodge. The majority of recent commentators (as Meyer, Alford, Conybeare, Ellicott, Stanley) favor the first meaning, but it very easily runs into the second.]

like those who convey an odor which is deadly in its origin and deadly in its result. The meaning is thus the same with that conveyed by the words, the savor of death and the savor of life (ὀσμῇ θανάτου—ζωῆς), in the Rec., where both genitives should be taken as genitives of quality. This contrast between the fatal and quickening effects of preaching has an analogy in the physical world. So far as relates to the lost, the result is accidental, *i. e.*, it is not caused by anything in the Gospel itself, but must be ascribed to the peculiar spirit of those who hear it. ["We convey to all the sweet odor of Christ, though all who participate in it do not attain salvation. Thus the light is noxious to diseased eyes, and yet it is not the sun which produces the injury. It is said that vultures avoid the fragrance of myrrh, and yet the myrrh is no less myrrh for being shunned by vultures. Even so the preaching of salvation tends to save those who believe, though it brings perdition to such as believe not."—THEODORET]. Where the word is pressed upon an unsusceptible and perverse heart, it provokes opposition to the truth, just as in other cases it brings into activity whatever is susceptible of Divine life and engenders faith (comp. Matth. xxi. 42 ff.: Luke ii. 34; Job ix. 39). The same figure has been used by the Rabbins for illustrating the different effects of the law. This strong contrast between the different effects of evangelical preaching suggests to the Apostle's mind the various dispositions of those who proclaim the Gospel. No one can produce such an influence upon these two classes of hearers and be acceptable to God whatever may be the result of his preaching, unless he proclaims the Gospel in a right manner and with a right spirit. This idea he introduces in a sudden and striking manner (καὶ) by a question—**And who is sufficient for these things?**—In this sentence πρὸς ταῦτα is put first because it is emphatic. He meant to say, that among those who acted as teachers, all were by no means sufficiently qualified for such a part, for he was obliged to place himself and his companions, who honestly presented God's truth, in strong contrast with the many who presented it in an adulterated form. The answer to the Apostle's question is in ver. 17, and is presupposed in the γάρ. Such are not the ones who adulterate God's word, but they are myself and those who are like me.—**For we are not like the many who adulterate God's word.**—Οἱ πολλοί does not mean the majority of all teachers of the Gospel, for this would either exhibit the Apostolic Church in a very unfavorable light, or (with Rückert) would make Paul guilty of a passionate extravagance. The article is demonstrative, and is intended to point to those who were well known. Those Judaizing teachers are meant who had set themselves up against Paul, and whose number must have been considerable at Corinth (comp. ch. xi. 13; Phil. iii. 18). With respect to the reading λοιποί, comp. Osiander, who regards it as more feebly sustained by documentary evidence but as easier to explain, inasmuch as it simply designates a number of persons to whom the Apostle wished to be considered an exception; and he explains οἱ πολλοί by saying that Paul had set up a very high standard for the purity of Christian doctrine.* The participal sentence commencing with καπηλεύοντες should be connected, not with οἱ πολλοί, although the character of these is indirectly given in it, but with ἐσμέν. The word designates the business of a κάπηλος, a huckster or a trader, but especially of a wine merchant; and it was used with an accusative to signify one who traded by retail or in small articles (more particularly to obtain a living). In accordance with the usual habits of such people, the word finally attained the meaning of practising usury or bartering with anything (as with σοφίαν, μαθήματα). It therefore signifies here—to deal dishonorably and deceitfully with the word of God, adulterating it by mingling together men's opinions with the Divine word (CHRYSOSTOM), [probably with the additional thought of making a trade of the Gospel from mercenary and corrupt motives], as the κάπηλοι were accustomed to mingle water with their wine (com. Isa. i. 22). It is implied that the Gospel had been vilified and adulterated by being mingled with Judaistic opinions, and that too with the sordid design of obtaining some personal profit, applause or authority (comp. Rom. xvi. 17 f.; Phil. iii. 19; Gal. vi. 12 *f.*; 2 Pet. ii. 1-13). [Comp. Adam Clarke and also Bentley and Trench, Synn. 2d ser. pp. 52 ff.]. In contrast with such impure motives the Apostle says—**but as of** (from) **sincerity, but as of** (from) **God we speak before God in Christ.**—Our discourse is such as might be expected from men who speak from pure motives and under Divine inspiration, *i. e.*, moved by God and inspired by His Spirit [Trench, Synn. 2d ser. p. 72 ff.]. Ὡς is here used as in Jno. i. 14, to express conformity. The repetition of ἀλλ' ὡς forms a powerful climax (comp. 1 Cor. vi. 11). He rises, from the hearty sincerity which is in strong contrast with all corrupt and selfish aims, to the Divine Source of Christian truth, with which no mingling of selfish or human elements was conceivable (comp. Osiander). The holy awe which those feel who act under the recollection that God judges and knows all things, and under a consciousness of the Divine presence, is pointed out in the phrase κατέναντι θεοῦ. The words ἐν Χριστῷ denote the element in which the discourse of such a one is supposed to move. Comp. ch. xii. 19. NEANDER: —"Probably the Apostle intended also to imply by this phrase that he held himself entirely aloof from everything which did not come from Christ."

[*Tischendorf quotes here a remarkable passage from Didymus Alex. to prove the genuineness of the reading οἱ πολλοί, but which is equally striking as a comment: "Paul calls these deceivers many (πολλοὺς) on account of their abundance. For when instead of naming them he designates them by this word, he intimates that they were more numerous, as when our Lord uses it instead of τινές: Many (πολλοί) shall say unto me in that day, *etc.* (Matth. vii. 22). But this word informs us that they are not a few, as when our Lord says, Many (πολλοί) are called, but few (ὀλίγοι) are chosen. It is evident that the word sometimes even signifies *all*, as when the Apostle says in Rom. v. 19: "The many (οἱ πολλοί) were constituted (κατεστάθησαν) sinners," for it is evident that all men are under sin in consequence of Adam's disobedience. Clearly then the word signifies a great number, not only in the passage before us but in another, where it is said, "Be not many masters" (James iii. 1.) Damascene adds in paraphrase: "We are not like those false apostles who claim to be so numerous (τὰ πολλοί). For then we should have to adulterate the Gospel. like some who corrupt or who sell for money the wine they have been employed to distribute freely."—*Migne's Patrol. Græc.* T. xxxix. p. 1691, and xcv. p. 719.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The word of God, not only in the individual heart (Heb. iv. 12, 13), but in the world, exerts a separating and judicial power. Its influence upon different individuals is not unfrequently very different—for while it enlightens and warms some, gives them a clear, tranquilizing and sanctifying knowledge of divine things, and raises them to a life of true light and love, it blinds and hardens others; just as the sun's light warms, makes fruitful, and quickens some things, while it blinds and destroys others. This decisive influence which must always accompany the full revelation of God in Christ, may be preceded by many divine announcements and influences, whether internally through the conscience, or externally by means of natural objects, or striking providences; but among those who enjoy a special revelation, it is principally through the presentation of the law and promises of God with all those influences of the Divine Word and dealings, which are usually so administered as to aid and bless, or punish and discipline the children of men. It is by such means that men become more or less receptive of God's word, and it is by the Gospel, by the presentation of the highest truths of revelation, that this susceptibility for good or evil will be most rapidly brought to perfection; since under its power they will speedily surrender themselves to the truth, or they will soon reject that truth and revile the way of salvation. This, however, can be the result only when the truth is presented properly, and in its purity. 1. It must come from a heart thoroughly pervaded by Christ himself, honestly directed to the glory of God, and regardless of personal and temporal advantages. 2. It should hold forth God's word and nothing but God's word, mingled with no human speculations. God will recognize as his own, only what flows from a heart which is pure and filled with Christ. But this will always and everywhere be attended with glorious results. Its preachers will soon show that they are the organs of a divine power which can penetrate through all obstacles, and that their proclamations of Christ's truth and their spirit are acceptable to God, whether those who hear them are saved or lost. But when those who speak are not upright, if they mix up with divine revelations the doctrines and opinions of men, and if they are governed by every kind of selfish and inconsistent ends, the proper influence of the Word will be hindered and enfeebled; men will be undecided and half-hearted; there will be no evidence that God is at work and of course no Divine victories, and old things will not pass away; or, things will sink down into a stupid and lukewarm state, in which none will be disturbed in their spiritual slumbers, or learn with any distinctness the true state and wants of their souls; real peace will be unknown, and no firm support will be found for human confidence. In such a state, men will make all kinds of efforts to satisfy themselves with dead works, and will fondly seek support in the authority of their fellow men. Nothing could be more opposed than such a state of things is, to that manly maturity which is to be found in Christ (Eph. iv. 13), and that establishment of the heart which true grace affords (Heb. xiii. 9); and it will not be difficult therefore to distinguish between those who are Christ's true shepherds, and those who are miserable hirelings.

["In this statement of St. Paul, we have an inspired declaration of the freedom of the human will. As Jerome says (*ad Hedib.* IV. p. 183): 'The name of Christ is ever fragrant; but men are left to their own freedom of will.' So Christ himself was set for the fall of some and for the rising up of others in Israel. Indeed it is a solemn truth that in the Christian scheme nothing that God has done, is indifferent. Everything is as a two-edged sword. All Christian privileges, and all the means of grace are according as they are used, either blessings or banes, either physic or poison. Comp. August. Serm. 4, and Serm. 273." WORDSWORTH.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—VER. 12. None but those who are Christ's, who have been anointed by Him and have fellowship with Him, know what it is to have doors opened to them in the Lord and by the Lord. Ver. 13. When the Church is suffering some great affliction, we should each one in our proper place, cheerfully give her our utmost aid, that Satan may not overthrow in a few days what has been built up with the toil of years. Ver. 14. It is the mark of a true minister to labor faithfully and with all his might and soul, and then ascribe nothing to himself but everything to God (1 Cor. xv. 10). It is one of the mysteries of the cross and of Christ's kingdom, that those who preach the gospel may have never so much opposition, and yet may always be sure of final triumph.—Vv. 15 and 16: HEDINGER: We are a sweet savor of Christ, though our preaching results only in the perdition of our hearers. True, if none are converted to Christ, they must be perverted to Satan; yet such is the natural effect of God's word; for if the wicked are hardened and the blind become yet more blind, it is God's righteous judgment upon their own wickedness (Isa. vi. 9 and 10). SPENER:—When the world is displeased with the word, and those who will not become sincere Christians become worse, and become more opposed to the truth, we may be sure that the word preached is genuine, and like that which the Apostles preached: for men feel its power, and are obliged to receive a fragrance which they abhor. But when wicked men like to hear and praise our sermons, when everything is dull and no one grows in grace under our ministry, it is a sign that whatever savor we have had has lost its power. The gospel may not convert all who hear it, but it will produce excitement—and wicked men will proportionably hate it. Ver. 17. HEDINGER:—Take care that you do not corrupt God's word! Even those who hear, must attend to this. How many thousand streams are daily flowing to refresh and sustain those who are secure in their own vain fancies and in the way of the world. Maxims to keep alive the old Adam are in every one's mouth. Alas! that so many must repent only when it is too late (1 Pet. iv. 11). Four things at least should ever be on the heart of the

true minister: that he speaks, 1, in all purity, with respect to his motives, his doctrine and his manner; 2, as from God, as if anointed and born of God; 3, as in the presence of God, with all reverence and zeal, feeling that God is always present and is the greatest of all his hearers; and 4, as in Christ.

Berlend. Bible, Ver. 14:—He must be a happy man, with whom everything, even the greatest perils, work for him only a perpetual triumph. Whenever truth and falsehood are most exposed, Christianity has its greatest triumphs; and this usually takes place when she is most severely afflicted. All Christians should diffuse around them wherever they go the fragrance of divine knowledge—and if they are the Lord's anointed, how can they fail to do so?—Vv. 15 and 16. The sweetest words of the Gospel become a savor of death unto death to those who resist the Holy Ghost. Such will have it so; they lay hold on death, and cast eternal life away. If this powerful odor of divine knowledge had not been diffused around them and arrested general attention, they had not had sin; but now they have no one but themselves to blame, for they have only the due reward of their own doings. Not every one who intellectually possesses the truth and has the form of knowledge (Rom. ii. 20), is prepared to present it profitably to his fellowmen; but only he who has himself put on the Lord Jesus Christ, is familiar with the mysterious cross of self-subjugation, and has obeyed the form of doctrine he has received. The spirit of God alone can prepare us for doing His work. Ver. 17.—True repentance, death, and pure truth will seem but trifling matters to hypocritical teachers; a good conscience, repentance, and a knowledge of Jesus Christ may fare as they may, if such men can only retain a hold upon the world's favor, and have Christ in peace without his cross and with their pleasures. Those who handle God's word should themselves be holy.

Rieger:—Vers. 12–14. Even afflictions are sweetened when we are enabled by them to promote the cause of Christ and share in his victories. When God opens such doors for the preaching of the Gospel that all its adversaries are ashamed, and we present such evidence that we have the truth that it sets men free and awakens them to activity, reflection and admiration, it should be looked upon as a triumph to the cause of Christ. Such results commonly take place especially in the place where the word is preached, but sometimes the odor of them extends to a distance, and induces multitudes to inquire after Christ. Vv. 15 and 16.—Our Lord sometimes allows his beloved ones to know that he is about to use them, more especially as the light of the world and the salt of the earth. The Apostle therefore could say that the whole work and calling of himself and his companions, had an influence upon every department of society, and was an honor and a pleasure to God himself. But it was according to the way in which men met the proposals of the Gospel, that it became to them at every step an omen of either salvation or perdition. Those who heard that the way to glory must be through suffering, might assume such an attitude toward it that it might seem to them worse than death—and hence, they might foolishly remain under death. But where the Gospel meets with no such opposition it tends only to life. The very first inclination toward the truth is produced by this savor unto life, and from that moment the course is from life to life, and from one degree of power to another.

Heudner:—Ver. 12. The Lord only has the key to the heart, and if he does not open it we may rattle around it as we please, it will remain closed against us.—Ver. 14. The triumphs of the Gospel are unlike every other (Ps. lxxxiv. 7, 8), for in them both victor and vanquished rejoice together. When the Apostles preached, the whole infected atmosphere of this world was purified by a balmy fragrance, and an acceptable incense mounted up to heaven. Why is it not always so, when the same Gospel is professedly preached?—Ver. 16. How can Christianity be a deadly poison? Only by being resisted, until the last spark of spiritual life is quenched in men's own wickedness. To refuse all direction from the word of the cross, is to harden ourselves against everything else. The same odor or medicine may kill or cure in different cases, and Christianity shows its real power when it arouses the opposition of wicked men.

W. F. Besser:—Vers. 15 and 16. When the sweet fragrance of Jesus' name is shed forth upon all men, without respect of persons, and in its full power, if any are saved, it is because they inhale it by a faith which the fragrance itself produces; and if any are still lost, it is not merely because they fail of receiving it (Acts xiii. 46), but because the fragrance itself becomes fatal, and avenges itself upon those who despise it. The power of God's word and the accompanying influence of God's Spirit are demonstrated, when that word leaves no one as it found him; but when its despisers become more wicked, and the indifferent become furious and abusive. God is not responsible for men's unbelief, but when they fatally injure themselves and sin against the word of life (Prov. viii. 36), we may regard it as a retributive judgment upon their own malicious and spiteful treatment of his mercy.

VI. HE MEETS THE CHARGE OF SELF-RECOMMENDATION BY POINTING TO WHAT HE HAD DONE AT CORINTH. THE DIVINE SOURCE OF HIS CONFIDENCE; EXCELLENCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT MINISTRY AND ITS SUPERIORITY TO THAT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER III. 1–11.

1 Do we begin again to commend ourselves[1]? or[2] need we, as some others [*om. others*],
2 epistles of commendation to you, or [*om. letters* of commendation[3]] from you? Ye are
3 our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men: *forasmuch as ye are*
manifestly declared to be [being manifested that ye are] the epistle of Christ minis-
tered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables
[or tablets] of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart [on hearts *which are* tablets of
4, 5 flesh].[4] And [But] such trust have we through Christ to God-ward: not that we
are sufficient [*om.* of ourselves] to think anything [from, *ἀφ'*, ourselves][5] as of [out
6 of, *ἐξ*] ourselves; but our sufficiency *is* of God: who also hath made us able
[sufficient as] ministers of the New Testament [Covenant]; not of the [a] letter, but
7 of the [a] spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if the min-
istration of death, written and engraven [engraven in letters] in stones was glo-
rious [in glory *ἐν δόξῃ*], so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold
the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which *glory* was to be done
8 away [is passing away, *τὴν καταργουμένην*]; How shall not [rather] the ministration of
9 the spirit be [*om.* rather] glorious [in glory]? For if the ministration[9] of condem-
nation *be* glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed [abound,
10 *περισσεύει*] in[10] glory. For even that which was [has been] made glorious had [has
been having, *δεδόξασται*] no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that ex-
11 celleth. For if that which was done [passing, *τὸ καταργουμένον*] away *was* glorious,
much more that which remaineth *is* glorious [abideth is in glory, *τὸ μένον ἐν δόξῃ*].

[1] Ver. 1.—Two important MSS. (B. and D.) *et al.* have *συνιστάν* which is accepted by Lachman: but *συνιστάνειν* is better authenticated, and is now almost universally received.]

[2] Ver. 2.—Rec. has *εἰ μή* according to A. B. *et al.* and it is preferred by Reiche, Meyer, Osiander, [Bloomfield and Wordsworth. Our author is wrong in inferring (*e silentio*) that the Vat. favors the Rec. Its authority (as revised,) is with C. D. E. F. G. and Sin. *et al.*, the Ital. Syr. Vulg. (*aut numquid*) and Arab. Verss. Theodt. and the Lat. fathers, decidedly in favor of *ἤ μή*, which is adopted by Alford, Stanley and Tischendorf (7th ed.) The interrogative *ἤ* would seem to a transcriber more natural after a question and easier of explanation than the conditional *εἰ*. It is remarkable that all our Eng. verss. (Bagster's Hexapla,) though following the Rec., translate the passage as if the text were *ἤ μή*. Wycliffe has: "or whether we need;" Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva and Amer. Bib. Union, have; "or need we as some," and the Rheims has: "or do we need" etc.]

[3] Ver. 1.—The second *συστατικῶν* is probably an explanatory gloss, to which some MSS. [F. and G.] add still further *ἐπιστολῶν*. [Tisch. retains *συστατικῶν*, but most critics reject both words.]

[4] Ver. 3.—*Καρδίαις* has strong manuscript authority in its favor, but it was probably a mistake of some transcriber. [The MSS. evidence may well be called strong, for A. B. Sin. C. D. E. G. L. have *καρδίαις*. Meyer calls it an error of the pen, and Bloomfield a critical correction, but Alford thinks the internal as well as the external evidence is too strong in its favor to be rejected, as it is the harsher word and the more difficult of construction.]

[5] Ver. 5.—The position of *ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν* after *λογίσασθαί τι* is sustained by the best authorities. Rec. puts the words after *ἐσμέν*, but B. C. [and Sin.] place them before *ἱκανοί*. [Tisch. agrees with our author, but he has changed *ἑαυτῶν* after *ὡς ἐξ* into *αὐτῶν* on the authority of only B. F. G. *et. al.*]

[6] Ver. 6.—Rec. has *ἀποκτείνει* with B. *et. al.* and Orig. Tisch. and Alford have *ἀποκτέννει* with F. G. K., and Sin. Lachmann from conjecture gives us *ἀποκταίνει*, and he is followed by Stanley; but A. C. D. E. L. have *ἀποκτένει*. Meyer, Bloomf. and Words. follow the Rec.]

[7] Ver. 7.—Lachm. on the authority of B. D. (first cor.) F. G. has *γράμματι*, but the reading was probably occasioned by the sing. *γράμμα* of ver. 6. [Alford and Stanley adopt it, but Tisch. on the decisive authority of A. C. D. (2d and 3d Corr.) E. K. L. and Sin., with nearly all the Ital. Vul. Syr. verss. and Greek and Latin fathers, agrees with the Rec. and most continental critics in giving us *γράμμασιν*.]

[8] Ver. 7.—*Ἐν* before *λίθοις* is not genuine: the best authorities are against it.

[9] Ver. 9.—Lachmann on important authorities [A. C. D. (1st Cor.) F. G. Sin. with some Greek fathers and verss.] has *τῇ διακονίᾳ*, but this reading was probably an attempt to remove a difficulty, and to explain the text. For a similar reason others have *ἐν δόξῃ ἐστιν* or *ἦν* instead of *δέξα*.

[10] Ver. 9.—The best authorities leave out *ἐν* before *δόξα*. It may have been brought from ver. 11. [It is not found in A. B. C. Sin., (though 3d Cor. inserts it and 1st Cor. has *δέξῃ*), and it nowhere else follows *περισ*; and yet Tisch. after wavering in his different editions restores it in his 7th. and regards the evidence as decisive in its favor here. Lachmann, Alford and Stanley cancelled it as brought from *ἐν δόξῃ* in ver. 8 and ver. 11.]

[11] Ver. 10.—Rec. has *οὐδὲ δεδόξασται*. The weight of evidence is decidedly in favor of *οὐ δεδόξασται*; the *δὲ* in *οὐδε* was probably taken from the first syllable of *δεδόξασται*.

D CRITICAL.

postle had said in vv.
rpretation by ill dis-
d that it was a boast-
himself. He guards
the Corinthians that
mmending himself to
h as the work which
him in their city was
on for him in every
re begin to com-
μεθα is capable of an
might be insinuated
ume etc. (comp. Luke
finitive, and refers to
regarded as self-com-
Epistle (chaps. ii.–iv.
10), or in his earlier
eed we like some,
dation to you, or
νιστάνειν (τινί) signi-
introduce, to com-
quently in our Epis-
the sense of praising
disapprobation also
wing sentence, if we
reading, we must sup-
tive and ironical an-
, or that the previous
mption of an absur-
. Obs. Webster *Synt.*
viii. p. 126.] *q. d.:*
l," *i. e.* only under
uch an idea be enter-
t really more difficult
cated ἢ μή, although
incorrect, inasmuch
ew Testament does μή
fter a ἤ, which must
hich precedes it. It
bsurdity of the ques-
eed? and it may be
her the two construc-
ζομεν. [Without the
(which we might ex-
a decided οὐδαμῶς),
ithout notice, and a
ly inferentially nega-
(as all usage requires
. (unless) the interro-
ntence it introduces
ersion) ceases, and it
on in the only way it
ically or even deri-
"I can need no com-
elf, for that would be
ting where I am al-
m others to you, for
you; or from you to
and present state are
han anything you can
e mention of such a
its absurdity."] We
στολαί in the church
les. When members
m place to place they
from one bishop to
hus given became a

means of maintaining fraternal intercourse between the bishops and their congregations. [Paul himself appears to have recognized the commencement of such a custom. In Gal. ii. 12, he speaks of some "who came from James," as if even then some authority was expected from the Apostolic College at Jerusalem. Two years before, Apollos passing into this very city of Corinth, *did* bring "letters from the brethren" of Ephesus (Acts xviii. 27); and as many of the Corinthians professed to be followers of Apollos, it is no impossible thing that such were here aimed at. The 13th canon of the Council of Chalcedon (A. D. 451) ordained that "clergymen coming to a city where they were unknown, should not be allowed to officiate without letters commendatory (*Epistolæ Commendatiæ,*) from their own bishop." Comp. NEANDER, Chr. Rel. vol. I, pp. 205, 360 ff. In the Clementine Homilies Peter warns his hearers against "any apostle, prophet, or teacher, who does not first compare his preaching with James, and come with witnesses;" where Paul seems especially aimed at, and we have perhaps a specimen of what Paul was contending against in our epistle.] W. F. BESSER: "Were the Corinthians inclined to reckon their own Apostle among those strangers who needed such letters?" The absurdity implied in the question lay in the supposition that the Apostle [ἑαυτοὺς] who was well known not only at Corinth but everywhere, should *need* any commendation from others or from himself, as if he were a stranger. By the words ὡς τινες he evidently alludes to those antipauline teachers, who, as his readers well knew, had brought letters of recommendation to Corinth, and had taken such letters from Corinth when they departed. He thus not only shows that he needed no such letters, but he shows this in a way which throws confusion upon his opponents, while it honors and encourages the Corinthians themselves—**our Epistle**, *i. e.*, the Epistle of commendation (gen. possess.; not: which we have written, for he speaks not of his own part in composing it until ver. 3, but which we have) **is yourselves**.—By placing the predicate first he makes it more emphatic and connects it more immediately with the preceding verse. The close collocation of the emphatic ὑμεῖς with ἡμῶν is also very significant. A similar arrangement of words may be seen in 1 Cor. ix. 2. The large Church which had been founded by him, and which had become so rich in spiritual gifts, was a glorious work of the Holy Ghost, and so a Divine Epistle which would commend him to all the world without any letters from men. BESSER: "it was an Epistle of a peculiar kind, for Paul was at the same time its writer and its receiver." —This metaphor he carries out in the subsequent verses in accordance with the nature of his subject, noticing first the complete certainty which he and Timothy possessed (this is the reason that καρδίαις is in the plural as in chap. iv. 6 and vii. 3) for the commendation of their work, and then the general notoriety of this work in all the churches:—**written in our hearts**.—In these words his own feelings are alluded to, inasmuch as he speaks of the writing in his own (ἡμῶν) and not their (ὑμῶν) hearts (although ὑμῶν may be found in some authorities of no great import-

ance, comp. Meyer).* "Paul meant that he carried this Epistle, not in his hand to show at any time, but continually with him, inasmuch as he bore the Church upon his heart." It is not of his love that the Apostle is here speaking (as in chap. vii. 3, and Phil. i. 7), and it would seem altogether inappropriate to make him allude here to the official breast-plate of the high priest (Olshausen). On such an interpretation we could trace no connection between it and the following sentence, [in which the Epistle is said to be known and read, not by God, but by men]. The phrase: in our hearts, is equivalent to: in us, and the meaning of the whole expression is: So inscribed upon us and so carried about with us everywhere, that it becomes known to all. This idea is yet further defined and explained in the words:—**known and read by all men**;—it is a work which will be universally recognized, a letter which every one will know to be his, and which all will read as his [Grotius: the handwriting is first "*known*" and then the Epistle is "*read*"] (Ewald: read within and without, thoroughly). Events which had taken place in one of the principal cities of the world would necessarily have a world-wide notoriety (comp. Rom. i. 8).—In this prominent relation to all the world we must not suppose that the Corinthians were themselves included, as if the *πρὸς ὑμᾶς* of ver. 1 were here again referred to, for as the Epistle was made up of the Corinthians, they would not be likely to be included also among its readers. **—Forasmuch as ye are manifested to be an Epistle of Christ, ministered by us,** (ver. 3).—Grammatically the participle: manifested (*φανερούμενοι*), the object of which is to give a reason for their being known and read of all men, is to be connected with the nominative of the previous sentence (*ὑμεῖς ἐστέ*). *χριστοῦ* in *ἐπιστολὴ χριστοῦ* is the gen. of the author, and it is implied that the Epistle came from Christ, for it is of the origin and not of the contents nor of the proprietorship of the Epistle, that the Apostle is speaking. He now speaks of himself in the words: *ministered by us*, as Christ's instrument in the composition of the Epistle; and he no longer thinks of it as a letter of commendation, but simply as an exhibition of the way in which their faith had been drawn forth and their Church had been founded. It had been prepared and sent by the Apostle and his companions, acting as the ministers and servants of Christ (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 5 ff.). *Διακονεῖν τι* is here used as it is in chap. viii. 19. The difference between this and any ordinary Epistle was evident from the materials with which and on which it was written.—**written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tablets of stone, but in fleshy tablets of the heart.**—The Epistle itself, the new spiritual life they had experienced, had been produced by the Holy Spirit, whose continual agency is here pointed out. This agency wrought with great power, so as to renew their hearts, but through the instrumentality of the Apostles and their testimony respecting Christ. It seems inappropriate and altogether too dogmatic to find in the ink here spoken of the figure of those lifeless and impotent means which were sometimes made use of, such as the law and those doctrines which have no quickening power, or the shadows and ceremonies of the Jewish ritual. Some representation of the Jewish law and the Sinaitic legislation must, however, have been floating before the Apostle's mind, when he brought out the additional figure of the tablets of stone. This representation is not strictly consistent with the metaphor of an Epistle and of ink, and we can explain it only by the recollection that the Apostle was contrasting the work of the Spirit under the New Testament with the work of the law under the Old Testament, *i. e.*, the effecting of a Divine life in the heart by the Spirit of the living God, with the outward engraving of the Divine precepts upon tables of stone. There may also have been in his mind some recollection of such passages as Jer. xxxi. 31–33 (comp. Heb. ix. 4). The phrase *πλάκες καρδίας* occurs in the Sept. of Prov. vii. 3. Fleshy (*σάρκιναι*) in contrast with stony (*λίθιναι*), designates a living susceptibility (comp. Ezek. xxxvi. 26). [The ending—*ινος* refers to the substance or material of which a thing is made, in distinction from—*ικος* which refers to that which belongs to that thing. Our Lord was *σαρκινός* (fleshy, of human flesh subsisting) but not *σαρκικός* (fleshly, subject to fleshly lusts and passions). The word is used only in this place according to the Receptus, but it is given for *σαρκικός* by many MSS. in Rom. vii. 14, and Heb. vii. 16. Trench, Synn., Series II., p. 114; Webster, Synn., p. 232, and Web. and Wilk. Com.]. The word hearts (*καρδίας*) expresses also more definitely the nature of the substance made use of. In speaking of their spiritual life, he could very significantly say: ye are an Epistle (a writing) inscribed upon heart-tablets. He does not exactly say: *your* hearts (*καρδίας ὑμῶν*) but generally *καρδίας*, and he thus describes the peculiar nature of the Epistles of Christ, *i. e.*, they are Christ dwelling in the heart by faith (Eph. iii. 17).

Vers. 4–6. In vers. 2 f. Paul had expressed great confidence with respect to what had been accomplished at Corinth through his instrumentality, and he had claimed it as an evidence of his Apostolic power. In what he now says he recurs to his assertions there:—**Such confidence, however, we have, through Christ towards God.**—The same word, *πεποίθησις*, occurs in chap. i. 15; viii. 22; x. 2. *Τοιαύτη* is stronger than *αὕτη* would have been. The reference here may be to chap. ii. 17, or ii. 15 ff.; at least so far as chap. iii. 1 ff. may be giving the reasons for what is there said of the Corinthian Church, but not so as to make chap. iii. 1–3 either a parenthesis or a digression.—He intended to say that he owed this strong and joyful confidence of which he was speaking (Neander: a confidence that we are able to work such results) entirely to Christ; for it was Christ whom he served and under whose influence he accomplished every thing he did; and it was therefore through Christ that he had such confidence in what he

[* Since our author wrote, the Sinaiticus has added its authority to that of two cursives of the 12th cent., one copy of the Vulgate, the Aeth. of the Rom. Polyglot, and one MSS. of the Slavonic, in favor of *ὑμῶν*. But as the Corinthians were themselves the Epistle, they could hardly be confounded by the Apostle with the material on which it was written.]

could do.—But he had this confidence, he says, towards God (*πρὸς τὸν θεόν*), *i. e.*, not before God, as a matter which was right in God's sight, but in the direction of, or in respect to God (Rom. iv. 2) the Author of the work and the One to whom all the results were due (Osiander, Meyer).—**Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing of ourselves, as if from ourselves** (ver. 5). Here *οὐχ ὅτι* is used as in chap. i. 24. If this sentence had been intended to be the object of *πεποίθησιν*, or to be simply a development of the thought contained in *πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, the phrase ought to have been *ὅτι οὐχ*. Even if he gave God the honor of governing and guiding all the circumstances and accomplishing all the results of which he had spoken, he might still without impropriety have referred to his personal qualifications and have commended, and had confidence in, what he had done. On the other hand, he is on his guard here and he gives to God all the praise. He more particularly defines what this sufficiency or ability is (*ἱκανός* occurs also in chap. ii. 16) by *λογίσασθαί*, (Lachmann: *λογίζεσθαι*) *τι ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν, etc.* *Λογίζεσθαι* signifies to consider, to reflect upon [with the notion of a result, to make out by reasoning], and refers here to that which proceeded from him and properly belonged to himself as an Apostle, in distinction from the results which depended upon the Divine blessing (1 Cor. iii. 6). It was the discernment of the best means and the best manner for the performance of his official duties, and a fixed purpose in the accomplishment of them (Meyer); or more comprehensively, the intellectual and moral qualification for his duties—the thoughts which were indispensable to the proper performance of his Apostolic work (Osiander). On no construction can we regard him as here ascribing this *πεποίθησίς* and his *ἱκανότης* for maintaining it to God, as if his object was to say that God was the source of this trust and of his confidence in his own qualifications [Rückert]. Nor should the assertion be limited to his work of instruction, for this is required as little by the context as is the doctrine which our older dogmatists were accustomed to derive from this passage, respecting the inability of the natural man generally to think any thing right or good.* The *ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν* which makes their ability *λογίσασθαί τι* dependent upon themselves, is more clearly defined by *ὡς ἐξ ἑαυτῶν*, which designates the original source or efficient cause; as if our sufficiency had its origin in ourselves (Meyer). [Hodge: "There is a difference in the prepositions: *ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν ὡς ἐξ ἑαυτῶν*: not *from* ourselves, as if *out of* ourselves. We should express much the same idea by saying, our sufficiency is not *in* or *of* ourselves"]. The *ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν* belongs not exclusively to *ἱκανοί ἐσμεν*, nor to *λογίσασθαί τι*, but to both of them in conjunction. If we accept of the reading *ἐξ αὐτων* (with B. F. G. *et. al.*), we should translate: as those who are sufficient of themselves (*ὡς ἱκανοὶ ὄντες, etc.*). The positive assertion contrasted with this is:—**But our sufficiency is of God.**—The word sufficiency here (*ἱκανότης*) refers to the same object with respect to which they were sufficient as *ἱκανοί* does. With this sentence must be connected the relative sentence—**who also hath enabled** (*ἱκάνωσεν*) **us as ministers of a new covenant** (ver. 6). —The object of *καὶ* is not to introduce a new, higher, or more general thought in contrast with *λογίσασθαί τι*, for then the expression would have been: *ὃς καὶ διακόνους—ἱκαν. ἡμᾶς*, but to introduce a sentence to confirm and explain what had gone before: "who has even (or truly) made us sufficient," *etc.* [Conybeare: comp. *ἱκανός* (chap. ii. 16) *ἱκανοί* (iii. 15) and *ἱκάνωσεν* (ver. 6). Ad. Clarke: a formal answer to the question: Who is sufficient for these things? God (replies the Apostle) hath made us sufficient as ministers]. *Διακόνους* (ministers) is a concise expression for *εἰς τὸ εἶναι διακόνους, etc.*, (to be ministers), or *εἰς διακονιαν* (for the ministry, comp. *ἱκανοῦν εἰς* in Col. i. 12).—The object of the ministry [*i. e.*, *κ. διαθηκης*, the new covenant] is put in the genitive, as in chap. xi. 15; Eph. iii. 7; and Col. i. 23, and is without the article because it is the genit. of quality. [The article is wanting also before *γράμματος* and *πνεύματος*] *i. e.*, "of a new covenant." It was new because it was altogether different from the old covenant which Moses founded. The basis of the former covenant was the law (*νόμος*), whereas the later covenant was founded wholly on grace and reconciliation in Christ; the condition of salvation in the former was obedience to the law, whereas in the latter it was faith in Christ (Rom. x. 5 ff.). [Neander: *Διαθήκης* is not to be explained here according to its pure Greek signification (arrangement, will), but in accordance with the Heb. בְּרִית, which denotes a mutual transaction, an agreement (covenant) in which God promises something on condition that men fulfil what He requires of them]. This ministry of a new covenant is explained immediately by an antithetical sentence: —**not of the letter, but of the Spirit.**—As this expression is in explanation of and in apposition with the phrase, a new covenant, it must depend not upon *διαθήκης* (covenant) but upon *διακόνους* (ministers). Comp. vers. 7 and 8. We have here the same contrast as in Rom. ii. 29 and vii. 6. The ministers of the Old Testament were busied principally with a letter, an inflexible, lifeless and written law; and they were bound to present and to inculcate with much zeal the duties of that covenant; whereas the ministers of the New Testament were concerned mainly with the Spirit. They had to do generally with a Divine power which wrought in the mind, renewed the heart and brought men into fellowship with God; and their work was to induce as many as possible to enter into this covenant and participate in its blessings. These two ministries gave a peculiar character respectively to the two covenants.—In the sentence—**for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life**—we have the reason for what had just been said, *viz:* God has made us sufficient for a ministry which is not of the letter but of the Spirit, for the letter kills, *etc.* (Flatt: what was written killed, but the Spiritual quickens into life). The

[* Though the *context* does not *oblige* us to interpret this assertion of any thing but Apostolical sufficiency, yet it is quite consistent with Paul's usual freedom, to break from a special to a general subject. The language is quite general (*λογίσασθαι τι*), and the word refers to the lowest form of human mental activity: it is not merely to judge or determine, but *to think* (Hodge: "much easier than to will or do.")]

connection must be sought by referring to the great aim of the Apostolic work, which was, as Paul's readers well knew, to bring men into a holy fellowship by a Divine life (comp. Rom. i. 16 f. *et. al.*). There is no need therefore of suggesting in addition that the ministry of a new covenant, not of the letter but of the Spirit, must be higher and far preferable, for, *etc.* The reason which the Apostle assigns is not that the ministry of a higher economy requires higher qualifications; nor, that under this higher economy the ministers must have a capacity for higher endowments (Osiander). NEANDER: "These words have been commonly applied to the contrasted literal or spiritual understanding of Christian truth. But Paul says nothing here directly on this subject. His words strictly refer merely to the law as a letter which gives commands, and the spirit of faith which makes alive. But probably this relation of the letter to the spirit may be applied to every precept of a merely ethical nature, with which Christianity, as the religion of the Spirit, is contrasted." Light is thrown upon the whole passage by recollecting that the Apostle had in his eye those Judaizing teachers whose motives were derived from the law, and who vaunted themselves over Paul because he proclaimed nothing but grace. Such teachers were in danger of leading souls astray by pretending that their influence was salutary, while his was dangerous and corrupting. In opposition to such he gives the reason why God had qualified him and his fellow-laborers to be ministers of a new covenant which was not of the letter but of the Spirit. Exactly the opposite of what they pretended was found, in fact, to be true. The letter to which they devoted their energies killed, while the Spirit to whose service he was addicted made alive. This killing refers, not merely to a negative powerlessness or inability to awaken that life in the soul through which men freely perform works pleasing to God; nor merely to the introduction of a moral death, *i. e.*, an opposition to the Divine will, produced by the sense of guilt which the commandment excites; nor even to a killing in a spiritual sense, because sin is the death of the soul; but to the sentence of condemnation and the exclusion from all hope of life and salvation which the law pronounces. Such is the idea of death (θάνατος) in Rom. vi. 21, 23; vii. 5 *et. al.* This death is indeed occasioned by those moral influences (Rom. vii. 7 ff.), and is in other passages pointed out under the phrases: the curse of the law (Gal. iii. 10), and, the law worketh wrath (Rom. iv. 15). This introduces also a death of the heart which paralyzes all moral power (Bengel, Osiander). The question, however, is, whether the Apostle has reference to this in our passage. He certainly had no thought of bodily (physical) death, as the wages of sin (Rom. v. 12), and produced and demanded by the law (1 Cor. xv. 56; Rom. vii. 9), for such a death takes place also independently of the law (Rom. v. 13); nor as a penalty of the law, for such a killing (ἀποκτέινειν) would not be a proper antithesis to the giving of life (ζωοποιεῖν). But the giving life or quickening is the effect of the eternal life (ζωὴ αἰώνιος) which is quickened in the soul (Rom. viii. 2; vi. 10, 11), or of the introduction of the soul into that fellowship with God which is completed in the resurrection.*

VERS. 7–11. The Apostle now proceeds (δὲ) to show that the ministry of the New Testament was far preferable to that of the Old, both in the effects which it produces and in the spirit which it reveals. For the sake of comparing them he brings them face to face with each other, and then from the glory of the Old Testament service which appeared with such splendor in Moses' face, that the children of Israel could not look upon him (ver. 7), he draws a conclusion, *a minori ad majus*.—**But if the ministration of death, engraven in letters upon stones, was in glory** (ver. 7).—Instead of the simple designation the ministry of the letter, which he had used in ver. 6, he now uses the phrase, the ministry of death—which works in favor of, or as it were, under the direction or authority of, death. He thus attributes the consequences of the letter directly to the ministry under it, and so anticipates the reason for the inferiority which is set forth in ver. 9. The definition: engraven in letters upon stones, shows that we must not here think of the Levitical priestly service (Rückert); and the express mention of Moses leads us to understand the ministry of Moses himself. We are to regard him, not as a mediator in contrast with Christ, but as a minister (διάκονος) representing all teachers under the law in contrast with the Apostles and ministers of the New Testament. By a bold turn of expression he combines the ministry itself with its object, and designates the whole as one which was engraven in letters upon stones (the only point on which we can here agree with Meyer, who regards the Decalogue as Moses' commission or *matricula officii*).† The ministration of Moses and of all his successors consisted in the presentation and enforcement of the law whose letters had been engraven upon stone (tablets). In this way he brings out in strong language the stiffness and externality of the ancient service. NEANDER:

[* The Apostle intends no disparagement of a written law, or of the letter of either Testament. God was the author of both, and both are perfect for their proper objects. The letter of the N. T. was not written when Paul wrote this, and the contrast was therefore more striking. Chrysostom (Hom. VI., ver. 5; and VII., ver. 8) notices that the law itself was spiritual (Rom. vii. 14), but the Apostle here means that it does not *bestow* a spirit, but only letters, whereas the Apostles were intrusted with the giving of a spirit. The law only punishes the sinner, the Gospel saves him and gives him life. Paul does not say that the law itself, but only the ministration under it, produces death; it is sin alone which produces death, and the law only shows what sin is and then punishes it. As instrumentalities of grace, forms and ministers and letters are indispensable. For the historical facts and the objects of its faith, Christianity is as dependent upon the letter as Judaism. But these and all educational influences are as dead and unquickening as syllables engraven on stones, without the spirit; and yet the spiritualism which would do without them will be as dead and destitute of the Spirit as the deadliest letter of Rabbinical Judaism. A religion with only a letter is powerless, but without that letter it will have no spirit or life. It was the very written word which has since been "a stereotyped revelation," which the Apostles made a judge of conscience (Acts xviii. 11; 1 Pet. iv. 11.)]

[† Our Engl. verss. have here "written and engraven in stones," which is hardly a literal translation even of the Rec. (ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπ. λίθοις). A literal rendering would be: "In letters engraven on stones." But on Lachmann's reading (ἐν γράμμασι,) the reference would be to the general writing of the whole ministration, whose essential germ however, was in the Decalogue. The plural λίθοις seems to imply that there were two tablets used.]

"The article before *γράμμασιν* was designedly left out by the Apostle, because he intended to imply that a ministration which was conveyed only by letters must have been of a very general nature." If *ἐν γράμμασιν* (or *γράμματι*) were connected directly with *τοῦ θανάτου*, as Luther and some others contend the words should be [the ministration of death in letters, or the ministration which produces death by means of letters], the article would have been required (*τοῦ ἐν γράμ.*). The predicate *ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ*, is essentially the same as if it had been *ἐγεν. ἐνδόξος*. But we are here evidently directed to the divine glory (כָּבוֹד) within whose radiance the ministration was performed. Of an essential dignity or eminence the Apostle was not in general speaking, for in the next sentence:—**so that the children of Israel could not keep their eyes fixed on Moses' face** (ver. 7), there is no representation of the consequences or of the visible tokens of the glory, but of the remarkable degree in which this ministration participated in the divine radiance. In ver. 8 also (*ἔσται ἐν δόξῃ*) it is the heavenly glory which is spoken of. [Webster and Wilkinson think that the *ἔσται* refers to the future, not from the time of writing merely, but to a future from past time, or rather a future of inference, as, if that were so, what *will* this be:] Then, amid the glories of the great day of revelation, when the kingdom of God shall be perfected, and when all external form shall correspond with essential excellence, the dignity of the New Testament ministration will be especially manifested. The narrative in Ex. xxxiv. 29 ff. is rather freely quoted, inasmuch as we are there merely informed that when Aaron and the children of Israel saw that the skin of Moses' face shone they were afraid to come near him. But everything essential to Paul's, and even to Philo's account, is there. For even the *ἀτενίσαι*, the fixed gaze upon his face, was too much for them. The reason for this is further given when it is added—**for the glory of his countenance**—but with the important additiou—**which was to be done away.**—This additiou gives us a new point in the comparison, and places the inferiority of the legal ministration in a strong light (comp. vv. 11, 13). NEANDER: "In this Paul discovers a symbol of the fading glory of Judaism." But he has not yet commenced speaking of the discontinuance of the ministration and its glory, but only of that fact in which he saw a hint of this. He there makes use of no purely present participle (Luther: that which nevertheless is ceasing), but, in accordance with the history, an imperfect participle signifying—that which was passing away. The Apostle presumes that this radiance was transitory; and with great justice, since it always became visible when Moses came from the Divine presence [Estius: passing away when the occasion was over]. The inference from this is briefly and simply expressed in ver. 8—**how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be yet more glorious?**—In *τοῦ πνεύματος* the Apostle resumes the subject of the ministration of the Spirit in ver. 6, which had been interrupted by the enlargement in ver. 7 with respect to the letter: engraved in letters upon stones. But the idea is not that the Spirit rests upon this ministration (though this is silently presumed), but that the ministration was the medium through which the Spirit, and the life he bestowed were communicated and enjoyed (in opposition to *τοῦ θανάτου*, comp. chap. vii. 6). [The verbs *γίνομαι* and *εἰμί* are here brought into striking contrast; *ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ —ἔσται ἐν δόξῃ*. BENGEL: *γίνομαι, fio, et εἰμί sum*, are quite different. STANLEY: *ἐγενήθη*, came into existence. ELLICOTT (on 1 Tim. ii. 14): "the construction *γίνεσθαι ἐν* occurs occasionally, but not frequently in the New Testament, to denote the entrance into, and existence in, any given state." WEBSTER: "*ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ*=was made to be in glory for a time; *ἔσται ἐν δοξῃ*=shall be in glory permanently" (Synn. sub. *γίν.*)]. As *ἔσται* leads the mind to the future (comp. "this hope" in ver. 22), we must not refer the glory (*δόξα*) to the miraculous endowments and works of the Apostles. Ἔσται, however, need not be regarded as the *fut. consequentiæ*, or as equivalent to *esse invenietur* (*si rem recte perpenderis*), and we are hardly safe in understanding it of a progressive development. In the Apostle's mind the second advent of Christ (Parousia) was so constantly present, that it would seem to him needless to give a more particular explanation of his language. The kind of ministration of the spirit, which he had in view, and the argument from the less to the greater, which he applies to it, will be accounted for or confirmed when he comes to explain more particularly the two ministrations, the first, as a ministration of condemnation, and the other as a ministration of righteousness. —**For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more does the ministration of righteousness abound in glory** (ver. 9).—[If Lachmann's reading (*τῇ διακονίᾳ*) be adopted, the translation would be, 'if *to* the ministration of condemnation be glory,' *etc.*, but the sense would not be essentially altered]. Here the former corresponds to the *killing* and *the death*, and the latter to the *making alive*, of vv. 6 and 7. The condemnation refers to the curse of the law. The ministration which was employed in the enforcement of the letter, *i. e.* the Old Testament law, was compelled to denounce condemnation against transgressors (comp. Deut. xxvii. 26), and by its enforcement of a law which brought the sinful passions into active opposition to its requirements, it brought men under the curse. The righteousness, which is here contrasted with the condemnation, is the same as the being just (or righteous) before God, and is the great object of the proclamation of Divine grace under the New Testament ministration. Under that ministration, faith is awakened, and man's relations to God are rectified, so that he can be justified, and attain everlasting life in the Divine kingdom (comp. Rom. i. 17; iii. 22 ff, 30 *et al.*). The Apostle, however, partially modifies what he had thus said of these two ministrations, by withdrawing all reference to time in the use of *ἐγενήθη* and *ἔσται*. Instead of *ἐν δόξῃ* we have the nominative *δόξα*, with *ἐστίν* understood. The meaning is the same, and the expression is more forcible than the adjective *ἔνδοξος* would have been (comp. Rom. viii. 10; *τὸ πνεῦμα ζωή*). On the other hand the expression is strengthened by

the use of περισσεύει, signifying: overflows or abounds in glory.—**For even that which has been glorious, is not glorious in this respect, on account of the glory which excels** (ver. 10).—Here the previous idea is further strengthened by saying that the glory of the contrasted ministration was abolished, although that ministration had previously been declared to have been made in glory (γενηθῆναι ἐν δόξῃ), or to have been glory (δόξα, vv. 7 and 9), on account of the superabundant glory of the other. The καί (even) indicates a climax and qualifies the verb: is not glorious, or has no glory (οὐ δεδόξασται), which expresses a single idea (that which is deprived of glory), and goes beyond the *minus* of the comparison. A more particular explanation of the idea is given in ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει, which signifies: in this particular, *i. e.* with respect to the relation which the Old Testament ministration bore to that of the New Testament.—The phrase, that which has been glorious (τὸ δεδοξασμένον), ["shows a strange use of the perfect (as does δεδόξασται), and is taken from Ex. xxxiv. 29, 35 of the Sept." STANLEY]. It does not stand here for the whole Old Testament economy, but simply the Mosaic ministration, or that which was surrounded by, or shared in a Divine radiance.—Having said that this was not glorious in this respect, the Apostle adds the reason for that deprivation, by saying that this was on account of the surpassing glory. He here refers to what he had said of the ministration of righteousness abounding in glory (περισσεύει ἐν δόξῃ). Before the superabundant glory of the ministration of the New Testament, the glory of the Old Testament ministration entirely disappears as the moon's splendor vanishes in the sun's radiance. There is, therefore, no necessity of taking the phrase, that which has been glorious, in a general and abstract sense (Meyer), without an allusion to the Mosaic service in the concrete sense, until it comes up in the predicate, where ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει has the sense of: "in this respect (*i. e.* when we compare the glory of the Mosaic ministration with the Christian, ver. 9) the glorified becomes unglorified." In ver. 11 the expression, the surpassing glory (τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης δόξης) is still further justified by the introduction of a new element into the comparison, although it had been symbolically suggested in ver. 7.—**For if that which is transitory was with** (passing through) **glory, much more that which abides is in glory.**—This new element is the permanent in distinction from the temporary, that which is vanishing: "on account of the superabounding glory." For each ministration there is presupposed an economy or dispensation, one of which is passing away, and the other is abiding. The Old Testament ministration with the law itself, is supposed to pass away with the entrance of the New Testament ministration (comp. Rom. x. 4). The latter must remain until the second coming of our Lord, when it will be eternally glorified in His heavenly kingdom. [Neander: The Apostle probably had a special design when he used the different prepositions διὰ (δόξης) and ἐν (δόξῃ). Διὰ designates a point of transition and hence implies that the thing spoken of, was passing and transitory, while ἐν implies that which is permanent.] Διὰ δόξης signifies strictly that the glory merely accompanied the object [Winer § 51, i. p. 306. Webster (Synn. p. 166) says that it indicates particularly an object in a state of transition, while passing through a state] whereas ἐν δόξῃ implies that the object continued in glory. Sometimes, however, even διὰ is used to designate the fixed condition or state of a thing (chap. ii. 4; v. 7), and hence it is possible that Paul used both expressions as nearly equivalent, for we know that he not unfrequently changed his prepositions even when he referred to the same relation. In either case διὰ seems appropriate to the καταργούμενον, and ἐν to the μένον. In the translation, the distinction can with difficulty be made perceptible (comp. Osiander).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

When nothing but Christ, and Christ in his completeness, is preached, and when the preachers know by experience the reality of what they preach, all who have learned the deadly condemnation and inefficiency of the law to save the soul will feel the power of truth, will be rescued, forgiven and renewed by Divine grace, and will become animated by a spiritual life which will know no limit but the perfection of God. Such results will need no proof that they are from God, for all who have eyes to see will not only commend the human laborer but give honor to the God who bestowed both the success and the power to labor. Those legal task-masters who exalt themselves so much above the preachers of free grace, will never disturb the common security nor bring anything to real order; and in due time, even in this world, it will not be hard to distinguish between the preaching which saves and that which destroys the soul. But a day is coming when all things shall be made especially manifest, when those who have turned many to righteousness shall present before the Lord a great company of enlightened, justified and sanctified ones, who shall shine as the stars forever and ever; while those who preached nothing but the law shall (Dan. xii. 3) be filled with unspeakable horror and confusion, as the lamentable and fatal consequences of their course shall be fully brought to light.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—Ver. 1. No one needs a better letter of credence than that testimony of men's own consciences and works which are sufficient to praise him.—Vv. 2, 3. Every believer is an epistle in which the Holy Ghost reveals the knowledge of God in Christ; he is an open epistle in which all can learn something of what God can produce in the heart; and he is an epistle of Christ, for the hands and tongues of all true teachers are the instruments which the Holy Spirit uses to form him into the Divine image. If God's writing is in the heart, the willing heart, the faithful obedience and the ready tongue will not fail to discourse of God. In such cases there will be real life, and not mere letters upon stone. Preachers should never doubt, that when they perform their parts, the appropriate fruits of

their labor will infallibly follow.—Ver. 5. No one can speak of God as he should, until he has been taught of God (Jno. vi. 45). Whatever gifts we have, and whatever praise we gain, should therefore be ascribed entirely to God (James i. 17). Oh how many make idols of themselves.—Ver. 6. LUTHER:—The letter is to teach us, that while the mere law of God and our own works give us knowledge, they cannot show us that God can be gracious; but it shows us that everything we are and do is condemned and worthy of death, since without Divine grace we can do nothing. The Spirit, on the other hand, is to teach us that grace without law or personal righteousness gives us knowledge, but in such a way as to give us life and salvation. HEDINGER:—The Gospel is accompanied by a penetrating life, which enlightens and gladdens those who are awakened and condemned to death; it is therefore from the Spirit and is the source of spirit and life. Every word of God, as it comes from the Divine heart and hand, has some special design and a power of its own. In some cases it is to command and in others to produce obedience; in some it is to threaten and in others it is to comfort; in some it is to chastise and wound, and in others it is to heal and revive. To every work which His wisdom has ordained He has also adjusted just that measure of power which is precisely adapted to the end he has in view. The word which created the world is not the word which creates a new heart. For this is needed a word of far greater power (Eph. i. 19). —Ver. 7. HEDINGER:—The law also has power and light It has a terrible thunderbolt for those who have awakened consciences, and where Christ does not comfort them and anoint them with His Spirit, they are struck down to the mouth of hell. Those who would partake of the Divine nature must mount up in spirit often to God, become familiar with Divine things, converse much with God in prayer, and listen in their most secret souls to God's voice in His word, and it will not be long before their souls will be full of Divine light.—Ver. 8. The Gospel is indeed a quickening and a saving power, by means of which Christ is glorified, and rises like a clear morning star (2 Pet. i. 19) to shed upon His people's hearts the full beams of His eternal glory (Rev. xxi. 23 ff.).—Ver. 9. HEDINGER:— When the word of the kingdom casts its clear light upon thee, look steadily upon it. Many love darkness and shun the light (Jno. iii. 19). Walk in the light lest darkness come upon thee (Jno. xii. 35).—Ver. 10. The Gospel is the source of an indescribable glory when it is truly applied to the hearts of God's people, for the glory of the Lord is even now shed forth upon them; but when Jesus, who is their life, shall be fully revealed, their glory will be complete (Col. iii. 4). —Ver. 11. The spirit of life is better than death, righteousness than condemnation, and that which is permanent than that which vanishes away; how much better then is the ministration of the New Covenant than that of the letter?

BERLENB. BIBLE, VER. 2:—Real candor and frankness of manner can spring only from a consciousness of innocence. A preacher's success must be estimated not from the multitudes who attend upon his ministry, but from the sound conversions which take place under it. Many may, and certainly will condemn him; but this is no evidence that he is wrong. Let us only be concerned that we are begotten by the Word of truth to the glory of God, and that men may say of us: The Lord hath created and formed them for himself.—Ver. 3. The minister who fails to point men from himself to Christ, is trying to make himself a pope. We should never stop at what is external, but press forward to the inward spirit of everything. Let men see that those hearts of ours which were once of stone, are now fleshly tablets, and that this is the Lord's work. The heart which takes no impression from the Gospel, has no part in the New Covenant.—Ver. 4. True confidence in God, is not of ourselves, but comes through Christ.—Ver. 5. The spiritual man finds that a union with Christ gives him an invincible power, in proportion as he sees that he is not sufficient of himself to do anything, as of himself, *i. e.*, to know and overcome the subtle assaults of spiritual pride and self-will. Few persons possess this power, because they never thoroughly know themselves, or understand how utterly insufficient they are even to think anything which will convince them of God's grace and truth. This is wholly a spiritual and divine work, and can be accomplished only by divine instruments. When this fact is fully recognized, we can no longer endure in ourselves those contrivances and counterfeits which the ingenuity of man has devised; for every degree of credit we take to ourselves, only hinders the growth of grace in our hearts. Whatever benefits the renewed man attains, is in consequence of his new creation, and never will he hesitate to cast the crown at the feet of God and of the Lamb. And yet this subjugation of the vile spirit of self-love, self-sufficiency, self-flattery, *etc.*, requires the severest struggle to which our natures are ever called. If Christians in general need to be divested of all confidence in themselves, surely those who lead them should seek to be especially free from it.—Ver. 6. The letter which supplies nothing but intellectual knowledge, can impart no life—but inasmuch as it reveals only condemnation and death, it must actually kill the soul. The law can never be anything but a dead work to those who regard it in a Pharisaic spirit, and set it in opposition to the Gospel. Hence the great object of the Gospel (and the law itself, when properly used, shuts us up to the same result Gal. iii. 24), is to reveal to men a Redeemer, in whom they may find life. The spirit of the Gospel of grace, of faith and of the Lord, gives us life, opens to us a way of righteousness and reconciliation in Christ, and makes us able to receive and use the benefits of Christ's kingdom. This living voice of the Lord stirs the sinner's heart, so that he must hear and obey. Those who have been slain by the law, will penitently recognize Christ, and the Holy Spirit will glorify the Father and the Son in their hearts, and make intercession there with groanings which cannot be uttered. The law alone produced disobedience, opposition, and consequently wrath; but the Spirit works nothing but a cheerful obedience, life and love, blessings and blessedness. The more Christ requires of us, the more he does for us. Under his influence we become con-

scious of new movements and new motives; our whole nature is renewed, and we take delight in those divine, pure and innocent enjoyments, which we never had, and could not have before. Then we shall gradually attain an incomparable treasure of divine life in a refined and good heart, from which we can derive light and power, victory over all sin, motives to diligence in every duty, and comfort and strength for every extremity. In a word, we have the whole power of the Holy Ghost, to make us partakers of the divine nature (2 Pet. i. 3 and 4).—Ver. 7. Not unfrequently, rather than stand on the ground of the Gospel, men prefer going out of their way to Moses—the glory of whose face at a distance attracts them; but they soon find that that glory is too strong for them, and shows those who love darkness rather than light, as in a glass, how great is their corruption. Thus God sometimes finds a way to accomplish his own work. The old dispensation of the letter must always be forsaken, that we may attain a true evangelical state in the new dispensation of the Spirit. This requires an honest recognition and confession of the truth, and a sincere repentance.—Ver. 8. Such is the glory of the spiritual word, that even the angels love to study it. Where once it enters the heart, it remains forever. The glory of the Lord so brightly illuminates it, that everything which speaks and acts without the Spirit will seem like utter darkness. Under such a dispensation everything begun or promised before, comes to its fulfilment; there is no abolition of the law and its various ordinances, but only an exaltation of them all into something spiritual and everlasting. And yet it often costs us much before our consciences apprehend the true distinction between the law and the Gospel, and the main power of the new covenant in the heart depends upon the clearness with which the promises are understood.—Ver. 9. So sublime and excellent is the glory of Christ in the new covenant, that no sooner does any man apprehend it, than he will feel humbled in utter amazement, as he beholds the majesty, the holiness, the wisdom, and the goodness of God; and thus God receives back from restored and redeemed man the honor of which sin robbed Him.—Ver. 10. From the nature and origin of the Mosaic law, it would not be hard to infer that it would necessarily come to an end. Equally evident is it, that the Gospel contains what must endure forever; and all the assaults of its enemies have only served to evince its perpetuity. It is therefore called an everlasting Gospel, and the redemption it proclaims is an eternal redemption. As what is good may not be permanent, we should not be satisfied until we have found what can never be moved. As everything else is passing away, the soul can never find complete rest until it receives that word which lives and abides forever.

Rieger, Vers. 1 and 2:—Gladly would we so speak and act that no one should take offence, but no one can always be so circumspect as to be beyond suspicion. It is well, therefore, sometimes to meet those misunderstandings which we know have arisen respecting us. "The first in his cause is righteous; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him" (Prov. xviii. 17).—Ver. 3. What God has joined together, should never be put asunder. Among these are: preaching and the word of Christ; the Spirit which glorified that word, and the ministry through which that Spirit is shed forth. Stone tablets are comparatively easy to be written upon, for only the surface needs to be changed. But only the finger of God can write His law upon the heart, since the soul itself must be softened and subdued, not only at first, but continually. We need not therefore be surprised that the dispensation under which God has promised to do this is the highest, and that every thing which preceded it was only preparatory for it (Jer. xxxi. 33; Ezek. xxxvi. 25–27).—Vers 4 and 5. When a man really holds communion with God, he will be so emptied of all confidence in himself and so united to the source of all light and power, that even when he is triumphing in a Divine sufficiency, no words can express his consciousness of utter insufficiency in himself.—Ver. 6. Even in connection with the law and other clearer declarations of God's will and of His claims, many promises of the Spirit were given through the prophets, so that the New Covenant was already partially developed in the Old. All who made a conscientious use of the letter of the Old Covenant found in it abundant directions to the Spirit, and through the Spirit breathed forth many sighs for the New Covenant. And yet the Spirit was not in it, for before our Lord's return to the Father that Spirit was not fully given, and the ministration of the Old Covenant was necessarily a ministration of the letter. Such a fact, however, is no reason for despising that dispensation, but rather a ground for praising that grace which reaches its perfection by successive periods of progress.—To slay the sinner who is living without the law in a worldly course of life, is really to prepare him for life and health. Unless the process stops there, he will be brought to a state in which he is willing to renounce the law and his own righteousness, and he will seek for that Gospel through which the Spirit is imparted.—Vers. 7 and 8. The more any institution or worship gives evidence that it came from God and leads to God, and the more the Lord uses it to reveal and communicate Himself to men, the more it can be called glorious. Hence that ministry which was set up at Pentecost, proclaiming peace through the blood of the cross, and imparting the Spirit, which is the only source of spiritual freedom and power, is possessed of a transcendant glory; for it has most plainly evinced its Divine origin, and its power to control the heart and bring the soul to God.—Ver. 9. It was a terrible thing to preach nothing but condemnation; and yet under the law such preaching was glorious. May we learn to make a right use of the law; not to show us the way of salvation, but to drive us through the door of mercy which the Gospel opens for us to the righteousness in which there can be no condemnation, but peace with God, the law established, and the Spirit of life dwelling continually in the heart!—Vers. 10 and 11. The law was originally designed to be only a provisional dispensation to prepare a way for the Gospel. Its fragmentary revelations of truth must unquestionably find their completion and their termination in the Gospel; and yet the law itself can

never lose its place in every subsequent dispensation, and it will find its absolute perfection when God shall reveal Himself to His creatures without a veil.

HEUBNER, VERS. 1 and 3:—However disagreeable it may be to a Christian to commend himself, if his personal interests are connected with God's cause, he may without vanity vindicate his character before his fellow-men. When his merits are manifest, he may dispense with letters of commendation, and certainly he will never truckle or beg for them by low arts. To be really useful, especially in the work of saving souls, will be our best commendation and will generally be the best known; for what work can be more honorable than that of transforming and impressing a new character upon the very spirit of a fellow-man?—Ver. 4. God will be the friend of all who are endeavoring to honor Christ. All such therefore have the best of reasons for confidence in God.—Ver. 5. Our sufficiency for every spiritual act is from God; for when He withdraws His Spirit from our hearts, they are lifeless, barren, and incapable of any good thought.—Ver. 6. Even among Christians (papists, coldly orthodox), the letter is served with slavish fear, where God's will is known *only* from the written word without the Spirit's testimony. In such cases nothing but precepts and threatenings are dispensed, and the written word is believed and obeyed from a regard only to authority and from terror without inward conviction and persuasion. In contrast with this stands the ministration of the Spirit; under which the will of God and His grace is cordially accepted; an inward witness accompanies the word, and under the leadings of the Divine Spirit, faith and obedience are delightful, sincere and earnest.—Ver. 7. That which is external and legal has frequently more influence upon rude dispositions than that which has more intrinsic grandeur.—Vers. 8 and 9. A judicial and admonitory severity has a dignity which is by no means to be despised, but unspeakably greater is that of a love which has compassion on the miserable and seeks to save them and give them spiritual life. No honor, therefore, is like that of the minister of the Gospel, under whose labors God's Spirit is communicated, and righteousness, pardon and grace are afforded to all men. Contrast between Deut. xxvii. 15 ff.; xxviii. 15 ff.; and Matth. v. 3 ff. (Cursed, *etc.* Blessed, *etc.*).—Ver. 11. If, then, God's glory is reflected from all who proclaim His love, how glorious must be that ministration which proclaims nothing but love.

W. F. BESSER, VER. 3:—As the savor of Christ diffuses Christ Himself, so a congregation of real Christians are an Epistle in which Christ is Himself inscribed and communicated to men. The letters which He writes are deeds and men (Ps. xlv. 1, "My tongue is the pen of a ready writer"). — Ver. 6. The whole ministration (*διακονία*) to which the public servants of the Church are regularly called, is simply for the purpose of presenting and applying the New Covenant or the treasures of grace which are promised through Jesus Christ to men.—Our sufficiency is not conferred by the office, but must be brought to the office itself. Those whom God calls to it are able to teach others, or are endowed with a sufficiency when they are called (2 Tim. ii. 2).—The letter kills, and even ought to kill, that the Spirit may quicken those who are dead. —Ver. 9. The glory of the ministry of the letter was terrible, because every letter of the law was emblazoned with tokens of Divine wrath (Rom. iv. 15). As the executioner of God's curse against transgressors (Gal. iii. 10), it can proclaim nothing but condemnation. But now, when grace abounds and is much stronger than wrath, the ministration of the Spirit is proportionably more glorious; for now even righteousness proclaims that God must absolve the guilty when they are reconciled to God through the blood of Christ (chap. v. 18–20).—Ver. 10. The glory of the legal ministry was by itself intolerable for its brightness; but when the ministration of condemnation and the ministration of righteousness are combined together, that which was so glorious becomes unglorified, and Sinai's radiance vanishes before that of Golgotha.—Ver. 11. The ministry which vanished away passed "*through* glory," and its glory was extinguished when the law had accomplished its end in Christ and His people; but the ministry which remains until the coming of the Lord abides *in* glory, that the whole world may behold its inherent excellence.

VERS. 4–11. Lesson for the 12th Sunday after Trinity. HEUBNER:—I. The glory of the evangelical ministry: 1. In its origin: *a.* It rests upon Christ's own institution (ver. 4); *b.* Christ alone can qualify us for it; 2. In its object: it is not of the letter, but of the Spirit; 3. In its means: it relies upon, not an external glory, which for a while blinds the eye and then vanishes away (ver. 7), but the coöperation of the Holy Ghost (vers. 8 and 9); 4. In its reward: *a.* even in this world it has more glorious rewards than any other employment (ver. 10); *b.* but finally it conducts to eternal blessedness. II. The superior glory of the Church under the New Testament above that of the Church under the Old Testament: 1. It was founded by the Son, and not merely by the servant of God; 2. It is the ascendancy of the Spirit, and not of the letter; 3. Its worship and dignities are of a spiritual nature, and are sustained not merely by worldly influences; 4. It will continue forever.—OETTINGER:—The glory of spiritual instruction and the weakness of that teaching which has reference merely to morality, the law and the outward letter (Serm. on the Epist. for the 12th Sunday after Trinity).—A. F. SCHMIDT:—We should never separate by arbitrary and nice distinctions what God has wisely and graciously arranged together; especially: *a.* letter and Spirit (ver. 6); *b.* the preaching of the law and of the gospel (ver. 3); *c.* confidence in God and despair of ourselves (vers. 4 and 5); *d.* fidelity to our calling and an assurance of success.

VII.—DIFFERENT RESULTS OF THE TWO KINDS OF MINISTRY. HARDENING OF THE JEWS.

Chapter III. 12–18.

12 Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness [unreservedness] of
13 speech: And not as Moses, [*om. which*] put a veil over his[1] face, that the children of
Israel could [might] not steadfastly look to [upon] the end of that which is abolished:
14 But their minds were blinded [hardened]: for until this day[2] remaineth the same
veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which *veil* is done away in
Christ [upon the reading of the Old Testament remains the same veil untaken away,
15 because it is taken away (only) in Christ]. But even unto this day, when Moses is
16 read[3], the veil is [lies, κεῖται] upon their heart. Nevertheless, when it shall turn
17 [turns] to the Lord, the veil shall be [is] taken away. Now the Lord is that [the]
18 Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord *is* [*om.* there][4] *is* liberty. But we all, with
open [unveiled] face beholding as in a glass [mirror] the glory of the Lord, are
changed into the same image from glory to glory, [*om. even*] as by the Spirit of the
Lord [the Lord, the Spirit].

[1] Ver. 13.—Rec. has ἑαυτοῦ; but the best authorities have αὐτοῦ. [Since our author wrote, the authority of Sin. has been added to that of D. K., and Chrysost., and Theodt., (Oslander, Bloomf.), in favor of ἑαυτοῦ. A. B. C. F. L., 4 cursives, one MS. of Chrys., Damasc., Theophyl. and Oecum., (Lachm., Tisch., Alf., Meyer, Words.), are for αὐτοῦ. D. (1st Cor.) and F. omit τὸ before μή.]

[2] Ver. 14.—The best authorities insert ἡμέρας. [Omitted as superfluous, comp. ver. 15. D. E. F. G. Chrys. (Ital. Vulg. *etc.* have *in*) instead of επι have ἐν. Ὅτι in Stephens and Griesb. is written ὃ τι, and it is translated in the old Ital. and Vulg. *quoniam*; Wyclif.: "for it is avoided in Christ;" Rheims (in parenth.): "because in Christ it is made voide."]

[3] Ver. 15.—Lachm. [Alford] following excellent authorities [A. B. C. Sin. *et al.*] has ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται. But some [D. E.] have the subjunctive ἀναγινώσκηται without ἄν: and others have the Indicative—κεται with the ἄν. The first syllable of ἀναγιν. was probably written first by mistake twice: then the verb was made to agree with it in the subjunctive, and sometimes it remained so when the ἄν was erased, it being looked upon as governed still by the ἡνίκα (Meyer).

[4] Ver. 17.—Rec. has ἐκεῖ before ἐλευθερία contrary to the oldest and best MSS. [A. B. C. D. (1st Cor.), Sinait. (1 Cor.), the Copt. version, and Cyril and Nyssa. Lachm., Tisch. and Alford reject it, but Griesb. inserted it on the authority of D. (2d and 3d Cor.) E. F. G. K. L. Sinait. (3d Cor.) Goth. and Syr. versions and most of the Greek Fathers]. It was inserted according to the analogy of Matth. xvjii. 20, xxiv. 23; James iii. 16, *et al.* But Paul does not commonly use it after οὗ. Comp. Rom. iv. 15, and v. 20.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 12, 13. Having, therefore, such hope.—The ἐλπίς (hope) has reference to the future glory of the New Testament ministry as it had been alluded to in ver. 8. This glory had been called permanent in ver. 11, and was to be for the glorification of Christ when he should come to judgment. Some interpreters regard ver. 6 ff. as a digression, and think that we have here a resumption of the subject (οὖν) there broken off, and that ἐλπίς is here equivalent to πεποίθησις there. This is, however, directly opposed to the peculiar and essential signification of ἐλπίς, and to the connection. [That trust, even if we regard it as "filled out into hope by the intervening vision of the glory of his work" (Stanley), had reference rather to the results of his work, while this hope looked forward to something future and undeveloped]. The *therefore* (οὖν) introduces us to the practical results which were to follow the glorious ministration of the Gospel, and τοιαύτην (such) indicates the greatness or superiority of the hope.—**We use great boldness of speech.**—The whole tenor of the discourse shows us that παῤῥησία cannot mean the internal confidence or joyfulness which the Apostle felt, but the frank, open and unreserved manner which characterized his outward deportment, and the plainness or perspicuity (*evidentia*) which distinguished his addresses. [Chrysostom: "We speak out everywhere with all freedom, abating, concealing, mistrusting nothing; with confidence, as if we had no idea that we should injure your sight as Moses did that of the Israelites." The Greek word παῤῥησία embraces the three ideas of openness, candor, and boldness. Moses' address was interrupted by intervals of concealment, and was constantly reserved on account of his want of full confidence in his people. We have no reason for fears, distrust or concealment]. The connection is: The glory which is connected with the New Testament ministry, makes us unreserved in our communications with the people, and induces us to present divine truth unveiled before them. The very spirit of our religion also demands this, for God's people could never reach the glorious privileges he has promised them without an opportunity of looking freely and without reserve upon all that our system of religion contains. (Emmerling).—The phrase χρῆσθαι παῤῥησία occurs more than once in Plato. The idea contained in παῤῥησία χρώμεθα (Indicative, not Subjunctive) is carried out into more detail in ver. 13, though negatively by referring to an opposite kind of proceeding by Moses.—**And not as Moses put a veil over his face.**—This principal sentence is elliptical, because its predicate is to be found in the incidental remark made in connection with it. Such an ellipsis may be found in other Greek writings, but must here be supplied from the words used and the connection following. We may supply after καὶ οὐ, simply ποιοῦμεν (we do), or more freely, τίθεμεν κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ἡμῶν (we put a veil over our faces). The allusion is to a veiling process, quite different from the great boldness which had just been professed.

It is said that Moses put over his face a covering (veil); that the children of Israel might not gaze at (clearly see) the end of that which is passing away. By *τέλος τοῦ καταργουμένου* is meant either the *end*, the literal fading away of the splendor which was on Moses' face (though such a view would not correspond with the subsequent part of the representation); the end of that splendor regarded as the symbol of the whole Old Testament ministration (office) and possibly of the Old Testament dispensation (Religion) itself; or (throwing aside the whole idea of a symbol) of the ministration or institution itself; or the end of Moses himself as the representative of that institution (in which case the masculine would not agree with the neuter *τὸ καταργ.* of ver. 11); or the *design*, the purpose which that ministration or even the law itself was established to accomplish, the result to which that institution led, and for which it was prepared, *viz.*, the divine glory to be unveiled in Christ, and of which the veiled radiance on Moses' face was a symbol and reflection. (Comp. vv. 14, 18, chap. iv. 4, 6). Well established usage will not permit us to take *πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι* ecbatically [implying a mere consequence of a course of action, without reference to the views of the actors] in the sense of: so that, but we are obliged to understand by them the aim or purpose which the agents had in view. In every instance in which the phrase occurs in the New Testament it probably has reference to a subjective Divine purpose (comp. Meyer), and not to a merely objective result of divine arrangements. And yet we may suppose that so great a prophet as Moses, profoundly acquainted with the general scheme of the Divine administration, may have known that he was fulfilling a divine purpose, or at least that he was promoting such a result. That he was practising an intentional deception (Fritzsche), or was guilty of an improper dissimulation, the Apostle was far from implying. Even if we make the end of that which is passing away, refer to the end of Moses' ministry (comp. ver. 11), and suppose that Moses saw that end (*τέλος*) typified by the disappearance of the radiance from his face, such a covert proceeding (*tecte agere*) must be regarded simply as a pedagogic or disciplinary course of conduct. The same may be said of an interpretation proposed by Meyer (but which need not include a reference to a Rabbinic allegory), according to which Paul recognizes in *τέλος*, what he afterwards brings out more fully, *viz.*, a judicial or retributive proceeding, at least on God's part. This implies that a sight of the Divine radiance on Moses' face was withheld from the children of Israel, because their previous conduct had made them unworthy of such a favor. Such a concealment was a symbolical representation of the fact that in consequence of their sins, Moses, *i. e.*, the law represented by him, or the Scriptures of the Old Testament read by them, would remain so veiled before them, that they could never perceive the Divine glory which rested especially upon those Scriptures and those rites which testified of Christ; and accordingly they would continue in unbelief and have no part in the salvation by Christ. NEANDER: "The mind of the Apostle was entirely taken up with the symbolical meaning of this incident. Moses is in his eye simply a symbol of the whole legal economy, and from this point of view everything in the history is regarded. The covering which Moses used to conceal his face, represents the entire veil of symbols under which divine things were represented. As long as these divine things could be seen only in the light of the Old Testament, there was no way of distinguishing eternal truth from the temporary form in which it was represented to men (essence and symbol). The contrast here implied may therefore be carried out thus: we who make known the Gospel to men need never fear that its glory may some day come to an end. We may allow our hearers the clearest and freest inspection of its mysteries, and its radiance will only shine forth the more brightly."*

["The whole subsequent section (14—18) is parenthetical. Before and after it, the *ministry* is the subject; in it, *they to whom the ministry is directed.* But it serves to show the whole spirit and condition of the two classes, and thus further to substantiate the character of openness and freedom asserted of the Christian ministry" (ALFORD)].

VERS. 14–16. **But their minds** (mental perceptions) **were hardened** (made callous).—The words distinctly announce that this was a divine judgment. *Νοήματα* signifies not the already formed thoughts (chap. ii. 11), but as in chap. iv. 4; xi. 3, the spiritual sense, the power

[* Without resorting to the explanation that Paul was here allegorizing to such an extent as to be inconsistent with the literal account in Ex. xxxiv. 29–35, we have only to give a correct translation of the original Hebrew of that account to get clear of all difficulties. Such a correct translation was given by the Septuagint, which was evidently used by Paul, for he has in every corresponding place of our passage, used the very words of that version. (comp. Wordsworth). According to the history in Exodus, Moses came down from the mountain with his face irradiated; and when the people shrunk from him, he put over his face a veil (either the *Kenaa*, which covered the whole head and was in subsequent times worn by persons of eminence, as by Mahomet, Mokanna and others, or the *Letham*, which concealed only the face, comp. Rosenmueller), at *first*, to relieve their fears, but *afterwards*, in his ordinary intercourse with them (vv. 34 and 35) to conceal from them the termination (*τέλος*) of the radiance, or its cessation until he went again into the Divine presence. Our English version translates the three first Hebrew words of ver. 33 thus: "And *till* Moses had done speaking;" and other Protestant versions render the verb in the last part of the verse in a Pluperfect sense, and translate: "he *had* put on a veil." This makes the historian say that Moses did not put on the veil until he had *ceased* speaking to the people, and that he resumed it when he reëntered the Divine presence, which is in direct contradiction to Paul's view. The true rendering of the Hebrew and the Sept. is: "and when he had made an end (Piel) of speaking with them, he put a veil on his face." The Vulgate is correct in its rendering of this verse (*impletisque sermonibus, posuit velamen super faciem suam*), but a confusion is thrown upon the whole by its strange mistake in translating קָרַן (a denominative verb, signifying to emit rays, from קֶרֶן a *horn*) as if it signified, *to have horns* (*ignorabat quod cornuta esset facies sua*). Paul's use of this incident as an illustration (not an allegory) of the people's inability to endure the full glory of Divine truth and the consequent veiling of that truth under the types and shadows of the Old Dispensation, is perfectly natural. But as Clemens Alex. remarks, this veil was simply against the reading of the Old Testament while the heart remained rude and unsusceptible, and not *κατὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον ἐπιστροφήν, i. e.*, not against those who were inclined to see Christ in the Gospel, and to return to that Lord who was concealed behind that veil. Stanley in *Comm.* and in his *Lectt. on the Jewish Church* 1st series, p. 72, and in his article on Moses in *Smith's Dict.* Also Hodge on Corr. and Rosenmueller on Ex. xxxiv. 29–35].

used in thinking and willing (Beck, *Seelenl.* p. 59), or the various activities of the *νους* (Meyer). We may furthermore conceive (retaining the signification usually given: thoughts, intellectual perceptions), that these powers become petrified or hardened, *i. e.*, are put so completely into stocks, and made immovable, that they no longer yield to pressure, and can make no progress toward that clear knowledge on which everything depends. Πωρουν, (from Πῶρος, callus, an induration of the skin which destroys all sensibility), *obdurare*, to harden, to blunt (Isa. vi. 10; Mark vi. 52; viii. 17), is sometimes used with respect to the heart (*καρδία*. Rom. xi. 25), and sometimes of the Jews (*οἱ λοιποί*). We are left in doubt when this hardening took place, for this depends upon the relation given to *ἀλλά*. If this has reference to *παῤῥησια χρώμεθα*, and particularly to *καὶ οὐ* (ver. 13), meaning: "We act in an open manner, with no such concealment as Moses practised, and *yet* their *νοήματα* have become hardened," we must suppose that the hardening had but recently taken place when the Apostle wrote. But if we refer it to *πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι*, (*i. e.*, to their gazing, *etc.*), the hardening must have taken place in Moses' time, though the subsequent remarks show that it had continued to the Apostle's own time. It is in favor of the latter reference, that the veil is immediately afterwards the subject of discourse. In this case it is said directly that the minds of the people were hardened, that they might not look upon the end (scope, object) of that which is abolished. He proves and illustrates his position, that the hardening was not abolished, by an appeal to the actual facts before their eyes, in the condition of the nation at the time he was speaking:—**for until this day, the same veil remains on the reading of the Old Covenant.**—That these facts resulted from the same causes which were in action in Moses' day, he asserts by saying that the same veil (*τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα*) remains: for as a veil was interposed between the divine radiance on Moses' face and the eyes of the Israelites, so has the divine radiance of the Old Covenant been concealed from that people down to the period in which he was writing. [It is not directly implied that this veil was over the heart, under the preaching of the Gospel. The reference is solely to the Israelitish nation under the hearing and reading of the Old Covenant. But the change of the medium of communication makes necessary a change of figure. After Moses oral communications ceased—it was *a book* which spoke to them. The reason any do not see the glory when they *read*, is not in the book which addresses them, but in the heart of the reader. The active influence which obstructed the proper understanding of the truth was in the other direction, and the veil had to be on the heart. Comp. Alford.] It is as if a veil had been thrown over the reading, for the great truths of the Old Covenant were not recognized even when they were plainly read, and the glory of God actually contained in that dispensation remained a mystery to them. [In opposition to Theodoret, who maintains that the power which hardens, was entirely from within the heart itself, Meyer endeavors to show that the passive *επωρώθη* clearly implies that the hardening was the act of another (comp. Rom. xi. 7). The word signifies blindness (as in our authorized English version) only by a double metaphor, *i. e.*, by supposing that the intellect and heart lose their perceptive power. Chrysostom says the nation became "*τὸ παχὺ καὶ χαμαίζηλον*, stupid and grovelling," because they prided themselves on the superior glory of Moses.] Ἐπι may refer either to *place*, *i. e.*, *over* the reading, which would here correspond to the face of Moses when he spoke to the people; or (better) to *time*, *i. e.*, during the reading. Comp. ver. 15, *ἡνίκα ἀναγινωσκεται*, *etc.* We meet with the phrase *παλαιὰ διαθήκη* (Old Covenant) nowhere else in the New Testament; and it must here designate, not the original Scriptures, the collection of books which now bear the name, but the Covenant itself; the substance of what was read in the synagogues (the writings of Moses and the Prophets), whose types and promises contained the divine glory afterwards revealed in Christ. [Such an expression shows how deep was Paul's conviction, that that ancient covenant was now becoming antiquated, and was about to be superseded.]

In the remaining part of ver. 14, *μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον* may be construed as if the participle were to be taken absolutely—**it not being unveiled** (or discovered to them) **that it** (the Old Covenant) **is done away in Christ.**—Or, inasmuch as it remained concealed from the Jews that the Old Covenant was to be abrogated in consequence of the appearance and work of Christ (Rom. x. 4; Col. ii. 14). Such an expression would be a particular determination of what had been meant by saying that the same veil remains, *etc.* These words may, however, be joined with the previous words so as to say: "the same veil in the reading of the Old Covenant remains *not taken away*," and then *ὅτι ἐν χριστῷ καταργεῖται* gives us the reason: "because it is taken away in Christ." That this would actually take place *only* in Christ was a self-evident thing to the Apostle and his readers; and that this "*only*" is sufficiently indicated by the emphasis which must be laid upon *ἐν χριστῷ*, cannot be doubted. It is very natural, however, from the example of ver. 13, to refer *καταργεῖται* to the Old Covenant, and an entirely different word (*περιαιρεῖται*) is used with respect to the removal of the veil. On the other hand the structure of the sentence makes it natural to connect *ἀνακαλυπτόμενον* with *κάλυμμα*; and even if we have a right to use the participle in this case absolutely (since it is not common for any verbs to be used in this way except *ἐξόν*, *εἰρημένον*, and such like), it is hard to justify the use of *ἀνακαλυπτεῖν* in this absolute manner, inasmuch as everywhere else it has with it an accusative of the object. The attempt which Rückert has made to combine the two constructions together, and to make the Apostle say: "and will not be taken away, that they (the people) might see that it (the Old Covenant) has its end in Christ," has no claim to our acceptance. The reading *ὃ τι*, which Luther [and our Eng. translators] followed, and which makes the nature of the covering itself the reason for its not being removed (=*quippe quod*, Meyer) has opposed to it all the old versions, whose testimony on such a point should have especial importance. The positive contrast to the negative *μὴ ἀνακαλυπτ.* is given in ver. 16—

But even until this day when Moses is read, a veil lies upon their heart.—This means, according to the previous construction, either, "it will not be disclosed that, *etc.*, but until this day the veil is upon their hearts;" or "and will not be discovered, because it will be taken away in Christ, but until this day a covering lies," *etc.* The latter interpretation would not seem to have required the repetition of *κάλυμμα*. The want of the article may be accounted for on both interpretations on the ground that the veil is transposed from the object looked upon to the persons looking. This change may have been in the Apostle's mind when he wrote ver. 14, if *ἐπὶ* (*τῇ ἀναγν.*) be taken with respect to time, and then the present clause is only a more complete definition of that idea. In no case (even if *ἐπὶ* has the sense of on or over) could the Apostle have spoken of two coverings in order to imply a high degree of incapacity. This would have required an additional *καί* before *ἐπὶ τὴν καρδ. αὐτῶν*. This is the only time *ἡνίκα* is found in the New Testament, but in the Sept. it occurs frequently, and in this very passage in Ex. xxxiv. 34 it is used in the sense of a space of time =when. The name *Μωϋσῆς* signifies here the writings of Moses. The covering said to be extended ["*κεῖται ἐπί* with the accusative* pregnans: involving the being laid on and remaining there"—ALFORD] over the hearts of the people, signifies not an obstruction to their moral powers *i. e.*, of the will, but a defect in the intellectual faculties of understanding.—**But when it turns unto the Lord the veil is taken away** (ver. 16).—Here the veil in fact is said to be removed in consequence of an act of the will. The heart (*καρδία*), which is the subject of *ἐπιστρέψῃ* (for as *τις* or *Ἰσραὴλ* have not yet been mentioned, they cannot be made such a subject), seems to be regarded here in two aspects: first as the seat of intelligence, and then as the seat of the will or of self-determination. The *ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον*, is the turning of one's self to Christ, and this is a conversion just as far as it had been preceded by a turning away. In the rejection of the Lord the heart of the children of Israel was regarded as completely apostate, and hence its conversion to Christ would be looked upon as a return to the Lord. This conversion is supposed to have taken place before the veil is taken away, inasmuch as the latter is said to be the consequence of the former (*ἡνίκα ἂν*). Luther's translation: "*Wenn es sich bekehrte, so würde,*" *etc.*, (if it shall turn, the veil will, *etc.*), is incorrect, and would not perhaps have been made had the author of it not been influenced, probably unconsciously, by the idea that such a conversion before the removal of the veil was impossible. But the same assertion is found manifestly in Rom. xi. 25 ff. The Apostle is not speaking of those individual conversions which take place in every age. But when this general conversion shall be brought about, when that aversion to Christ which springs from a carnal mind and proud self-righteousness shall be overcome, and when, consequently, they shall confidingly and with sincere acknowledgements of their guilty error and unbelief, turn to Him, they will clearly discover as they read the Old Testament that it everywhere bears testimony for Christ. The Divine glory really contained in its types and prophecies, and now more fully revealed in Christ himself, will shine so clearly that they will be able to look upon it with a steadfast gaze. The expression reminds us of Ex. xxxiv. 34. In the mind of the Apostle the removal of the covering from Moses' face when he went again into the Divine presence seemed a type of the future removal of Israel's blindness. *Περιαιρεῖν* contains an intimation that the veil was completely around the heart. [As this is the verb used in the Sept. of Ex. xxxiv. 34, and as *περιῃρεῖτο* there and almost uniformly throughout that version can be taken only in an active sense, Stanley contends that the word here (*περιαιρεῖται*) should have an active and not a passive sense (strips off—not, is stript off). He also thinks that the only nominative which both *ἐπιστρέψῃ* and *περιαρεῖται* can have is *Μωϋσῆς* (and in *this* Calvin and Estius agree with him), since *Ἰσραὴλ* is too remote, and *ἡ καρδία* is not sufficiently prominent. He thinks that then each clause beginning with *ἡνίκα* will correspond, and that the parallel with Ex. xxxiv. 34 will be preserved. He takes Moses as the representative of not only the Old Covenant but of the nation, and makes the sense to be: "when Moses, in the person of his people, turns again to Him who is our Lord now as he went of old time to Him who was their Lord in Sinai, then he strips off the veil from his face and from their hearts, and then the perishable nature of the law will be made manifest in the full blaze of the Divine glory." But *ἡ καρδία* is quite as natural a subject for *ἐπιστρέψῃ*, and as likely to be prominent in the Apostle's mind as *Μωϋσῆς*, and the idea of *ἐπιστρέψῃ* is certainly that of a thorough conversion, and not a mere change of opinion about the law. The careful adoption by the Apostle of the words of the Sept., some of which were strange to him, shows that he was closely copying the imagery of the history; and he here intends to say, that as Moses had on a veil when his face was turned away from God, and took it off when he went in to God, so the heart of the people when turned from the Lord was veiled, and when it turned to him had the veil removed. Both *ἐπιστρέψῃ* and *περιαιρ.* should be rendered as an indefinite present and not in the future as in the authorized version. The turning and removing of the veil was in process of completion. The process was continually going on by the turning of individuals in every

[* Of the three explanations given of *μὴ ἀνακαλυπτ.* that of Luther and our Eng. version is now universally given up by all critical scholars for want of authority for its reading. That of our author ("the veil remains untaken away because it (the veil) is removed (only) by Christ") is adopted by most of the ancient expositors, de Wette, Neander, Wordsworth and Hodge, but is weakened by the awkwardness of saying that the *κάλυμμα* is *μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον*, by this transitive participle having no object, by *καταργ.* being used three times (vv. 7, 11, 13) with reference to the Old Covenant, and by the fact that it is not the *veil* but the dispensation which the Apostle is saying was abolished by Christ. On the other hand the third explanation ("the veil remains not to be taken away in the reading of the Old Covenant, it not being unveiled to them that it (the Old Covenant) is done away in Christ") is adopted by Chrysostom, Meyer, Bloomfield, Osiander, Conybeare, Alford and Stanley, makes a natural use of *ἀνακαλ.* since the end of the O. T. was the very thing which was under a veil; makes good sense; and has only the difficulty of the absolute participle, but is quite consistent with the symbolism of the entire section. Comp. especially **Stanley and Hodge.**

age, though the general conversion was in the distant future.]

VERS. 17-18.—**Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, is liberty**—(ver. 17). This sentence is connected with ver. 16, and explains or gives the reason for what is said there. We have in fact a syllogism, though its several members are not given in their regular order. The *major premise* is: Where the Spirit of the Lord is, is freedom; the minor is: as the Lord is the Spirit, whoever turns to the Lord has that Spirit; and the conclusion is: therefore such a one must be free, and will no more be enveloped by the covering which veils and checks the action of the soul (Meyer). It is evident from ver. 18 that the liberty connected with the removal of the covering which obstructed the people's open insight into the divine glory, is not a new subject of discourse foreign to what had been discussed, as *e. g.*, a freedom from the yoke of the law (though this must be virtually communicated during such an insight). Ὁ δὲ κύριος is intimately connected with ver. 16: 'But the Lord, to whom their heart thus turns, is the Spirit.' Many artificial explanations have been given of this verse. Without noticing those attempts which have been in direct contradiction to the meaning of the words and the scope of the context, (one of which went so far as to conjecture that the reading must have been οὐ δὲ κύριος) we find here such an identification of Christ and the Holy Spirit, that the Lord, to whom the heart turns, is in no practical respect different from the Holy Spirit received in conversion. The fellowship of Christ into which it entered, when it turned to the Lord, was in truth the fellowship of the Holy Spirit. Christ is virtually the Spirit, inasmuch as He communicates Himself in conversion, and at other times by means of the Spirit; the Holy Spirit is His spirit: the animating principle of the Lord's indwelling and influence in the hearts of believers is this Holy Spirit (comp. Rom. viii. 9 ff.; Gal. ii. 20, iv. 6; Phil. i. 19; Acts xx. 28 comp. with Eph. iv. 11; John xiv. 18 *et. al.*). In favor of this explanation is the immediately following phrase: οὗ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου (where the Spirit of the Lord is), in which we may notice also, that the article before πνεῦμα indicates that every thing which is certainly the work of the Spirit, must be exclusively from Christ (Neander). But such a virtual identification of Christ and the Spirit, can have reference only to Christ in His state of exaltation (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 45); for it is only in that state that He is the independent source of all divine light and power to the bodies and souls of believers. He is then no longer dependent upon any source beyond Himself, for the divine light and power which he possesses or dispenses: and the Son of man is no longer the Son of God in a state of self-renunciation, dependent upon the influences of the Spirit, but a perfect centre of divine fulness. Hence, we may say of Him: he is the Spirit, (not merely *quasi*) because he is glorified in the spiritual world. From this it moreover follows (for the idea is essential to that of the Spirit of God), that the new birth, (in which what is here called liberty, *i. e.*, the free action of the mind, a free intuition of the divine glory, and a release from the impediments of a fleshly nature, is included) must have its source in Him. He it is who makes like Himself those who turn to Him, and from Him proceeds the pure free light of life (the truth which makes us free). Hence no sooner is it said that the Lord is the Spirit than He is called the Spirit of the Lord. [Paul had been speaking of a spirituality in the ancient dispensation, which had been entirely missed by the ancient Jews. This abstract spirituality he wished to connect with a concrete reality, and hence he here says that the Lord (to whom the heart of the people must turn) is that Spirit. Even this Lord, he also wishes to identify (not in his essential nature, but in his activity in this special department) with the Holy Spirit (who, the next verse shows, is here meant). Comp. Alford. The ancient fathers (especially Chrysostom and Augustine, see Wordsworth) were led by their extreme dogmatic zeal to press this verse into a proof of the Holy Spirit's divinity. They almost universally construed τὸ πνεῦμα as the subject, and ὁ κύριος as the predicate of the sentence. Grammatically this is allowed to be perhaps possible, (Alford, Meyer), but it is evidently forced, and the sentiment so expressed would be entirely foreign to the course of the Apostle's argument. It is only inferentially from the identity of our Lord's and the Spirit's operations, that such a doctrine here enters]. In ver. 18 he refers still further to the way in which this freedom, which has its source in the Lord and his Spirit, is produced among those who believe in Christ. In illustrating this he now recurs to the figure of the glory and the free looking upon it. —**But we all with open face.**—The object of δὲ is, not to put what was now to be said in contrast with what had been said of the Israelites or of Moses, (as if his idea was: "this is true not only of one, but of all,") but simply to indicate a continuance of the discourse. Ἡμεῖς (we) includes not merely the Apostle and his fellow-laborers, or the Apostle and all who preach the Gospel (Catholics appeal to chap. iv. 1, and contrast πάντες (all) with the single individual Moses), but all believers, who, the connection shows, must be included in the πάντες. (Chap iv. 3 and 6). In correspondence with the removal of the veil and the liberty of which he had been speaking, he now speaks of an open or unveiled face (ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ). This implies that the covering which had been extended over the heart of the people might be taken off, and that the spiritual face might thus be freed from the veil which prevented its vision of the glory. In consistency with this, must be our explanation of the next clause:—**beholding in a glass**—(κατοπτριζόμενοι). This word, which is not found at all in the Septuagint, and occurs in the New Testament only in this place, has the sense in the active voice of: to show in a mirror, or, as in a mirror, to reflect; and in the middle: to reflect one's self, to see one's self in a glass [WINER, § 39, 3; JEFF., § 362 ff.]. With reference to the example of Moses, we may interpret the words thus: we show to ourselves in a mirror the glory of the Lord; and in doing so we are not veiled as Moses, but we have uncovered faces. We are compelled, however, by both the preceding and the succeeding context, to think of a looking o-

believers, 1, in contrast with the Israelites, who were kept from looking upon the Divine glory by a covering upon their hearts; and 2, with reference to the being changed (*μεταμορφοῦμεθα*) connected with this looking (comp. 1 Jno. iii. 2). *Κατοπτρίζεσθαι* has therefore the meaning in this place of: to perceive as in a mirror (we meet with the word in this sense in Philo.; see Meyer). There is no imperfection of vision necessarily implied here, as in 1 Cor. xiii. 12. The glass is not the internal spirit, *i. e.*, the heart of the believer (for the eye which looks is supposed to be there), but the Gospel.—**The glory of the Lord** (*i. e.*, of Christ, not of God) is the representation which is given of Christ's life, greatness, power, loveliness, *etc.* (Beck, *Christl. Lehrwiss.* I., p. 67), or of His grace and truth (Jno. i. 14), His holiness and Divine fulness (Col. ii. 9), as these were manifested among men. These are exhibited to us in the Gospel as in a mirror. And as we look into this by faith, freely and unobstructed by any covering of a fleshly mind (such as impeded the vision of the Jews)—**we are changed into the same image.**—The image here is the image of the Lord, and that with which it is said to be identical (*αὐτὴν*), is not the *πάντες* (as if he would thus say that all were made alike), but that which they had been said to look upon, *viz.*, the very same image which we all behold, for we all behold the glory of the Lord as in a mirror. While thus looking we shall be changed: we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is (1 Jno. iii. 2; comp. Rom. viii. 29). Neander: "We have here a beautiful contrast: the Jews who looked with covered faces upon the glory in Moses' face, did not really look into it, and so remained as they were before, unchanged. But when Christians look with unveiled faces upon the image of God in Christ, this very looking implies that they are already in communion with Christ, and necessarily reacts upon their internal and spiritual life. The more they penetrate by such a believing contemplation the Divine glory, the more will their hearts be pervaded by what they behold." There is no direct reference therefore to the final transformation which believers will experience when Christ shall come in the Parousia, but only to the gradual assimilation to Christ which takes place in them during the present life: the becoming partakers of the Divine nature (2 Pet. i. 4) and the putting on, of Christ, and of the new man (Rom. xiii. 14; Eph. iv. 24). The accusative does not require that any word like *κατά* or *εἰς* should be understood; nor need the whole phrase be taken in an adverbial sense analogous to *τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον* (in this wise); for in the very idea it is implied that the development or change is according to a particular form (Meyer). In the phrase: **from glory to glory**, the words *from* glory (*ἀπὸ δόξης*) may designate the causal source from which the influence proceeds, *i. e.*, "the glory of the Lord;" and *to* glory (*εἰς δόξαν*) the glory which is produced in us, that to which it brings us (comp. chap. ii. 16); or the whole phrase may signify the continuous development as it advances step by step. The former explanation receives support from the sentence which immediately follows:—**as by the Lord the Spirit** (*καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος*). And yet the other explanation harmonizes very well with *μεταμορφούμεθα*, and on etymological grounds may readily be conceded, inasmuch as *ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν* would be quite as allowable a form of speech as *ἐκ δυνάμεως εἰς δύναμιν* (Ps. lxxxiv. 8). The *καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρ. πν.* may also be made to harmonize very well with this explanation: we shall be changed from one degree of glory to another just as might be expected from the Lord (or according to the nature of what comes from the Lord). The *καθάπερ* has a more forcible signification than *ὡς*, and denotes the agreement of the effect with the cause (like *ὡς* in chap. ii. 17). We may inquire whether *πνεύματος* in the phrase *ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος* is dependent upon *ἀπὸ* and *κυρίου* upon *πνεύματος* [by the Spirit of the Lord], comp. ver. 17, *πνεῦμα κυρίου*; or whether *πνεύματος* is governed by *κυρίου* [by the Lord of the Spirit], in which case we may also inquire whether the words *πνεύμ.* and *κυρ.* are in the relation of dependence (by the Spirit which is from the Lord), or in that of apposition (by the Spirit who is the Lord). To govern *πνεύματος* directly by *ἀπὸ* is not allowable evidently on account of the position of the words. We must certainly concede also that the relation of apposition is not as natural as that which is commonly given to the genitive. The relation of dependence which has commonly been acquiesced in for our passage gives us likewise a very good sense: "very much as we might expect from one who is the Lord of the Spirit" (comp. *κύριος τῆς δόξης* in 1 Cor. ii. 8). *Κυριος* (Lord) furthermore implies that the Lord not only has or possesses the Spirit, but that He has complete power in this matter to direct in the dispensation and communication of the Spirit according to His pleasure in ever growing fulness. If we so construe it as to make this Spirit the same as the Holy Spirit, even that Divine agent is *His* Spirit (Rom. viii. 9 f.; Gal. iv. 6), for the Spirit is shed forth or sent, by and through Him (Tit. iii. 6; Acts ii. 33; Jno. xv. 26); so that the Spirit's agency among men is dependent upon Him. If, however, the words are taken in a qualitative sense: "by one who is the Lord of the Spirit," *i. e.*, of the Divine light of life, this Divine light of life is no other than the *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* which He communicates from the infinite fulness of His own Divine life. The want of the article before both *κυρίου* and *πνεύματος* makes this qualitative signification most probable. [As Meyer well remarks, however, this qualitative meaning is entirely inadmissible here, since throughout our passage the word *πνεῦμα* must mean the Holy Spirit (the Divine Spirit) in His personal subsistence]. Both interpretations, however, terminate in the same general sense. Neander: "Paul has before his mind in this passage the whole course of the Christian's progress, commencing here on earth and attaining its perfection in the heavenly world."

[Each prominent word in this passage has been made the object of special attention and difficulty. 1. *The object beheld*, was the glory of the Lord. Paul had shown this to be Christ (ver. 17), but He is here contemplated as an image (*εἰκόνα*) in a mirror (not "a glass," but *κατόπτρου*). An image is usually an imperfect likeness (1 Cor. xiii. 12), and the Gospel must imperfectly repre-

sent Him. It is not the objective and glorified Christ Himself that we see. 2. *The act of beholding*, is here (not ἀτενίζω, as with Moses, but) κατοπτρίζω. The rays are reflected and not directly received (see Chrysostom's beautiful comparisons in the Hom. notes). The ancient expositors usually interpreted this word in the sense of: *reflecting* as in a mirror, meaning that believers reflect the glory of the Lord, and they are followed by Luther, Olshausen, Billroth and Stanley. But most modern commentators have felt compelled to disregard their authority, high as it is on such a question, and to take the word in the sense of *beholding* as in a mirror. Though they have been able to appeal to but one well established quotation (Philo) to sustain them in such a usage, one instance especially in Alexandrian Greek is sufficient, with the obvious necessities of the context, to warrant us in adopting such a meaning. Certainly no instance has been found in which the word has the meaning: *to reflect*, and we can see no connection between reflecting the Divine image and being changed into the same. 3. *The persons beholding*, are *many*, "all (πάντες in contrast with one Moses), with open face." Both Christ and the heart are ἀνακεκαλυμμένοι. 4. *The effect of the beholding* is, "we are metamorphosed into the same image" (accusative without a preposition to show the immediateness of the transition, and the present indic. to show the beginning but not the completion of the change, WEBSTER, *Syn.*, pp. 81 ff.). All become like their Lord, and of course like one another. 5. *The reason for the change*, "as by the Lord the Spirit." Suitably, as might be expected from the Lord (καθάπερ), and efficiently (ἀπὸ) from Him as the source of influence. We cannot but sympathize with Alford when he says of the rendering: the Lord of the Spirit, that it "seems to convey very little meaning, besides being altogether unprecedented." We add that Paul had been preparing us for the expression: the Lord the Spirit (apposition, the Lord who is the Spirit) by expressly showing that Christ was both the Lord and the Spirit of the Old Covenant (vers. 16, 17 and 18). Such an expression seems as grammatical and suitable as "from God the Father" (ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς) in Rom. i. 7; Eph. i. 2; Phil. i. 2, *et alic.* comp. 2 Cor. i. 2].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Even in the understanding of revealed truth, there is a clear distinction between legal bondage and evangelical freedom. Until the mind gets extricated from that bondage it is concerned only with a multiplicity of special details; the living unity formed by the general truths, in which all these concentrate, is covered by a veil—and no proper conception of the divine system as a whole, is possible. The glory of Christ which constitutes the true aim of every part of God's word can never be appreciated or discovered by a heart thus confined and lowered, for such occupations will be like a veil over the internal eye. But no sooner does one attain the position of evangelical freedom than his eye is opened upon the general system and principles of truth. And such a position is gained when the heart is turned toward Christ, in whom the fulness of the Godhead substantially dwells, all particular rays of truth concentrate, and each truth acquires a self-evidencing power. The moment we thus recognize and surrender our hearts to Christ, we renounce all idea of satisfaction in ourselves or our doings, and we lay hold on Christ as the only source of peace or life. The veil immediately drops from our spiritual face, the divine glory in the Scriptures acquires a wonderful lustre, our souls become thoroughly enamored of God in Christ, and we begin to grow into the image of holy love as it beams from the Gospel. A living likeness of Christ is formed within, old things pass away, and all things are created anew. A quickening light brightens up within us, from glory to glory unto the perfect day of the celestial life.

2. This legal position may be illustrated in all those who turn from the more perfect revelation God has given us in the Gospel, but especially in the Jewish people still clinging to a dispensation which was intended to be only provisional and shadowy. In religious matters, their intellectual faculties have always been torpid and inflexible; and they seem unable to leave the schoolmaster, whose only business was to direct them to Christ himself (Gal. iii. 24). They know only the law as given by Moses, and nothing of grace and truth by Jesus Christ (John i. 17). By minute acts of obedience to many particular precepts they hope to merit the divine favor, and they fail of recognizing that righteousness of faith which renounces all merit and trusts to mere grace, though it was often illustrated in the lives of their own saints, and in all the dealings of God under the ancient covenant. In like manner when they contemplated their prophetic Scriptures, their minds were occupied only with such particular expressions as best accorded with their carnal notions, and they failed to comprehend that general kingdom in which all such specifications find their right position and unity. But a time is coming when not only a few individuals, as in past and present times, but the whole nation shall become tired of such things, and with humble hearts and broken spirits shall turn to Him who was promised and offered first, and who still offers Himself, to them as their Messiah. In His own time He will so present Himself to them, that they will confess with shame, that He, and He alone, is their Messiah; with a free and clear insight they will read that Word which has so long been a sealed book (Isa. xxix. 10 ff); the covering shall be taken away from their hearts; and they will look with unveiled faces upon that Christ who is not only their true Lord, but the Spirit, and communicates the Spirit and spiritual liberty to all who turn to Him.

[3. The Old Testament should be studied under the New Testament light. Not only should we throw ourselves back among the persons and scenes there portrayed, so as to understand what was real and necessary for them, but as much as possible look on them in their relation to the whole future of God's kingdom. As a part of a preparatory system, directed by a Ruler who sees the end from the beginning, all persons and events have quite as much significance with reference to something in the future, as with reference to the age and circumstances in which they were

A Grotius therefore, who found a Christ nowhere in the Old Testament, fails of reaching its true significance, quite as much as a Cocceius, who found Him in everything.

4. The Lord Jesus was as fundamental a reality under the Old Covenant as under the New. He "was that Spirit" which was truly under the letter, and "the Lord" from whom the people then turned. The Incarnation was not the first and abrupt entrance of a divine Person into our humanity. Christ was not only "the body" to every "shadow" (Col. ii. 17) but the agent in every event and institution of the ancient covenant. Every redeemed sinner of every age must owe not only his redemption to "the blood of the cross," but his recovery and conduct unto actual salvation, to him as the "Captain of the Lord's host." He is the only Mediator between God and man; and whatever falsehood we discover under the Rabbinic fables of the "Angel Jehovah," we must recognize "the Lord the Spirit" under the "Jehovah" of the ancient covenant.

5. And yet there is an essential distinction between the Old and the New Dispensation. If we refuse to go with many who would totally divorce Christianity from Judaism, we equally shrink from those who look upon it simply as a developed Judaism. Though every dispensation of the true religion must be built upon the same fundamental principles, their outward forms may be radically different. The patriarchal and Mosaic ministrations were predominantly and characteristically legal. The latter especially, was a system of minute rules, and but few principles. Little was left to discretion or free affection. Pardon was shadowed forth as well as human guilt under the sacrifices, but these were a veil which concealed a mystery not to be trusted to men's weakness. An esoteric reserve was in every rite and symbol. The New Covenant abolishes all this. God's people are entrusted with the highest mysteries. The *disciplina* of Hellenism, of Rabbinism, and of Sacerdotalism generally, is entirely abjured. All idea of a pedagogic system, preparatory to something hereafter, is renounced. God's people are no longer in pupilage, but in their full majority. Christianity is an everlasting Gospel, and the last of all conceivable dispensations of the true religion among men. See a *Sermon of Dr. Emmons*, on "The Mosaic Dispensation abolished by the Christian Dispensation." *Works*, Vol. VI. Ser. 13.

6. Congeniality of mind is indispensable to a perception of the truth. No one is prepared to study theological truth until he has "turned to the Lord." When he yearns after the Lord and salvation, *then* the veil which confined the view to what is selfish and individual, drops off from the heart, and a full system of truth and an everlasting kingdom beams upon an "open face." John vii. 17.

7. The Jewish people are yet to be converted to Christ. It is a wonderful prophecy which the ancient Prophets and Apostles have given us, that amid the wreck of all ancient nations, the Jewish, the most unlikely to do so of them all, should survive; and that the heart (the collective national heart) would turn to Christ. This is a separate matter from the assertion, that as the "Covenant people," they are to have *special* privileges and honors among other nations *in* the kingdom of Christ.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

CHRYSOSTOM:—VER. 18. "As soon as we are baptized, our souls being cleansed by the Spirit are illuminated so as to shine brighter than the sun; we not only look into the divine glory, but we receive a degree of lustre from it, as a piece of pure silver receives the rays of the sun when it is placed within its beams and reflects them—not merely because of its own nature, but because of the sun's luminousness. In like manner the soul which has been purified and made brighter than silver, receives a beam of the Spirit's glory, and reflects it." [THEODORET:—As clear water presents an image of those who look upon it, of the sun itself and of the vaulted sky, so the pure heart is converted into a kind of copy and mirror of the divine glory.]

STARKE:—VER. 12. Whoever would cheerfully speak of divine truth, must first receive Christ freely and joyfully to his own heart, and believe that salvation is freely offered to all men (1 Tim. ii. 4). HEDINGER:—ver. 13. Israel's blindness was more than common; they had much preaching and but slight impression; Moses' face shone brightly upon them, and why could they not behold him? A brutish habit, a dull intellect, inveterate wickedness, and an irreconcilable antipathy to God and His Word, had formed a thick covering around their hearts (chap. iv. 3). Ver. 14:—HEDINGER. Israel's blindness was not a mere natural effect, but a judgment of God that they might henceforth be ever reading but learning nothing. What multitudes seem in haste to harden their hearts by their abuse of hearing and reading! Why do they read at all, if they have no desire to be healed (Mark iv. 25)? If we would derive any profit from reading the Old Testament, or get rid of Moses' covering, we must become acquainted with Jesus Christ and seek for Him there. Then shall we perceive that the law was never given us to justify us, and that the only justification which will avail before God, is not in ourselves, but in Christ by faith.—Ver. 15. It is a terrible thing to be blind, but to be blind with no desire to see in the midst of clear light, is far worse (John ix. 39; Rev. iii. 17).—Ver. 16. We can never have a true practical knowledge of God except by turning to the Lord. Ver. 17. To have Jesus alone, is to have the Gospel comfort and the sweetest pleasure. The surest refreshment is found in the way of godly sorrow. Glorious triumph of faith! The curse is abolished, Satan is vanquished, and sin is taken away; every cord is cut, and we are free!—Ver. 18: A knowledge of God's love, holiness and goodness as they are presented in the Gospel, is like a clear reflection of the sun, it produces a copy of those divine perfections in the soul, which receives the impression as naturally as the eye does an image from the mirror. The more we receive of such knowledge, the more perfectly are those attributes reproduced in our faith and life.—HEDINGER: Imprint, O Jesus, thine image on our souls, and make us more entirely like thyself!

Berlenb. Bible, Ver. 12:—A spiritual mind knows in whom it has believed, and the Spirit of the Son will lead it directly to the Father, that it may know and make known to others, both the Father and the Son. This is the perpetual well-spring of an ingenuous spirit.—Ver. 13. Why should any now be kept back by a slavish, timid and hesitating spirit, when they have a right to claim all the blessings of divine grace?—Ver. 14. "They have eyes, and yet they see not." It is all the same as if they could not read. This is a righteous judgment upon them for shutting themselves from the light, and refusing to be drawn by the Father. "Ye search the Scriptures, and ye do well; but ye will not come to me"—(John v. 39–40). Thus it is among many at the present day; indeed a double covering is now in their way, for it rests not only upon the Old, but upon the New Testament. They have never been anointed with the Spirit; they will not humbly bow before the Lord, and their own righteousness always stands before them as an idolatrous pillar. Ver. 15. Let us by all means get out of that old Judaism which receives nothing but what pleases us—for it is under the influence of such a spirit that the hearts of many are hardened, and hypocritically indulge in a thousand prejudices against the truth and its proper spirit. "Are we not Lutherans," they exclaim, "have we not been baptized, *etc.*" Those who resist the truth, tell us much of certain intellectual powers with which man is endowed (reason). We would not despise these, but we dare not appeal to them as the final arbitrators and sources of religious truth. And yet this is what has bewitched multitudes of our learned men.—Ver. 16. Let men cease to prescribe barren rules and institutions for the Lord, and let them turn to Him prayerfully and with all their hearts, and they will soon find that their light will brighten, a host of prejudices will vanish, and darkness and error will be cleared away—(Isa. xxv. 7). Though the covering may have wrapped itself completely around our spirits, if we will but turn to the light and seek wisdom from God in sincere faith, it will be torn away. (Eph. v. 14; Acts ix. 11, 18).—Oftentimes when an intelligent man imagines that he has attained a permanent and lively conception of sacred mysteries, he receives the Divine anointing, and finds that a number of coverings had been formed upon his heart; he is surprised to gain entirely new views of God's word, and as the salve of God's Spirit gradually extends over his mental eye, one film of legal and figurative forms after another falls off.—Ver. 17. The Lord is the Spirit who gives us spiritual life, and delivers us from all constraint of external authority, all unwillingness, indolence and feebleness, *etc.*, in the performance of our duties. (John viii. 36). The glory of the Lord then sheds its beams upon an open face.—Whoever truly looks into the ministry and law of liberty, can never be out of harmony with the Divine will, for the Spirit directs him and supplies him with all he needs. He can have no fellowship with any thing which is impure, for the Spirit is always directing his mind to those higher and better things which satisfy him. Such is the spiritual freedom which withdraws us from the slavery of sense, and not only subjects the body to the spirit but the spirit itself to God's Spirit.—The way by which we reach it is very likely by a painful experience of what a legal bondage is. Under such sorrows faith in Christ puts forth its power and finds deliverance in Him. Then the humbled heart knows how to appreciate the freedom of a pure service, and yields a cheerful obedience. Without making a sinful conscience of any thing, it will indulge in no sin, and will rather renounce its own freedom on account of another's weakness.—What before seemed a severe discipline and torment, is now a light which drives away all darkness. The soul is in the light and walks in the light.—Where the Lord is, He has a sanctuary in which He and His Spirit dwells; a glorious ministration of the Spirit is carried on; God is worshipped in the beauty of holiness; and a new life, and a new freedom, and a blessedness never known before, is enjoyed.—Ver. 18. As sunbeams produce an image of the sun, so the beams of Divine glory produce a Divine likeness.—If we will but stand before the mirror of our crucified Lord, His lovely image will so impress itself upon our hearts that we shall partake of His peculiar Spirit. Loving Him with all our hearts we must become like Him. We shall thus in our measure see God as we walk, and possess a more than ordinary enjoyment of God and of His glory.—And yet such a transformation must not be expected at once, but gradually, from one degree of glory and Divine blessedness to another (comp. iv. 16); and always in a way which makes us feel our dependence upon grace (as by the Spirit of the Lord). The moment we take our eyes from Him we shall fall back into stiff and legal forms.—All true Christians, in proportion to their susceptibility, must even in this life have a part in Christ's glory. Obstinate sinners, on the other hand, will be overshadowed by the image of Satan, from one degree of darkness to another as by the Spirit of the pit.

Rieger, Ver. 12:—We must often think of the permanent results of our preaching in another world. (1 Thess. ii. 19). "If we make it our constant and all absorbing aim to please the Lord Jesus and to stand approved at His coming, we cannot but be more earnest in our work and more untiring in our diligence and patience. If I would not lose my own soul and be rejected as an unprofitable servant, I must be sure of finding some souls who have been benefited by my ministrations. The Lord grant it for Christ's sake." (Seitz)!—A sincere and honest preacher will not hesitate to speak boldly from the fulness of his heart whatever he thinks may be useful to his fellow men.—Vv. 13–16. It is not uncommon for those to become hardened in heart (and this is nothing but one kind of blindness, or at least of unsusceptibilty) who are ignorantly familiar with God's Word, but are obstinately set upon their own way and make use of that word only for a pretext.—Vv. 17–18. Turning to the Lord is turning to Him who gives the Spirit. He secures to us the righteousness which the law demands, and enables us to serve God under a free dispensation of the Spirit. This is spiritual freedom, seeing every thing without a covering, and coming boldly to a throne of grace. We look with an uncovered face upon the glory of

the Lord in the Gospel as in a mirror, and we convey the image which thus falls upon our hearts to our fellow men, that their eyes also may be opened, and their hearts may be won for Him.—The lustre of Moses' face was liable to fade away and cease forever, but our glory advances from one degree to another, until that shall appear which we shall be, when we see our Lord as He is.

Heubner, Ver. 15: A perusal of the Scriptures without intellectual energy or susceptible hearts can do no one any good. And yet even many nominal Christians may unhappily fancy that they are models of virtue; and from that moment the true Christ, who is our only available righteousness, is under a veil. The very law which should teach them their poverty and drive them to Christ and His righteousness, serves only to make them fancy themselves rich and able to get along without Christ.—Ver. 16: Believe in Christ, and then the soul and the whole Bible will be full of light.—Ver. 17: The same Christ, in whom the Spirit dwells, must bestow that Spirit upon men. There can be no Spirit without Him. He alone can free us from the fetters of error and delusion, and then we shall know what a free faith, a free will and a free enjoyment and love are. True freedom is wherever a man is not hampered by selfishness, *i. e.*, by his own opinions and purposes, and when Christ has the supreme control of his whole being.—Ver. 18: Has thy soul the features of Christ: truth, love, meekness, fidelity (Matth. xi. 29)? The looking upon Christ has this power, because the image which the Gospel presents of Him is spiritual and quickening. The Spirit comes from Christ.

W. F. Besser, Vers. 12: The evangelical minister's joy is the dawn of an eternal day begun in time. It is the joy of our Lord, the faithful Witness from the bosom of the Father, showing us plainly of the Father (Jno. xvi. 25).—Ver. 14: God often gives up (Rom. ix. 18) those who are obstinate and disobedient to be hardened and blinded by the preaching of the same word whose softening and enlightening influence they had resisted. The law will be a school-master to bring those to Christ (Gal. iii. 24) who commit themselves to its discipline, and never think of blunting the point of its deadly letter by their self-righteous performances; but it will only harden those whose perverted and carnal minds fancy that they are righteous before God, because they externally keep His commandments and go through certain forms of worship. It depends not so much upon the kind of Scripture which we read, as upon the manner in which we read it, whether it shall be unmeaning and sealed to us.—Ver. 15: Even to the present hour God is punishing the sins of the wicked children of wicked ancestors with the veil which Moses put upon his face. The heart's covering is woven out of those delusions into which the natural man so often falls with respect to the merit of free will and the goodness of merely outward works.—Ver. 16: It is only "in Thy light that we see light" (Ps. xxxvi. 10); for the glory of Moses and the prophets has not been uncovered even by the appearance of the true Light Himself. It is not in the light of common sense nor the light of philosophical schools, says Hamann, that we see light, but only in the light of the Lord who is the Spirit.—Ver. 17: The Lord is wherever the Spirit converts, enlightens and quickens the hearts of men. This is in the Church of the New Testament, where He Himself dwells by His word and Spirit, and where He has declared that He is to be found. And yet where the Spirit of the Lord is, is freedom (Jno. viii. 36; Rom. viii. 15) from every legal letter which kills and condemns, or obliges and compels any one.—Ver. 18: We look upon the Lord's glory with uncovered faces: the covering upon our hearts has been removed, for we see *ourselves*, sinful and condemned as we are in the flesh; and then the covering has been removed from before the Divine heart, for we now see Him, our gracious God and merciful Father, as He is in Christ. However many of us there may be who with uncovered faces behold the glory of the Lord, we shall all be changed into the single image of our common Lord, although its manifold glories are shed forth in separate features from the various members of His general Church; and its collected radiance, like the seven-fold colors of the rainbow, are given forth, not from any single Christian, but from the whole collected body of Christ.

[Whitby has given us six particulars in which the Apostle presents the superiority of the Gospel to the law (in substance) as follows: "1. Sinai's glory only made the people afraid, the Gospel's gives confidence and joy; 2. Moses gave only a letter which killed, the Gospel gives spirit and life; 3. Moses' glory diminished and finally vanished forever, but the glory of the Gospel increases and has no end; 4. The law sought reserves under many shadows and ceremonies, the Gospel has but few fixed forms and seeks only a complete display of its truths and spirit; 5. The law could not remove the veil from men's hearts, the Gospel gives us all open faces; 6. Israel looked only upon Moses' radiance, Christians look directly upon a glorified God-Man, whose lustres transform them into His own likeness. Stanley's beautiful summary of the Apostle's imagery in this chapter, though slightly affected by his peculiar interpretation of ver. 16, is yet worth transcribing (much abridged). We have: 1. The commendatory epistle, written on the Apostle's heart; and, 2. the same written on the hearts of the Corinthians. 3. The contrast between this Epistle of the Spirit on the heart, and the lifeless engraving upon the Sinaitic stones. 4. The grand figure of Moses with his face irradiated by Divine glories. 5. The same, but veiled, to hide its fading splendors, and surrounded by a multitude of veiled figures with eyes turned upon him. 6. The same, but unveiled, and entering the Divine presence with more than rekindled radiance; and 7. The same figure multiplied in the Apostle and his brethren, with unveiled faces turned toward Christ, whose light transfigures them into glorious images of Himself."]

VIII.—GLORY OF THE APOSTOLIC MINISTRY, WHOSE DUTIES WERE OPENLY AND HONESTLY PERFORMED, NOTWITHSTANDING THE INJURIOUS INFLUENCE OF ITS ENEMIES.

CHAPTER IV. 1–6.

1 Therefore, seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not[1];
2 But [we] have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty [shame, *τῆς αἰσχύνης*], not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully [falsifying (*δολοῦντες*) the word of God]; but by manifestation of the truth, commending[2] ourselves to every
3 man's conscience [conscience of men] in the sight of God. But if [and even if] our Gospel be hid [veiled, *κεκαλυμμένον*], it is hid [veiled] to them that are lost [perishing]:
4 In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel [gospel of the glory] of Christ, who is the image of
5 God, should shine[3] unto them [should shine forth]. For we preach not ourselves, but
6 Christ Jesus [as] the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. For [that same] God, who commanded the light to shine[4] out of darkness, [said out of darkness light should shine] hath shined in our hearts, to *give* the light [in order to the shining forth, *πρὸς φωτισμὸν*] of the knowledge of the glory of God[5] in the face of Jesus [*om.* Jesus][6] Christ.

[1] Ver. 1.—The Recep. has *ἐκκακοῦμεν*, but Lachmann and Tischendorf have *ἐγκακοῦμεν*. Meyer thinks the latter an emendation to make the text accord with general usage among all Greek writers, with the exception of some doubtful passages of the New Testament, and some writings of the Fathers. [A similar, though not quite the same variety of readings is found for the same word in Luke xviii. 1; Gal. vi. 9; Eph. iii. 13; and 2 Thess. iii. 13. Meyer thinks that *ἐκκακ.* was probably more used in *oral* speech in Paul's time, though it appears in no Greek writer before him; and that Paul and Luke introduced it into ecclesiastical usage, where it sometimes occurs, but still less frequently than *ἐγκακ.* The Codd. A. B. D (1st Cor.) F. G. (the three last have it written *ἐνκακ*). Sinait. and some cursives favor *ἐγκακ.* but C. D. (3d Cor.) E. K. L. *et al.* with Chrys., Theodt., Damasc., *et al.* have *ἐκκακ.* Among the versions some of the old Ital. have *non defecimus*, and others with Tertul. and the Vulg. have *non deficimus*, still others with one copy of the Vulg. and Ambrosiast, have *non deficiamus;* August. has *non infirmemur*, the Gothic *non flamus segnes*, the Syriac *non est nobis tædium*. Erasmus *non degeneramus*. Wycliffe and the Rhemish have *we fail not;* Tyndale and Geneva with our A. V. and Bib. Union, *we faint not;* and Cranmer, *we go not out of kynde*. The difference of meaning between the two readings is not very serious; for which see Exeg. notes]

[2] Ver. 2.—The Rec. has *συνιστῶντες* with D. (3d Cor.), E. K. L. Chrys., Theodt., *et al.*, A. and B. seem uncertain whether the reading should be *-ῶντες* or *-άνοντες*, but C. D. (1st Cor.) F. G. and Sinait. and three cursives, have *συνιστάντες*, which is edited by Lachm., Tisch. and Alford. (comp. chap. vi. 5; and x. 18].

[3] Ver. 4.—*Διανγάσαι* and *καταυγάσαι* are both glosses to define more precisely the simple verb. [The principal authority for the former is A., four cursives, and some copies of some Greek fathers of the Antiochian school: and for the latter, C. D. *et al.* The Recep. *αὐγάσαι* is sustained by B. F. K. L. Sinait. and the best MSS. of the Greek Fathers]. The Recep. has *αὐτοῖς* after *αὐγάσαι*, but without much MSS. authority. It is evidently an interpolation.

[4] Ver. 6.—Lachmann has *λάμψει* instead of *λάμψαι*, on the authority of A. B. [D. (1st Cor.) Sinait (1st Cor.) *et al.*] It is probably a suggestion from Gen. i. 3. [Bloomfield, Meyer, Wordsworth, Tischendorf, agree with the Recep. and most of the versions and fathers in preferring *λάμψαι*, but Alford and Stanley agree with Klug in thinking this a quotation of the creative fiat. Some respectable MSS. omit *ὅς*].

[5] Ver. 6.—Lachmann has *αὐτοῦ* in place of *τοῦ θεοῦ*, but the MSS. evidence for it is not satisfactory, and the internal evidence is against it, since no one could have been uncertain of the antecedent of *αὐτοῦ*, [and hence would have had no motive to put *τοῦ θεοῦ* in its place for an explanation. Its only uncial authorities are F. G. and the 1st Corr. of C. and D].

[6] Ver. 6.—*Ἰησοῦ* before *Χριστοῦ* is not genuine. [And yet it is inserted before *χριστοῦ* by C. K. L. and Sinait., and after *χριστοῦ* by D. E. F. G., the Italic and Vulgate versions, and the Latin Fathers; A. B. and some Greek writers have only *χριστοῦ*].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 1, 2. [Paul "now resumes the thread of the general argument, which he had twice before taken up (chap. iii. 4 and 12); but with the difference that from the confidence which he possesses in the greatness of his task, he now draws a new conclusion; not 'we use great plainness of speech,' as in chap. iii. 12, but 'we faint not;' a conclusion which, as it is more directly an answer to the original question, 'who is sufficient for these things?' in chap. ii. 16, so is it the basis of the ensuing chapters iv 7; v. 10. But with one of the inversions peculiar to this Epistle, he has hardly entered on this new topic before he drops it again. The charge of insincerity which had occasioned the digression in chap. iii. 1–18, still lingers in his recollection, and accordingly he turns round upon it, as if to give it one parting blow before he finally dismisses it from his mind. Hence chap. iv. 2–6 are still closely connected with iii. 1–18, while the new subject begun in this first verse is not resumed till verse 7, where it is expanded in all its parts, so that the true apodosis or close of the sentence commenced here does not occur till verse 16, where the same words are repeated: *for this cause we faint not.*" STANLEY]. Returning from his digression respecting the hardening of the Jews, he now resumes his account (chap. iii. 12, 16) of that course of action which he was now pursuing, and which he thought suitable to the glory of the evangelical ministry (and

to the Apostolic office).—**Therefore having, through the mercy of God, received this ministration, we faint not.**—What he means by *διὰ τοῦτο* is more distinctly expressed in what follows: having received this ministration. This ministration (*διακονία*) he had spoken of as a ministration of the Spirit (chap. iii. 8), of righteousness (ver. 9), that which remaineth (ver. 11), and that which produced the results described in chap. iii. 18. *Διὰ τοῦτο* therefore finds its original reference as far back as chap. iii. 7. The boasting (*καύχησις*) which seems implied in this, is reduced immediately to a glorying in the Lord, and made to involve an actual humiliation of himself, when he adds the words, *as we have received mercy;* implying that he had been personally unworthy of such a ministry, and owed it entirely to Divine grace that he had been called and ordained to it (comp. 1 Cor. vii. 25; xv. 9, 10; 1 Tim. i. 12–16; Gal. i. 15, 16). The course of conduct which he had suggested in chap. iii. 12, and which was suitable to a ministry thus graciously bestowed upon him, he describes first negatively: *οὐκ ἐκκακοῦμεν*, we are not faint-hearted or cowardly. The reading *ἐγκακοῦμεν* would have substantially the same significance. [The former word can hardly have in this place a strictly moral signification (*κακός, bad, wicked*) as Rückert contends it should have, contrary to its usage and the connection; but it seems to signify here that the consciousness of such a high calling would not allow him to turn out bad, to prove recreant, or to act inconsistent with it (Luke xviii. 1; Gal. vi. 9). Osiander notices that the word has two distinct meanings: the one to slacken or flag, and the other to be discouraged or dispirited. The former agrees very well with the explanation in the next clause; but perhaps the latter agrees equally well, since the discouragement is evidently one which springs from an anxiety about difficulties and opponents, and so leads to deceit and an adulteration of the word of truth. The etymology of the word also confirms this meaning, since the word *κακός* signifies *bad* not only in a moral sense, but especially with respect to war. Accordingly the Greek expositors and the more modern strict philologists (Billroth, Meyer, de Wette), embrace both meanings in the rendering: segnescere, to become slow and dull. The connection with the subsequent negative may be regarded as a *litotes* in which he modestly expresses a high degree of courage by denying the contrary. Thus Theodoret (and Chrysostom, see below): Οὐ δὴ χάριν, φησὶ; *φέρομεν γεννάιως τὰ προσπίπτοντα λυπηρά.* "On which account, he says, we endure what befalls us with a noble spirit." Ἐγκακοῦμεν signifies the opposite of *παῤῥησιάζω, i. e.* to shrink from plainness of speech or action (Alford), to behave in a cowardly manner]. The positive contrast to what is here claimed, is not dulness or indolence in the performance of his duties (and above all, Rückert's interpretation, which makes it involve something generally and morally base, is entirely inadmissible, or at least not proven), but from what we find is repelled in ver. 2, we are led to believe that it is discouragement or faint-heartedness under difficulties. Chrysostom: We are so far from being without heart, that we are rather full of joy, and bold in speaking and in labors].—**But we have renounced the secret things of shame** (ver. 2).—These secret or hidden things of shame (*τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς αἰσχύνης*) were either, in accordance with the original meaning of *αἰσχύνη*, a feeling of shame, or that sense of honor which hides its own shame, and will not let that come to the light which may cause dishonor (Meyer after Chrysostom); or better and more in accordance with predominant usage in the New Testament (Phil. iii. 19; Heb. xii. 2; Jude ver. 19; Rev. iii. 18; Luke xiv. 9), a dishonor, the concealment of a disgrace, *i. e.* of a dishonor done; or, still better (inasmuch as the emphasis lies upon *τὰ κρυπτὰ*) disgraceful secrets, hidden things which would produce or bring dishonor if they were known (comp. Rom. i. 26).

There is no need of supposing that the Apostle had his eye directly as yet upon particular acts, such as plots, intrigues, suppressions or perversions of the truth, or even *obscenas voluptates;* but he probably alludes simply to those general matters which are mentioned in the participial sentence, those secret things which would infallibly cause shame if they were brought to the light. Neander: "those disgraceful and secret arts of carnal wisdom which had been falsely attributed to him." Ἀπειπάμεθα is an *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* so far as it relates to the New Testament. [On the reflexive force of the middle voice, implying that "the act belonged to the inner mental world of the agent rather than the actual world without." See Jelf's *Gram.* § 363, 6; and Winer, *Id.* § 39, 3, and on the aorist, "as denoting what is done at all times alike, and is habitual," see Bloomfield]. The word by no means implies that he had acted in this manner at an earlier period of his life, but it simply means that he declined or refused such things (*ὑπορρίπτεσθαι, παραιτεῖσθαι*).—**Not walking in craftiness, nor adulterating the word of God.**—(Comp. chap. i. 12; x. 2). He refers here to his own official course, but he unquestionably alludes very significantly to a very different kind of conduct in his more sordid opponents. Πανουργία, here rendered craftiness [from *πᾶς* and *ἔργω*] (1 Cor. iii. 19), signifies adroitness, dexterity; but it is used generally in a bad sense to signify a cunning craftiness, a shrewd use of those intrigues and schemes by which a man makes a way for himself and acquires and maintains influence ["a *πανοῦργος* is one who *can* do every thing and is *willing* to do any thing to accomplish his ends." Hodge]. A second point in which his conduct differed from that of his opponents, was, that he did not adulterate the word of God (*μηδὲ δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*), a kind of dealing essentially the same as the *καπηλεύειν* repudiated in chap. ii. 17. Men were in the habit of saying: a man adulterates his wine (*δολοῦν τὸν οἶνον*). In contrast with such deceit, he says of himself and his companions:—**but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience.**—The truth here spoken of is the word of God, the Gospel in its unadulterated purity; and the way in which he had preached it was the reverse of such adulterations of the word of God. Συνιστάνει *ἑαυτόν* signifies to gain confidence and esteem in this regular

way, as opposed to the self-commendation imputed to him by his opponents (chap. iii. 1). The way he pursued was directed to every man's conscience (*πρὸς πᾶσαν συνείδησιν ἀνθρώπων*; comp. Rom. ii. 9: *ἐπὶ πᾶσην ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου*). In this way of interpretation, *συνείδησις* becomes more prominent. The word is used to signify that mental power which makes us conscious of, and certifies to us those thoughts and emotions which pass through our minds, shows us what is truth and duty, and enforces its assertions and claims only on the ground that every thing it approves must be true and right, and that our spirit and motives must be conformed to our conceptions of truth and duty (Beck, *Bibl. Seelenl.*, p. 75; comp, 73 and 77). The Apostle intended to say, therefore, that the way in which he preached was such that every man's conscience approved of him, and hence that all who attended to the verdicts of conscience, and were not led by corrupt inclinations to reject such decisions, would be obliged to confess that his conduct sprung from a true and honest heart. Such an explanation seems to us more conformed to the context than that of Osiander, who defines the *συνείδησις* here to be the "essential organ for the recognition of truth, and which must assent to the Gospel as the truth and power of God, because it corresponds to man's necessities and is effectual to awaken and tranquilize his moral nature." The phrase: **in the sight of God** (*ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*, comp. chap. ii. 17; vii. 12) is not a solemn oath, but simply implies that the assertion he had made respecting his commendation of himself to every man's conscience, was eminently pure, inasmuch as he made it under a full sense of God's presence to hear him. NEANDER: "There is indeed a moral intelligence in every man to which we may appeal as to the impression he receives from us; and yet as every thing human is fallacious, Paul made his final appeal to God himself as the infallible witness of his upright motives and his honest deportment." [It was not the truth *directly* which the Apostle says he and his associates commended to the *συνείδ.* but *ἑαυτοὺς*, themselves, their whole persons, conduct and preaching and this by means of the *ἀλήθεια* which they preached. By recognizing the truth and the honesty of the preaching, men were obliged to commend them. *Συνείδ.* then is more than "consciousness," for it recognized the morality and truth of things not only in ourselves, but in others. (See note on chap. i. 12). The only condition of the recognition was that truth and its relations should be correctly apprehended, *i. e.*, that each case should be truly presented at the bar of conscience. (See *Serm.* of Chalmers and J. Howe on this passage). *Πᾶσαν συνείδ. ἀνθ.* is every conscience of man, the universal, or the public conscience. CHRYSOSTOM: "not only to believers, but to unbelievers, are we manifested, since we are presented before all, that every thing belonging to us may be scrutinized according to their pleasure." Nor was it merely "to every *good* conscience (Grotius), for the Apostle expressly implies that it was even to them that are lost?"].

VERS. 3–6. The Apostle now meets (ver. 3) the objection, that what he had just said would hardly harmonize with the fact that his preaching was not successful with a large portion of his hearers, and was not recognized and received by some as the truth. He does not deny this, and he now recurs to the figure of the covering (chap. iii. 14).—**But if our Gospel be veiled, it is veiled to them that are perishing** (ver. 3). —He concedes no contradiction in this to what he was saying, since those who failed of receiving him were among those who were perishing on account of their blindness by Satan. There was no defect in the requisite clearness of his preaching, but only in the mental perceptions of his hearers (ver. 3, 4). The fact objected against him is made emphatic by putting *ἐστιν* at the very head of the major proposition (the protasis). "Our Gospel" has here the same signification as the manifestation of the truth (ver. 2). The word *ἡμῶν* tells us who were engaged in proclaiming the Gospel, as in Rom. ii. 16; xvi. 25; 1 Thess. i. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 14; and it is equivalent to the Gospel which I preached (*ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην*) in 1 Cor. xv. 1 (comp. Gal. i. 11). In the conclusion the emphasis should rest upon *ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις* (among them who are perishing), and hence these words are placed at the beginning. Comp. chap. ii. 25; 1 Cor. i. 18. [*Ἀπολλυμένοις* does not necessarily mean the finally lost, those who deserve to be lost (Grotius), but those who are perishing (Alford), those who were then lost. In Matth. x. 6; xv. 24; xviii. 11; and Luke xv. 4, 6, 24, 32, the lost were such as were at that time lost to the Church, to God and to goodness, but might afterwards in some cases be recovered. HENRY: "The hiding of the Gospel was both an evidence and a cause of their ruin, and if the Gospel did not find and save them, they were lost forever]. *Ἐν* is equivalent neither to the dative, nor to *in respect to*, but to, *with, coram;* since the persons spoken of did not recognize the Gospel on account of inward darkness, a covering on their own hearts, it has the force of *in;* or, since the *ἀπολλυμένοι* expresses the sphere or the department within which the Gospel is veiled or not recognized, of, *among* (*inter*). Indeed, all these significations come to the same general result. The fact alluded to is still further developed when he goes back (ver. 4) to its original cause.—**Among whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving** (ver. 4),—*i. e.*, the blinding of the mental perceptions (*νοήματα*) and the author of the blindness, the god of this world (*θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*). The blinding of the *νοήματα* implies that the mental perceptions of these persons had been impaired and so blinded that their understandings were deluded with sophistries until all original inclination to truth was gone (comp. Matth. vi. 22), and their minds (*νοῦς*) had no correct intellectual views (Beck, p. 53, 54). *Τὰ νοήματα* (comp. chap. iii. 14) may here very appropriately be translated, "the perceptive powers, the understanding." The blinding is the work of the god of this world (*ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτου*), by which phrase is meant not the spirit of the age, or anything of that kind, but Satan (as in chap. ii. 11), the prince of this world (Jno. xii. 31; xiv. 30). Similar expressions occur in Eph. ii. 2; vi. 12. NEANDER: "It was with a direct purpose that Paul gives Satan this appellation, for he intended to imply

that the selfish principle, here represented by Satan, was to such men all that God should have been." The word θεός in other places signifies the principle which absolutely determines things (comp. Phil. iii. 19). BENGEL: *Grandis et horribilis descriptio Satanæ, grandi ejus, at horribili operi respondens. Quis alias putaret, illum posse in hominibus tantae luci officere?* [Augustine tells us that nearly all ancient commentators were of the opinion that the word θεός was too exalted to be applied to any created being, and hence, that it must here have meant the Supreme Jehovah. CHRYSOSTOM, in opposition to Marcion and Manichees, says: "We assert of this passage that this is spoken neither of the devil nor of another creator (in distinction from the just and good), but of the God of the universe, and that it is to be read thus: *God hath blinded the minds of the unbelievers of this world;* for the world to come hath no unbelievers, but the present only. He blinds them, not by working unto this end (away with the thought)! but by suffering and allowing it." As the Arians argued from this passage that a created being might be called God, even Augustine and others would not concede to them the natural construction of our passage; on which Calvin remarks: "we see how far the spirit of controversy can lead men in perverting Scripture." Among moderns, Dr. Adam Clarke was of a similar opinion, and he refers to 1 Tim. i. 17, as a similar phrase, reminding us also that αἰών does not necessarily mean a wicked age or generation (Matt. xii. 32; Luke xx. 34). Even on the common rendering, however, it is not implied that God had surrendered to Satan the rightful or actual sovereignty of any one age, but only that men have yielded him such a sovereignty. Archbishop Trench (Synn. 2d ser. p. 40) regrets that the difference between αἰών and κόσμος has not been preserved in the English version. He assigns to the former in all cases a reference to time, but in a secondary and ethical sense; he thinks it embraces all which exists in the world under the conditions of time, the course and current of this world's affairs, often with an evil significance (Eph. ii. 2). It includes all that floating mass of thoughts, opinions, maxims, speculations, hopes, impulses, aims, at any time current in the world, which it is impossible to seize and accurately to define, but which constitute a most real and effective power, being the moral or immoral atmosphere which at every moment of our lives we inhale, again inevitably to exhale; what we often speak of as "*the times*," attaching to the word an ethical signification; or still more to the point, "*the age*," the spirit or genius of the age]." Comp. further upon this τοῦ αἰώνος τούτου what is said on 1 Cor. i. 20; ii. 6. The sphere in which this alienation from God takes place is one which originally was completely dependent (ethically) upon this power. But the expression has a peculiar sharpness in application to the Jews who thought they knew and appropriated to themselves the true God in some special sense, but who were here in their unbelief consigned with the heathen to this mock deity (the simia Dei of Tertullian), as if they belonged to his special department (comp. Jno. viii. 44). Instead of ὧν τὰ νοήματα ἐτύφλωσεν (in whose minds) the Apostle writes: *among these lost ones*, Satan hath blinded the minds of *them that believe not* (ἐν οἷς ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων). By them that believe not, we are not to understand those whose unbelief was the direct *consequence* of the blinding, as if the expression were εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀπίστους. According to the analogy of other places, the word in this case would have been ἄπιστα (comp. 1 Thess. iii. 13; Phil. iii. 2). We may remark also that such an idea does not accord with that which follows εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγ. *etc.*). Nor is it precisely a designation of the cause of this blinding, as if the expression had been διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀπίστους. Τῶν ἀπίστων implies a self-determination toward falsehood, and a turning away from the truth, the reason of which must be traced finally to a perverted will. In these words is brought forward another aspect of the case, *viz.*, that in this blinding process Satan was not alone active and guilty, but that the subjects of it coöperated with him, and were guilty during the process and before it. (comp. Jno. iii. 18; 2 Thess. ii. 10). [Dr. Hodge, while conceding that the doctrine is Scriptural, that unbelief provokes judicial blindness, contends that the connection here demands a different interpretation, inasmuch as Paul accounts for the hiding of the Gospel to them that are lost, by saying that Satan had blinded their minds. The blindness, therefore, precedes the unbelief, and is the cause of it]. The ἐν οἷς is perhaps equivalent to ὅτι ἐν τούτοις (for, because, *etc.*), and indicates either the object of the blinding, the persons who could be blinded (Satan's great work, the blinding of the νοήμ. of unbelievers has to be carried on in the hearts of the lost, for such a work cannot be performed in the hearts of the saved ones, with respect to whom the Gospel is not veiled, Meyer); or, is equivalent to *among whom*, and so points out the sphere or department in which Satan thus acts. The meaning, however, would be essentially the same on both interpretations. There is no carelessness or tautology in this language. Paul means to give special prominence to the idea that Satan carries on such a work among those who are in ἀπώλεια (perdition). The clause might be translated: in the department of lost souls, where the understandings of unbelievers are blinded by the god of this world. **—In order that the shining light of the Gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, might not shine forth.** (ver. 4 *b.*). Here we are informed what Satan's design is in all this; but inasmuch as what he accomplished was the infliction of a Divine judgment (Jno. xii. 40; 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12), it may also be looked upon as an announcement of God's purpose. According to the reading of the Rec. αὐγάσαι αὐτοῖς must be rendered: might not irradiate or shine upon them, *etc.* But αὐτοῖς is very feebly authenticated, and betrays evidence that it is only a gloss. In like manner the compound verbs διαυγάσαι and καταυγάσαι seem at first more appropriate: (to shine through, to beam upon), inasmuch as the simple verb appears never to have been used intransitively among the Greek authors. Others, therefore, take the simple form as equivalent to, *to see* (properly: to beam upon something with the eyes, to cast the light of the eyes upon an object, sometimes

with an accusative and sometimes with *πρὸς τι*). But as we never meet with it in this sense except among the poets, the intransitive meaning (which is favored by the attempt to make it out by the insertion of the compound forms) is to be preferred, especially as it then gives a more suitable predicate to *τὸν φωτισμόν*. The *αὐτοῖς*, which we are sorry to be obliged to throw out, is nevertheless implied by the context. In the later Greek, and frequently in the Septuagint, *φωτισμός* has the sense of: the imparting of light, an enlightening, light (a translation of אוֹר in Ps. xxvii. 1; Job. iii. *et al.*), *i. e.*, light when in movement and in communication. (Osiander). The words *τῆς δόξης* do not here express merely a quality of the Gospel itself (the glorious Gospel), but rather an attribute of Christ, and hence the object or substance of the Gospel (*χριστοῦ*). The glory of Christ is the same as the glory of God in the face of Christ (ver. 6), and the glory of the Lord (chap. iii. 18). We are to understand it not exclusively of Christ in his glorified state, for the glory of the only Begotten Son of God is exhibited during his whole manifestation of Himself among men, full of grace and truth (Jno. i. 14); and it was shed forth even in His earthly life, and especially in His death on the cross, which is set forth as the very essence of the Gospel (1 Cor. i. 18). Hence Christ in His glory signifies what the Gospel sets forth as the entire revelation of God through Him in His various conditions. The whole salvation revealed in the Gospel depended on this state of humiliation, including His obedience unto death, and His subsequent exaltation (Phil. ii. 6–11; Rom. v. 10; iv. 25; viii. 34; Luke xxiv. 26). Comp. Meyer, Osiander. This Christ, whose glory is revealed in the Gospel, is yet further said to be the image of God. On *εἰκών* comp. 1 Cor. xi. 7. ["The article is idiomatically omitted after *ἐστιν*." ELLICOTT]. The same expression is used respecting Christ in Col. i. 15 (from which some manuscripts have borrowed the adjective *ἀοράτου*), and Heb. i. 3.* We are not necessarily required by what is said in Phil. ii. 6; iii. 21; and Jno. xvii. 5, to refer this with Meyer exclusively to Christ in His exaltation for the glory of God beamed from Him even during His earthly life (Jno. ii. 11; xiv. 9). Although Christ in His exalted state is more perfectly the image of God, yet this expression must be looked upon as a particular representation of Christ in every condition. To justify the Apostle's language in calling his Gospel (ver. 3, *τὸ εὐαγγ. ἡμῶν*) a proclamation of the Divine glory, and to show how inappropriate were the insinuations referred to in chap. iii. 1, he now proceeds to say (ver. 5):—**For we preach not ourselves but Christ Jesus the Lord.**—From the context, we conclude that *κυρίους* ought to be understood after *ἑαυτοὺς κηρύσσομεν*, *i. e.*, we do not preach ourselves as your lords (in contrast with *δούλους ὑμῶν*, your servants). Had he in his preaching set forth himself as a lord (*κύριον*), and made his authority, his power, and his lordship over them (chap. i. 24, comp. xi. 20) his main object, instead of commending Christ in his glory as the only Lord over them, he would have adulterated God's Word (ver. 2; chap. ii. 17). If we prefer not to supply *κυρίους*, we may explain the sentence with Osiander thus: "The substance of our preaching is not our own light, or wisdom, or merits, and hence we do not commend ourselves, nor seek our own interests." Both explanations come to the same thing in the end. *Κύριον* is here used in the sense of Lord, because in consequence of Christ's redemption the Church belongs exclusively to Him (comp. Acts xx. 28). The positive side in relation to *ἑαυτούς* (ourselves) is expressed in the phrase—**and ourselves your servants** (*δούλους ὑμῶν*) **for Jesus' sake**—where there is an allusion to a very different position which some opposing teachers had arrogated to themselves (chap. xi. 20). He thus gives expression to the deep humility which he felt, and shows how entire was the surrender he had made of himself to his work; comp. 1 Cor. ix. 19. The phrase *διὰ Ἰησοῦν* (through Jesus) gives us the reason he was willing to sustain this servile relation to them; it was because the love of Christ constrained him to be their servant. It is possible that he meant thus to say that it was by the authority of Jesus that he had been invested with this official dignity (by, on account of); or we may even regard the expression as equivalent to *beneficio Jesu* (this blessing was due to Jesus). The first of these meanings suits our connection the best, and according to it the sense would be: that the Apostle gave himself to be their servant, for Jesus' sake, and to retain possession of the property he had already won for the Lord, or to bring them to a better acquaintance and more intimate fellowship with Jesus. The reason assigned in ver. 6 seems to point to this last interpretation, for it is there implied that this was the Divine purpose regarding him when he was first enlightened:—**Because God who called forth the light to shine out of darkness**—(ver. 6). It seems quite needless and arbitrary to make this refer back to ver. 4, and regard ver. 5 as a parenthesis. But perhaps we may more completely bring in the contents of ver. 5 in another way. The reason that we preach Christ as our only Lord, and are willing to be your servants for Jesus' sake, is, that God has enlightened us:—**hath shined in our hearts for the shining forth of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ.**—[Our explanation of this verse will depend on the answer we give to the question, for what purpose the Apostle introduced it. If his object was to assign the reason for his being the servant of the Corinthians (ver. 5, *b*), then he intended to say here that God, who commanded, *etc.*, had shined into his heart that he might diffuse it to others. But if his object was to give his reason for preaching Christ (ver. 5 *a*), it was because (*ὅτι*) God, who commanded, *etc.*, had shined in men's hearts (as our version has it) to give us the light, *etc.* On either interpretation the sense is good. The first accords with Gal. i. 16, and is

[* In Col. i. 15, and Heb. i. 3, the reference is to the *λόγος*, and hence *ἀοράτου* was appropriate. The word in the latter passage (*χαράκτηρ*) is different, but the idea is nearly the same. An image is more than a likeness (*ὁμοίωσις*, Trench, Synn. 1st Ser. p. 77): things may be alike, but not images of one another. An image must have a prototype after which it was drawn, and which it must more than resemble. Greg. Naz.: *αὕτη γὰρ εἰκόνος φύσις, μίμημα εἶναι τοῦ ἀρχετύπου*. The present *ἐστιν* signifies that the thing spoken of was always present].

generally adopted. But surely the main idea of the passage is that Paul preached Christ, and the mention of his being a servant to the Corinthians was only incidental; the phrase "our hearts" (plural) can hardly mean here merely Paul's own heart; and φωτισμὸς τῆς γνώσεως seems naturally to mean the objective light which came from Christ and would be obstructed by blindness. (Comp. Hodge and Billroth)]. There are also considerable difficulties in the grammatical structure of the sentence, especially on account of the ὃς before ἔλαμψεν. This is probably the reason that this relative has been left out in a number of manuscripts, though for external as well as internal reasons, it must be regarded as unquestionably genuine. The easiest way would seem to be to supply ἐστιν before ὁ εἰπών: *q. d.* it is God who commanded, *etc.*, who shined, *etc.* And yet in this way, that which was designed to be merely a type of something higher becomes the principal object of the statement. Certainly the phrase: who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, should be looked upon as describing neither a mental illumination nor a breaking forth of the light of the Gospel from the obscurity of the law, but what took place in the first act of creation (Gen. i. 3); and even then it must be taken in such a way that ἐκ will express not a special, but a causal relation.—The idea then expressed would be that he who was the Creator of physical light, and caused it to break forth out of darkness, is the same Being who has caused a light of a higher nature to rise in the heart of the Apostle. Or, if we take ἔλαμψεν, like λάμψαι in a preceding passage, and every where else in the New Testament, intransitively (for the transitive use of the word is confined to the poets, and even among them is infrequent), the idea will be: He hath shined into our hearts (dwelling in us by His Spirit; comp. 1 Cor. iii. 16; xiv. 25; Jno. xiv. 23). There will then be no need either of an αὐτός or of an ὃς, and the preceding ὁ εἰπὼν-λάμψαι, which gives a transitive sense, will not stand in the way. That we may gain this sense, we must either supply an ἐστιν or an οὗτος ἐστιν before ὃς ἔλαμψεν: the God who commanded, *etc.*, is the one who has shined, *etc.* (de Wette); or the ὃς ἔλαμψεν, *etc.*, must be taken from this and repeated in the principal sentence before πρὸς φωτισμὸν, *i. e.*, the God who commanded, *etc.*, and who hath shined in our hearts, hath shined with the light, *etc.*, (or: hath done this with the light, *etc.*, supplying τοῦτο ἐποίησεν). But will not this, after all, be more difficult than to complete the sentence by supplying ἐστιν before ὃς ἔλαμψεν (is the one who hath shined)? The analogy of chap. iii. 13 would not perhaps be decisive in favor of this, since the completion of the sentence is much easier there. The easiest way would be, to take ὃς as equivalent to ὁυτος or αὐτός: he has shined. But this is only a poetic, and particularly a Homeric usage, and only in special cases is ὃς ever met with as a demonstrative pronoun (comp. *Passow s. v.* ὅς 1). The logical objection, however, to the completion of the sentence by ἐστιν before ὃς ἔλαμψεν, *viz.*, that this sentence would then have an emphasis which does not belong to it, inasmuch as the principal stress must be laid upon πρὸς φωτισμὸν (Meyer), is not very convincing; for we must certainly lay an emphasis also upon the Divine agency which is here so solemnly introduced, and by means of which Paul had been directed to, and fitted for, the φωτισμός. This shining of God into his heart is the same thing which he describes in Gal. i 15, 16, thus: it pleased God to discover (or reveal) His Son in me; for it is his own experience which he probably has uppermost in his mind. What he there says in plain words: that I might preach Him among the Gentiles (comp. Acts xxvi. 16–18), he here expresses by a figure of the light moving itself, thus: by the shining forth of the knowledge, *etc.* By these words he certainly intended to say that he was the medium through which such a knowledge was communicated to others. But may φωτισμός be regarded as meaning: to make light, to show, or intransitively to shine? The latter is the only meaning which accords with its use in ver. 4, and the uniform usage, at least, of the Hellenistic writers.—The question may still be raised, whether *in the face of Christ* (ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ) ought to be connected immediately with πρὸς φωτισμόν or with τῆς δόξης (*i. e.*, so as to mean the shining in the face of Christ, or the glory which was in the face of Christ)? In the first case, γνῶσις must be taken objectively (not as the subjective knowledge of the Apostle or the Apostolic teachers, but) as the knowledge of the glory of God, irradiated from the face of Christ, the image of God (ver. 4). The sense then would be: if any one converts others to Christ, he makes the knowledge of the Divine glory beam from the face of Jesus Christ (Meyer after Fritzsche). But this explanation of the γνῶσις (knowledge), as if it were entirely objective, is not indispensable, inasmuch as the words: *the glory of God in the face of Christ*, so naturally follow: *who is the image of God* (ver. 4), and so precisely correspond with these, that the article was not necessary before ἐν προσώπῳ, especially as the idea of the glory of God in the face (ἐν προσώπῳ, τοῦ προσώπου) in the Mosaic type (chap. iii. 7) was yet present to the Apostle's mind. The knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ (love, power, wisdom) was therefore subjective to the mind of the Apostle by a Divine revelation to his heart (ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν), and then it shone around him so as to lead others to know Christ as their Lord, and to have fellowship also with Him. ["Christ is called the image of God in two respects: first (as in Col. i. 15) with reference to the λόγος which is in him the perfect representation of God; and secondly with reference to that human manifestation in which the λόγος itself was revealed (comp. chap. iii. 18). We have in this place to think of the latter relation, although the other is included in the idea of the historical Christ. The glory of God is manifested in the absolute image which the historical Christ sets forth." [NEANDER.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The only persons who can so preach that the Divine glory in the Person and life of Christ, shall shine into the hearts of men, and cause them to recognize Him as their Redeemer and Lord, are those who have had their own hearts illuminated by that glory, and have mercifully

been delivered from condemnation. But a personal experience of that grace was never designed to be the limit of this revelation. When once the stream of Divine love has flowed into a single heart, from its very nature, it cannot be confined there, but it must struggle for communication. If I have myself been delivered from destruction, I shall long to commend the mercy which has saved me, to all who need the same experience. For the sake of Him who has saved me, and who has purchased those precious souls which are perishing around me, I shall strive to make men acquainted with Him in whom all fulness dwells, and who can satisfy all their wants. I shall cheerfully give myself to the work of winning souls to Him, and not esteem life itself too dear, if thereby I can bring them to salvation, or confirm them in its possession. In such circumstances the servant of Christ will have no room for preaching himself, that he may take the place of Christ by making His people dependent upon Him, and usurping a lordship over them. He will never wish to impose his opinions upon others, so as to impair the authority of God's word; and he will never be guilty of those tricks and intrigues which gain esteem at the expense of those who have a better right to confidence and honor. He will have no heart for those hypocritical arts by which others seek to become all things to all men (1 Cor. ix. 19–23), and under the guise of disinterested benevolence, flatter men's sinful passions, and accommodate themselves to the weak sides of their followers. Never will he think of evading by such arts the real difficulties of the Christian life, and shunning all earnest labor and self-denial in the pastoral work. Those who have a holy calling to bring their fellowmen to behold the Divine glory, and thus to transform them into Christ's image, will rather encounter all cares, and reproaches, and afflictions with cheerfulness. They will renounce those impure motives which cannot bear the light, and they will so act and speak as to commend themselves to every man's conscience. All things will be done as in the presence of that God who sees and judges the secrets of the heart.—And yet even when they are most faithful, their words may not get access to every heart. Some love darkness rather than light, and will, therefore, turn away from their testimony. Satan takes advantage of their aversion to truth, to bewitch them and to blind their understanding, so that the light of Christ, the image of God, cannot reach their hearts. God then gives them up to this blindness for their abuse of His testimony. As they would not yield to the attractions of grace, they are cast out of the sphere of gracious influences, and given up to those arts of the father of lies, for which they have such a predisposition. As they had no pleasure in the truth, and would not believe it, they become more and more unsusceptible to its influence, they willingly yield themselves to every kind of delusion, and fall into superstitions in which nothing but lies can be received (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 10–12).

["The Gospel may be said to be hidden when it is never preached to a people at all, when it is not understood, when it does not take hold of the conscience, and when the heart doth not entertain or give reception to it. Hence this hiding may be either sinful or penal—sinful, when men hear the Gospel but will not set themselves to understand it, or will not receive conviction or a suitable impression from it; and penal, when God gives up such sinners to their chosen way. Such a hiding is a sad token that they are lost, for it is evident that they are not recovered and saved, and hence that they are in a state which both excludes what is necessary to their salvation, and includes what promotes their destruction. There can therefore be no hope that their state will be safe at last who live in the neglect of those methods which the Gospel prescribes for their salvation; and there can be no ground for them to fear that they shall be finally lost, who, with dependence on grace, are using these methods to their uttermost." Condensed from Howe's Six Sermons on the Hidden Gospel and Lost souls].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—Ver. 1. The most faithful servant of Christ may become tired *in* his work but not *of* it. But he has only to strengthen himself in God and perform his part to the best of his ability. It is upon the end, upon the glorious crown that he should fix his eye.—Ver. 2. LUTHER:—False Apostles sometimes make a fine show, but look within and they are full of filthiness (Matth. xviii. 27 f.)!—HEDINGER:—Many vain talkers cover up their pride, avarice, envy, malice and bitterness, under a pretence of good intentions, and by this very thing show that they are ashamed of their own dishonesty. They therefore paint it up in false colors, and they twist and pervert the word of God so as to please men and sanction their carnal objects (Tit. i. 9 ff.; Phil. ii. 21).—Ver. 3. Alas! that even in the Church the glorious Gospel should be so covered up! How few have so truly turned to the Lord that the glory of the Gospel has dawned upon their spirits!—LUTHER:—Ver. 4. The devil is this world's prince and god, and therefore God in righteous judgment has given it up to serve and to be ruled by him.—HEDINGER:—Dost thou feel, O man, no touch of God's word? Know then that the enemy is covering up thine eyes and thy heart (Heb. iii. 13). In the voluntary blinding and hardening of the unbeliever's heart, there is a concurrence of his own guilt and the malignity of Satan; for if he were not guilty Satan could do nothing. Above all things, then, beware of unbelief.—SPENER:—Satan can hardly keep men from knowing God simply as God, for all nature proclaims that it has a Creator and a Governor. But the point on which he has a special desire to blind them is the knowledge of Christ the Son of God, and the work of salvation by Christ.—Ver. 5. The sum of all true preaching is Jesus Christ. Everything must run into Him (Col. i. 27).—Ver. 6. The best eye can see nothing without light. "In Thy light, O God, shall we see light" (Ps. xxxvi. 10).—If we would lead others to Christ, we must ourselves turn to Him, and receive the clear beams of faith into our own hearts. If we would know the mind of our heavenly Father, and especially how he feels toward men, we must direct our eyes to the face (*i. e.*, to the words and life) of Christ, for there

we have the best expression of His heart (Jno. xiv. 9).

Berlenb. Bible:—Ver. 1. It is a great mercy when God calls a man to such a work. We should not, therefore, make much account of what we have to endure in it.—Ver. 2. Ministers should never attempt to draw the people by going around the cross and flattering them. God's servants have no need of intrigues and impure arts.—God's word is always the same, but it is very easy to add to it something of our own. It can be corrupted either by addition or by subtraction, especially when one has some evil design, and wishes to accommodate it to a corrupt world. The truth is our own best evidence, but it is effectual only when we coöperate with our consciences and open our hearts to it. The truth and we must meet face to face. No true minister will be without this test of himself: that when he merely manifests the truth, he can appeal to every man's conscience. If he cannot do this, he can do nothing.—Ver. 3. The Gospel is covered to those who spend their lives to no profit and seek for life in the enjoyments of the flesh and in the evil suggestions of a carnal reason.—Ver. 4. The god of this world is sure to blind those who believe not and who will not listen candidly to God's kind invitations. He will suggest to them: "If you choose that way you will never get along in the world." Such a god they will serve, and we need not wonder that their thoughts and hearts should be so occupied that they can receive no light. Even if the light shines upon them and they feel it, they turn away from it. Though God may penetrate through every obstacle till he reaches the conscience, he never works absolutely, *i. e.*, irresistibly, and the result is not necessarily saving. Light may shine clearly and yet a man may not perceive it: 1, If the windows of his house are closed and all around him is darkened (false principles and erroneous views); 2, If his eyes (the windows of his body) are so closed that no light can enter them (misunderstandings and perversions of revealed truth). The first obstacle is removed when the armor of light is put on; and when with the help of a Stronger, the strongholds of reason are demolished. The other is removed without violating the established laws of moral and intellectual freedom, when the preventing grace of God destroys Satan's work in the heart and prepares it to welcome and entertain the light of revealed truth. God therefore first makes an assault upon our wills. When the sun is admitted the darkness flies of course. God does not arbitrarily force us to receive the light, but we must receive it by a free faith. The only reason that many have no light is, they love the world more than God. The spirit of the world holds possession of them. The arch-deceiver makes the poor soul think: "Surely it is not necessary to give up everything; we may retain this thing and that, and still be Christians; others do so, and are nevertheless very good people; God does not require us to be so very strict." These are the lies which many admit with greater readiness than they do the truth and the glory of the Gospel. God is resisted by them as if He were an enemy, and was preparing to inflict on them some great calamity and injustice. When the love of self is the reigning principle in the heart, there can be no interest in the glory of Christ, and the image of the sinful Adam will be inscribed over the whole man.—Ver. 5. Where shall we find those who preach nothing but Jesus Christ? We meet with many who are eager to obtain honor and personal comfort; but so absorbing is their interest in themselves, that they have very little time or heart to give to Christ.—Ver. 6. God's works are all in harmony. The illumination of a soul like that of the natural world is a Divine work, a new creation, and can be effected only by the fiat of the Almighty. Our hearts are at first in chaotic darkness, and the type of the process by which they become temples of God must be sought in what took place at the beginning. As the first day's work was the separation of the light from the darkness, so the first work of grace in the heart is to give it light. We must allow Christ to break through the darkness of our hearts and discover it to us, or we shall never see the light. But the mere admission of the light is not enough; it must be received into the most secret recess of the heart. Then, when the light of a true knowledge is received, how clearly do we see our poverty, but how clearly also the wonders of grace! The darkness is past and the true light shines (1 Jno. ii. 8). But this light of Jesus Christ must necessarily shine beyond ourselves. Others also will see it and be enkindled and won to Christ. One great object of the vocation wherewith we are called is to make us God's witnesses.—God is to be known only as we look upon the face of the only begotten Son (Jno. i. 18). God never presents Himself to us in an absolute manner, but only through this face. Such is the old but sublime theology which was always so precious to His humble ones. There we may look upon God and our lives be preserved (Gen. xxxii. 30). But such a sight can often be gained only by a wrestling like Jacob's, and with a painful discovery of our poverty. But no sooner is this sight gained than we are drawn toward God. We can bear to look upon the Deity Himself, even in His glory, when we behold Him in the face of a Mediator (Ps. lxxxix. 16; Ex. xxix. 10 f.; xxxiii. 14).

Rieger, Ver. 1, 2:—The unjust treatment which the word of faith sometimes receives, and the unhappy results which sometimes follow its dispensation, are no reason why those who are called to preach it should renounce their hope or their enjoyment of it; nor should they thus be tempted to use means which are unsuitable to their work. Never should they keep back doctrines or precepts which belong to the mind of Christ, from a fear that they might injure His cause. Let them never show punctiliousness in matters which are known and judged of by their fellowmen, while they tolerate great imperfections in those which none but the eye of God can discern. Let them use no means to please men which would not be commended by God and approved of in the consciences of all who see them, and which would not tend to bring out the truth in still clearer terms.—Ver. 3, 4. The god of this world has a great variety of instruments conspiring together to promote his wicked purpose of covering up the Gospel from the eyes of

men.—The unbelieving world is always inclined to throw out the suspicion that ministers are seeking only their private interests. But those who have accepted Jesus as their Lord, will cheerfully confide in His servants, and in the arrangements He has made respecting them.—Ver. 6. In one of His first acts God acquired a peculiar name: "He who called the light out of darkness." That ancient name He still maintains by similar manifestations of His power on a larger or smaller scale; but especially by the revelation of His Son in the hearts of men through the Gospel. In the life of Christ we have concentrated as in a single person, and everything given which we need to reveal God to us, and to make us trust in Him as our Father. The Apostles have given us so complete and so credible a testimony of what they saw of Christ, that we may have from their preaching and writings the same impressions which they had from His personal presence. Truly blessed is every reader whose faith looks steadily and with an unveiled face upon Jesus!

Heubner, Ver. 1:—Keep your eye upon the greatness and sanctity of your calling, and you will be in no danger of falling.—Ver. 2. The only way for a preacher, is always to be open and honest.—God's word should be preached in its purity as it was preached at first, with no recent improvements or disfigurements; for not only must it be a great sin, in the Lord's sight, to present in His name what is not His, but we shall thus deprive His word of its real power.—Luther: Counterfeiters of money are burned, but falsifiers of God's word are canonized.—Ver. 3. Though the truth and power of the Gospel are hidden from the eyes of many, it is only to them that are lost, and because they would not believe.—Ver. 4. A good or an evil spirit rules all men. Why it is by the one rather than by the other, must ever remain one of the mysteries of human freedom, for the result is not always according to the power of the outward influence. The corrupt mind may truly be said to be blinded, when the world is regarded as the only thing real or glorious, when the world's vanities appear to be all that is substantial, and when the Gospel and Christ's glories are counted as nothing. Christ, His glory, His love, His holiness, His power, His government, and His Divine excellence, are the substance of the Gospel. He is the image of God, so that as the Son is, the Father must be.—Ver. 5. The Gospel has an enlightening power, for it is not a system of human inventions; and those who preach it are not founding systems of philosophy, nor leading off new sects or schools of religious belief; but they present Christ as the Master of every other master, and the only Rock of all wisdom, righteousness and salvation.—Ver. 6. When Christ enlightens a soul, it is as great a miracle as the creation of a world. As the physical light enables us to discern God's power and glory in the natural universe, so the light of faith enables us to recognize His glory in the spiritual universe.—The highest grace is that look of grace God gives us when we experience His grace.—Every thing which belongs to Christ's manifestation to men, is a reflection of the Deity. What then was the lustre upon Moses' face compared with the light in which God manifests Himself?

W. F. Besser, Ver. 2:—An ingenuous deportment is the glory, and an artful concealment is the shame of a minister of Christ. Every man's conscience recognizes with more or less distinctness what God commands or forbids; and hence when the Gospel is manifested to it, a ready witness there gives an affirmation to the truth; and when this affirmation is withheld, the conscience of the lover of lies feels the penal brand (1 Tim. iv. 2). The consciousness of his guilt is indelibly fixed in his soul. The conscience of believers is good; it is polluted with no corruptions, and it is restrained by no fears; while that of unbelievers is vicious, defiled and burdened; it perpetually accuses them that are lost because they obey not the truth.—Ver. 3. It may do us no harm to remain ignorant of some truths, but we are lost forever if we know not the Gospel.—Ver. 4. The special work of the great Corrupter is to corrupt still more them that are lost. In this work, however, he is only God's executioner. This blinding is nothing but a punishment for the sin of unbelief (Eph. ii. 2), for loving darkness so much that the light was necessarily hated (John iii. 19, 20), and for being so much devoted to earthly things, that all the blessings of heaven offered in the Gospel, are rejected with scorn. The blindness itself is effected by covering up the Gospel, by mystifying God's clear word, by misconstruing the obvious meaning of what God has done, and by closing the eyes against the truth as it is dispensed in the Church.—Ver. 6. The very central point of man's nature, his heart's treasure (Matth. xii. 35), has been darkened ever since he became a sinner; the Spirit of God, the light of his life has been put out. It is indeed true that the heart (where the conscience has its laboratory) is always aware to some extent, that its life and rest *should* be in God, but this light of conscience cannot give life; it is rather a deadly lightning (Rom. i. 32) to those who have fallen from Divine fellowship. If in our hearts there ever springs up a spiritual light by which we recognize spiritual things, just as we behold the works of creation by the natural light, it must be by the act of that same God who in the beginning commanded the light to shine out of darkness (Ps. xviii. 29). This work of the Almighty Creator, in which He irradiates man's darkened heart, is just the counterpart of that work of this world's god in which the mind of the unbeliever is blinded.

["The Christian ministry: I. As a ministry of Light. It does not *make* the objects of faith; it only unveils or manifests them as they are. To live in sin is to live a false life—a life of lies—in which a man is untrue to his own nature. The Gospel does not make God our Father; it only reveals Him as He had ever been, is, and ever shall be; not a tyrant but a Father; not a chance or a necessary thing but a Person; and in the life of Christ the love of God has become intelligible to us. So it throws light on *man's* nature; shows him with God-like aspirations and animal cravings; a glorious temple in ruins, to be re-built into a habitation of God through the

Spirit. It throws light upon the grave and the things of that undiscovered land beyond. Hence our life is to be a perpetual manifestation of the Gospel, and a diffusion of the light of the Gospel; while the evil and worldly heart is ever hiding the truth. This light is the true evidence of Christianity. II. As a reflection, in word, and experience of the life of Christ." F. W. ROBERTSON, Lect. XL.].

IX.—THE WORTHLESS AND FEEBLE APPEARANCE OF MINISTERS. CONFIDENCE IN VIEW OF THE GLORIOUS RESULT OF THEIR AFFLICTIONS.

CHAPTER IV. 7–18. V. 1–10.

7 But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency [exceeding great-
8 ness] of the power may be of God, and not of us. *We are* troubled on every side [In every way we are hard pressed], yet not distressed [inextricably straitened]; *we are*
9 perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not de-
10 stroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord [*om.* the Lord][1]
11 Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body. For we which live are alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be
12 made manifest in our mortal flesh. So then [that][2] death worketh in us, but life in you.
13 We [But] having the same Spirit of faith, according as it is written, "I believe, and
14 [*om.* and][3] therefore have I spoken;" we also believe, and therefore speak; knowing that he which raised up the Lord[4] Jesus shall raise up us also by [with][5] Jesus, and
15 shall present *us* with you. For all things *are* for your sakes, that the abundant grace might through the thanksgiving of many redound [that the grace, becoming more abundant in consequence of the greater number, might multiply (*περισσεύση*) the
16 thanksgiving] to the glory of God. For which cause we faint not[6]; but though our outward man perish [is wasting away, *διαφθείρεται*], yet the [our] inward[7] *man* is re-
17 newed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment[8], worketh for
18 us a far more exceeding *and* [*om. and*] eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen *are* temporal [temporary, *πρόσκαιρα*], but the things which are not seen *are* eternal.

V. FOR we know that, if our earthly house of *this* tabernacle [tent-dwelling] were dis-
2 solved, we have [in the heavens] a building of [from, *ἐκ*] God, a house not made with
3 hands, eternal [,] in the heavens [*om.* in the heavens]. For in this [also] we groan, earn-
4 estly desiring to be clothed upon with [to put on over this] our house which is from heaven: if so be that [since indeed, *εἴγε καί*][9] being clothed[10] we shall not be found naked. For [even] we that are in *this* [the][11] tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, [because we are not willing to be unclothed], but clothed upon,
5 that mortality [our mortal part] might be swallowed up of [by] life. Now [But] he
6 that hath wrought us [out] for the self-same thing *is* God, who also [*om.* also][12] hath
7 given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore *we are* [Being] always confident,
8 knowing that, whilst we are at [in our] home in the body, we are absent from [our
9 home in] the Lord: for we walk by faith, not by sight [appearance]: we are confident, *I say*, and willing [well pleased] rather to be absent from the body, and to be present
10 with the Lord. Wherefore [also] we labour, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of [acceptable to] him. For we must all appear [be made manifest] before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things *done* in [through] *his* body, according to that he hath done, whether *it be* [*were*] good or bad.[13]

[1] Ver. 10.—Rec. has *τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ* in opposition to the best authorities [*viz.*: A. B. C. D. E. F. G. Sin. *εἰ μή*. It is sustained only by K. L. and some versions and three of the best Greek fathers. Sin. has *τοῖς σώμασιν* instead of the second *τῷ σώματι*.]

[2] Ver. 12.—Rec. has *ὁ μὲν θάνατος*, but it is feebly sustained. [Alford thinks it was "inserted to correspond to *δὲ* below."]

[3] Ver. 13.—Sin. alone has *καί* after the first *διό*. After *γεγραμ.* of ver. 13, the Cod. Alex. (A.) is entirely lost until chap. xii. 7.]

[4] Ver. 14.—Without sufficient authority, Lachm. has thrown out *τὸν κύριον*.

[5] Ver. 14.—The διὰ of the Rec. is not as well sustained as σὺν before Ἰησοῦ. It was intended probably for a correction [ALFORD: "on account of the difficulty found in σὺν Ἰησοῦ being joined to a future verb, his resurrection being past." Σὺν is given in B. C. D. F. Sin. (1st cor.).]

[6] Ver. 16.—As in ver. 1, ἐκκακοῦμεν is preferable to ἐγκακοῦμεν, and for reasons similar to those there given.

[7] Ver. 16.—Lachm. has good authorities for his reading: ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν, and yet his reading is probably not genuine, but arose from an attempt to make it correspond with ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν. [The same reason probably produced the reading ἐξωθεν instead of ἐξω, *i. e.*, to make it correspond with ὁ ἔσωθεν after the latter had been accepted as the true reading. But even ἔσωθεν is not satisfactorily sustained. Ἡμῶν is also inserted by high authority (B. C. D. E. F. Sin.) after ἔσω. Tisch. and Rec. omit it after ἔσωθεν. Alford (but with a doubt) and Stanley insert it with ἔσω. Meyer suggests that it was inserted for uniformity.]

[8] Ver. 17.—Before ἐλαφρὸν D. (1st cor.) E. F. G., the Vulg. Syr. and Goth. versions, and some of the Latin fathers read πρόσκαιρον καὶ, but it was probably a gloss upon παραντίκα. Comp. διὰ τοῦ παραντίκα ἔδειξε τὸ βραχύ τε καὶ πρόσκαιρον in Theodt.]

[9] Ver. 3.—Lach. has εἴπερ, Rec. has εἴγε. The latter is sustained by the testimony only of C. K. L., but by the strong authority of nearly all the cursives and all the Greek fathers. Meyer, however, thinks it an arbitrary change by some transcriber. [Sinaiticus has since given its testimony for εἴγε. The great majority of the recent critical editions now adopt εἴγε.]

[10] Ver. 3.—Rec. and Lach. have ἐνδυσάμενοι instead of ἐκδυσάμενοι. Both readings are well supported. See Exeget. Notes.

[11] Ver. 4.—After σκήνει Lachmann inserts τούτῳ; the evidence is not decisive. Meyer thinks it was added more clearly to define σκήνει.

[12] Ver. 5.—Excellent authorities are in favor of ὁ δούς.—Rec. and Tisch. have ὁ καὶ δούς with equally good authority.

[13] Ver. 10.—Rec. and Lachm. have κᾶκόν. Tisch. has φαῦλον, but without sufficient authority. [B. D. E. F. G. K. L favor κακόν, and C. and Sin. favor φαῦλον. The Greek and cursives are divided nearly equally.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VER. 7. [*This glorious ministry was intrusted to weak and decaying vessels.* "As the Apostle had spoken many and great things of the indescribable glory, there was danger that some would say, 'How can those who have such glory continue in these mortal bodies?' He, therefore, says that this is indeed a matter of chief surprise, and a remarkable instance of Divine power, that an earthen vessel should be able to endure such extreme splendor, and to hold in custody so great a treasure." CHRYSOSTOM. He insensibly passes to the Divine supports which he experienced under the weaknesses of his body and the difficulties of his work].—**But we have this treasure in earthen vessels.**—The δέ leads us on to the exhibition of the contrast between the glory of which he had just been speaking, and the infirmity and afflicted state of those who were its possessors. We can hardly suppose that he is here directly defending himself against objections which had been formally arrayed against him (see Meyer); and yet he doubtless had his eye on those opponents who had endured much less for Christ's cause. (comp. chap. xi. 23 ff.).—The word treasure indicates the great value of the Divine illumination (ver. 6), and of course implies the importance of the office which is directed to the diffusion of the light of the knowledge, *etc.* In contrast with this is the ὀστράκινα σκεύη, clayey vessel, which is of a cheap and fragile nature. We naturally expect that a valuable possession will be deposited in precious and valuable vessels. In this he has no reference to some special insignificance or weakness of his person, or to some peculiar sickliness of his bodily frame, nor indeed [illegible] himself exclusively (σκεύεσιν, καρδίαις, ver. 6), but according to his usage, to the general state of the human body, perishable as it always is, and destined to dissolution. (comp. ver. 16; chap. v. 1 ff.).—[The word σκεῦος, as applied to the human body, had almost lost its metaphorical character among the Greeks. (comp. Rom. ix. 22, 23; 1 Pet. iii. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 21). The Platonists spoke of two bodies; one (ὄχημα ψυχῆς) was the external chariot or vehicle of the soul, and the other (ὀστράκινον σκεῦος) was the frail body which the soul inhabits as the testacea do their shell. The substantive ὄστρακον signifies either burnt clay, with any thing made of it, a piece of tile, and especially the tablet used in voting (hence ostracise), or the hard shell of the testacea. The latter seems to have been the most ancient meaning, and the two significations are connected, perhaps because shells were at first used as vessels, or were the material from which vessels were made. CHRYSOSTOM: "Our mortal nature is nothing better constituted than earthen ware; for it is soon damaged, and by death and disease, and variations of temperature and ten thousand other things, easily dissolved." Dr. Hodge, Neander and Billroth think that earthen vessels here signify not the frail bodies merely, but the whole human nature of ministers since it is not solely on account of their corporeal frailty that they are incompetent to produce the effects which flow from their ministrations. But though the fact here assumed is true, the mind of the Apostle was evidently here fixed upon the body alone; as is clear from the usage of ὀστράκινον σκεῦος, and from the equivalent phrases (our outward man, and our earthly tent in which we dwell) in ver. 16 and chap. v. i.]. In the apparent unsuitableness of such an arrangement, he discovered a Divine purpose of an exalted character.—**That the exceeding greatness of the power may be seen to be God's and not ours.**—[On the telic and not ecbatic signification of ἵνα consult Winer § 57, p. 355]. The exceeding greatness of the power (ὑπερβολὴ (found also in chap. xii. 7) τῆς δυνάμεως) signifies the power which was so triumphant in the whole sphere of the Apostolic ministry to convert and enlighten men, notwithstanding the afflictions, persecutions, difficulties and conflicts which had to be endured. (comp. ver. 8 ff.). It was in these very circumstances that its superiority to every other agency had been shown (δύναμις 1 Cor. iv. 20).—The ᾖ like γένηται in Rom. vii. 13, and εἶναι in Rom. iii. 26, has the logical import of φανῇ or εὑρηθῇ οὖσα [*i. e.*, may appear to be.]. The genitive θεοῦ has the force of, belonging to God; and it is contrasted with ἐξ ἡμῶν: going out from us.

VERS. 8–10. [All the sentences in this passage are participial, and yet they are not inappropriately rendered in our A. V. in the first person of the present Indicative. "In each of these pairs of antitheses the signification of the second is *cognate* to that of the first; in those in chap. vi. 9, 10, *contrary:* each second is also here the

extreme of the first." WEBSTER & WILKINSON]. They are connected in signification with the preceding verse, in which had been announced the design or end God had in view. He thus asserts that the superabundant power which was exhibited in his Apostolical work belonged entirely to that God who helped him and carried him through all his distresses and infirmities.—**We are pressed in every way but not straitened.**—Ἐν παντὶ signifies here, not in all places, but in every way and on every occasion, as in chap. vii. 5. [Dr. Hodge also suggests that the words belong to all the following clauses, and not merely to the first]. Στενοχωρεῖσθαι signifies to be hemmed in a narrow space from which there is no exit. [STANLEY: pressed for room, but still having room]. The noun occurs in chap. vi. 4, and xii. 10. As οὐ στενοχωροίμενοι, in which God's power is displayed, is related to θλιβόμενοι, so is οὐκ ἐξαπορούμενοι to ἀπορούμενοι: —**perplexed but not despairing.**—The word ἀπορούμενοι signifies, to come into perplexities, and ἐξαπορ. to come into such extreme despair, that one knows not what to do or where to look for help. [STANLEY: losing our way, but not entirely; bewildered, but not benighted]. There is probably in this antithesis an allusion, not merely to his external, but to his internal state; for under distressing and straitened circumstances, under fatigue and hostile assaults, the mind becomes oppressed, and hence perplexed and in despair. In such a condition God's power had been revealed, so that in the midst of his human infirmities, he had not been reduced to extremity, nor been without counsel or hope.—**Persecuted, but not forsaken** (ver. 9).—He here begins to speak of outward circumstances. In διωκόμενοι and ἐγκαταλειπόμενοι the metaphor is not that of a foot-race [pursued, but not left behind, (Olshausen, Stanley,) for the Apostle is speaking, not of rivalry from those who as runners had the same end in view, but of troubles and persecutions" ALFORD]; for διώκεσθαι, as in 1 Cor. iv. 12, signifies to be persecuted (so διωγμοί in chap. xii. 10), and ἐγκαταλείπεσθαι, to be left under persecutions, to be abandoned without help (see Meyer). The word occurs also in 2 Tim. iv. 16. The figure of a conflict runs through both clauses of the verse:—**cast down, but not destroyed**; καταβαλλόμενοι is an advance beyond the meaning of διωκόμενοι, for it asserts that he was not only chased, but pulled or stricken down to the ground. NEANDER: "We have here the comparison of a combatant who is indeed thrown down by his antagonist in the conflict, and is awaiting his death blow, but who, after all, succeeds in rising again." The Catholic interpretation is: "one who is seized in his flight, and is prostrated, but not slain." Not being destroyed was the consequence of not being forsaken. In ver. 10 the apostolic sufferings are set forth in their highest degree of intensity, as an extreme peril of life itself, a perpetual hanging in suspense:—**always bearing about in our body the dying of Jesus.** (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 31; Rom. viii. 36).—Νέκρωσις is a killing, or putting to death, but it has also an intransitive signification, a dying; here in a physical and not an ethical sense. (comp. ver. 11). The dying of Jesus is represented as permanently connected with his body in such a way that he was never without it, and always carried it with him. [It was a perpetual νέκρωσις, a *dying*, but never a θάνατος, *death*]. It was something which attached to him in consequence of his common fellowship with Jesus in his mode of life and his office, and accompanied him wherever he was. [CHRYSOSTOM: we are shown every day dying, that we may also be seen every day rising again]. Those explanations miss the true sense of the Apostle, which describe it as a violent death from wounds (Gal. vi. 17), or a sickness which contained the seeds of death (Rückert). The antithesis is introduced in the following final sentence—**that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body**—where we are told the purpose or design which God had in view when He permitted such sufferings (comp. ver. 7). The life of Jesus, the ζωὴ, contrasted with the νέκρωσις, signifies that life which is the triumphant result of the death of Jesus, *viz:* the life which He had in His resurrection. Its manifestation in the body of the Apostle was probably nothing but the fact that although he was always in danger of death, he always came forth alive out of his deadly perils. The idea is that of unity with Christ or resemblance to Christ in His life, as before in His dying. The context and the contrast suggest this. Though Jesus or the life of Jesus may have been the source of this life, such is not the assertion of the text, and such an assertion would not be suitable to the context. If we attempt to unite the two ideas in one explanation, we only mingle together two distinct representations (life in its unity and resemblance, and life in its energy). In a subsequent part of the Apostle's discourse (ver. 14ff.) the glorification of the body in the resurrection is perhaps a topic of consideration, but no allusion is made to it here. Still less is there any reference to a spiritual or moral influence, as though the Apostle would assert that the same living power through which Christ was raised and now lives, might be seen in the invincible energy of soul which he exhibited in the midst of all his adversities (de Wette). It is inconsistent with such a view that he uses the phrase, in our body (ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν), and the corresponding expression, in our mortal flesh (ἐν τῇ θνητῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν, ver. 11, comp. also chap. vi. 9); and it is not a sufficient explanation of this idea to say, that his official influence is conceived of in its outward manifestation, in connection with and acting through the feeble members of his body (Osiander). [It is, however, against this wholly natural view of the life of Jesus acting in Paul's body that, in ver. 12, he speaks of it as acting through him upon the Corinthians, and in them producing spiritual effects (comp. Alford. But see notes on that ver.). "Perhaps Paul does not refer to any single thing in the life of the Lord Jesus, but means that he did this in order that in all things the same life, the same kind of living which characterized the Lord Jesus might be manifested in him; so that he resembled Him in his sufferings and trials, in order that in all things he might have the same life in his body."—BARNES].

VER. 11. **For we which live are ever delivered unto death.**—This is an explanation and a confirmation of what had been said in ver. 10. Corresponding with the bearing about the dying of Jesus in the body, we have here a being delivered unto death for Jesus' sake. And yet it does not follow that the dying of Jesus was precisely the same as the dying for Jesus' sake. The thought (ver. 10) of the identity of the dying (in behalf of the same cause) is modified in ver. 11 by becoming a deliverance unto death for Jesus' sake. Both ideas, however, are fundamentally the same, so far as the cause of God's kingdom, for which both Jesus and His Apostle endured such deadly sufferings, and the person and name of Jesus himself, were essentially connected. In *διὰ Ἰησοῦν*, here rendered, for Jesus' sake, *διά* indicates the true reason but not the object had in view (to glorify Jesus), although the cause and the design are closely united. Much less does this preposition mean the same thing as: *auctoritate Jesu*, for it cannot have reference to the motive of the action, inasmuch as the deliverance (*παραδιδόμεθα*) is passive, and can have no allusion to the voluntariness of the subject of the action. The being delivered to death (*εἰς θάν. παδιδ.*) is intensified by the contrast implied in, *we who are alive* (*ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες*), as if they were delivered up to death in full life. NEANDER: "Now we seem in the midst of life and a moment afterwards we are given up to death." This is neither an anticipation of what is said in the succeeding final sentence (as if the Apostle had intended to say: we who are kept alive), nor is it the same as to say: "as long as we live;" nor is it a feeble expression by which he would inform us: we who are still alive while so many of our fellow-Christians are dead; nor, moreover, is it to be taken as an emphatic description of the spiritual life (Osiander, Bisping); those in whom Jesus' life acts to make them His organs of communication with men must have life through the spirit and power of faith (Jno. iii. 36; xi. 25; Gal. ii. 20). Such a view as is contained in this last mode of interpretation could derive support only from the final sentence in ver. 10, as it is explained by de Wette. The deliverance to death was accomplished through the agency of men, but it must be referred ultimately to God (*ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*), inasmuch as the final sentence indicates that there was a Divine purpose in the case.—**that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh.**—In the inference which is drawn in this final sentence, the words, *in our mortal flesh* (*ἐν τῇ θνητῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν*), are emphatic, and are an augmentation of the thought expressed in ver. 10 respecting the manifestation in our body (*ἐν τῷ σώματι*); or perhaps they are a stronger expression to bring into more striking contrast the revelation of Jesus' life, inasmuch as this life must become more manifest in the midst of this weakness and frailty of the body.

VER. 12. **So then death worketh in us but life in you.**—We have here the result of what he had just described, and its relation to the Corinthian Church. We should naturally have expected in such an expression *ὁ μὲν θάνατος* (lect. rec.), but the particle was probably left out by the Apostle intentionally, that the contrast might be the more striking. Death and life were both active powers (as in every other part of the New Testament *ἐνεργεῖται* must be taken in an active and not in a passive signification.) Death was working in the Apostle, inasmuch as he was always exposed to death (vv. 10, 11), but life was working in the Corinthians. But in what sense was this true of the Corinthians? Not directly but mediately, in the degree in which Jesus' life was revealed in the Apostle's body. The connection with vv. 10, 11 seems to demand this. It was by the Apostle's dangers that he came into just the position to exert his apostolic powers for their good. While, therefore, he felt the continual influence of death, they were receiving a perpetual stream of quickening energies from his death. We are neither compelled to understand (with de Wette and Osiander) the life (*ζωή*) here spoken of as meaning the higher spiritual life, the Divine power which was glorified in the Apostle's sufferings and its working (*ἐνεργεῖται*), as expressing the beneficial influence of his ministry in implanting and strengthening their faith, nor would we be justified in giving such a turn to the thought. [On the other hand Alford contends that the idea of Christ's natural life acting upon the Corinthians through Paul, is much forced. "In Rom. viii. 10 f., the vivifying influence of His Spirit, who raised Jesus from the dead is spoken of as extending to the body also; here the upholding influence of Him who delivers and preserves the body is spoken of as vivifying the whole man: *life*, in both places, being the higher and spiritual life, including the lower and natural. 'And in our relative positions—ye are examples of this life since ye are a church of believers, alive to God through Christ in your various vocations, and not called upon to be *θεατριζόμενοι* as we are, who are (not indeed excluded from that *life*—nay, it flows from us to you—but are) more especially examples of conformity to the *death* of our common Lord, in whom death works." "Death and life are personified, and the one is operative in Paul and the other in the Corinthians."—HODGE]. Entirely unsuitable to the whole tenor of the Epistle and of this particular section would be the supposition of an irony in which the Apostle contrasts his own extreme perils with the peace and prosperity of the Corinthians. Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 8 (Chrysostom, Calvin).

VERS. 13, 14.—**But having the same spirit of faith (as it is written, I believed, therefore I spoke).**—The Apostle now passes on to the spiritual side of the description he was giving of the Divine power in him (ver. 7). [But though you might think this working of death discouraging to us, it is not so in fact; for we are animated by two great principles: first, an assured *faith* that we shall participate with you in the benefits of the Gospel (vers. 13–16), and secondly, a confident *hope* of a glorious renovation (vers. 16–18). Our version omits the connecting particle *δέ* which expresses the contrast between what follows and what precedes: death worketh indeed in us, *but*] the same spirit of faith impels us to speak to our fellow-men and to make known the Gospel, which had been expressed in that passage of Scripture, in which it

is said: I believed, therefore I spoke. The *δέ* also introduces an additional point in the discourse. The Spirit of faith denotes, not the spirit or disposition of faith, but the Spirit of God, which produced faith in the heart, the Spirit which he had received, which dwelt in him, and whose organ he was in the ministration of the Spirit. Chap. iii. 8; comp. the spirit of meekness in 1 Cor. iv. 21; Gal. vi. 1, *et al.* NEANDER: "the Apostle is here speaking of that peculiar influence of the Holy Spirit by which he acquired a confirmed confidence in God that he would come forth triumphant over all death, and that every thing would promote the welfare of himself and of the whole Church." Τὸ *αὐτό* refers not to the faith of the Corinthians (the same which ye have), for the context suggests nothing of this kind, and the Apostle is speaking of the Corinthians only as the receivers or objects of his beneficial agency, but to the *τὸ γεγραμμένον* with its contents: the same spirit of confidence in God which is expressed in the following passage of the Scriptures. The passage is found in Ps. cxvi. 10, though it is taken from the LXX., and does not give us the precise translation of the original Heb. הֶאֱמַנְתִּי כִּי אֲדַבֵּר, "I believed, for I spoke." [Comp. Hengstenberg on the Psalms.]. This, however, conducts us essentially to the same idea, for the speech, the discourse of the psalmist, expressive of prayerful submission, thankfulness and hope (vers. 1–9), is something in which faith is shown, and must have proceeded from faith. BENGEL says: "No sooner does faith exist than she begins to speak to others, and while speaking recognizes herself and grows in power."—Like the Psalmist, **we also believe and therefore speak.**—The believing of the Apostle, like that of the Psalmist, was a firm assurance that the quickening power of the Lord would help him through, and deliver him out of all his distresses. From this proceeds a spirit of praise for the deliverance given him; for in his preaching and in his testimony before the Church, his great object was to glorify God. —But the faith which moved him to speak involved also a confident hope that the power of God would ever afterwards be manifested in him, ver. 14: — **Knowing that He who raised up the Lord Jesus.**—We have *εἰδότες* in like manner in 1 Cor. xv. 58. The basis of this hope was the Divine fact on which all his faith and his salvation rested, 1 Cor. xv. 13 ff.; Rom. viii. 11, *et al.* The substance of this confidence was, that he who had raised up the Lord Jesus, **will raise up us also with Jesus.**— The most natural and probably the correct view of this passage leads our thoughts to the general resurrection. The fact that in other passages Paul holds before himself and his fellow-believers of that period the possibility that they might be changed without dying (1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 15 f.), does not militate against such a view, for he also intimates (chap. v. 8) that they miht possibly be called to die, and we may include under the general idea of being raised up, the more special one of a simple change (comp. on 1 Cor. vi. 14). Instead of *σύν* one would more naturally have expected *διά* or *ἐν*, 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22. But just as in *ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ*, 1 Thess. iv. 14, the fellowship with him into which they were to be introduced, was pointed out, so the resurrection with Jesus in this place is a pattern which, in like manner, is founded upon a fellowship with Him, and is its highest realization and glorification, Eph. ii. 6; Col. ii. 12; iii. 1. Of a resurrection with Jesus, in some other sense than that of a bodily resurrection, the Apostle never speaks, except in the past tense. No intimation is given of a deliverance from the peril of death (Meyer), and the words, with Jesus, are at least no more fitted to such an idea than they are to *ἐγείρειν* in the sense of a literal resurrection of the dead. If the former is a common fellowship in the lot of the risen Jesus, the latter is still more so. It is for this reason that he immediately adds:—**and will present us with you.**—This must refer to a presentation before the judgment seat of Christ for the reception of the great prize (chap. i. 14; v. 10; comp. 2 Tim. iv. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 19), or, which comes to the same result, a presentation of them as the companions of Christ in His kingdom. [This presentation *by* Christ is not the same with standing before *His* bar for judgment. The Apostle has here no allusion to the more awful scenes of the last judgment (chap. v. 10) but only to the more animating presentation with Christ and by Christ for final acceptance by the Father].

VER. 15. **For all things are for your sakes.**—This is immediately connected with the preceding phrase, in which he had declared that he would have fellowship *with them* in the future glory. The *all things* has reference to what he had said of his afflictions and his deliverances, of his faith and its fruits, and of his speaking and witnessing for the truth in the power of faith. In ver. 12 he had said that life was energizing in them, and he now declares that all things he had mentioned (*τὰ πάντα*), would turn out for their good. (comp. chap. i. 6; Phil. i. 25; 2 Tim. ii. 10). He will present us with you, for all these things take place for your sakes. In the final sentence he tells them of the ultimate result to which all things would be conducted:—**in order that the grace which abounds through many, might multiply thanksgivings to the glory of God.**—The grace (*χάρις*) is here not the whole salvation sealed by the resurrection of Christ, for such an idea would not be expressed by a phrase like *τὰ πάντα*, but the gracious assistance of which he had just spoken. (ver. 10 ff.). Πλεονάσασα *διὰ τῶν πλειόνων* signifies that the grace was increased or enlarged by the greater number of those who participate in it, or to whom it is extended. The persons here spoken of are not those who would become interested in the blessing in consequence of the Corinthians' intercessions in his behalf, for his subject did not call for such an allusion (as in chap. i. 11). The same general sense of the passage would be gained if we should connect *διὰ τῶν πλειόνων* with the following *περισσεύσῃ*:—**that the abounding grace might multiply the thanksgivings by means of many.**—In this case the increased number, who participated in the blessing, were those through whom the grace, extended or enlarged by their participation, would be the means of a more abundant thanksgiving. This

is certainly better than passing over the intervening *τῶν πλειόνων*, to govern *τὴν εὐχαριστίαν* by *διά* (in which case the genitive would have been more grammatical; comp. chap. ix. 12), and to take *περισσεύσῃ* in an intransitive sense. The word, however, is frequently used in either a transitive or an intransitive signification; comp. ix. 8, 12. On the phrase, to the glory of God, comp. 1 Cor. x. 31. [Alford presents us with four ways of translating this clause: 1. "that grace having abounded by means of the greater number (who have received it), may multiply the thanksgiving to the glory of God;" 2. "that grace having abounded, may, on account of the thanksgiving of the greater number, be multiplied to the glory of God." (Luther, Bengel, *etc.*); 3. "that grace having abounded, may, by means of the greater number, multiply the thanksgiving to the glory of God." (De Wette); 4. "that grace having multiplied by means of the greater number, the thanksgiving may abound to the glory of God." (Proposed as possible, but not adopted by himself). He prefers the first as "most agreeable to the position of the words and to the emphasis."]

Vers. 16–18. **For which cause we faint not.**—*Διό* refers back to ver. 14. (ver. 15 was only an explanation of ver. 14). We faint not (*οὐκ ἐκκακοῦμεν*) occurs here in the same sense as in ver. 1. In positive contrast with this, he says:—**but even if our outward man is wasted away, our inward** (man) **is nevertheless renewed day by day.**—The outward man (*ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος*), is an expression found only in this place, and it denotes the whole personal existence, so far as it is embodied in nature and the laws of the external common life. On the other hand, *ὁ ἔσωθεν ἄνθρ.* denotes the same personal existence, so far as it is determined by the Divine law, and participates in the fulness of the Divine life. Comp. Rom. vii. 22; comp. 23 (where *νοῦς* is an equivalent word): Eph. iii. 16 comp. 19. (Beck, *Seelenl.*, 68 f. comp. 42, 37). Meyer thinks the former expression denotes that which is visible in us, *i. e.*, our corporeal nature, and the latter, our intellectual, rational and moral selves. Osiander understands by the latter term, the essential nature of man, kindred with God and capable of regeneration. [Hodge: "man's higher nature—his soul as the subject of the Divine life."] Comp. Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychol.*, pp. 145 f. 331, 333. [Alford, Stanley, Barnes and Bloomfield understand by it simply the *soul* in distinction from the body]. The doctrine of Collenbusch and Menken, that the inner man is an invisible body, existing in some concealed form within us, cannot be sustained by any natural exegesis, or by the plain meaning of these words. The attempt which Osiander has made to devise an intermediate doctrine according to which the inner man is the sphere of the higher spiritual life, which, however, communicates itself to the whole man by perpetually acting in an outward direction, and which, therefore, contains the germ of a higher bodily life and of a corporeal resurrection, is certainly problematical. The wasting away (*διαφθείρεσθαι*) of our outer man, *i. e.*, the destruction of the outer man by the consuming, fretting, and disintegrating conflicts which his sufferings involved, is here alluded to as an actual process in the *εἰ καί* (which cannot mean: *even supposing that.* Rückert), and was an actual fact of the Apostle's experience, notwithstanding the salvation asserted in ver. 10 f. In contrast with this perishing of the outer, he now places the renewal (*ἀνακαινοῦσθαι*) of the inner man. Neander: "the *ἀνά* presupposes an original image of God in man." Both processes are represented as perpetually going on, but the inward man is said to be continually endued with new power, *i. e.*, to be renewed, and sustained by the quickening Spirit (*πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν*) which came to him from Christ. (chap. iii. 17 f. and ver. 6). *Ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ* is like the Hebr. יוֹם יוֹם, Ps. lxviii. 20; Gen. xxxix. 10; Esther iii. 4). The second *ἀλλά* is equivalent to: yet, nevertheless, as is frequently the case in hypothetical conclusions in which the apodosis contains a contrast to the protasis. (comp. chap. v. 16; xi. 6; xiii. 4; 1 Cor. iv. 15; ix. 2). —**For our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh for us exceeding abundantly, an eternal weight of glory.** (Ver. 17).—He here notices what it was which gave such continual refreshment to his inward man, under the exhausting influence of his sufferings. It was the hope of glory with which the Spirit of Christ had inspired him, and which showed him that these suffering were only the momentary and slight inconveniences of a transition state, and the necessary means of attaining a state of glory. (Comp. ver. 14; Rom. v. 6; viii. 17 ff.). Inasmuch as this view of his sufferings contained the reason for the renewal of which he had spoken (*ἀνακαίνωσις*), he introduces it with a *γάρ*. The verse contains a sharp antithesis. There is on the one hand *τὸ παραυτίκα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως*, the momentary* (coming and going in a moment) lightness (in respect to weight and therefore easily to be borne) of the affliction (an oxymoron, since *θλῖψις*, oppression, implies something heavy), and on the other, the eternal weight of glory (*τὸ αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης*). *Βάρος* signifies weight, and therefore pressure, and would seem more appropriately connected with the affliction (*θλῖψις*), but is here applied to the glory (*δόξα*) on account of the great extent or high degree of the glory. The meaning is: the afflic-

* [Bloomfield notices that the natural meaning of *παραυτίκα* (*παρ' αὐτ, ἀπὸ αὐτίκα* present) is "at present," and that the Syriac translators and most recent commentators therefore assign to the passage the sense of: "our *present* light affliction." But the ancients generally, and almost all the earlier moderns took *παραυτίκα* to mean *momentary*. The idea, "for the present," readily suggests the notion of what is temporary, and such a version seems required by the antithetical *αἰώνιον*. Chrysostom's observations on this passage are admirable: "The Apostle opposes things present to things future: a moment to eternity; lightness to weight; affliction to glory. Nor is he satisfied with this, but he adds another word and doubles it, saying, *καθ' ὑπερβ. εἰς ὑπερβ.* This is a magnitude excessively exceeding. The repetition is intensive, after the Heb. מְאֹד מְאֹד exceedingly."

Dr. A. Clarke says: "It is every where visible what influence St. Paul's Hebrew had on his Greek: כָּבֵד signifies *to be heavy* and *to be glorious:* the Apostle in his Greek unites these two significations, and says, "*weight* of *glory*." Comp. Hodge. Barrow has two passages finely illustrating this favorite text of his, in Sermn. 4th and 40th (Works by Hamilton Vol. I. pp. 38 and 384). Also Bp. J. Taylor, Consemp. on the State of Man, Lib. ii. chap. i.].

tion is soon over and light, while the glory is everlasting and weighty. Possibly the affliction was called momentary on account of the nearness of Christ's second coming, *i. e.* the Parousia (Meyer). Certainly the everlasting duration and the magnitude of the glory, when contemplated by a steady eye of faith, would make afflictions seem but momentary and light.—But we must understand the Apostle as implying that the afflictions are the actual cause of the glory. The θλῖψις is the means of producing and bringing to pass the δόξα, *i. e.* the glory of the heavenly kingdom. This is a consequence of that. What is represented in other passages as a reward (com. Matth. v. 10; Luke xvi. 25; Rom. viii. 27; 2 Tim. ii. 12; Rom. v. 2–5), is here represented as a natural result. The affliction so exercises and purifies the believer, that he is qualified to enjoy the glory, or, it promotes the sanctification of both soul and body. Nothing is said, however, to imply that the sufferings have any merit in themselves, or have any intrinsic value in the matter of our justification.—The qualification καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολήν does not seem applicable to αἰώνιον, and it must therefore be connected with κατεργάζεται; they work in a superabundant manner, even to a superfluity. Meyer explains it as: the measureless energy and the measureless results of the working (κατεργάζεται, comp. chap. i. 8; x. 15; 1 Cor. xii. 31; Gal. i. 13; Rom. vii. 13, *et al.*). It may then be indirectly connected with the δόξα (Osiander). A separation of the words so as to make the first καθ' ὑπερβ. have reference to τῆς θλίψεως (the exceedingly intense affliction), and the second εἰς ὑπερβ. to the δόξαν (Bengel) is not sustained by grammatical usage.—Such an accumulation of epithets indicates the highest possible degree, but not a development of the glory from one super-eminent position of glory to another still higher. In ver. 18 he notices still further the subjective reason for such a result: while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen. To take this in the sense of something which must be presupposed as a condition to what had just been said, is not called for, since the Apostle in the context is not exhorting his readers, but is simply describing a fact, and ἡμῶν can be taken only by way of application to a more extensive class (to believers generally). Σκοπεῖν is: to take in sight, particularly to look upon the object of our exertion, as in Phil. ii. 4. The things which are seen (τὰ βλεπόμενα) are the blessings of the αἰὼν οὗτος, the things we perceive by our senses; the things not seen (τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα) are those of the ἀιὼν μέλλων, things which are beyond the perception of our senses, and yet not precisely the same as the ἀόρατα (invisible things). Bengel says: "many things which are at present unseen, will be visible when faith's journey is accomplished." The μή in connection with μὴ σκοπούντων ἡμῶν describes the subjective position in which believers are supposed to be (Winer*).—**For the things which are seen are temporary, but the things which are not seen are eternal** (ver. 18).—He here gives the reason for the not looking at, *etc.*, πρόσκαιρα (temporary), is applicable to a definite period of time, that which continues only for a limited season, and hence means not so much temporal as transitory. It occurs also in Matth. xiii. 21; Mark iv. 17; Heb. xi. 25.

[* What the author alludes to here is expressed in Winer (Gram. § 59, Andover ed. p. 366): "Of the negative particles οὐ stands when the intention is to represent something exactly and directly (as a reality), μὴ stands where something is only conceived of (according to the idea) in the mind; the former is the objective, the latter the subjective negation. This usage, he thinks, is uniform, especially in the New Testament. Thus he points out that in our passage τὰ μὴ βλεπ. signifies the mere idea of what cannot be seen, while in Heb. xi: 1, τὰ οὐ βλεπ. signifies what actually is not seen. (Idd. p. 370). Stanley, on the other hand, thinks that the only reason why μὴ is used in this passage and οὐ in Heb. xi. 1, is "merely from the Greek usage, which requires μὴ after the article, and οὐ where the article is not used." Alford thinks that μὴ is used here only to express what is *hypothetical*: "on the supposition that," *etc.* There can be no question that in these two passages Winer's view throws light and beauty over the thought. Faith (in Heb. xi. 1) looks to that which is *beyond the reach* of bodily sight and (in 2 Cor. iv. 18) turns away so as not to look upon what *might* be seen.]

Chapter V.

Ver. 1. For we know that if the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved.—We have here the reasons assigned for what had been said in chap. iv. 17: "We have said that our temporal afflictions worked for us an eternal weight of glory, and the reason is, we know," *etc.* Or, it will come to the same end, if we take the idea thus: Our afflictions accomplish the result we have mentioned; for we have, as we know, *etc.* Οἰδαμεν, "we," *i. e.*, the Apostle and his companions "know," for there is no appeal here to the *general* consciousness of men, as in some other places. Ἐάν expresses the possible occurrence of an event, the actual occurrence of which he leaves to the future to determine. This event is his not living until the Parousia, the second coming of Christ. It was the death of his present body, here figuratively called the destruction of his earthly tabernacle. Τοῦ σκήνους is here the genitive of apposition, for the house was the same as the (well-known) tabernacle. The body is thus described as a dwelling of the spirit which is easily broken up. There is no allusion, however, to the tent habitations of the Israelites in the wilderness, or the tabernacle of witness there. In the same way we have σκήνωμα in 2 Pet. i. 13 f. The word σκῆνος (tent) was frequently used among the Greeks for the earthly habitation or covering of the soul, but invariably with reference to the earthly body, and always with some allusion to the fundamental notion of a temporary tent. (Meyer).* Ἐπιγέιος, as in 1 Cor. xv. 40, means that which is on earth. [Stan-

[* Stanley suggests that the mingling of the metaphors of a tent and a garment may have been caused by Paul's familiarity with the Cilician materials used in tent making. Sometimes these were of *skins*, which Wetstein thinks were suggestive also of the human *body*, often called by the Greeks a tent; and sometimes they were of *hair cloth*, which was almost equally suggestive of a habitation and of a vesture. When such tents were separated into their parts (καταλυθῇ), if they were not strictly *dissolved* (Stanley), they were at least *taken down* and *made away* with (Alford). Chrysostom says that "by these means Paul shows how superior future things were to the present. For to the ἐπίγειον he opposes the οὐρανίαν, and to the οἰκίαν τοῦ σκήνους, which was easy to be dissolved and was made for the present occasion, he opposes the αἰώνιαν; for the name of tent often indicated something only for a special emergency; hence Jno. xiv. 2."]

LEY: "*ἐπὶ* not *of* but *upon* the earth (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 40), opposed to *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* and *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*"]. In case this earthly habitation, which was given him only for a time, should be destroyed, he expresses his certain assurance that we have a building (which is) from God—**a dwelling not made by hands, eternal, in the heavens.**—The words *ἐκ θεοῦ* are not to be joined with *ἔχομεν*, as if we *received* it from God, and yet the dwelling was said to be of a directly Divine origin. This is said in the highest sense, as if it were the result of an *immediate* Divine agency (1 Cor. xv. 38); and was not like the present body, merely of a general Divine origin (1 Cor. xii. 18-24). In this respect it was like the heavenly city of which it is said that its builder and maker is God. Heb. xi. 10. But this building (*οἰκοδομή*) is not the city of God nor the house of the Father, Jno. xiv. 3 (in which case the phrase: our earthly dwelling of this tabernacle, would imply that the earth itself is a transient place of residence), but the resurrection body, the result of a new Divine creation. This is still further defined as an house not made by hands (*οἰκία ἀχειροποίητος*). In this expression, the lower human origin is denied, but in a way corresponding to the figure and not to the thing spoken of. It is not needful here to recur to the original formation of the body in Gen. ii. 7-21. NEANDER: "He is here speaking of a higher heavenly organ to contain the soul, instead of the earthly body." ["The use of *αἰώνιος* (comp. chap. iv. 1 ff.) forbids us to understand by the *οἰκία*, a temporary lodgment of the soul, to be succeeded by the glorified body at the resurrection. It must mean a permanent spiritual corporeity (so to speak) capable of coexisting with the body of the resurrection. It is something which is not the soul, but essential to its perfect consciousness of personality and identity. The human being, it is probable, cannot exist as pure spirit. A vehicle or form, perhaps an organization, may be necessary to its action. (See Taylor's Physical Theory of Another Life, chap. i.). Hence the use of the varied terms *οἰκοδομή, οἰκία, οἰκητήριον*· also the expressions *ἐπενδύσ. ἐνδυσάμ.* and the deprecatory language of ver. 3, and *ἐπειδή—ἐπενδ.* ver. 4."—WEBSTER and WILKINSON]. But this dwelling is said to be eternal in contrast with the dwelling of this tabernacle. [In our English version a comma should separate "eternal" and "in the heavens." FAUSSET]. The last qualification, *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* (opp. *ἐπίγειος*) should be joined with *ἔχομεν*, so as to say that we have this dwelling in the heavens. But how is this to be understood? The present tense would seem to refer to some period immediately after death. But if the soul is to have a body corresponding to its condition at that time (of which, to say the least, the Scriptures distinctly say nothing), then the dwelling here mentioned cannot be eternal. Nor would what is said in ver. 2 of our house which is from heaven, agree very well with such an assertion. Comp. Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 374 ff. It is possible indeed that *ἔχομεν* refers to a mere reversion or expectancy, *i. e.*, to an ideal possession like that which is spoken of when it is said: Thou shalt have treasure in heaven (Luke xviii. 22). In such a case the dwelling would merely be secured for believers, just as the life mentioned in Col. iii. 3 (comp. i. 5, and the crown of righteousness in 2 Tim. iv. 8) is said to be. Or it may be alleged that the intermediate state between death and the resurrection is entirely lost sight of in the Apostle's mind, inasmuch as we know that he looked upon it as altogether temporary, and hence that the perfection to be attained after the resurrection was the absorbing object of his attention in this passage (Osiander). It is hardly probable that such a man would have changed his mind so soon after writing the fifteenth chapter of his former Epistle to the Corinthians, and so should now have believed that he was to pass immediately at death into the blessedness of the resurrection body. And yet how can we reconcile what is here said with what is said in that chapter respecting the development of the resurrection body out of the earthly? It was doubtless his deliberate conviction that in the Parousia, when our Lord shall return, the heavenly bodies prepared for all who belong to Christ, shall be brought down to this earth, and a power shall be imparted to those then alive of changing, and to those then deceased of uniting with, the essential germs of their bodies, and that these shall thus attain their proper fulness and form. NEANDER: "There is certainly a marked distinction between what Paul here says and what he had taught in his earlier Epistles. During that earlier period his most ardent thoughts had been directed to the second coming of Christ. Now, however, when he was oppressed by apprehensions of death (chap. iv. 10-12), his mind was more impressed with the feeling that he might not live to see this second coming of Christ. In this state of mind he had new and additional discoveries of Divine truth on this subject, either by means of his own reflections under the direction of the Holy Ghost, or by means of direct revelations from heaven. From the promises of Christ, and from the very nature of fellowship with Christ, he was now satisfied that death would be only a progress toward a higher state of existence, and this thought had been developed into a conviction that the soul must come into possession of an organ adapted to the active conscious life immediately after death."*

[* Dr. Hodge has recently very elaborately defended the interpretation which makes the house not made with hands to be heaven itself. In this he agrees substantially with Anselm, Aquinas and Rosenmueller. His arguments are (1), the frequent Scriptural comparison of heaven to a house in which are many mansions (Jno. xiv. 2), a city in which are many houses (Heb. xi. 10, 14; xiii. 14; Rev. xxi. 10), or more generally a habitation (Luke xvi. 9); (2), the appropriateness of the metaphor; (3), the agreement of the description here given with other descriptions of heaven. Heb. xi. 10 (comp. Heb. ix. 11), *et. al.*; (4), any body after death or in the resurrection could not be spoken of as at present in the heavens, or as to be received from heaven: whereas Christ expressly authorizes such language respecting the mansions He is preparing; (5), the building here spoken of is evidently to be entered upon at death. When Paul died this was to save him from being found naked, and this could not be at the final resurrection; (6), believers are said to pass immediately into glory at death (Matth. xxii. 32; Luke xvi. 22; xxiii. 43; Phil. i. 22 f.; Heb. xii. 23). In favor of the common view, which makes the house not made by hands the same as the body to be received at the general resurrection, it is alleged (1), that as the earthly house of this tabernacle is a body, the heavenly house must be a body also. Paul's object was not to inform his readers that he expected a new place of residence or to be in heaven, but that he looked for something in the place of his present corporeal tenement; (2), the building was not to *be* heaven,

VERS. 2–4.—**For in this also we groan—earnestly desiring to put on over it our house which is from heaven:**—We have here one proof or sign that what he had asserted in ver. 1 was a reality. This proof was the fact that even while we remain in our earthly bodies we have an intense longing for a house from heaven. Ἐν τούτῳ has here not the sense of therefore, on this account, as in John xvi. 30, as if the succeeding participial sentence were merely an exposition of the previous verse; nor is its object simply to explain what was meant in ver. 1 by the dissolution of the earthly habitation. It rather refers (comp. ver. 4, we who are in this tabernacle) to the tabernacle (σκῆνος) of ver. 1, and presents a contrast to the supposition there made that it might be dissolved. The accent, therefore, should be placed upon ἐν; and καὶ should be looked upon as belonging to it. The sense would then be: we know this to be so, and the proof of it is in the fact, that even now in these bodies also we show our longings after the object of that confidence by our sighs.—A similar style of argument may be found in Rom. viii. 22 f. The earnest desire here spoken of gives us the true reason for the sighing. That which he had called in ver. 1 a building from God, a house which we have in heaven, he here calls a habitation from heaven (οἰκητήριον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ) not merely on account of its origin, but because it was actually to come down from heaven to earth. Οἰκία is somewhat more absolute, whereas οἰκητήριον, a domicile, expresses its proper relation to the inhabitant (Bengel).—Ἐπενδύσασθαι (to superimpose, to put on over, in which he passes to the figure of a garment) is not a putting on of one garment after another has been laid aside, but a putting on of one garment over another, comp. ver. 4. The longing is for a transformation in which the earthly body will not be laid aside (in death), but the heavenly will be thrown over it. The idea is that of a new embodiment without a destruction of the corporeal system which had been possessed on earth. ["The expression τὸ ἐξ οὐρ. compared with ἐκ θεοῦ ἐχομεν and ἐν τοῖς οὐρ. sufficiently distinguishes the οἰκητήριον spoken of from the resuscitated body." WEB. and WILK.]—**Since, in fact being clothed, we shall not be found naked.** (Vr. 3). We have here a *crux interpretum*. If we adopt the two readings, εἴπερ—ἐκδυσαμενοι, we shall have a natural meaning by giving to εἴπερ the sense of: although, albeit; in which case the idea would be: although we may be unclothed, (dead), we shall not be found naked, *i. e.*, without a body; for we shall be clothed with a resurrection body. With the reading ἐνδυσάμενοι we obtain the same general idea, if we contrast that word with ἐπενδύσασθαι, and regard it as the putting on of the resurrection body: If indeed we shall be found clothed and not naked (Flatt). Such a method, however, would be of very doubtful propriety. But it would be quite unallowable to interpret εἴγε as a concessive particle, or to concede no force to the γε, as if the word were equivalent to εἰ καί. Fritzsche regards ἐνδυσάμενοι as having the same force as ἐπενδυσ., and εἴγε the sense of quandoquidem, and he then looks upon this verse as giving a reason for the longing mentioned in ver. 2: since we shall attain the possession of our imperishable bodies just as well by putting on our immortal bodies when we shall be alive, as by putting them on after we have laid aside our earthly bodies (*i. e.*, in consequence of death and the resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 52). Such an announcement would be grammatically appropriate, but 1, such a use of ἐνδυσάμενοι in connection with ἐπενδύσασθαι before and after it, vers. 2, 4, is not very probable; and 2, the remark itself seems so self-evident and trivial, that it would be unworthy of the Apostle. But Rückert's interpretation: "as it is certain that we shall not be without a body (ἐκδυσάμενοι) after death," breaks up the logical train of thought, and with many the assertion thus made would not be looked upon as quite certain from the Scriptures. Meyer (who adopts the readings of the Rec. εἴγε—ἐνδυς.) thinks that the Apostle has reference occasionally in this argument to those who denied a future resurrection (1 Cor. xv.), for otherwise he cannot account for the insertion of ver. 3. He thinks the Apostle intends to assert here his belief, his absolute certainty (εἴγε) that not only those Christians who shall finally be changed, but those who shall then be raised from the dead, shall meet the Lord at His second coming not destitute of bodies (γυμνοί), but provided with corporeal coverings: "we have these longings (*i. e.*, for the ἐπενδυσασθαι, ver. 2) on the presumption that, being clothed, we shall not be found naked (εἴγε has the sense of: if indeed, or if so be, implying a certainty, not by the force of the particle itself, but in consequence of the connection of the idea and the tenor of Paul's discourse). Και would also have in this case the sense of: "truly."* Ἐνδυσάμενοι would denote an

but it was then *in* the heavens, and was to be received from heaven, (3), the reason why the Apostle did not especially refer to the intermediate state between death and the Parousia, was that he had yet received no revelation on the point whether he and his fellow-Christians of that age would live until the Parousia, and so whether there should be any such state to those of whom he was speaking; (4), in contrast with ἐνδύω in this conection ἐπενδύω must have a special meaning which it need not have in 1 Cor. xv. 53 f. for it seems to have the idea of an investiture over the whole person and state of the individual, and not that of a general inhabitation of a people. In spite of the obvious difficulty that Paul seems to speak of receiving the investiture at death, or at least to regard it as ideally at hand when he should die, we cannot but regard these arguments as conclusive in favor of the common interpretation. Neither Calvin nor Olshausen advocated the idea (sometimes imputed to them and here avowed by Neander) of a body prepared for the soul at death and to be inhabited until the Parousia. The spiritual interpretation that the building to be received from heaven is the glory of Christ's righteousness, needs no refutation. It cannot be denied that Paul was familiar with the Rabbinic fancy, that "Adam lost the image of God by his fall, and so became naked." In the Synop. Sohar, it is said that "when the time draws near in which man is to depart from this world, the angel of death takes off this mortal garment and clothes him with one from Paradise." We cannot, however suppose that Paul was much influenced by such prevalent opinions.]

[* Hermann (*ad Viger.* p. 834) expounds the difference between the two particles thus: "Εἴπερ corresponds to the Germ. *wenn anders* (provided that) and εἴγε to the Germ. *wenn denn* (since). The former is used of a thing which is assumed to be, but the writer leaves it in uncertainty whether it is so or not, while the latter, on the other hand, is used of that which is correctly assumed to be." NEANDER says that "in the later Greek this distinction was not always observed, since the words were not unfrequently used in each other's place." For Paul's disregard of the distinction, Dr. Hodge appeals to 1 Cor. viii. 5; Gal. iii. 4; Col. i. 23; 2 Thess. i. 6. The Apostle had no doubt about his ἐνδυσασθαι) and we therefore incline to think he must have used εἴγε. This suits the general tone of confidence which runs through the passage. If the other word was used, it must have been because he conceded something either ironically

act which had taken place before the *εἱρεθησόμεθα*, and it is therefore an aorist participle. Such an interpretation has nothing grammatically against it. But a reference to the deniers of the doctrine of the resurrection cannot be presupposed without a high degree of improbability, and as the whole interpretation becomes feeble and forced without such a reference, it must therefore be considered very doubtful. It is still more difficult to agree with de Wette, who thinks the idea of the passage is: as we confidently expect that our heavenly house will also be a body. For it is evident from the words themselves that those who are *ἐνδυσάμενοι* are not *γυμνοί*; but if the idea of the body had been prominent, *γυμνοί* would have been followed by *σώματος*. NEANDER: "We take these words in connection with those which precede them as merely an incidental expression: we are passing on with believing confidence to a higher state of being, for we shall in no event be destitute of a higher organ when we lay aside our earthly body; and it is only to this necessity of laying aside our earthly body that our natures now feel such a repugnance."—As the participle is really in the aorist and yet must in such a case have the sense of the perfect *ἐνδεδυμένοι*, there are strong reasons against referring *ἐνδυσάμενοι* and *οὐ γυμνοί* exclusively to those who shall be alive and clothed in earthly bodies when Christ shall appear in the Parousia (GROTIUS: if we shall be found among the changed, and not among the dead). Finding all these interpretations unsatisfactory, Osiander gives in his adherence to the figurative meaning which had been proposed by many ancient and some modern commentators. Thus Chrysostom *et al.* have *γυμνοί δόξης*; USTERI: "under the presumption that we are clothed, we shall not be found naked in a different sense, *i. e.*, without the crown for which we have struggled." EWALD: "criminally naked, as Adam and Eve were" (Gen. iii. 11). Others make out a similar meaning by taking *οὐ γυμνοί* as explanatory or epexegetical of *ἐνδυσάμενοι*, and referring both words to Christ or the garment of his righteousness—an idea which Hoffmann (*Schriftbeweis*), following Anselm, understands of an ethical application of Christ. But neither the authorities which have been adduced for this, nor the arguments by which it has been supported (as *e. g.* that it is an allusion to the secret Divine reasons or conditions in chap. iv. 14 ff., and an introduction to the mysteries of faith in ver. 14 ff.) are sufficient to warrant such an explanation of *ἐνδυσάμενοι* and *οὐ γυμνοί* in this connection (where the figure of a garment is used in application to a new heavenly body), without the express addition of some such word as *Χριστοῦ* or *δόξης*. We would prefer either to accede to Meyer's interpretation, or to adopt the very well sustained and ancient reading *εἴπερ—ἐκδυσάμενοι*, giving *εἴπερ* the sense of: although [*i. e.*, we earnestly desire to be clothed with our house from heaven, even if (or although) being unclothed we shall not be found naked]. (Comp. 1 Cor. viii. 5). Here, if anywhere in the explanation of the Scriptures, we may be allowed to say: *Non liquet.*—In ver. 4 the assertion in ver. 2 is again taken up, and is more particularly defined, and confirmed by reasons:—**For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened.**—The words *οἱ ὄντες*, being put at the head of the sentence for the sake of emphasis, have the meaning of: we who are in earthly bodies, *i. e.*, while we are yet in them. The word *βαρούμενοι*, oppressed, feeling ourselves burdened, gives a reason for the groaning. BENGEL: "a burden forces out sighs and groans." This is to be referred partly to the oppressions caused by our earthly bodies (comp. Ecclus. ix. 15), and probably also partly to the sufferings which we have to endure while we are in them (but of which no mention is made in the context). Ἐφ' ᾧ would then have to bear the meaning of: wherefore (quare), and perhaps be equivalent to *ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅ*—we sigh over that which, *etc.* This, however, could hardly be allowed, inasmuch as the earthly body would not then be the object which was to be clothed upon (*ἐπενδύσασθαι*).—**Since we do not desire to be unclothed, but** (we desire) **to be clothed upon.**—We may find a partial interpretation of this expression in what follows, which would incline us to make *ἐφ' ᾧ* equivalent to because that (*propterea quod*), as in Rom. v. 12 (not: in which, or although), and to refer it to the oppression which produces sighs on account of the dread of death. And yet this natural horror which all men feel in prospect of being unclothed, must be carefully distinguished from an unmanly fear of death, which would be unbecoming to the Apostle. The phrase *οὐ θέλειν ἐκδύσασθαι* in the sense of: not wishing to die, is the more intelligible, since the Apostle, perhaps, supposed that he might live till the time of Christ's coming, and hence he might easily think of being spared the pains of death. (The word *ἐκδύεσθαι* occurs in profane authors as a figurative expression for death. Comp. Wetstein on the passage). The reason why the Apostle wished to be clothed upon, is given in the final sentence:—**that what is mortal might be swallowed up by life.**—That which in 1 Cor. xv. 54 is expressed by a putting on of immortality and a swallowing up of death, is here called a swallowing up of all that is mortal in us in the life, *i. e.*, in the new imperishable life which becomes manifest when the body is changed, and its mortality is forever abolished. The earnest desire expressed in ver. 2 is again alluded to when it is said that they did not desire to be unclothed; but when it is said that they were burdened (*βαρούμενοι*), the Apostle shows that a feeling of oppression is connected with it, inasmuch as they might be called to encounter the dreaded process of being unclothed (*ἐκδύσασθαι*). And yet another way of construing it in which *ἐφ' ᾧ* is taken in the sense of *since*, deserves the preference, inasmuch as it is not easy to see how the oppression caused by our present bodies, so much disturbed by sin and the many evils of our present lot, should make us long not to die, but to be changed. If it be said that it is precisely in death that the oppression of the tabernacle is

---

or for the argument's sake at the time. Καί connects with the previous clause, and may be rendered with either of the particles, "if in fact," or "since in fact," as in chap. iii. 6, and in ver. 5. A specimen of the same half doubt on a matter really certain to his own mind may be seen in Phil. iii. 11.]

the greatest, inasmuch as it is then as it were breaking down over the head of the inhabitant (Osiander), we reply that the expression: we th[at] are in this tabernacle, seems to refer rather t[o] troubles to be encountered in the midst of our present earthly life.

Ver. 5. **Now he who has completely wrought us out for this self same thing is God.**—[The δὲ here is transitional. The exalted expressions he had used were not made because of any thing in himself, or without a deep foundation being laid in his renewed nature]. He traces all those things of which he had been speaking to a Divine origin. The self same thing (αὐτὸ τοῦτο) of which he speaks, was not the groaning of the previous verse (comp. Rom. viii. 23), as Bengel and Hoffmann contend it was, for this would compel us to distort the signification of κατεργάζεσθαι so as to make it mean to impair by severe labor (to wear down), to break down the spirits and so to make one sigh over his bodily state and its troubles; the words rather refer to what he had just said about being clothed upon, that our mortal part might be swallowed up by the life. The meaning of the Apostle is: this longing to be clothed upon is not exclusively from an internal source, for it has a profound Divine origin. Κατεργάζεσθαι means to work out, to finish, and so to make ready. [The preposition κατὰ in composition often introduces the idea of completeness, as in καταρτίζω in 1 Pet. v. 10. Our word also implies a powerful effort as if against opposition]. In no other place in the New Testament is it used with a personal object. It has reference not to the first or natural creation, but as the further qualifying expression (who hath given us the Spirit) teaches us, to the Divine agency in man's redemption; and it comprehends that whole process of renovation and sanctification through which we attain and enjoy everlasting glory. But the actual entrance into this everlasting glory, the glorification itself, is accomplished, as the context informs us, by means of a transformation.—**Who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit.**—If we adopt the reading of ὁ καὶ δόὺς in the following clause, the καὶ will introduce another qualification, *i. e.* the warrant on which we expect a state of glorious perfection in the future world. But if we accept the reading ὁ δόὺς merely, the sentence becomes an additional point, in the description of Him who had wrought them; *i. e.* "who has given us the Spirit as an earnest." The condition for which God had wrought them out, had already been described as one which was not in fact permanent. This temporary character is more distinctly brought forward in the word *earnest* (ἀρραβῶνα comp. on chap. i 22). But the Spirit itself is the Divine principle by which they were thus wrought and prepared—the Divine Spirit who by the word and all means of grace enables us to attain everlasting glory (comp. chap. iv. 6, 17, 18; Eph. i. 13, 14; iv. 30, 31).

Ver. 6–8. **Therefore being always confident, and knowing whilst in our home in the body we are absent from our home in the Lord.**—We have here an inference (οὖν) from what has been said in ver. 5, in reference especially to his disposition or frame of mind. He was always confident (ver. 6), and he was willing to be absent from the body (ver. 8). In consequence of this well-founded expectation that we shall be so gloriously perfected, we are willing, in spite of our reluctance to be unclothed, to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord (ver. 8). This desire or willingness, however, is founded not merely upon the cheerful confidence in such a prospect, but also upon the knowledge which is expressed in ver. 6, *viz.*, that while we are in our home, *etc.*). But as this knowledge was itself founded upon a peculiar faith, the Apostle leaves the construction which he had commenced, that he might give the reason for this knowledge in an independent sentence (ver. 7). The assertion of his confidence (θαῤῥεῖν) is repeated in a new sentence, but not in a participial form, but in the first person of the Indicative. Originally he was ready to write: being therefore confident and knowing, *etc.*, we are willing to be absent from the body, *etc.*, but he was diverted from his train of thought by his desire to give a reason for this knowledge (ver. 7), so that the original sentence was left unfinished. The passage is therefore anacoluthic; and ver. 7 is not a parenthesis (still less are vv. 7 and 8), but indispensable to the argument. [Being therefore (in consequence of having the earnest of the Spirit) always confident, and knowing by our walk of faith and not of sight, that while we are here in the body we must be absent from the Lord, we are well content to be absent from the body that we may be present with the Lord]. The word θαῤῥεῖν in its various forms occurs frequently in our Epistle, and is used also in Heb. xiii. 6; but the older form which predominates in the Gospels and the Acts is θαρσεῖν. It has the sense of, to be full of confidence and courage, to be cheerful and undismayed under disheartening circumstances (comp. chap. iv. 8ff.; vi. 9, 10; xii. 10). [Tyndale translates it: we are always of good cheere]. The word *always* (πάντοτε) does not exclude a variety of feelings in the frame of our minds, but only signifies that confidence is always predominant in our hearts (comp. Osiander). The phrase καὶ εἰδότες is not of the same signification as καίπερ εἰδότες [even if, or although we know, *etc.*], nor should the sentence it introduces be understood as assigning a reason for the courage just expressed, but simply as introducing an additional thought. The substance of this knowledge was that their being at home in the body was the same thing as an absence from the Lord. He returns to the metaphor of a habitation. The first expression (ἐνδημεῖν, *etc.*) was the same as to say: we are at home in our native place; the other was the same as, to tarry in a strange land, to be in a foreign country. To be at home in the body is to be abroad, or away from home with respect to the Lord. The words ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου are a pregnant expression for being away from the Lord. Or, as long as we have our home in the body, we cannot be with the Lord. The same general idea is brought out in Phil. i. 23; iii. 20, and 1 Thess. iv. 17 (comp. Heb. xi. 13, and xiii. 14). He explains himself more fully [with respect to the nature of this ἐκδημοῦμεν] in ver. 7.—**for we walk by faith and not by appearance.**—The spheres in which we move are, that of faith (πίστις) on the one hand, and that of sight (εἶδος) on the other.

In that faith we have fellowship with the Lord (comp. Gal. iii. 27; Eph. iii. 17), but it is a veiled fellowship, in which Christ is beheld not immediately, but concealed in His heavenly glory. In another state of existence our Lord will permit His people to behold Him without obstruction, they shall be at home with Him, and they will participate in His glory (Rom. viii. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 17; John xvii. 24; Col. iii. 3, 4). The preposition *διὰ* directs to the means: we walk by means of faith, Neander. [It generally denotes any attending circumstance or quality, particularly in a state of transition (Webster). Here the states themselves are named those of faith and appearance, because these are the prevailing guides, and we are passing through them]. The life on earth is a walk *διὰ πίστεως*, inasmuch as Christ having entered into His heavenly glory, is invisible to His people, their corporeal natures prevent them from beholding directly His heavenly form, and they know the fact that he is glorified only by means of His word and their spiritual enjoyment of His power in their hearts (comp. Col. iii. 3; 1 Pet. i. 8; Rom. x. 14). Εἶδος does not signify either in classical or sacred writers (Luke iii. 22; ix. 29; John v. 27; and often in the Old Testament) the act of seeing or looking, but the form or prospect beheld (Hebr. מַרְאֶה, רְאוֹת). The meaning is: we are moving in the sphere of visible objects, where our senses have no perception of the form, or the actual appearance of Christ's person. The general sense, however, of Luther's translation, "*ein schauen*," [and of the authorized English version, "by sight,"] is correct. With reference to the contrast here, comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 12 f. (where it is implied that the faith will, in a certain sense, continue even after the seeing has commenced). The interpretation which represents ver. 7 as intended to give a reason for the confidence (*θαῤῥεῖν*), and which regards faith here as the certainty itself which we have with regard to the future and the supernatural world, and sight as the phenomenal world, *i. e.* those things which are present to our senses and are empirically perceived, is certainly in opposition to grammatical usage and to the spirit of the context (comp. on the other hand Meyer and Osiander). Inasmuch as this concealment of our Lord within His glory, and His consequent withdrawal from their immediate possession and enjoyment, might produce despondency on the part of His people, the Apostle proceeds in ver. 8 to say:— **But** (*δέ* is adversative) **we are confident and are willing rather to leave our home in the body and to come to our home in the Lord.**—The reason for this cheerful confidence is the same as that which had been assigned in ver. 6. But then from this confidence also, and from the consciousness of the insufficiency of the present life to afford us what we consider our supreme good, there springs up what he here connects with *θαῤῥοῦμεν δε*, *viz.*, the willingness rather to be from home, *etc.* Εὐδοκεῖν occurs also in 1 Cor. i. 21, and here means, to be satisfied that something should take place, and hence to wish, to long for it. The *μᾶλλον* (rather) should be connected with his absence, *etc.*, so as to mean that he was willing rather to be absent, *etc.* The desire which he had expressed in ver. 4, had implied that he would prefer to remain in the body (until the Parousia) rather than to be separated from it. In view of the confidence just expressed, and the consciousness that if he were present in the body he must be absent from the Lord, he now changes this desire into a longing (no longer a groaning and being burdened) rather to depart from the body, and hence to die (*ἐκδύεσθαι*, ver. 4), and to be present with the Lord. Ἐκδημεῖν is the opposite of *ἐνδημεῖν* (ver. 6), and hence is not merely a change of the body (ver. 4), but death. The words to be present with the Lord, have the same meaning as to be with Christ in Phil. i. 23, for there also it was necessary to die (*ἀναλῦσαι*) before he could be with Christ. Πρὸς *τὸν κύριον* is, in relation to the Lord, a pregnant expression, and it signifies: to depart, to go to another country, in order to be with Christ. He entertained the hope that immediately after death he would be in heaven with Christ. Such was the happy state which he expected in its perfection at the approaching Parousia.

Vers. 9, 10.—**Wherefore we make it our ambition that whether at home or absent from home we may be acceptable to Him.**—The particle *διό* (wherefore) should be connected back with ver. 8 (*ἐνδοκοῦμεν*). Wherefore, since we have such a desire, and in order that we may realize such a desire, we, *etc.* The verb *φιλοτιμεῖσθαι* signifies properly to love and seek for honor, to be ambitious; and with an infinitive, to strive after what one regards as his honor or reputation, and to give one's self much trouble about it. It is used in the same way in Rom. xv. 20 and 1 Thess. iv. 11. If in the phrases *εἴτε ἐνδημοῦντες, εἴτε ἐκδημοῦντες*, any thing is to be supplied, the two participles should be made to refer to the same noun; and of course this should be either the body (*σῶμα*), or the Lord (*κύριος*). The latter seems the most natural from the connection, but the former is probably allowable. As he had last spoken of an absence from the body, it is rather easiest to refer the absence here mentioned to the same object, and such a reference would control also the object of *ἐνδημ.* The reason that *ἐνδημοῦντες* is mentioned first is most naturally explained by the fact that being acceptable to the Lord would of course be first thought of when speaking of one who was alive on earth, and would therefore be first sought after by such a one (provided the participles are connected with the finite verb *φιλοτιμ.*, *i. e.*, we strive, whether in or out of the body, *etc.*). But it must be remembered that *ἐκδημ.* from its peculiar signification (to leave a country, to set out on a journey) must refer not to the state after death, but to the very process of dying. And we may very well conceive that the Apostle might speak of a laboring to be acceptable to Christ, even in this act of dying, since the mind of a believer is supposed then to be active and to be striving to maintain its hold on Christ and to avoid whatever might displease Him. The idea is furthermore an important and an appropriate one; and we shall find it essentially the same, whether the participles are connected with *φιλοτιμ.* (see above), or with the infinitive sentence (*i. c.*, we strive to be acceptable, whether

we are in or out of the body.) [The sense of the passage is in fact virtually the same, whether these participles be joined with the body or with the Lord; for the Apostle assumes that an absence from the one involves a presence with the other. Alford's objection that we cannot be supposed to labor to be acceptable to Christ after or in death, since we are then saved, is of no great force, inasmuch as the labor is present in this life, that we may be acceptable after this life is closed]. In this way we are not obliged to depart from the meaning which ἐνδημεῖν and ἐκδημεῖν has borne throughout this connection (together signifying the same as πάντως or διὰ πάντος: wherever we may be, without regard to place), and with Meyer to take these words in their original meaning (analogous to that which they bear in 1 Cor. v. 10; comp. vers. 6 and 7), without supplying any thing as understood. In ver. 10 the Apostle sets forth also the objective side of what he had said in ver. 9:—**for we must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ**:—*i. e.*, the reason why he so earnestly endeavored to please the Lord, was because he regarded this as his highest honor; or, (if we prefer to go further back), he shows how the effort to please the Lord would spring from his desire to be present with the Lord (ver. 8). In other words, he here shows that such a desire could only be fulfilled by his being found approved at that tribunal where he and his fellow believers were shortly to appear. The whole connection shows that by τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς he means not all mankind, but only all Christians. He enlarges upon this point, probably to excite his readers to diligence and to impress upon their minds the importance of laboring to be acceptable to Christ (ver. 9). Τοὺς πάντας makes the subject apply to the whole body of Christians. NEANDER: "This is said with special emphasis in relation to the Corinthians, who were disposed to give judgment arrogantly against their fellowmen, without remembering how bad their own case was." To be manifested (φανερωθῆναι) is not precisely equivalent to παραστῆναι (to be presented, Rom. xiv. 10), for it looks to a complete manifestation of all that transpired within us or in the external life (comp. 1 Cor. iv. 5). Our Lord will show that He looks through every individual part as well as the whole body of His people. The words ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος (as in Rom. xiv. 10), are a solemn expression, and have a real significance; for if we ought not to make the tribunal of Christ merely a cloud, it certainly implies something more than a judicial inquiry with respect to each man immediately after death (Flatt), respecting which we have no intimation elsewhere in Paul's writings. [In classical Greek, βῆμα always signified, not a judgment seat, but the raised place or step from which public speakers addressed the people at the great πανήγυρεις or other popular assemblies and courts of law. In the Sept. it still retained this signification (Neh. viii. 4; 2 Macc. xiii. 26). In Roman usage it passed from the tribune of the orator to the tribunal of the judge, which was an elevated seat on a lofty platform at one end of the Basilica in the forum. In the New Testament it always means (except in Acts viii. 5, where Luke gives it a meaning something like that of the classic Greek), a judgment seat where a *formal* trial is held. See Stanley's note]. In 1 Cor. iv. 5 also, it is said that Christ will be our Judge, and in Rom. xiv. 10 [where the true reading is τοῦ θεοῦ] nothing inconsistent with this is necessarily implied, inasmuch as Christ is described as the representative or the organ of the Father (comp. v. 22, 27; Acts x. 42; xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 16). But the judicial office of Christ is perfectly consistent with His being the absolute revelation of God and the Redeemer of men.—The necessity of this judgment on the part of God is expressed by δεῖ: the only way to secure such a righteous retribution as would be honorable to God, is to have such a revelation of the hearts and conduct of us all. The object of this general manifestation was that all who were thus judged might be properly rewarded, and now in accordance with such a view he points each individual to his own particular interest in such a judgment (comp. Rom. xiv. 12):—**that each one may receive the things** *done* **in** *his* **body.**—The meaning of κομίζεσθαι is, to bear away, to receive; also, to bring back (for himself), to receive again; and thus it signifies a reward or recompense. The moral actions of a man are something laid up with God in heaven, and must be received again in a corresponding retribution. Comp. Eph. vi. 8; Col. iii. 25. A similar idea is expressed by the figure of the sowing and reaping in Gal. vi. 7, and of the θησαυρίζειν in Matth. vi. 20 and 1 Tim. vi. 19. A fuller expression may be found in 1 Pet. i. 9; v. 4; 2 Pet. ii. 13. —The things given in this recompense are said to be τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος. The body to be received in the resurrection cannot be the one here intended [as if the Apostle would say: that each one may receive back through or by means of his (resurrection) body according to the things which he did. This view was much favored by some ancient expositors (the Syrian, Tertullian, Theodoret, Chrysostom and Oecumenius). It must be conceded that such a construction avoids some harshness, and Osiander seems inclined to favor it. He, however, concedes that it is difficult to believe that the new body should be designated by the simple word σῶμα] for that word is throughout our passage used for the earthly body. The word to be supplied is not exactly πραχθέντα, although this would be consistent with the proper sense of the passage, but ὄντα: that which took place by means of the body as an organ (comp. Plato: ἡδονῶν, αἱ διὰ τοῦ σώματός εἰσιν). Neander: while in this body. The reading of the Italic, the Vulgate and some other versions [: τὰ ἰδια τοῦ σώματος, *propria, etc.*] may have originated in a mistake, or τὰ διὰ τ. σ. may have seemed difficult of construction. Certainly τὰ διὰ is critically well authenticated—**according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.**—In this sentence πρός has reference to the rule or standard according to which the reward is given. The ellipsis in εἴτε—κακόν must be supplied by a word from the relative sentence, *viz.*, ἔπραξεν.—If the Apostle had his eye on some mongrel kind of Christianity, κομίσηται might imply that those who adhered to it would be excluded from the kingdom of God. But on the supposition that he was speaking of real Christians in the restricted sense, he must

have been distinguishing between different degrees in their rewards according to the different degrees of fidelity on earth. Such distinctions are not inconsistent with the idea of a justification and salvation by grace; for in the economy of grace the law of righteousness prevails. Even if the atonement by Christ extends to the whole life of those who believe in Him, its influence upon individuals must be exerted by means of a progressive repentance (*μετάνοια*); and though they may be secured against condemnation, and though they may actually be saved, they may yet have their gracious reward diminished in proportion to their want of faithfulness. Such a humiliation will be as nothing in comparison with the gratitude they will feel for a salvation which will be greater in proportion as they recognize it as a free gift of grace (comp. Meyer and Osiander on ver. 10).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. It is a fundamental law of the Divine kingdom and the leading aim of the faith by which it is implanted in the heart, that man the creature should be seen and known as the feeble and powerless, and God as the only mighty one. Hence it is that those whom God makes use of for the advancement of His kingdom and His cause must sometimes experience much infirmity of body and of spirit, that all may see that God alone is strong, faithful and wise, and that He will help through every trial, and never will forsake his people. He brings salvation and deliverance when all hope has failed; He manifests the power of a divine life when nothing but death is anticipated, because while death with its distresses and infirmities is seen working in them, that life exhibits all its energies in those who receive it. Thus while the work of grace is witnessed in many and is accomplished in many by such means, abundant thanksgivings redound to that God who achieves such results. In this way they are never left without courage under the greatest difficulties, for though the outward man may waste away, the inward spirit is endowed with ever freshening energies. Then while their eye is directed steadily to the things which are unseen and eternal, and to those heavenly glories which God has promised His people, they are taught by the spirit of humble faith to speak and to confess Christ before men with cheerfulness, and to regard their trials in a very different light from that in which the eye of sense perceives them. Those trials seem exceedingly light and transitory compared with the eternal weight of glory, for which God is preparing them even by such means, and for which no suffering can be properly endured here without fruit there. (comp. Heb. xii. 11).

2. The sure hope of eternal life and the expectation of a perfect bodily nature, must make the Christian breathe forth many a longing sigh while he remains in this mortal body; and the horror which nature feels in prospect of the violent dissolution of its corporeal life, must awaken in him a desire to escape the dying process and to be clothed with a glorious life by an immediate transformation; but such a hope will teach him also to be of good courage under all his trials. Yet this courage arising from the hope of future glory on the one hand, and the consciousness that he must be, during his present pilgrimage, without a complete and an immediate fellowship with his Lord on the other, will finally change all such longings (after such a superimposed body) into a single great desire to leave this state of alienation in a foreign land, and to be at home with the Lord. Though in this life we have many animating experiences of Christ's gracious nearness, and have access by faith to His throne of grace, we have nevertheless to encounter many hinderances in consequence of our life in the flesh (Gal. ii. 20) and we cannot behold our Lord in His essential glory. But when a desire for a higher life has been awakened, we shall make the most earnest efforts, in every possible way, to please the Lord. Indeed every thing which is an essential condition to the enjoyment of our future glory will give intensity to such efforts, for every one, without distinction, must expect a full revelation before the judgment seat of Christ. Every action, even of God's children, during their bodily life, must there be judged according to the law of strict righteousness, and each believer must be rewarded according to his good or evil conduct.

[3. Though our passage does not say that "holy obedience is our only *title* to eternal life" (Emmons), it does distinctly assert that believers are to be fully "*manifested*" at the judgment seat of Christ, and that the reward of grace will be proportioned exactly to that which they did in (*διὰ*) the earthly body. These "things done in the body" are neither expressly nor impliedly confined to any period of life after justification, whether this be placed in conversion or baptism].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Starke, iv. 7:—If God had set angels or glorified men to preach the Gospel, we should easily have been astonished at such instruments, and have ascribed the power to such glorious personages. But now when so much is accomplished by poor and feeble men, the honor must be the Lord's alone. (comp. 1 Cor. ii. 5).—Ver. 8. Enlightened souls are full of courage, and know how to accommodate themselves to crosses, Ps. iii. 7 f. xxvii. 1. If afflictions arise, they suffer not themselves to be overcome nor to cast away their confidence. If they become involved in dangerous circumstances, so that they know not how to extricate themselves, their courage will not fail, for they know that when all human aid is farthest, God's hand is nearest—Ver. 9. God often protects his servants and his children in a wonderful manner, and helps them by means of other men. This is especially accomplished by means of those believers who pray for them (Acts xii. 5), minister to their temporal necessities (Phil. iv. 14–20), and afford them the means of safety (chap. xi. 33), but it is not unfrequently accomplished also even by means of unbelievers (Acts xxi. 31 f.).—Observe the blessed fellowship of the members with their head! Christ's life was nothing but a series of sufferings, a perpetual dying, for he was poor, despised and pained

both in body and soul. His followers meet with the same trials, and they get no release but with their lives. Yet he preserves them, makes them joyful, often plucks them from danger as if by miracle, and thus proves that he is indeed alive. —Ver. 12. HEDINGER:—Faith seeks not concealment, for it speaks, teaches and warns. The nearer we are to death, the more diligent we should be in our callings and our work. Hearers are strengthened and confirmed in their spiritual life by witnessing the sufferings and death of those preachers who steadfastly hold to the Gospel in all their trials.—Ver. 13. Faith gives us the right discourse, and therefore the best liberty in speaking. Many speak much, but they will endure nothing in behalf of what they say, for they speak not as they should, and never speak from faith. (Gal. vi. 12).—Ver. 14. Since Jesus is the head of all true believers, they can no more remain dead than a member can remain separate from the head.—What a joy, when we shall all be presented before Christ and be forever in his society!—Ver. 15. Where much suffering, and much consolation and help are experienced, thanksgivings will also abound to the praise of God.—Ver. 17. In thy distress thou sayest, Ah! Lord, how long! But it is not long. It is only in thine infirmity that it seems long. What is time to eternity?—HEDINGER:—Light, light indeed, is the cross! Thou sayest No, it is heavy. Lift up thine eyes to the glory. What sayest thou now!—The more suffering on earth, the more joy in heaven; and yet all this is of grace and not of works, Rom. vi. 23. We deserve as little for our sufferings as for our works. God makes use of them as of a file to rasp away all that is useless in us. They are His blessing to make the good seed germinate within us and grow up into glory. Our earth has many beautiful things to the praise of its Creator, but in heaven are things a thousand times more beautiful. Let the believer see and admire the earthly beauty, but let him believe and rejoice in the heavenly far more, for he will possess and refresh himself with them forever and ever. Are all visible things only temporal? then give thy heart to no creature. So use everything you have that it shall fix your heart more on God; and be able and willing to let it go when He shall see fit to remove it. The children of this world seek satisfaction only in what is visible, in money and property, and reputation and worldly pleasures, but our spiritual natures can never be satisfied with such things. If the Divine light of faith has risen within us, we shall turn our thoughts to our spiritual welfare; we shall be more concerned that we may be sanctified and properly adorned in God's sight, and that we may have the heavenly joy and glory he has promised; and hence we shall choose a higher and better portion.—Chap. V. 1. We have here a salutary lesson for those who have health, that they may not calculate with confidence upon their health, but frequently think of their perishable tabernacles, and may be always ready for a blessed departure. Equally salutary is it for the sick, that as their tabernacle begins to break up, they may by faith lay hold upon the dwelling God has built for them in heaven, and joyfully be invested with it.—Ver. 4. A man must be a great hero who feels no terror at death; and although the saints have overcome it, they are not altogether free from apprehensions.—Ver. 5. All do not die happy, because they are not all prepared, and some have not the earnest of the Spirit.—HEDINGER:—Heaven will be glorious! Have we the seal and the letter for it? This is the Holy Spirit who convinces us of the truth, and so sweetens the bitterness of death.—Ver. 6. Although Christ is every day with his people (Matth. xxviii. 20), and they live in communion with the Father, Son and Spirit (Chap. xiii. 14), they are not yet where they can behold his glory, and are only aliens so far as relates to such a revelation of God.—HEDINGER:—Wilt thou not go home, my child? Away, for the danger is pressing! Go home to God and get out of trouble! Array thyself in such garments as will please the Lord! Get ready, O Pilgrim, for thine eternal home! Heb. xiii. 14.—Ver. 7. To walk by faith is not a perfect life, but it is essentially a great and glorious thing; for whoever desires it must be born of God and be united with him. In the future life of spiritual vision, the brightest object will be the Son of God, in whose glorified humanity we shall behold not only the majesty of his eternal Godhead, but also the Father and the Holy Spirit.—Ver. 8. Our home is where the place of blessedness is, where all believers have their home, where our Father, (James i. 18) our mother (Gal. iv. 26), our brethren, Christ, and those who have entered into glory are (Col. iii. 1; Heb. xii. 22 f.); and there is our habitation, for we shall remain in it forever (Heb. xi. 14), and it is our inheritance (1 Pet. i. 4).—Rightly to wish for death is a mark of one who belongs to God and is ready for his departure to a blessed eternity (Phil. i. 23). Try thyself by this! Whoever gives all his time and attention to the body, and so thinks nothing of his soul, how can he have pleasure in the thought that he is to journey forth from the body (Rom. xiii. 14)?—Ver. 9. Only when we are by faith in Christ, and all our works are from Him, can our walk be pleasing to God. The best evidence that we are entirely acceptable to God is, that we are striving in all things to please Him; and that we are displeased with our own imperfections, and so are always humble.—Ver. 10. We are even now perfectly manifest at all times before the Lord, but we need to become manifest hereafter, that the whole world may see what we have been, whether we were good or bad. Many can now play the rogue under their disguises, but in due time every thing shall be revealed before the eyes of angels and the whole world. Without fault of thine own thou mayest suffer, but God sees it, and he will surely bring thine innocence to light. Ye unjust judges who turn aside the righteous cause, and ye Epicurean worldlings who live without shame, and sport yourselves in sin, how will it be when you stand before Christ's judgment seat? Turn or tremble (2 Chron. xix. 6 f.; 1 Pet. iv. 5)! In this world it is often with the godly as if they were ungodly, and with the ungodly as if they were godly (Eccles. ix. 2 f.). Should not the leaf some day be turned? God is righteous; and He must have a judgment day to give each one his due reward (Rom. ii. 6–9).

Berlenb. Bible, Ver. 7:—We need to be convinced of our inability, that grace may shine the brighter, and that we may not confound the creature with the Creator and nature with grace. God is not a God for seasons of prosperity or court favor merely, but a God of patience. We should bless Him for such methods with us as are indicated in Matth. xii. 20.—Ver. 8. A genuine triumphal song. Let no one ever despair; only be faithful. Though God never overburdens His children, they must expect sometimes to be in perplexity. But when our passions cease to boil, the impurities which might otherwise become sedentary, are driven off. Anxiety and doubt will retire before the spirit of faith.—Ver. 9. We must often be thrown like a ball hither and thither, but we need fear no evil for we have a Lord who delivers from death.—Ver. 10. We must not be ashamed of a sanctified cross-bearing. But first we must take up the cross, have fellowship in the death of Christ daily, and never shake off from our necks what God lays upon them.—Death before life! such is God's inviolable law.—Our fallen nature cannot receive the blessed life of God in Christ, until we have given up our own mind and will to God.—Reason says: "What to me is a life which can be gained only by death?" and it praises the scorner who merrily enjoys the world. Others despise the idea as a vain fancy. But the believer knows better whom he has believed, and by what power it is that he must live.—Unless thou holdest before the eye of thy heart every day, hour and moment, as thy only true glass, the despised cross of Jesus, and His perpetual renunciation of Himself, no permanent rest canst thou know, and the Holy Spirit who is the Spirit of Christ and not of the world, can never dwell with thee.—Ver. 11. Thou art no longer in the state in which God made thee, but thou must be cured of disease before thou canst be blessed. Blame not God then and call Him cruel when He is carrying thee through this process. He never makes us experience the power of this death, until He bestows upon us a power to live a spiritual life. Christ therefore gains over our wills that He may subdue them in spite of the opposition of the flesh. But a Christian always soars in spirit to the eternal and heavenly world, and thence derives strength for a new and secret life.—Ver. 12. God allows the Christian, on his first conversion, to enjoy much spiritual delight, that he may perceive the advantages he has gained, and may be encouraged to go forward in face of death.—It often seems a great mystery when the watchman suffers for those committed to his trust (Col. i. 24). And yet a good shepherd is willing to give his life for the sheep (John x. 12), not indeed to redeem them, for Christ alone can do that, but because He is stronger and must go before them that are weak. —Ver. 13. Faith in Christ gives the believer a new life, for it draws down living and active energies from God; and while it allows Him no rest but in God, it gives him true rest there, with life and strength, victory and complete salvation. No one must attempt to live without this Spirit, for nothing else can give us the beams of Divine light and cheer our souls, with the radiancy of a heavenly life. Where this exists deeply in the heart, it will find expression in the lips. It will take away all our timidity, and make us willing not only to confess Christ for ourselves, but to carry the Gospel to our fellowmen.—Ver. 14. He who raised up Jesus from the dead, imparts to all who put faith in Him, the confident assurance and lively feeling that they too shall not be left in the grave.—Christ has acquired the right to represent and introduce His members wherever He is Himself. He will hereafter bestow upon us blessings, far surpassing what the Gospel now gives us, for as yet we have had to endure very much of the shame of the cross.—Ver. 15. Ministers should strive to make all their sufferings as well as their labors a means of edification to all around them. —In no way is God more glorified than when man gives up himself in his utmost glory as nothing, that he may be made what infinite wisdom and love may think best.—Ver. 16. A Christian should not voluntarily bring troubles upon himself, for a false nature may of its own choice involve itself in difficulties, and then make a martyrdom out of it. If our heavenly Father is pleased to let our outward man, in connection with which God has in His wisdom decreed that all our spiritual and corporeal troubles shall take place, fall into decay and perish, His will be done. The renewal of the inner, the hidden man of the heart (1 Pet. iii. 4), is usually in connection with the decay of the outward man. In proportion as we are daily melted in the fire of affliction, we grow in the kingdom of God. According to the crucifixion of our flesh will be the activity of the spirit and the life of the man in Christ.—Nothing more promotes the daily renovation of even the converted man, than the cross.—Every pain, sorrow and trouble is a needful birth pang, for the production of a new life and for its healthful growth.—Ver. 17. The fear of the cross, which young converts and many who are patiently pressing on in the Divine life, are accustomed to feel, outweighs all they can endure in this world, and is not worthy of mention if they think of making a merit or a matter of importance of their afflictions. However long or severe any trial may be, it sinks to nothing, the moment we catch a reflection of the future glory. Our choleric tempers cannot long bear the fire of affliction. The suffering will seem intolerable because our sense and reason cannot get beyond the eternal and temporal.—You who complain so much of the weight of our sufferings, can yet bear very well the weight of glory which is to be found under the cross —Rejoice rather, for death, pain, sickness, and loss of honor, of property, of friends and of comforts, if for conscience's sake, are nothing but gain. The moment we begin to enjoy the fruits of our sufferings, we see the cross in a new light and are ashamed that we were not always faithful. Indeed, it ought to have been glory enough to bear reproach with the Son of God. But who can tell the glory which in another life follow these brief sufferings? Even a foretaste of these has often been sufficient to carry God's people altogether beyond themselves, and to cause them to break out into the highest strains of exultation. —Ver. 18. We must get accustomed to raise our thoughts above our outward state and seek in

God, where our treasure and best portion are, the motives of our daily life, our consolation, our counsel and our peace. Our troubles will then seem very insignificant. As when a man is on a high tower or mountain, objects far below him seem very small and even invisible, so to a mind in communion with God, all temporal things and all sufferings of course will seem small indeed. We very soon find, when our carnal minds try to make something interesting of the things that are seen, that they are indeed fleeting and vain. How easy then to use such things as a test whether we have true faith or not (Heb. xi. 1). CHAP. V. 1. How will it be with us when our present mortal bodies are dissolved? We say indeed, we hope for the best. But what reason for hope have we? Those who in this life have been dead to sin, have put off the old man with its affections and lusts, when they come to die, give honor to Him who in His death gave them life; they have put on a new man, which after this life shall be invested with another body, a habitation in the Jerusalem which is above, an angelic body, formed indeed from this earthly one, but endowed with such heavenly attributes that it shall never be destroyed. He who is unwilling to have his old house demolished may well tremble when his Lord shall come, and after all shall break it up against his will.—Ver. 2. Our sighs, which seem now so painful, are nevertheless longings which spring from a sight of something better and can be satisfied with nothing here.' They are a kind of necessity for man; for after all, a great treasure, something supernatural, is concealed under them. Eternity is thus at work in our souls, for its eternal longings have taken possession of them. These may be faint and confused at first, and hence they must be directed and brought to distinctness. The longings have reference to the great end of our existence, but the sighs to our present condition along the way.—Ver. 3. The spirit of man appears to be by itself naked, as it were unclothed. It is therefore incomplete before God until it is invested with a new body of spiritual powers and light. Those who desire to enter the New Jerusalem must have within themselves that spiritual building which belongs to the new creation, *viz:* the character and image of God, by which this mother can recognize her child.—Ver. 4. Our mortality is now a burden, but God so changes its nature that when it is assailed we think of something very different. It is natural for us to wish we could avoid the separation of our souls from our bodies, and by an instantaneous change (1 Cor. xv. 51 f.) be with Christ in the resurrection state. But ere this can be we must be unclothed. The mortal must be dried up, but life must enter its remains. It is right to love life, but we may hasten too fast, or go in the wrong direction in pursuit of it. Here it is that sense is likely to intermeddle and do mischief. But Christ took upon Himself even this fleshly nature, though without sin. It is no evil in itself, but only a token that a man has life in himself. Christ assumed it not that He might retain it forever, but that he might in due time lay it aside. "Not my will," He said, "as far as it is a human will, but Thy Divine will." In that great conflict He maintained His ground, and His success should be our encouragement. We may, indeed, see in Him what it costs to bring the will into its proper state. But just as He overcame, by subjecting the lower to the higher nature, so must we.—Ver. 5. God does not abandon His work, and His spirit puts His seal upon our hearts that we may have, what we very much need, a certainty for the future.—Ver. 6. Just as far as we succeed in making the present world our home, we shall be absent from the Lord, and without the complete enjoyment of Him.—Ver. 7. Faith unites us with God and gives us as high a knowledge of Him as is possible in the present life. But clear as this faith is in itself, it is in fact dark to us. We do not behold the face of God with an unobstructed vision. And yet this obscure faith gives us a far brighter light than can ever be attained by seeking to find out God by the highest exercise of merely human reason.—Ver. 8. Though we are yet far from our native land, we are full of cheerful confidence. We are citizens of it still (Eph. ii. 19; Phil. iii. 20), and in some respects are already there (Heb. xii. 22).—Ver. 9. Wherever we may be, our only honors are in another world; let us, then, for the present be satisfied with God's allotments, and give ourselves completely up to be led as He pleases.—Ver. 10. This is a stimulus which the believer always needs, for he has always some remnants of an evil nature.—Everything which is now concealed must one day come to light, and be either condemned or approved. It is surely a righteous thing that God should recompense to every man what he has thought, spoken, or done, according to all that he has done by means of the body. Everything which men have done—all the evil which the redeemed as well as the good, which the lost have done, will be investigated and scrutinized with the strictest justice.—Blessed, indeed, will they be whose works shall be found right. And yet those in whom Christ Jesus lives, reigns and works will own Him as the source of all their goodness. Such a blessedness and dignity will be of the most exalted nature. No works will then be recognized or accepted before God except those which belong to believers justified by faith, and saved by grace; for all others will be traced to some false principle.

RIEGER:—Ver. 7. God conceals His choicest instruments under the lowliness of the Cross—not that they may be undervalued, but that they may show their unshaken dependence upon the Lord Jesus.—The ability and disposition to undertake the work of the ministry, the knowledge of Christ by means of a Divine enlightenment, the honesty not to seek our own selves, the willingness to spend and be spent in the service of another, the courage never to be ashamed of any of Christ's words, the good conscience which nevertheless avoids all private dishonor, the sincerity which never corrupts God's word, and the untiring patience which never gives out—all this treasure Christ's servants have in a frail outward man (chap. iv. 16) in an earthly tabernacle which is liable to be broken up at any moment (chap. v. 1). Such an earthly vessel may have a special fragility of its own (comp. x. 10) in addition to the general weakness of its kind. If we are

never weary, if our spirit and power is demonstrated in the consciences of other men, and if we are sufficient for all our duties, it is because we continually receive from God a stream of influences which keeps us in dependence upon Him and sustains our inward life. Thus our weakness and the Divine support are always seen in mutual relations.—Ver. 8ff. As the Apostle repeats his "not, not," we not only see the encouragement which faith supplies and the victory he gained over his own natural feelings, but the happy issue of each trial tends to bring to light and to refute those secret objections which other men are apt to feel with respect to the humiliations of the Cross.—Ver. 10f. The infirmities which our Lord Jesus took upon Himself, and which continued with Him until death, the purpose never to use His Divine powers for His personal relief, whatever contempt might be heaped upon Him on this account by carnal-minded men, are now the proper medium through which we have fellowship with Him in His life, and we must now bear them about with us, and never intentionally conceal them.—Ver. 12. It is in Christ's ministers that we may most impressively see the fellowship of Christ's sufferings and the likeness of His death; but in the conversion of souls, in the powerful effects of the Gospel, in the awakening life and flourishing condition of the Church, we have a proportionate proof of His life.—Ver. 13. Those who openly confess the truth and cheerfully suffer for it, must have a believing spirit and a firm hold upon invisible realities.—Ver. 14. Faith always finds access to God only through Christ. The resurrection and glorification of Jesus is the true ground for hoping that God will raise up and present us also. Only in this light shall we be able to estimate what each one gains or loses under the sufferings or unclothings of our present state.—Ver. 15. Every thing we ministers acquire by our spiritual treasures is intended to win, to confirm, and to relieve, as much as possible, you the people. The more, then, you observe how this abounding grace of God sustains us under our trials, the more you have reason to give God thanks.—Ver. 16. Our bodies, lives, health, strength, comforts, prospects and all that we have on earth, may be gradually wasted in consequence of our fellowship with Christ's sufferings; but the heart, the spirit which animates us in it, and the willingness to spend every thing in the service of God, will never be changed, because it is always enlivened by hope.—Ver. 17. According to the great principle of the Divine kingdom: "Through suffering to glory," every trouble we have gives us a pledge of the glory, a salutary foretaste of the powers of the world to come, such as we could never obtain without the decay of our outward man.—Ver. 18. Every moment, in all our public discourses, testimonies, ministerial work, and intercourse with our people, we are making our choice and laying hold upon and aiming at either the temporal or the eternal.—Chap. v. 1. The word of God and the spirit of faith which it produces tends uniformly to humility, but never to feebleness of spirit; and it teaches men to think but little, but not contemptuously, of the body. Inasmuch as houses, tents, clothing, are very necessary and very convenient, we should learn that our bodies are not to be hated. But as such things can be laid aside and be changed without tearing away any portion of our hearts, we should learn that our bodies ought not to be over-valued.—The house which is from heaven, that portion of the heavenly glory which every believer will have for an ornament and a covering, and the residence in which the inward life of his spirit manifests itself to others and receives from them its highest enjoyments, is not given him until the earthly tabernacle falls off; for it has been prepared, designed and promised only for that occasion. As this is of heavenly origin, it will never be dissolved, and can perceive heavenly things.—Vers. 2–4. Our heavenly calling gives us the hope of a house above, while we are enduring the oppression of our earthly tabernacle, that we may under both influences sigh to be clothed upon by the higher house.—Our spiritual nature has always abundant reason to long for a deliverance from our present bodies. Great as our enjoyments may be on earth, we cannot but sigh for something better. Our reluctance to be unclothed may therefore be beneficial in moderating and purifying our longings for deliverance.—Ver. 5. By faith and the dealings of His providence, God is always preparing us for this glory, always cherishing our hopes and longings for it, and always chastening and purifying the expression of our desires. Oh, how wisely has God combined together in our worldly and spiritual experience these after throes of our troublesome life and these longings for future glory!—Vers. 6–8. True faith prepares us for either alternative; whether to remain in the flesh, or to lay aside our present tabernacles.—We walk by faith, and we are therefore cheerful during our pilgrimage; but the feeling that our Lord is not in sight often makes us forlorn and desolate when we are in trouble.—Nothing that we can do or enjoy on earth can be compared with being absent from the body and at home with the Lord.—Ver. 9f. The effort to be, and the consciousness that we are, accepted of the Lord, is our strength along the way, and will be our satisfaction when we reach our home.—This Divine approbation will be publicly awarded when we stand at the judgment seat of Christ.—Great power of faith, which makes us joyful even in the day of judgment!

Heubner:—Chap. iv. 7. In these dying bodies great and glorious treasures are hidden. We are never perfectly pure and true, except when we ascribe every thing good to God.—Ver. 8. The Christian's superiority to the world and his peculiar skill are owing to his watchfulness, steadfastness of purpose, cheerfulness and calmness of mind.—Ver. 9. The more persecution and ill-will we receive from our fellow-men, the more cheering is God's favor, and the nearer is His aid. When the danger is most imminent, His servants may feel sure of a speedy deliverance.—Ver. 10f. The death and the life of Christ should be revealed in every Christian by a continual self-sacrifice for others, and by a power to overcome all temporal sufferings.—Ver. 12. The more a man sacrifices himself, the more power he has over others. In this case life comes from death.—Ver. 13. When faith urges thee on, let

not thy mouth keep thee back. But without faith, thy speech will displease God and have no blessing. Without faith no one can give a true testimony for God; but with faith no one can refrain from it.—Ver. 14. The hope of an eternal life makes us strong to give up a temporal.—Ver. 15. The reason that pious men are kept in the world is that they may bring the wandering to the path of safety. God's grace should be celebrated by well-filled choirs. It is sad to hear His praises from such feeble choirs on earth. Thank God, it will not be so in heaven!—Ver. 16. The more our life of sense is renounced, the purer, the stronger and the more triumphant will be the life of the spirit. Piety always rejuvenates the inner man (Isa. xl. 30 f.).—Vers. 17, 18. Troubles are light when they come from men, and affect only the outward man. All that earth can do is as nothing to him who has God's grace; but God's wrath is terrible indeed! Our indemnification for all sufferings and sacrifices is infinitely greater than our pains, our reproaches, and the loss of all earthly things could be; for God gives us everlasting joy and honor. The only condition is a heavenly mind, directed to the eternal world as the needle to the pole. We should see no reality any where else.—CHAP. v. 1. The hope of a glorified body comforts the sick and holds the spirit as if it were a foreigner in the (earthly) body.—Ver. 2. The worldly man is terrified at the thought of losing his body, and he wishes it might be his home forever; but the Christian sighs for its dissolution. A truly pious longing to die is the Christian's home-sickness, but the desire which many have to die is only a desire to be free from trouble.—Ver. 3. A body is necessary to the soul, and the resurrection of the body will bring an inconceivable augmentation to our bliss. Ver. 4. Nearly all the troubles and oppressions which we experience during our earthly life spring from the body. Ver. 5. God has reserved to man a better portion than this world can give. The Holy Spirit, by a celestial birth, makes us children of God, and, of course, immortal. Whoever knows by experience this Divine life, can never think of its interruption or cessation. A Divine life must be an eternal life.—Ver. 6. Our earthly life of care is only a brief pilgrimage.—Ver. 7. Our only fellowship with the Lord must be by faith. On earth we cannot behold Him immediately, nor hold direct intercourse with Him through any of our senses. None but a fanatic will think of a visible intuitive enjoyment of Him here.—Ver. 8. The Christian's home-sickness never paralyzes, enfeebles or effeminates him, as a natural home-sickness frequently does the worldly man; but it rather sanctifies and strengthens him.—Ver. 9. The assurance of being united to Christ makes the believer long more earnestly to please the Lord. This will not leave him even in the future world, for even there shall he remain in the service of the Lord.—Ver. 10. 1. We must all stand before Him, for none can escape Him. Whoever is inclined to call this right of Christ in question will surely experience its terror in his own heart. 2. The thought that thy heart will be revealed is either joyful and comforting or terrible (John v. 24. We read elsewhere of a condemning, but here of a revealing judgment. The latter is rather a Christian glorification).

W. F. BESSER:—Ver. 7. The transcendent power which triumphs over all earthly things, which makes the ministers of Christ superior to all suffering, and which sometimes is communicated from him to others, is owing not to the excellence of the vessel, but to the preciousness of the treasure it contains; not to the person of the preacher, but to the name he proclaims; not to the natural ability of man, but to God's grace and word of power. The saying the Apostle uses respecting the treasure in earthern vessels is true in general of all Christians who possess the precious pearl, Christ Jesus, in the shell of this natural life.—Vers. 8–10. "I shall never die," says the Church, as she bears forth the treasures of Christ's kingdom, "but live to make the Lord's work known to all men" (Ps. cxviii. 17).—Vers. 13, 14. Though much distress may follow her confession, faith can never withhold the confession itself (Rom. x. 10), and in making it she becomes conscious of herself and grows.—Ver. 15. The more thanksgiving, the more grace (Ps. l. 23).—Ver. 16. At no time do the energies of a new life stream forth so freshly and with such quickening power upon the heart of the Christian as when he is in the vale of adversity. "Day by day!" Paul was not "already perfect."—Ver. 17. In God's hand is a pair of balances; one scale of which is called Time and the other Eternity. In the former are weighed earthly afflictions, and in the other future glory.—CHAP. v. 1. Christ gives Himself to His people, even in this life, in such a way that they may be one spirit and one body with Him spiritually, and also sacramentally by faith; but when we behold Him in our spiritual bodies, He will prove Himself to be that perfect Love which communicates its whole self to its loved ones!—Ver. 3. We need to be clothed and covered in this life, or we can never be clothed upon with our house from heaven in the day of the Lord. We must put on the Lord Jesus Christ, as He gives Himself now for a spriritual clothing to all who receive Him by faith through the word and sacraments (Gal. iii. 27; Rom. xiii. 14). Only thus shall we be able, in the day of final visitation, to put on the same Christ in His glory (Rom. viii. 30), over our present mortal nature, whose original nakedness will be covered by grace and so will be capable of the further investiture of a glorious immortality (Rom. iii. 18).—Ver. 4. As in Spring the green branches and leaves are thrown over the trees and transform the rigid mourning habiliments of Winter into the fresh garments of Spring, so will the Lord Jesus Christ, our life from heaven (Col. iii. 4), triumpbantly lay hold upon all that is mortal in us and abolish it in an immortal nature (1 Cor. xv. 54 f.).—Vers. 6-8. The native citizens of heaven are foreigners on earth, just as the heirs of the promised land were wanderers without a home in the wilderness (Heb. xi. 13-16). Our residence in earthly bodies necessarily implies that we should have possession of and perceive our Saviour in no other way than by faith. Sense and reason cannot apprehend Him; only faith, the new sense which God gives to the new man, and which is conver-

sant with things unseen, can discover or receive Him as He is presented in the Gospel.—Ver. 10. Just as in this life our body is the vessel and instrument for all that we have and do by faith, so in another life will the body be the vessel and instrument for possessing and enjoying by means of direct vision. Gloriously will the blessedness of these bodies be manifested, when those features of sorrow which have been imprinted upon our mortal bodies, so as to make us like Christ here, shall be brightened up in our risen bodies with the reflected radiance of our Lord's glorified body (Rom. viii. 29).

X.—FURTHER ASSERTION OF THE PURITY OF HIS CONDUCT AND OF ITS PROFOUNDER REASONS. THESE DEPEND UPON HIS RELATION TO CHRIST AND HIS SPECIAL WORK TO MAKE KNOWN GOD'S METHOD OF RECONCILIATION BY CHRIST.

Chapter V. 11–21.

11 Knowing therefore the terror [fear] of the Lord, we persuade men; but we are
made manifest unto God; and I trust also are made manifest in your consciences.
12 For [*om.* For][1] we commend not ourselves again unto you, but [*we say this to*] give you
occasion to glory on our behalf, that ye may have somewhat to *answer* them which
13 glory in appearance [in face, ἐν προσώπῳ], and not in[2] heart. For whether we be
beside ourselves, *it is* to [for] God: or whether we be sober [of sound mind], *it is* for
14 your cause. For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge [judged],
15 that if [*om.* if][3] one died for all, then [therefore] were all dead [all died]: And that
[*om. that*] he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them [*om.* for them] and rose again [for them].
16 Wherefore henceforth know we no man after [according to] the flesh: yea [*om.* yea][4]
though [and if] we have known Christ after [according to] the flesh, yet now hence-
17 forth know we *him* no more [so no longer]. Therefore [so that, ὥστε] if any man *be*
in Christ *he is* a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things [they][5]
18 are become new. And all things *are* of God, who has reconciled us to himself by
Jesus [*om.* Jesus][6] Christ, and hath given [gave] to us the ministry of reconciliation;
19 To wit, that [because, ὡς ὅτι] God was in Christ, reconciling the [a] world unto
himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the
20 word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did
beseech *you* [*om. you*] by us: we pray *you* [*om. you*] in Christ's stead, be ye [*om.* ye]
21 reconciled to God. For [*om* For][7] he hath made him *to be* sin for us who knew no
sin; that we might be made [become][8] the righteousness of God in him.

[1] Ver. 12.—The testimony in behalf of γάρ is not convincing; it is omitted by the best authorities [B. C. D. (1st Cor.) F. G. Sin., the Lat. Syr. and Copt. versions, Chrysost. and Theodoret *et. al.* Tisch. inserts it however, and thinks it betrays no evidence of being an emendation].

[2] Ver. 12.—Lachmann has μὴ ἐν before καρδίᾳ [and he is sustained by B. and Sin. *et. al.*] but it is not sufficiently authenticated. It was probably an emendation to adapt the passage to the subjective explanation [Winer's Gram. § 55, 1. In D. (1st. Cor.) E. F. we have instead οὐκ ἐν].

[3] Ver. 15.—The εἰ before εἷς is left out in the best MSS.; it was probably an interpolation to make out a better logical connection. De Wette thinks it was left out by a mistake of transcribers, or because a hypothetical form of expression seemed improper on such a subject [Tischendorf inserts εἰ, but acknowledges the high authority of B. and D. (to which must now be added Sinait.) against him. He was much influenced by the testimony of the Vulg. and Copt. versions and his favorite C. Alford and Meyer omit the word].

[4] Verse 15.—Δὲ after εἰ was probably inserted for the sake of the connection, but strong testimony is against it. Some MSS. have εἰ δὲ, and others καὶ εἰ. [Lachm. and Alford have εἰ καὶ; Rec. has εἰ δὲ καὶ].

[5] Ver. 17.—Lachm. throws out τὰ πάντα on the authority of B. C. *et. al.*, and by others these words are placed before καιναί. Meyer thinks that transcribers passed over them on account of the following τὰ δὲ πάντα. [Tisch. agrees with the Rec. in inserting them, but Alford and Stanley (with B. C. D. (1st Cor.) F. and Sin. *et al.*) omit them].

[6] Ver. 18.—Rec. has Ἰησοῦ before χριστοῦ, but the best MSS. B. C. D. (1st Cor.) F. and Sin., most of the versions and Chrysost.) omit it].

[7] Ver. 21.—In the best MSS. γάρ is wanting.

[8] Ver. 21.—Authorities are decidedly in favor of γενώμεθα. Rec. has γινώμεθα, [Alford says, "with *none* of our MSS.;" but it has *many* cursives to sustain it].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VERS. 11, 12. **Knowing therefore the fear of the Lord.**—This is probably an inference from vv. 9 and 10, but doubts have been raised respecting not only that inference but the interpretation of the individual sentences and their relation to one another. Some take τοῦ κυρίου as the genitive of the subject, *i. e.* since we know the terror of the Lord, and are acquainted with the fear which it inspires, or since we are not ignorant of the fearful things we must meet when we stand before Christ's judgment seat, and behold His awful majesty. In this case our minds are turned to the fearful judgment which is to reveal all things and to arraign all who have done evil (ver. 10). It must be conceded that the expression never has such a meaning any where else in the New Testament and especially in Paul's writings, where it evidently signifies the fear we have for God. And yet with this latter meaning εἰδότες—[which always refers to beholding (or knowing in consequence of beholding) what is visible to the external sense]—does not seem to correspond; we should rather have had ἔχοντες. Rückert's explanation, knowing the *true* fear of the Lord, *i. e.* in what it consists, introduces something new, for in the context we have had no reference to any false fear to which this would be opposed. But the interpretation proposed by Meyer *et al. viz.* 'since we are no strangers to the feeling of a holy reverence for Christ as our Judge;' has no grammatical objection to it, for the perf. εἰδέναι may have the sense of not only a practical (to understand something), but a theoretical knowledge (comp. Phil. iv. 12) [especially when it is derived from an intercourse with the things known]. Neander paraphrases the sentence thus: "we know what the fear of the Lord (Christ) requires of a man; for it will make him act under a sense of his responsibility."—**we convince men.**—The same words in Gal. i. 10, have the sense of: to win over to our side by arguments (comp. Acts xii. 20). The idea of something immoral is connected with it there, on account of the context; and hence some regard it here, either as a question, (do we persuade men?) which is hardly allowable, or as an indicative sentence expressing a bare possibility: "even if I could deceive men (craftily persuade, or draw over by talking) I should nevertheless be manifest to God." The mere indicative, however, could not be made to express this, and an arbitrary interpolation of some clause like: "as our opponents say," would become necessary. But even if the word is taken in the sense of: to convince, we are led to inquire, of what? Some reply: 'that we know the fear of the Lord,' or, 'that we fear the Lord.' But this is not very agreeable to the relations of the sentence. Others say: 'that we are earnestly endeavoring to be acceptable to God' (ver. 9), and hence "that we are sincere in our work." This seems to us most natural; and Neander thus paraphrases it: 'we are called upon to prove what our disposition is;' this can be manifest only to God, for man can take cognizance of no such matter. We therefore endeavor to convince men that they do us injustice (by their objections), and that we are actuated by a true Christian spirit. Certainly the subject of discussion in the connection was the person and the ministry of the Apostle; and nothing leads us to think of a persuasion of the general truth of Christianity, as if a motive for the better performance of his work was to be drawn from what is mentioned in ver. 10. Such a construction would essentially destroy the idea of any thing to be gained for Christianity.—We now come to the contrast: —**but to God we have been already manifested,**—and the sentence connected with it: —**and I hope also we have been manifested in your consciences,**—in which we have an obvious reference to chap. iv: 2 where he had spoken of commending themselves to the conscience of every man (συνιστάντες ἑαυτοὺς πρὸς πᾶσαν συνείδησιν ἀνθρώπ). Even this, however, refers probably to the manner in which he had discharged his Apostolic duties, and to the honest and sincere efforts he had made to please only God. He knew he was without concealment in the presence of the Omniscient, whose perfect light will reveal not him alone, but all things before the judgment seat of Christ (ver. 10). He also hoped that he was made manifest in the consciousness, or the conscience of the Corinthians among whom the Divine light had shone so brightly, and among whom he had given so many impressive proofs of his spirit. Ἐλπίζειν is here expressive of an opinion that something was true, and the confident expectation that it would turn out to be so. Observe the transition to the first pers. sing. on the introduction of a matter so purely personal. From a point which God had so distinctly revealed that it needed no more attention to secure a favorable judgment, the Apostle turns to convince those who could not see his heart and who were too easily influenced by false appearances and the unfavorable remarks of others, that he was not actuated in what he was saying by an idle vanity of which God would disapprove, but by a pious regard for the great day of final revelation. In this conviction is involved also the consequences to himself after all the gain, the confidence and the esteem he might acquire, and of course the opposite prejudices he might have to meet, should be set aside. The object of the sentence, however, is not precisely to assign the motive of his conduct (εἰδότες), as if he had said: "Since we know" (a form which would best suit Luther's translation: "*So fahren wir schön mit den Leuten,*" [also Tyndale's and Cranmer's English version: "we fare fayre wyth men], *i. e.*, we do not tyrannize over and drive the people by excommunications, *etc.*, but we teach them by gentle means, *etc.*; a translation and an interpretation which is opposed to the grammatical sense); but it is to define more particularly the πείθομεν, and to show that it was done in a pious spirit. So far as relates to the essential meaning, it comes to the same result whether τοῦ κυρίου be taken as the genitive of the object or the genitive of the subject. In either case the Apostle intended to assure them in the participial sentence (ver. 11) that he acted under a reverential sense of the Divine presence and with reference to that tribunal before which

all things were to be revealed. We may, perhaps, explain it thus: we act in full view of the awful things connected with the Judge, or under the reverential fear which the thought of him, *i. e.*, the terror of the Lord the Judge, awakens. The common usage of the language would probably decide us in favor of the former view.—**We are not again commending ourselves unto you.**—The γὰρ, which some important manuscripts insert after οὐ, has induced some commentators to look for an intimate connection with ver. 11. The Apostle has been made to say: 'we hope we have been manifest in your consciences, for we are not commending ourselves, *etc.* He did not commend himself, for he presupposed that he had already been made manifest to their consciences. I am already assured of your confidence, *for* I am not thus commending myself in order to recommend myself to you, but it is to give you, *etc.* But as the best critical authorities are not in favor of the γάρ, a very good connection is made out, by supposing that he is here meeting a possible misconstruction of the confidence he had expressed, or rather of the whole vindication he had made of himself in ver. 11, comp. on iii. 1.—**But we say these things to give you an occasion for boasting on our behalf.**—From the words ἑαυτοὺς συνιστάνομεν, we conclude that λέγομεν ταῦτα (not ἐσμέν) must be supplied before ἀλλὰ—διδόντες. The word ἀφορμή occurs also in chap. xi. 12; Gal. v. 13; Rom. vii. 8, 11; 1 Tim. v. 14. It properly signifies the point from which an undertaking takes its start, a point of support, a holding point; hence the necessary means for doing or attaining any thing, the materials or means which give occasion for it. In connection with this, καύχημα must mean, not the matter respecting which one glories, but only the honor or glory which is the result of the glorying. The words ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν signify, in our favor, for our advantage, as in chap. vii. 4, 14; viii. 24; ix. 2, 3; xii. 5 (giving him the honor due for his faithful and sincere labors in planting and sustaining the Church). This idea is carried out in the final sentence:—**that ye may have an answer against those who boast in appearance** (face) **and not in heart.**—After ἵνα ἔχητε, either τί or λέγειν τί must be understood. The sense of ἔχειν here is: to have in readiness (1 Cor. xiv. 26), and πρός must signify: against. They should have something with which they might meet the Apostle's opponents, with whom they had become so captivated that they needed to have such an occasion given them by him. We have here a delicate reference to the way in which they had been turned against him by the influence of such men. Those against whom the Corinthians ought to have boasted in his behalf, he calls in an antithetical sentence, men who boasted ἐν προσώπῳ καὶ οὐ καρδίᾳ. By ἐν προσώπῳ he must have meant either: in the sight of men, in contrast with those who had a true approbation of their own consciences before God, or (in better correspondence with usage in other places 1 Cor. iii. 21, *et al.*): what was visible in the sight of men. In the latter case, πρόσωπῳ and καρδίᾳ would stand in contrast with one another, as the external and the internal. Πρόσωπον would be equivalent to the face or countenance, and the object of their boasting would be the holiness, the zeal, the love, *etc.*, which might be seen in a man's presence, not what existed in the heart. The hearts of those to whom he here alluded, he implies were destitute of all that of which they boasted. He designates their act not according to its intention, but according to the fact. (Meyer). Or πρόσωπον may be taken as equivalent to the person (whether it were a man's own or other people's person), personal relations, connections, leaders, ancestors, and particularly his external relations to Christ (ver. 16; xi. 18 f.; 1 Cor. i. 12); and καρδία, in this case, would signify that which is internal and noblest in man, that which God looks upon (1 Sam. xvi. 7) as the seat of faith, the proper ground of all true boasting. (Osiander). As πρόσωπον almost uniformly bears in other places the sense of the face, the first interpretation is probably to be preferred. The sense will then be: those who boast not so much of the heart as of the face, and whose piety, therefore, is seen entirely in the countenance, *etc.* The reference, therefore, is to hypocrites. [Chrysostom: "He does not bid them glory on his account absolutely, *i. e.*, when no cause existed, and they had no occasion, but when his adversaries began to extol themselves. In all things he looks out for a fitting occasion. His object was not to induce them to make him illustrious, but to silence those who improperly commended themselves to the injury of others. Such gloried in what is seen for display. They did all things out of a love of honor, and they wore an aspect of piety and venerability, while they were empty inwardly and destitute of good works."]

Vers. 13-15. **For whether we have been beside ourselves it is for God.**—He now shows them that they had good reason for boasting of him rather than of those who depreciated him, for if he was to be judged by what he had done among them, they could not doubt his sincerity. Two different judgments might be passed upon him, and are pointed out in εἴτε ἐξέστημεν and εἴτε σωφρονοῦμεν. [They referred to his former (ἐξέστημεν) and to his present (σωφρονοῦμεν) state of mind. In his former course (either when he was at Corinth, or when in some part of his epistles he had commended himself), he might have seemed to some beside himself with zeal and earnestness, but more recently he might have seemed to the same persons unduly reserved and sober. In both cases he may have been charged with acting an interested and artful part; whereas he maintains that he was governed by higher motives, which prompted him to adapt himself to varying circumstances]. The first, however, may have been more especially the judgment of his opponents, and showed the low estimate they had formed of him. It was not that he had overacted his part (Luther: done too much, dealt sharply with the people), nor merely that he had been foolish or had acted foolishly. Nor do we understand by the word here used that he was charged with going beyond the limits either of ordinary intelligence (mysterious contemplations), or of intelligent consciousness (ecstasy); for neither of these things are hinted at in the context. Nor does the extravagance al-

luded to seem to have been a transgression of propriety by an excessive self-glorification (Schott), nor an immodesty of deportment (R. Cath.). The idea intended is rather that of losing one's senses, an insanity in contrast with being of good mind, reasonable (*σωφρονεῖν*). In like manner *ἐξέστη* is used in Mark iii. 21, and *μαίνεσθαι* in Acts xxvi. 25. The objection to him was not that he had commended himself, as in chap. xi. 17 f.), in which case *σωφρονεῖν* would signify, to be diffident in this respect; to God would then signify, for the honor of God; and for your sake would mean simply as a salutary example or as an instance of condescension for you. Such a sentiment would not have been needful after what he had said in ver. 12. He probably had before his mind the whole course of his action, for this had probably seemed to his opponents as madness. In contrast with the Judaizers especially, he had shown a burning zeal for the advancement of the pure Gospel, for the conversion of souls and for the perseverance and progress of those who had been converted. Did he then have reference to his personal experiences, such as his sudden conversion or his ecstatic state? The contrast as well as the following sentence seem to favor the allusion rather to his whole conduct, his general activity. But even on the supposition that his opponents were right, he suggests that the madness they imputed to him was an extreme devotion to God, in the service of his Lord, and therefore worthy of esteem. But he adds—**whether we are now sober minded, it is for you.**—If any one saw his conduct in an opposite light, or thought he acted in a reasonable and wise manner, he assured them it was all for their welfare. This explanation, according to which the Apostle speaks of his conduct as it appeared to others and was judged by them, seems to us much more simple and more eligible than that which Osiander defends; according to which he speaks on the one hand of his actual deportment, of his transcendant style of doctrine and practice, and of his highly exalted spiritual life, which he however contends actually redounded to the glory of God; and on the other hand of his more tranquil and judicious manner of action, which was better understood and more generally useful. Had such been the Apostle's meaning he makes use in the first clause of an ambiguous expression, an amphiboly, in which he refers ironically to his opponents' insinuation, that he had been enthusiastically extravagant. The signification of *ἐξέστη*, adopted by Hofmann (Schrigtbew, II. p. 323): "to be in an exalted state of inspiration" is not favored by the common usage of the words.—**For the love of Christ constraineth us** (ver. 14).—He here gives a reason not for what he had said in the first half of ver. 13, but for his assertion that his course of action had been sincere, and that whatever might be its appearance before men, it was for the service of God and for the welfare of his brethren. In this sentence the words *τοῦ Χριστοῦ* are in the genitive of the subject according to the prevalent usage of Paul with respect to this phrase; comp. chap. viii. 24; xiii. 13; Rom. v. 5, 8; viii. 35, 39; Eph. ii. 4; iii. 19; Phil. i. 9 et al. (The personal object of the *ἀγάπη* is introduced by *εἰς* in Col. i. 4 and 1 Thess. iii. 12). In what follows also it is evident that the object is to point out the highest manifestation of Christ's love. Although this love of Christ is a power which produces love to Christ, we are not to suppose both points embraced in the expression here. The verb *συνέχει* means either, it presses, it drives, or, it holds together. The pronoun *ἡμᾶς*, however, cannot mean here, you and me (to hold us together in friendship), but, as the context shows, only me. This holding together must be the opposite of those separations which selfishness is apt to produce or occasion. Calvin says: constrains our hearts or affections; Meyer: holds us that we may not pass beyond the limits which are required by a regard for God's honor and your welfare (*θεῷ* and *ὑμῖν*). The former interpretation seems indeed contrary to usage, since everywhere else the word has the meaning of, to press hard, or to afflict; but never, to urge or to impel; only in the passive is it used of the affections by which one is ruled. But why can not the active be used according to the analogy of the passive, of an affection which directly and thoroughly controls a man? With such a meaning the idea becomes more expressive. When the Apostle adds —**we having formed this judgment**—he introduces the subjective cause of that influence which the love of Christ had over him. That love had led him to form this judgment, *i. e.*, had brought him to this conclusion, to this conviction. Whether this judgment was reached at the time of his conversion (Meyer), or whether the whole meaning of the death of Christ became thus clear to his apprehension at some later period of his life (Osiander), may be left undetermined. Neander remarks that "the aorist was here used because Paul intended to speak of something which happened once upon a time. He means, that ever since he became conscious of the saving love of Christ, a new principle of conduct had entered his heart." The substance of this conviction, or rather of the judgment then formed was:—**that one died for all, and so all died.**—If we accept of the reading of the Receptus, which gives us *εἰ* after *ὅτι*, we must regard *ὅτι ἄρα—ἀπέθανον* as belonging together: that (if one died for all) then all died. The hypothetical sentence, however, could have been only formally problematical, since what is there expressed must have been really certain to the Apostle. But if *εἰ* be left out, *ὅτι* is either equivalent to: *because*, and so introduces the antecedent of a proposition (Meyer); or, it is in this instance equivalent to: *that*, and both clauses depend upon it, *i. e.*, we have judged that one died for all and that all died. (Osiander). *Τοῦτο* appears to favor this latter supposition (we judged this that, *etc.*). One thing, however, which would go far to determine us in favor of the causal signification is, that it brings out more prominently the *οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον* as the proper substance of the judgment to which the Apostle says in the context he had come (we judged this, that one died for all and so all died). And yet the whole force of the sentence seems to require that *ὅτι* in the sense of *that* should be made to govern both clauses of it. This logical relation, however, would be destroyed if we thus bring in an independent conclusion by means of *ἄρα*. The inference which the Apostle makes from the

proposition that one died for all, argues strongly in favor of its judicially vicarious signification. One was in the place of all, therefore all must be looked upon as dead; one has made expiation for the offence of all, therefore all are to be looked upon as having suffered punishment. This usage, by which *ὑπέρ* indicates that something was done or suffered in the name of some one, in consequence of which the latter is regarded as doing or suffering the same thing, prevailed even among classic writers; but among later authors the usage was extended until the word was introduced in connections in which a purer style would have required *ἀντί*. (*Passow s. v. ὑπέρ*, A. II. 1. p. 2064 *a. b.*). [Stanley contends that although *ὑπὲρ πάντων* has the same ambiguity as the English "for," '*in behalf of*,' the idea of service and protection always predominates. Wherever, in speaking of the death of Christ, the idea of *substitution* is intended, it is under the figure of a *ransom*, in which case it is expressed by *ἀντί*. (Matth. xx. 28; Mark x. 45). Wherever the idea of *covering* or *forgiving* sins is intended, it is under the figure of a sin-offering, in which case the word used is *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* or *ἁμαρτιῶν*, as in Rom. viii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 18; 1 Jno. ii. 2; iv. 10. The preposition *περί*, as thus used, has partly the sense of "on account of," but chiefly the sense of "covering," as if it were, he threw his death "*over*" or "*around* our sins." Such generalizations contain a truth deserving notice, but we may doubt whether the usage was so strictly conformed to the etymological law. In the actual interpretation of our passage Stanley is compelled to confess that there would be no force to the Apostle's inference that all were dead because Christ died, except on the idea of Christ's representing or standing in the place of those who died with Him. See some excellent remarks of Trench (*Synn.* 2 Series, pp. 163–166) and Tischendorf, *Doctr. Pauli de vi mor. Chr.*]. But as in the final sentence (ver. 15) *ὑπὲρ πάντων* would belong also to *ἐγερθέντι*, such a meaning would not seem appropriate to the connection, for we should be compelled to understand the resurrection for all in a sense like that which is expressed in Eph. ii. 5 (comp. Col. ii. 11; iii. 1), *i. e.*, Christ's resurrection would be regarded as the resurrection of all. Not only the final sentence (ver. 15) but that from which the whole reflection is derived ("the love of Christ constrains us") would probably bring us to the conclusion that the main idea of the passage is, Love is for love, *i. e.*, corresponding to the love which sacrifices itself for the salvation of all, is a love which renounces all selfish motives and devotes itself to the great purpose of the other love. In such a connection the phrase *all died* would denote a moral death. The Apostle implies that an essential object aimed at in the sacrifice of one for the redemption of all, was that the latter might forsake the fleshly life of sin which was opposed to this work of love, and which by its very nature was a life of selfishness, having self for its central aim, and in direct contradiction to this self-sacrificing and diffusive love. Olshausen says: that death of Christ for all is the principle or reason for the death of all for Him. But when any have fellowship with Christ this is effected by a faith in which His death for their sakes becomes actually beneficial to them, and they cease to live for themselves. This is what the Apostle means in other places, when he says, we are crucified with Christ, Gal. ii. 19; comp. Col. iii. 3; ii. 12; Rom. vi. 4. The Apostle speaks of believers who in the very act of faith have entered into the fellowship of Christ's death, and hence are dead with Him, and are in the sphere of His death, because they have the essential principle of that death in a love which surrenders its personal life of selfishness. (comp. Meyer). We would not be understood as defending that interpretation, which combines and mingles together the subjective ethical and the objective judicial signification of Christ's atoning death, or which makes out that all are both morally and legally dead by virtue and in consequence of Christ's death. (Osiander). The only explanation which seems to us correct, and to which the whole connection (ver. 13–15) conducts us, is that which represents the death of Christ, which brings salvation to all, as set forth in this passage, according to its ethical meaning, but as a result of love in Him and as a reason for love in men. Neander says: The article before *πάντες* implies that precisely the all for whom Christ died must have died in Him. That which had been assumed as a principle in ver. 14 (*the all died*), is presented in ver. 15 as a purpose or aim. [It should, however, be remarked that the purpose is limited to those who live (*οἱ ζῶντες*), whereas no limitation is put to the all (*οἱ πάντες*) for whom Christ died, and who died in Him. See below]. The Apostle speaks of this living of some as a moral result flowing from the death of Christ for all:—**that they who live should no longer live for themselves.**—He here resumes the thought involved in the being dead. In that dying the fleshly life of sin had ceased, the man no more lived to himself, the object of all his action was no longer a life of sense in the service of self alone. The positive side in contrast with this is given when the Apostle adds—**but to him who died and rose again for them**—*i. e.*, Christ who had died and risen again for their salvation (Rom. iv. 25) should now become the object of all their efforts. But the subjects of what is here spoken of are said to be *οἱ ζῶντες*. These are such as have entered into the fellowship of Christ's death; but, as the invariable consequence, are also in the fellowship of his new life: *ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντες*. Comp. Rom. vi. 4 ff. 13. We regard as defective not only the interpretation which renders *οἱ ζῶντες* as long as they live (for the article forbids such a rendering), but also that which regards it as meaning those who are alive *i. e.*, those who are conceived of as a part of the same general multitude who had been redeemed and were dead. [It is precisely on account of the article before *ζῶντες* that we think the Apostle intended to emphasize and distinguish the living here from the more general mass for whom Christ died. Those who make the living in Christ as extensive and the same as those for whom He died, are obliged to take the word *died* (*ἀποθανεῖν*) in ver. 15 in two different significations, one judicial or literal, and the other moral. If on the other hand we make the death in ver. 15 in each case to mean a legal

death, then the living signifies the opposite justification; or if we make it signify a physical death, then the living must be such as partake in His resurrection and are alive in Him who rose again (*ἀποθαν. κ. ἐγερθέντι*). We may also ask, how it follows from Christ's dying in any sense, that all or any would die in a moral sense? Is not this making the Apostle assert a mere assumption? Our English A. V. makes the Apostle to have judged, that if one died for all, then all must *have been* dead. This is contrary to the aorist tense of *ἀπέθανον* which signifies literally they died. Even with the sense that His death *proved* that all were dying creatures, we cannot see how such an argument was pertinent to the Apostle's line of thought. His object was not to refer to the original state of man without redemption, but to the obligations which that redemption imposed on him. Even those who deny that the dying of all men in consequence of Christ's death was merely by imputation (Webster and Wilkinson), acknowledge that His death indicated what was due to them, and condemned them unto death; and that the interest of the *οἱ ζῶντες* extended to the resurrection, as well as to the death of Christ. Comp. Stanley].

VERS. 16, 17.—**So that we from this con- know no man according to** representa- —An inference is here drawn f[rom] *ἡμᾶς* in a yet just been said. Inasmuch as C[hrist] xv. 10; 1 Tim. all, and so their selfish life [ac]tion is not necessary. clusiveness, narrowness, e[tc.] it with ver. 19.—**Be-** and inasmuch as believ- **ciling a world unto** who has died for them ver. 19).—We have here an be entirely devoted to [Je]sus for what had just been forth we must be ex[pli]ed (*θεός*) stands so emphati- ever he may be, [at] the sentence as to indicate a *σάρκα*). The *σάρ*[ξ] all this preparatory work, and which believers [ig]norance of it. Shall we now take To know accor- *was in Christ*, as if they consti- either subjec- nce by itself, and regard the whole those here [as]serting that the work of atonement man without [ac]complished by the Divine being in Christ, i. 17; 1 C[or.] Godhead of Christ (comp. Col. i. 19 ff.): natural r[e]gion to a lower Christological view? In Phil. iii. God would signify the Father (others ing the t[er]m mean the *λόγος*, and still others the merely God), and *εἶναι ἐν* would designate an and e[s]sential and substantial presence, and not merely knowi[n]sient dynamic fellowship (Osiander). Or no con[st]*καταλλάσσων* an emphatic periphrastic im- Jewi[s]ct (as in Gal. i. 23), by which Paul wished cum[s]form us in what things God was acting; "If that God was when Christ died, reconciling whi[le] world unto Himself; *i. e.* God was in the wo[rld] of Christ, in that series of acts by which no[t] world was reconciled to God, and especially b[y] that great event in which Christ died to atone for the world (the *καταλλάξαι* of ver. 18, Meyer)? Our decision upon these questions must depend pr[im]ry much upon what we find in the succeeding context. According to Meyer, Paul is in that context assigning the reasons which had induced him to say that God was reconciling the world. These are given when it is said that God was not imputing to men their trespasses, and had committed to him and his fellow laborers the word of reconciliation; from both which it was evident that God was in Christ's work engaged in a scheme to reconcile the whole world unto Him- *ἀλλά* has the sense of nevertheless, as in chap. iv. 16. He acknowledges he had once had a knowledge of Christ according to the flesh (the emphasis should be placed upon the praeterite *ἐγνώκαμεν*, which on this account is placed first in the sentence); but he asserts that for the present, now (*νῦν*, comp. *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* in the preceding clause), he knew Christ thus (*i. e.*, *κατὰ σάρκα*) no longer. The emphasis cannot be[ar] *Χριστόν* on account of its position [was treated] tion between the protasis and the [ap]ion up to the sentence. [In such a case *χριστ*[ὸν] interpreta- stood before *κατὰ σάρκα*]. But *κ*[όσμος] with, consistent objectively, refers to the merely the D[ivi]- (*τὸν μὴ* lity, that which made its appe[ar]*ἐμενος, εἰ δικαιο-* This defines what kind of knowiling act, a[s] 329. to, and consequently also th[e] realization in [the] is ing Christ which was in [Paul] him, an element which had preceded [his] wever, be conceded, th[at] enment when he [Paul] eyer connects the participial (*Χριστόν* here *ἦν καταλλάσσ.* ("it is evident that an ap[ostle] reconciling the world unto Himself, of C[hrist] much as He does not impute," *etc.*), has something rather artificial about it. Such a connection of the words would have been proper only if the Apostle had said, God *is* reconciling the world, or if he had continued by saying, *God did* not impute (imperfect) to men their trespasses. On the whole we think it best with Meyer to take *ἦν—καταλλάσσων* together, but to regard the participial sentence as a more particular description of the way in which God was reconciling the world to Himself in Christ, "God was in Christ, (a phrase equivalent to *by* (*διὰ*) *Jesus Christ* in ver. 18, but with the understanding that Christ and what He has done are the only basis on which the reconciliation is founded), bringing back the world to a state of friendship with Himself; *for* He imputed not men's sins to them, and He has committed unto us the word of reconciliation." Not imputing men's trespasses to them is equivalent to the bestowal of forgiveness upon men, and implies that God was applying the benefits of salvation by Christ to individuals (*αὐτοῖς*). This is set forth by means of a present participle (imperf. Winer, § 40), because the act was continuously to be repeated, while the word describing the institution of the ministerial office (*θέμενος*), is an aorist participle, because the act was accomplished at a certain time. But the reconciliation, or the restoration of the happy relation, which was the consequence of this proceeding, is mentioned as a process commenced in Christ but not as yet concluded (*ἦν—καταλλάσσων*). As we do not think that this refers exclusively to the objective facts of the redeeming work, the objection which de Wette urges, that *καὶ θέμενος, etc.*, is not an expression quite suitable to those facts [inasmuch as it implies that they were put into the mouth or heart (see below)] will not apply to us. *Κόσμος*, as in Jno. iii. 25 *et al.*, signifies the human race, and as it is here without the article, it means perhaps "a whole world." The word *trespasses* (*παραπτώματα*), as in Rom. iii. 25, signifies faults, sins, aberrations from the right way, from the truth, from rectitude, *etc.* [Trench, Synn. 2d ser. p. 76]. *Hath committed to us the word of reconciliation* signifies, according to some, that God had established and arranged the

ence to what he was before he became a Christian (subjectively or objectively). The phrase, a new creature, occurs again in Gal. vi. 15. In relation to the thing itself comp. Eph. ii. 10; iv. 21; Col. iii. 9 f.; Rom. vi. 6. The new birth is spoken of in Tit. iii. 5; John iii. 3; James i. 18. Κτίσις designates not only a Divine act (creation), but also the product of such an act (creature). The in cons. is the ordinary meaning in the New ...rded as do. comp. Rom. i. 25; viii. 19 ff. 39 *et al*). prevailed even ...on was also used by the Rabbins later authors the ... a conversion to Judaism. The word was introduc...reature is carried out in an antipurer style would the following sentence—**Old** *s. v. ὑπέρ*, A. II. 1. **assed away**—that is, with retends that although are in Christ. The old things ambiguity as the Etsition and (theoretically) the the idea of service and one had before he became dominates. Wherever, in stitute the whole mental of Christ, the idea of *substitution* ...ised in all things. under the figure of a *ransom*, in which ...elonged to us expressed by *ἀντί*. (Matth. xx. 28; Mark ...r., pp. Wherever the idea of *covering* or *forgiving* sins ...es: intended, it is under the figure of a sin-offering, ...e in which case the word used is *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* or *ἁμαρτιῶν*, as in Rom. viii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 18; 1 Jno. ii. 2; iv. 10. The preposition *περί*, as thus used, has partly the sense of "on account of," but chiefly the sense of "covering," as if it were, he threw his death "*over*" or "*around* our sins." Such generalizations contain a truth deserving notice, but we may doubt whether the usage was so strictly conformed to the etymological law. In the actual interpretation of our passage Stanley is compelled to confess that there would be no force to the Apostle's inference that all were dead because Christ died, except on the idea of Christ's representing or standing in the place of those who died with Him. See some excellent remarks of Trench (*Synn.* 2 Series, pp. 163–166) and Tischendorf, *Doctr. Pauli de vi mor. Chr.*]. But as in the final sentence (ver. 15) *ὑπὲρ πάντων* would belong also to *ἐγερθέντι*, such a meaning would not seem appropriate to the connection, for we should be compelled to understand the resurrection for all in a sense like that which is expressed in Eph. ii. 5 (comp. Col. ii. 11; iii. 1), *i. e.*, Christ's resurrection would be regarded as the resurrection of all. Not only the final sentence (ver. 15) but that from which the whole reflection is derived ("the love of Christ constrains us") would probably bring us to the conclusion that the main idea of the passage is, Love is for love, *i. e.*, corresponding to the love which sacrifices itself for the salvation of all, is a love which renounces all selfish motives and devotes itself to the great purpose of the other love. In such a connection the phrase *all died* would denote a moral death. The Apostle implies that an essential object aimed at in the sacrifice of one for the redemption of all, was that the latter might forsake the fleshly life of sin which was opposed to this work of love, and which by its very nature was a life of selfishness, having self for its central aim, and in direct contradiction to this self-sacrificing and diffusive love. Olshausen says: that death of Christ for all is the principle or reason for the death of all for Him. But when any have fellowship with Christ this is effected by a faith in which His death for their This great change the Apostle now proceeds to refer to its original principle. [Osiander: "he mounts from this idea of the new creation to God the source of all life, and traces the mental change of which he had been speaking to the great fundamental improvement of all human relations by the atonement of Christ"].

Vers. 18, 19. **And all things [are] of God.**—The "all things" of which he had just spoken, the whole state in which the old nature and life had passed away and every thing had become new, comes to us from God. The way, however, in which this occurs, is immediately described more definitely by directing our minds to the manner in which God effects such a change—**who reconciled us to Himself by Christ**—*Καταλλάσσειν*, according to one class of interpreters is simply the accomplishment in man's disposition toward God, of a change in which he gives up his dislike and his distrust of God; but according to another class, it is a change in God's treatment of men, in which He no longer regards them with disfavor, and causes His wrath (*ὀργή*) towards them to cease, and N they become His beloved ones instead of enemies that ...mp. Rom. v. 10; Col. i. 20 f.). According to have dietter view, it includes what is meant by sumed as a...vor to them (*χαρίζεσθαι*) and forgive- presented in *νοσίζειν τὰς ἁμαρτίας*); and the result should, however, b...his side returns to a state of is limited to those wh...f comp. Rom. v. 1 ff.; vi. 1 ff.; no limitation is put to...e views might, however, be whom Christ died, and *ὑπὲρ πάντων*, so that the idea below]. The Apostle spea...n of a state of friendsome as a moral result flowin... but with the under- Christ for all:—**that they** w...ion of grace is first **no longer live for themse**...Neander remarks: resumes the thought involved in man's enemy, but In that dying the fleshly life of sin is everlasting the man no more lived to himself, ... nothing like all his action was no longer a life of ...from God has service of self alone. The positive sin...l must be trast with this is given when the Apost' communi- **but to him who died and rose a...** And yet **them**—*i. e.*, Christ who had died ...no means again for their salvation (Rom. iv. 25) ...n's disnow become the object of all their efforts. ...t of an the subjects of what is here spoken of are When to be *οἱ ζῶντες*. These are such as have entered into the fellowship of Christ's death; but, as place invariable consequence, are also in the fellowship of his new life: *ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντες*. Col. the Rom. vi. 4 ff. 13. We regard as defective ... deonly the interpretation which renders *οἱ ζῶντες* as long as they live (for the article forbids such a rendering), but also that which regarded it as meaning those who are alive *i. e.*, those who are conceived of as a part of the same general multitude who had been redeemed and were dead. [It is precisely on account of the article before *ζῶντες* that we think the Apostle intended to emphasize and distinguish the living here from the more general mass for whom Christ died. Those who make the living in Christ as extensive and the same as those for whom He died, are obliged to take the word *died* (*ἀποθανεῖν*) in ver. 15 in two different significations, one judicial or literal, and the other moral. If on the other hand we make the death in ver. 15 in each case to mean a legal

tion a effected by the death of Christ) seem to hint a to at this idea. And yet we see no injury but rather a great benefit to theological exegesis if *καταλλαγή* could be uniformly distinguished from *ἱλασμός* and its kindred words, and confined to that part of the redeeming work by which man is reconciled (whatever may be the means, objective or subjective) to God. OLSHAUSEN on Rom. iii. 24; STANLEY'S *Obss.* on the result of our passage; C. F. SCHMID'S *Bibl. Theol.* Vol. II. p. 316 ff. EBRARD'S *Chr. Dogm.* § 406]. But the phrase *by Christ* refers to something which becomes more distinctly prominent in ver. 21 (not by means of his doctrine or his example. Pelag). The pronoun *us* (*ἡμᾶς*) signifies not the Apostles exclusively, but believers generally; for there is no limitation implied until the nature of the subject calls for a limitation in the next sentence—**and hath given to us the ministration of the reconciliation.**—This ministration of the reconciliation is analogous to the ministration of righteousness, in chap. iii. 9. It is a ministry entirely devoted to the work of reconciliation, whose business it is to make known that reconciliation, and in consequence of which men believe in Christ. To define this ministry so as to make it include all believers (Olshausen) is contrary to the whole analogy of Paul's representation. One might much rather take *ἡμᾶς* in a yet more limited sense (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 10; 1 Tim. i. 12 ff.); but such a construction is not necessary, nor would it be consistent with ver. 19.—**Because God was reconciling a world unto himself in Christ** (ver. 19).—We have here an explanation and a reason for what had just been said. The word God (*θεός*) stands so emphatically at the head of the sentence as to indicate a Divine agency in all this preparatory work, and a special prominence of it. Shall we now take the words *God was in Christ*, as if they constituted a sentence by itself, and regard the whole verse as asserting that the work of atonement was accomplished by the Divine being in Christ, or by the Godhead of Christ (comp. Col. i. 19 ff.) in opposition to a lower Christological view? In this case God would signify the Father (others make it mean the *λόγος*, and still others the Triune God), and *εἶναι ἐν* would designate an habitual and substantial presence, and not merely a transient dynamic fellowship (Osiander). Or is *ἦν καταλλάσσων* an emphatic periphrastic imperfect (as in Gal. i. 23), by which Paul wished to inform us in what things God was acting; *viz.*, that God was when Christ died, reconciling the world unto Himself; *i. e.* God was in the work of Christ, in that series of acts by which the world was reconciled to God, and especially in that great event in which Christ died to atone for the world (the *καταλλάξαι* of ver. 18, Meyer)? Our decision upon these questions must depend very much upon what we find in the succeeding context. According to Meyer, Paul is in that context assigning the reasons which had induced him to say that God was reconciling the world. These are given when it is said that God was not imputing to men their trespasses, and had committed to him and his fellow laborers the word of reconciliation; from both which it was evident that God was in Christ's work engaged in a scheme to reconcile the whole world unto Himself. The words *μὴ λογιζόμενος* ha nces in which a verb in the present tense, for they uld not make is not reckoning unto men their re in our own the other hand the committing to erefore to be reconciliation was what God did in and finds work to men, after it had been acco beginning Christ. Even Osiander concedes that g Him to tences are not to be coördinated with bu earer of nated to *καταλλάσσων, etc.*, and that *μὴ λ* is suffer- describes a result which is intimate was treated and nearly coincident with the en up to the This is the remission of guilt, a be interpreta- dividuals may receive through faith, consistent municate which is the object of the D (*τὸν μὴ* tution of the ministry (*καὶ θέμενος, εἰς λόγον δικαιο-* yet this result of the reconciling act, a 329. organ so indispensable to its realization in is viduals, is not, according to him, an element part of it. It must, however, be conceded, th the way in which Meyer connects the participial sentence with *ἦν καταλλάσσ.* ("it is evident that God is reconciling the world unto Himself, inasmuch as He does not impute," *etc.*), has something rather artificial about it. Such a connection of the words would have been proper only if the Apostle had said, God *is* reconciling the world, or if he had continued by saying, *God did* not impute (imperfect) to men their trespasses. On the whole we think it best with Meyer to take *ἦν—καταλλάσσων* together, but to regard the participial sentence as a more particular description of the way in which God was reconciling the world to Himself in Christ, "God was in Christ, (a phrase equivalent to *by* (*διὰ*) *Jesus Christ* in ver. 18, but with the understanding that Christ and what He has done are the only basis on which the reconciliation is founded), bringing back the world to a state of friendship with Himself; *for* He imputed not men's sins to them, and He has committed unto us the word of reconciliation." Not imputing men's trespasses to them is equivalent to the bestowal of forgiveness upon men, and implies that God was applying the benefits of salvation by Christ to individuals (*αὐτοῖς*). This is set forth by means of a present participle (imperf. Winer, § 46), because the act was continuously to be repeated, while the word describing the institution of the ministerial office (*θέμενος*), is an aorist participle, because the act was accomplished at a certain time. But the reconciliation, or the restoration of the happy relation, which was the consequence of this proceeding, is mentioned as a process commenced in Christ but not as yet concluded (*ἦν—καταλλάσσων*). As we do not think that this refers exclusively to the objective facts of the redeeming work, the objection which de Wette urges, that *καὶ θέμενος, etc.*, is not an expression quite suitable to those facts [inasmuch as it implies that they were put into the mouth or heart (see below)] will not apply to us. Κόσμος, as in Jno. iii. 25 *et al.*, signifies the human race, and as it is here without the article, it means perhaps "a whole world." The word *trespasses* (*παραπτώματα*), as in Rom. iii. 25, signifies faults, sins, aberrations from the right way, from the truth, from rectitude, *etc.* [Trench, Synn. 2d ser. p. 76]. *Hath committed to us the word of reconciliation* signifies, according to some, that God had established and arranged the

ence to what the Christian faith in the Church, tian (subjectively) gated the doctrine of reconcilia- a new creature unmistakable reference of this ex- relation to that what had been said in ver. 18, re- 21; Col. iii. giving of the ministry of reconcilia- spoken of Apostle, induces us to understand the Κτίσις described by ἡμῖν. [The use of the aorist parti- but ἀποκατηλλαγμένος, *here*, is remarkable. We should Τιθέναι ἐν connected καὶ ἔθετο, and a slight anacolu- rded as defensible denied (Olshausen). The word prevailed even connected back with θεὸς ἦν, since later authors election of an aorist part. with- word was intricate and an imperfect verb, would purer style only without an example but with- *s. v.* ὑπέρ appropriate sense (God hath committed to tends to deposited in us, *etc.*). Our English version ambiguously that this phrase (θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν) sig- thereby, hath committed or intrusted to us, or laid depositories upon us, the work of preaching the outward word of reconciliation. And yet the phrase is so peculiar that we cannot but look for an additional and a deeper meaning. Beza long ago finely remarked, that "among the Hebrews one was said to put words in the mouth of another who used his agency in making something known to others. But when this formula is applied to God it has a special emphasis, and signifies that the heart is impelled and the tongue is directed by the Lord to speak in a particular way, and that the person is chosen by God and authorized to speak in the name of God." From the force of the middle voice, we infer that the Apostle speaks of the mental act or purpose of God, rather than of the external ordination of the Apostles (Jelf's *Gram.* § 333, Winer, § 39, 2); or as Wordsworth prefers to take it, in a more special sense reflexively: "having deposited *for Himself* the treasures of His grace in us, as in vessels chosen for that purpose, earthen and fragile though we be"]. The words τίθεσθαι ἐν would then mean, to put into the mouth (Ex. iv. 15), or to put within us, to inspire us that we may communicate it to others [not, however to the entire exclusion of the idea of a more external intrusting of the Gospel to us]. With respect to the impropriety, for grammatical reasons, of connecting θέμενος with ἦν, comp. Meyer. The word (λόγος) of reconciliation in this passage is similar to ὁ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ (the word of the cross) in 1 Cor. i. 18, and it signifies here the word, the substance of which is the reconciliation. The particles ὡς ὅτι are equivalent here to *utpote quod* (*seeing that, because, for*, in a very different connection from the same words in chap. xi. 21), and connect our passage with chap. i. 18. Everything is represented as proceeding from God, "who has reconciled us to Himself by Christ." For God in Christ has truly entered upon a process by which He is reconciling the world. He makes believers perceive in their own experience that God has reconciled them to Himself by Jesus Christ; He brings them into the state of reconciliation which He has established with the world." The Apostle now proceeds to describe further the method in which this was effected, so far as relates to its general principles. Or, rather, he gives the reason for the assertion, that the change mentioned in ver. 17 b, in which old things had passed away and all things had become new, was to be ascribed to God, who had reconciled believers to Himself through Christ. In this way he brings before us the vast extent of the Divine agency in saving men. Inasmuch as God in Christ exercised such a comprehensive agency, that great change must be referred to the same God who was reconciling us to Himself by Christ.

VERS. 20, 21.—**In behalf of Christ then we are ambassadors, as though God were exhorting by us.**—["It is indeed doubtful whether γάρ, *for*, belongs to the text, as it is omitted in many of the oldest manuscripts. Its omission only renders the transition more abrupt, for the relation of the passage remains the same." HODGE]. The particle οὖν (then, therefore) refers to that which had been said in the preceding verse. [As God is reconciling men and hath committed to us the work of reconciling men, I turn to you Corinthians as a part of the community to whom I am sent, and as partially unrecovered or strayed from the right way, and I commence my work with you]. The words, we are ambassadors for Christ, imply as their logical antecedent that the ministry of reconciliation had been committed to them (ver. 18). The reconciliation (καταλλ.) was in fact communicated to men through Christ, and had its origin in Him (vers. 18 f.): and of course it was Christ's cause which the Apostles represented among men. The verb πρεσβεύειν signifies to be a messenger ("sometimes merely to deliver a message to another without being empowered to do any thing more than to explain or enforce it." BLOOMFIELD). It is found also in Eph. vi. 20. The preposition ὑπερ signifies here, not *instead of* (Luther), but *in the interest of* another, and especially in behalf of Him who is the Mediator and Author of the reconciliation. It refers to those to whom the ministry of this reconciliation had been committed, and through whose agency this reconciliation was to be effected and Christ was to be glorified. From the same fact that it was God who had committed unto the Apostles the word of reconciliation, it followed further that when those Apostles fulfilled their commission, it was as though God exhorted by means of them. [CHRYSOSTOM: "The Father sent the Son to beseech and be His Ambassador unto mankind. When then He was slain and gone, we succeeded to the embassy, and in His stead and the Father's we beseech you"]. It is implied here that in our work as messengers we stand in the place of God; our exhortation should be looked upon as given by God through us; or we perform the duties of our office with the feeling that it is God who addresses or admonishes men through us. This participial sentence, however, may be easily connected with what follows: as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you, *etc.* But as the complete sense of this participial expression can be understood only by means of ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, it seems more appropriate to connect it with that which precedes it. But even then the idea of substitution is not the only one which is suitable. The prayer which the Apostle utters is presented in behalf of Christ in the sense just explained. **We pray on Christ's behalf: Be reconciled to God.**—*We pray* (δεόμεθα) is the language of the most condescending love (Osiander). The tenor of the prayer is that they would be reconciled to God. This is a most urgent appeal to those who had not yet believed in

Christ, or participated in the blessings of salvation (not to those who had already believed, and for the purpose of exciting them to continued advances in repentance and faith). [Dr. Hodge remarks that the word καταλλάγητε is in the passive voice, and cannot mean, 'Reconcile yourselves;' but, 'Be reconciled, embrace the offer of the reconciliation.' C. F. Schmid (*Bibl. Theol.* Vol. II., p. 318) notices that the word has here not a medial but a passive signification, implying that we have merely to accept an influence or act of God, under which we were originally passive. We were at first ἐχθροί and objects of the Divine ὀργή, and in ceasing to be these we become reconciled to God]. According to the way in which we translate the words, 'Reconcile yourselves, or be ye reconciled (comp. Rom. v. 10), or, allow yourselves to be reconciled,' the meaning must be, 'Accept the reconciliation God has extended to you by Christ, accept what He presents to you, take the hand of reconciliation He reaches forth to you.' The Apostle in this passage evidently had no thought of a reconciliation of themselves by laying aside the minding of the flesh and putting on the minding of the Spirit (Rückert). Such a process was looked upon by him as merely the necessary result of the reconciliation; or the application of the reconciliation by means of faith (comp. Meyer, Osiander).

Him who knew not sin He made to be sin for us (ver. 21). According to the true reading of the text, the Apostle here introduces without a connecting particle γάρ (*asyndeton*), a motive which should induce his readers to comply with his prayer or exhortation. This was the work which God's holy love had accomplished in Christ for effecting reconciliation. Now enters the notion of the ἱλασμός, the propitiation. Comp. Rom. iii. 25; viii. 3; 1 John ii. 2; iv. 10; Heb. ii. 17. By τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν he means Christ in His perfect sinlessness (what Chrysostom calls in the positive sense τὸν αὐτοδικαιοσύνην ὄντα), He who knows no sin, to whose internal nature or outward action all contradiction to God or departure from the Divine will was a complete stranger, altogether beyond His personal experience or consciousness. The μή is here required [instead of οὐ] not by the participle with the article (comp. 1 Pet. ii. 10; Eph. v. 4), but it expresses the denial of the thing as it appears to the mind, *i. e.*, in the representation of the mind itself. [Winer's *Gram.*, § 59, 3 *b.*]. This may be in the mind of men (*i. e.*, in the minds of Christians); in which case it says of Christ that we Christians regard Him as One who knew no sin, or it may refer to the mind of God, and so it tells us how Christ appeared before the Divine mind.. As God is here the subject of the Apostle's remarks, the latter is undoubtedly the correct interpretation. Hofmann in his *Schriftbeweis*, Vol. II., 36, says: "God has made Him in His sinlessness to be sin. It is from this denial of sin in Christ according to the Divine judgment that we must explain the use of the relative negative particle." When it is said that this sinless Being was made sin for us (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποιήσεν), ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν stands first to give it more force; and it seems very natural to take the phrase in the sense of a substitution. And yet this is not absolutely necessary, nor does it seem quite appropriate in both instances in which the word is here used, since God could not make *us* sin at first, inasmuch as we were in our own selves sinners. The ὑπὲρ is here therefore to be taken as equivalent to: *for our good*, and finds its explanation in the final sentence beginning with ἵνα. The idea expressed in making Him to be sin must be that God made Him the bearer of sin when He suffered, inasmuch as by His sufferings and death as a malefactor He was treated as a sinner (ἁμαρτωλός), or was given up to the fate of those who were sinners. The interpretation of ἁμαρτίαν as a sin offering is consistent neither with usage, with the context (τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν), nor with the contrast (δικαιοσύνη). Comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.*, II., p. 329. Sin becomes actualized in one in whom there is no sin, when he becomes a sinner in outward appearance, though he is not so in reality. God allows sin to become an actual experience to him who has never committed it in fact. So was it with Christ when God determined He should experience what befel Him. In like manner, Gal. iii. 13. If Paul had intended to say that God designed to set forth Christ as one in whom sin is concentrated and represented in its completeness, and with whom it is in certain respects identified (Osiander), he could do no better than to say, "He made our sins to be His." The idea expressed in ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν is further carried out when it is added: **that we might become God's righteousness in Him.**—The *righteousness of God* is probably equivalent to being *righteous with God* (δίκαιοι παρὰ θεῷ); or, provided we take θεοῦ in the sense of ἐκ θεοῦ as in Phil. iii. 9, it would have the meaning of being made righteous by God (δικαιωθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ). Ewald: "we thus become in Christ (to use the old sacrificial language) a legal offering before God and well pleasing in His sight; an expression much like what is used in chap. ii. 15." From the nature of the case, a righteousness which came from God must be sufficient in His sight. Neander: "A perfect righteousness, the ideal of a holy life, like the sufferings in which this holy life was perfected, is given to our humanity. For all, and in the place of all, He has borne the burden of human guilt, and made this ideal a reality. All who enter into communion with Him appear in God's sight δίκαιοι ἐν Χριστῷ; for their surrender into His hands is a pledge that this ideal of holiness will be actualized in them also." [Chrysostom thinks that there was a profound reason for using the abstract for the concrete form here: "the word δικαιοσύνη expresses the unspeakable bounty of the gift; that God hath not given us only the operation or effect of His righteousness, but *His very* righteousness, His very self unto us. Paul does not say that God treated Christ as a *sinner*, but as *sin*, the *quality* itself; in order that we might become not merely *righteous men*, but the *righteousness* of God in Him." The Receptus which our English A. V. follows uses here the present (γινώμεθα) instead of the aorist (γενώμεθα)]. But as there is no reference to time in this place, and the object is to express the simple occurrence once for all time without regard to the instant of its accomplishment, the aorist was preferable. There were also internal reasons for using a tense ap-

plicable to all time. In *ἐν αὐτῷ* is expressed the fellowship with Christ which takes place by means of a faith which is by its nature a putting on of Christ. In fellowship with Him we become a righteousness of God, for whoever is in Christ is looked upon by God as righteous, or as possessed of a just title to life. Comp. on 1 Cor. i. 30. The necessary fruit of this is holiness, but the two things are not to be confounded. (Hofmann, p. 230, says: "We become in Christ the righteousness of God, because we have it in His person. We need nothing else to make it ours than to share in His fellowship").

[After all the efforts which have been made to show that this passage (*τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτ. ἐποίησεν*) cannot mean that Christ bore the punishment of human sin, we cannot divest it of that essential signification. Granting that it does not mean strictly that Christ became an actual sinner, it surely signifies that He bore the consequences of sin, if not in the personal anger of God toward Himself, at least in being surrendered to the malice of evil beings, and to the endurance of those evils which God has decreed shall be the curse of actual sin. Why may we not then use the Scriptural language by saying He endures our curse, that is, the evils which are the ordinary curse of our sinful humanity? And why should we not say in strict accordance with our verse, that God's object was that we might be delivered not only "from sin itself" (J. Young, *Life and Light of Men*, p. 300 and 335), but "from the punishment which is its necessary result;" yea, that we might be placed in the position of completely righteous persons, and not only "rightened in spirit," but justified from all guilt and invested with all the benefits of righteousness? While with Billroth and Calvin, we may concede that *ἁμαρτία* cannot be strictly rendered a *sin-offering* (for which Paul gives us no example in his acknowledged writings), it is plain that the idea of an offering, whereby the wrath of God was turned away, lies at the foundation of all that Paul teaches concerning the reconciliation of God to men. Comp. 1 Cor. v. 7; Eph. v. 2 *etc.*, with Rom. v. 9; 1 Thess. i. 10 and Eph. ii. 3"].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. It is a wonderful expedient of holy love that a sinless being should be given up to endure the fate of sinners, and so should bring about a Divine righteousness, a perfect Divine title to life for all sinners in fellowship with Him. Sin involves a desire to be as God in the way of self-exaltation, and it is a complete denial of God's prerogatives. It necessarily provokes a reaction of these prerogatives. This reaction is the Divine *ὀργή*, which disowns the right which man in the image of God originally possessed to have fellowship in the Divine life, and gives him over to death. But as this reacting power is nothing but God's eternal unchangeable love, which seeks to communicate itself to men, and knows how to bring all that opposes it into subserviency to its purposes, a restoration has been secured in which it will find complete satisfaction. Into that very world in which this Divine reaction against sin was displayed One has been introduced, to whose nature all ungodly thoughts and purposes (sins) were completely foreign. In the bodily and mental sufferings which His holy love to God and men led Him to endure while He was in that state, He appeared to be just the reverse of what He really was. He appeared to be *sin*, and thus the reaction against sinners was in fact abolished. God Himself thus brought it to an end by means of that Son who is essentially one with Himself. In accordance with His righteous will, that Son denied Himself, completely entered our sinful humanity affected as it was by that reaction, and as the Son of man, as another Adam, suffered death for the benefit of all our race. This abolished the influence which denied the title of all men to life, or rather restored it to them altogether. Now every one who enters into fellowship with that Sinless One, who has thus been made sin, (*i. e.* whoever believes in Him) becomes possessed of this Divine title. When we are in Christ, *i. e.*, in fellowship with this Sinless One whom God has made sin for this very purpose, we affirm or justify that reaction which fell upon Him who deserved it not, that it might not fall upon us who deserved it (*γνόντας ἁμαρτίαν*). We justify God in His opposition to us, condemn ourselves, confess our absolute unworthiness and Christ's perfect worthiness; and we present for acceptance before God nothing in ourselves but only what there is in Christ. Such is the work of holy love by whose efficacy our restoration has become possible.

2. It is therefore in the work of *expiation* which God's holy love has devised and accomplished, that we must find the basis of the work of *reconciliation*. This reconciliation is simply a restoration of the friendship which once existed between God and our race (the world) perverted from Him by sin and lying under His wrath. It is a work which must be ascribed entirely to God. He it was who reconciled the world unto himself, and two things may be especially remarked in what He is doing for its accomplishment: 1. He imputes not to men their sins, He blots out the record of them in His book; 2. He has committed to the hearts and lips of those who are called to the ministry, the word of reconciliation (comp. Col. ii. 13 f.; Eph. ii. 17; Rom. x. 14 f.). These messengers in God's name, with great earnestness make known the Gospel to men, that they may procure for Christ the best reward for all His suffering, as they urgently press those for whom He died to accept the reconciliation He has provided, to be reconciled to that God who has bestowed such great things (ver. 21), and with full confidence in Him to renounce every thing inconsistent with His will.

3. The proper fruit of all this must be a complete change and *renewal*. The love of Christ giving Himself up to atone for sin, swallows up the individual life of all in His own death for them. The selfishness which made its own gratification the only end and centre of all its efforts, is exchanged for a life devoted to Christ. In the eyes of His followers Christ will be surrounded with a glorious radiance. Every unworthy thought of Him will be renounced, He will be glorified by the Divine Spirit in our hearts, and He will be acknowledged to be exceeding great, their all in all. Another result of His influence will be that each of these followers

will regard his brethren and his fellowmen, whoever they may be, in an entirely new light, not according to their natural and external relations, but according to what they are or should be in Christ, *i. e.* what they are in consequence of His redeeming work and the fellowship of His general mercy. Their hearts will be thus greatly expanded and strengthened in love, selfish passions will be restrained and overcome by the love of Christ and a burning zeal, for the cause of God (which will probably seem like insanity to those who know not the love of Christ), or, if the salvation of souls demand it, a wise moderation and a prudent circumspection will be manifested in all their conduct.

4. AUGUSTINE:—"Behold our Mediator! Not God without humanity, nor man without divinity; but intermediate between mere Deity and mere humanity, he is a human divinity, and a divine humanity" (ver. 19).

[5. The whole scheme of salvation is the offspring of Divine love. No one should imagine the absurdity that God has changed and become any more merciful and loving in Himself since Christ has interposed for our salvation than He was before. That scheme and Christ's work only removed obstructions to the manifestation of a love which was forever the same. By what Christ does for man and in man, He makes it consistent for God to pardon and have fellowship with men. And on the ground of such a manifestation of love, we have a right, and we who have heard of it are bound to call on every human being, in every possible condition, to be reconciled to God. To all who reject this scheme of mercy it is right to proclaim the terrors of the Lord still, for there remaineth no other sacrifice and no power in the universe to save a man who neglects so great a salvation. Comp. Barnes Observv. on the whole chapter].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—Ver. 11. (On Luther's translation: *schön fahren*). Christ ought to be preached in a way which is attractive and appropriate to the nature of the Gospel, but so that men may be truly converted. Happy is it for that preacher who in all his duties and aims is so manifest to God that he can humbly and truly enjoy a good conscience. A faithful pastor will so walk that the consciences of all who hear him will be deeply impressed with a conviction of his ability, his fidelity, and his uprightness.—Ver. 12. If a faithful minister is bound to convince his hearers of his uprightness, they are equally bound to defend him against every attempt to destroy his reputation (chap. xii. 11).—Ver 13. HEDINGER:—When a man is grieved by the severity of his minister, he should remember that it was done on God's behalf, and if God was pleased, why should he find fault and be angry? Jer. vi. 27. Of all persons in the world the minister of Christ should see that he is both loving and severe in due moderation (2 Tim. ii. 24 f.).—Ver. 14. In His incarnation and in all He did and suffered, our Lord acted as a Mediator for the whole human race. In God's sight we are all dead and risen with Him. It is a glorious mark of a true servant of God when the love of Christ is the moving principle of all his duties and his zeal. Such a one cannot but be truly simple and sincere (chap. ii. 17). The hireling, on the other hand, who loves only himself and the world, will be silent when he ought to speak and speak when he ought to be silent. —Ver. 15. If sanctification is taken away from redemption, grace is turned into licentiousness; but if redemption is taken away from sanctification, Christianity becomes difficult, yea, impracticable. By a believing application to ourselves of redemption by Christ, we are delivered from the guilt and punishment, but by sanctification, its fruit, we are delivered from the dominion of sin. Justification and sanctification are always to be united. The purer and the richer the appropriation of mercy the easier and more perfect the performance of duties. When faith receives the mercy, it sets the heart to work by love. Thus the whole of Christianity consists in faith receiving and love giving. Whoever receives much has much to give. To receive much and give nothing proves that you do not properly receive, and to give without receiving proves that you do not properly give. You receive not, and you give not, from God.—Ver. 16. HEDINGER:—Christians should esteem one another in proportion as they discover upon each other the tokens of the Spirit's presence and of a new creation. All else is of no importance (Matth. xii. 46 f.).—HEDINGER:—Let it be your first object to know whether a man is in and through Christ a new creature. That, and that alone, is what God looks at.—Ver. 17. Everything depends upon the new man in Christ, upon regeneration and an active faith (Gal. v. 6). We may apply to the kingdom of grace what our Lord says of the kingdom of glory (Rev. xxi. 5). HEDINGER:—How often we hear of old usages! In Christ everything is new and is renewed day by day. What is old in opposition to the Scriptures, old without growth is good for nothing. HEDINGER:—Golden truth! God is reconciled, peace proclaimed, Christ a sinner for us, and we righteous and holy in Him. The curse, sin and death, what harm can they do to one who is in Christ (Eph. ii. 5 f.; Rom. viii. 1)? The principal point for those who give instruction under the New Testament is, in what way reconciliation with God takes place, and how each of us can have part in it? But he who is himself unreconciled to God, and especially with his neighbor, dispenses to others what he rejects for himself.—Ver. 19. HEDINGER:—There are two kinds of non-imputation: 1, When God lays upon His Son the sins of the world (Isa. lxiii. 5 f.), that all men may be freed from the necessity of satisfying God's Law, either by perfect obedience or by punishment. This is the general grace which is prepared for all, but is not actually imparted to all. But when faith appropriates our Lord's merits, there immediately follows another and truer kind of non-imputation; 2, When the sinner is justified, *i. e.*, is absolved from all guilt and becomes a partaker in all Christ's benefits, yea, in Christ Himself and everything that belongs to Christ.—Ver. 20. SPENER:—If one had committed an offence against a great sovereign, and had forfeited his life, it would be looked upon as a great matter if that sovereign condescended to give him mercy when he humbled himself to

ask for it. But what would be said if that sovereign should send messengers and entreat him to be reconciled? And yet God has done this, and shown a love beyond all comprehension. Always present God's word in such simplicity and purity that all shall see and feel that it is God who teaches, exhorts and comforts through thee. When listening to God's ministering servant remember that it is God's voice you hear, and that it is with God you have to do.—Ver. 21. SPENER:—As God made Christ to be sin, who had no sin in Himself, and hence divine justice saw none of his own righteousness, but only imputed sin in Him, so God makes us who are in Christ to be righteousness, and henceforth He beholds no more the sins which are in us and have been forgiven, but only righteousness. We thus become righteousness; not in appearance or in imagination merely, but in deed and in truth. Oh, the depth of God's wisdom and love!

BERLENB BIBLE, VER. 11:—The fear of the Lord makes us anxious to possess those powers of persuasion which are so needful among men. Fear and love thus act together.—Ver. 13. Not unfrequently what seems extravagant, and beyond all bounds of discretion, may be really right, and spring from the exceeding greatness of one's love to God. A discreet gentleness is a truly divine gift, for which we have much reason to pray.—Ver. 14. The love of Christ is a cordial affection which Christ has toward the new born soul, and which the soul has for Christ. The one highly esteems, properly recognizes, embraces and longs for; the other is willing to do any thing to please the beloved one; avoids everything which is likely to grieve, injure or displease him; adapts himself honestly to his wishes; endeavors to unite with him more and more, and has a complete fellowship with him in all things. It makes each Christian careful and quick to understand the will of his beloved Lord, and to know what will be agreeable or disagreeable to Christ, what will be injurious or beneficial to Christ's kingdom, and what will be disgraceful or honorable to Christ's cause. It makes him compliant and submissive to his Lord's will; it frees him from the necessity of pleasing the world, and takes away all fear when he is called to testify against prevailing corruption. Ministers especially should allow nothing but this love to control them in their preaching and in their lives. The surest sign that we have it is, when it urges us to a loving obedience, to fidelity, truth and uprightness, to love our neighbor and even our enemies, to be merciful and forbearing toward those who are in trouble, to help those who are oppressed, and to give counsel and assistance to all who stand in need. Those who hunger for Christ's love, have already begun to love Him, and the more this desire is awakened, the more will their love increase, until it will become strong enough to overcome all earthly love. And yet this love is of a delicate nature and habit, for it can easily be injured and lost. (Rev. ii. 4). The enemy can never bear to have a soul know, and hear, and speak only of the love of Christ. Even well-meaning persons often think that such a one does too much. (Martha, Mary). The whole of Christianity springs from the death and life of Christ as our Saviour and our Head. The ministry of the Gospel is therefore a ministry of death and life. —Ver 15. It is by a profound consideration of the death and resurrection of Christ that we are brought most effectually to deny ourselves, and to renounce what we before loved. The love which led Jesus to suffer and die for us will so affect our hearts, and His resurrection will awaken in us a love so peculiar, that we shall live for Him, depend upon Him, eat and drink for Him, sleep and awake for Him, walk in and with Him, and find every thing sanctified and sweetened by His love. What a wild fancy to think of having part in Christ and in His glory while we continue in sin! Accursed delusion, to make the infinitely Holy One a minister of sin! To live wholly for ourselves is to live far from God and in corruption. It is nothing but hell and death for a man to consult only his own interest, to think of, to love and to have others love no one but himself, and to make a god of himself. Christ's death should draw us off from all such wretched idolatry as this. Self-denial takes from us nothing, but it restores us much which we had lost.—Ver. 16. They who die with Christ for all, can never more know or depend upon man according to the flesh. (Deut. xxxiii. 9). They love even their own children only in and for God. The more we are devoted to God, the more acceptable and the nearer we are to Him. Childhood must give way to youth and manhood. We must not always remain satisfied with Christ's humanity, but venture to be familiar with His Divinity. For the very idea of the sons of God implies that those who have been alienated from God are reunited with Him in spiritual friendship.—Ver. 17. The new creation is the life of Jesus in us, it is being born of God, it is a holy life. In it the old must completely pass away; and henceforth we must never creep back, but be ever pressing forward. We live among shadows no longer, but with Christ Himself. (Col. ii. 17).—Ver. 18. God's eternal love has given us all things and has found means of restoring peace and friendship between us and Him by Jesus Christ (1 Jno. ii. 2 f.) whom He has therefore exalted above all things. (Heb. i. 3).—Ver. 19. God has committed all things to Christ; it is with Him, therefore, that we have to do, and to Him we must apply. The world had to be reconciled to God, for His wrath was upon it. He was not, indeed, our enemy, for then He would have sent His wrath upon us; but He loved us even when we were His enemies. Had he not extended mercy to us we should never have turned to Him. The whole world has now a right to mercy. Christ has acquired for all men a *non-imputation* of those sins which they had committed in the days of their ignorance; for He has taken them upon Himself and offered a sacrifice for them, so that God can now be gracious and extend mercy to sinners. He has thus become a Christ *for us*. The Holy Spirit may now lay hold upon those sins which reign in our hearts, expose them, and make them so painful and grievous to us, that we shall be willing to renounce them. They are eradicated from our souls, and we are freed from their power. Not imputing our trespasses unto us will not therefore make us feel secure in sin,

but drive us in our extremity to exclaim, Who is a God like unto Thee, *etc.* (Mic. vii. 18)? The work of preaching the Gospel is the most exalted of all employments, and yet never exalts the preacher. As he must always be entreating and enduring the wrath of his fellowmen, and as he is perpetually dealing with the miserable, he must surely find enough to smother a spirit of pride. The creative word by which all things came into being, is the same word which reconciles and reunites the creature with the Creator, and which so sanctifies and justifies all who receive it, that they become meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.—Ver. 20. God's reconciliation reaches not only to the world in general, but to each one of our race in particular. Jesus Christ offers each man abundant means of acquiring an interest in His blood. Those who are sent to us with the Gospel, entreat us to allow the work of salvation in our hearts, to put ourselves in the way of reconciliation, and to accept of its conditions, in order that our disordered minds may have fellowship with God — Ver. 21. When the great truth that a sinner may be looked upon in Christ as righteous, has once become established in the heart, every other essential truth of the Gospel must follow. Christ Himself enters the heart, and the sinner becomes righteous even as He is righteous. (1 Jno. iii. 7).

Rieger:—Ver. 11. Whoever lives habitually in the light of that day (ver. 10), will do those things from the fear of God which will gain the confidence of his fellow-men. He feels constantly open to an inspection far more perfect than that which he looks for from men.—Ver. 12. Many can so manage matters in the sight of men as to gain esteem for their doctrines and lives for a season; but not only does God know their hearts, but occasionally even a human eye penetrates this outward form, and discovers that such are not what they seem.—Ver. 13. When we find those who are condemned for doing too much, and acting in an extravagant, unreasonable and irregular manner, if it is honestly done for God and His truth, we should bear with them, wait for more light, and rather leave the tares to grow than to root up the surrounding wheat. Let us only be careful that our forbearance springs from a good conscience, and not from that lukewarm spirit which our Lord has pronounced so loathsome.—Ver. 14. Love to Christ should have reference to two very different aspects of His character. On the one hand we find that His zeal for His Father's house made Him break through established usages, and expose Himself to the deadly malice of His enemies: and on the other He yielded much that He might spare the plants which His Father had planted. Christ bore us all upon His heart when He suffered unto death, and if we would share in His passion, we must not find our pleasure in ourselves and in external advantages, but strive to exhibit the proper fruit of His life and death by dying ourselves to sin and living unto righteousness.—Ver. 16 f. Such a knowledge of Christ, when it has power in the heart, will never more allow us to judge of things according to the outward appearance, the opinions of the multitude or the prejudices of our own hearts. A thorough knowledge of Christ dying and rising again for us, will destroy confidence in every thing else, and make us glory only in His cross (we shall especially put no reliance upon our own personal intercourse with Jesus, *etc.*).—Ver. 18. The doctrine of Christ dying and rising again, one for all, is doubtless far above human reason; and yet we soon learn from experience that it perfectly tallies with all that God's law and grace utters in our consciences. The great work of reconciliation *commenced* in the bosom of God, when he pitied us in our apostasy, our enmity, and our utter inability to return to Him. And yet the actual work of reconciliation had to be *accomplished* by Jesus Christ, whose obedience, and sufferings, and death glorified God's righteousness, and implanted a permanent hatred to sin in our hearts, without which we could never come to God. And yet with all this provision for our reconciliation on God's part, much would have been wanting if there had been provided no means of actually implanting faith in our hearts; the work of love was, therefore, not complete until the *ministry* of reconciliation had been appointed and sent forth to proclaim what had been done, and to beseech men to be reconciled to God.—Ver. 19 f. God has Himself provided the Lamb on which He has laid the iniquities of us all, and has determined that the Son whom He has sent to effect reconciliation must suffer for us; but He has promised and fulfilled the promise, that that Son should appear before God in the Holiest of all with an offering which is sufficient for the sins of the whole world, and should send forth messengers to preach forgiveness in His name to all who penitently believe on Him. Whoever now bears the burden of sin and is lost, it must be because he will not believe, but despises the offered reconciliation. This word of reconciliation is the very kernel and substance of God's testimony in the Scriptures, and if we desire to promote His designs of mercy to men, we must seek to bring men to Him through faith in this word.—Ver. 21. By the utter rending of the flesh of Christ, the innocent and spotless Lamb, the sin which has penetrated every part of our nature has been so condemned, that His righteousness may be imputed to us. He has become sin by the imputation of our sins, and by the imputation of His righteousness to us we have become the righteousness of God; and we now have a legal and unquestionable right to an access to God in His kingdom, and an heirship to all things like that which the Son of God Himself possesses. Hallelujah!

Bengel:—Ver. 14. What an admirable universality! ministers constrain, hearers are constrained, and both because Christ died for them!

Heubner:—Ver. 11. The Christian not only loves but fears the Lord; and this fear is by no means a feeble power in his heart. Our conduct is known to man, our hearts to God. No one can have infallible knowledge of another's heart; and yet we may see enough of a Christian brother to give him our unreserved confidence.—Ver. 12. A minister's reputation should be precious to his people, for it belongs to them; and they should be supplied with such materials as are necessary to maintain it.—Ver. 13. A fervent Christian's zeal is sure to seem like extrava-

gance and enthusiasm in the eyes of the indolent and lukewarm.—Ver. 15. The ultimate object of the atoning death of Jesus was a holy Church, thoroughly consecrated to His service. A real Christian therefore longs, and his constant prayer is, to be freed from self-will—Ver. 16. Our relationship to Jesus is far higher than that of family or of country (Matth. xii. 48 f.).—Ver. 17. Christ has founded a new world in every respect; the world itself is to have a new form, and society new principles; and as to an individual man, when the spirit of Christ takes possession of his heart, he must become a new creature, his mind and heart must be completely changed, and all his springs of action must be renewed (a good text for a new year: Have we actually lived to see a new year)?—Ver. 18. God is the original author of salvation, and the whole scheme was formed by Him, but Christ executed it. In Him God came down to man. Only by His incarnation could our freedom from sin become possible. The greater then the guilt of those who neglect so great a salvation! The ministerial office, through which the mediatorial work of Christ is itself mediated to man, must continually hold up the offer of reconciliation through Christ alone. This must be the salt of every sermon.—Ver. 19. It is by Christ's entrance into our humanity, His sufferings for sin and His fulfilment of all righteousness, that man can be absolved from condemnation and worthy of the Divine favor. God was not before our enemy, for He is nothing but Love; but only through Christ is it possible for Him to exercise complacency as well as benevolence toward man. Only in consequence of His blood can our sins be forgiven and we be redeemed from wrath (Matth. xx. 28; xxvi. 26; Jno. i. 29; 1 Jno. ii. 1, 2; iv. 10; 1 Thess. i. 10).—Ver. 20. Christ cannot in person come to each individual of our race; and hence he sends his messengers into all the world, to every creature. Their exhortations are, in fact, God's; for as He speaks in God's name, so must they. And yet the spirit in which they speak is not that of command but of entreaty. Their words are words of pleading love: "Be ye reconciled to God; accept the reconciliation He offers you in Christ; put confidence in God, that He loves you, and that He can and will forgive you." Whoever thinks of preaching the Gospel, must present Christ as an atoning Saviour, and must himself know what it is to be reconciled to God. If you would be the trumpets of grace, yield yourselves entirely up to grace. If we would honor Christ Himself, we must honor this ministry.—Ver. 21. Only He who was Himself guiltless, and could bear a guilt not His own, will be the destroyer of sin.

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 11. If we have been redeemed from the wrath to come, we need not be tormented with fears of our future Judge; yet we should have a holy reverence for that glorious Being who will reward every man according to his works (1 Pet. i. 17), and we should be watchful lest we displease Him by unfaithfulness to our vows and an unholy life.—Ver. 14. One for all. Here we have the sweetest kernel and best sample of Christ's love. Faith in one who died for me and in whom I died, can only come by hearing of this wonderful exhibition of His love. My faith creates no Saviour for me; it is only the act by which I receive a Saviour offering Himself to me.—Ver. 17. Although those who know Christ by faith may endure many conflicts with the flesh, they are really new creatures, for the Holy Spirit will keep alive the spark of faith, even in the hearts of weak believers. The Apostle's "Behold," refers to every Christian, though he may be never so imperfect. For though our fleshly nature may retain much which is old, it is only what is dead and dying by a daily repentance; but the old guilt and the old dominion of sin is gone (Rom. viii. 1, 12).—Ver. 18. Everything in our salvation begins with God and nothing with us. It is of God, that he can now receive and love us (Tit. iii. 5; 1 Jno. iv. 10).—Ver. 19. Christ's death was an act of reconciliation, for it was in fact His own act.—Ver. 20. As the king's own majesty is supposed to accompany the ambassador by whom he is represented, so those who preach the Gospel have something of the dignity of Him who sends them.—God beseeches us! Such entreaties have power, because God lays aside all His wrath and cordially offers us all His treasures with a fatherly admonition, that we despise them not but truly accept of them, and turn to Him with a childlike spirit (Heb. xii. 25). He who prayed for us in the days of His flesh with many tears, since His ascension, as our merciful High Priest, to the right hand of God, directs His most affecting prayers now to us, as the voice of His blood comes through His messengers, crying: Be ye reconciled to God.—Ver 21. Nay, He says not: "Come and make reconciliation for yourselves! Bring something of *your own!*" Nothing of this. He demands nothing from us. Atonement, grace, and eternal life, are all prepared through the blood of the Lamb! Repentance, faith, life and all needed strength are given and effectually wrought within us by the quickening energy of that blood.

Gerock:—Ver. 20. Think how needful it is to seek, how easy it is to find, and how blessed it will be to have, this reconciliation.

[We have in this passage: I. Man's original condition. 1. He was sin (ver. 21), and lived after the flesh (ver. 16); 2. Was alienated from God, and an enemy of God (needing reconciliation); 3. Was under Divine wrath, although still loved and not abandoned by God (ver. 11). II. Man's redemption by Christ. 1. This originated wholly in God's love (ver. 18); 2. Christ was made sin for us (ver. 21); 3. Man's trespasses were not imputed to him (ver. 19); 4. He can be made the righteousness of God through Christ (ver. 21). III. Application of this redemption to man. 1. It must be made known to men through the ministry of Christ and His people (vers. 18, 19); 2. Men must be persuaded (ver. 11), and be reconciled to God (ver. 20); 3. They must die in Christ, and live as new creatures unto Him who died for them (vers. 15-17).

F. C. Robertson:—Vers. 18-21 (Abridged): I. The reconciliation of God to man. God needed a reconciliation, for there was wrath in Him towards sinners. This was shown in the punishment of sin, in the convictions of our own consciences, and in the anger which Christ showed toward sinners. God is indeed immutable, but,

when man changes, God's relation to him changes. Love to good is hatred to evil. Distinguish the true from the false notion of the Atonement. II. The reconciliation of man to God. Here is first Christ's priestly work, to which man can add nothing; and secondly, the work of the ministry, which consists in declaring God's reconciliation to man, and in beseeching men by every variety of illustration and every degree of earnestness to be reconciled to God].

XI.—THE APOSTLE'S APPEAL IN AN ETHICAL POINT OF VIEW. HIS CONDUCT IN RELATION TO IT.

CHAPTER VI. 1–10.

We then, [*om* We then] *as* workers together *with him*, [then, we also] beseech *you*
2 also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain. (For he saith, I have heard thee in a
time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, now *is* the
accepted [well accepted, εὐπρόσδεκτος] time; behold, now *is* the day of salvation).
3 Giving no offence [occasion for stumbling, προσκοπή] in any thing, that the ministry
4 be not blamed: But in all *things* approving ourselves as the ministers of God, [as the
ministers of God, commending ourselves] in much patience, in afflictions, in necessi-
5 ties, in distresses [in straits, στενοχωρίαις], in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults
6 [tossings to and fro, ἀκαταστασίαις], in labours, in watchings, in fastings; by [in] pure-
ness, by [in] knowledge, by [in] long suffering, by [in] kindness, by [in] the Holy
7 Ghost, by [in] love unfeigned, by [in] the word of truth, by [in] the power of God,
8 by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by honour [glory,
δόξης] and dishonour, by evil report and good report: as deceivers, and *yet* [*om. yet*]
9 true; as unknown, and *yet* [*om. yet*] well known; as dying, and, behold, we live; as
10 chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many
rich; as having nothing, and *yet* [*om. yet*] possessing all things.

[1 Ver. 1.—D. (1st cor.) omits ὑμᾶς, and C. and Sinait. (1st cor.) substitute for it ἡμᾶς.
2 Ver. 2.—F. and G. have δεκτός instead of εὐπρόσδεκτος. Their authority, however, is not great.
3 Ver. 3.—After ἡ διακονία, D. E. F. G. and two other MSS., the Ital., some copies of the Vulgate, the Gothic and Syriac versions, many Greek and the Latin Fathers insert ἡμῶν.
4 Ver. 4.—Rec. has συνιστῶντες on the authority of D. (3d cor.). E. K. L. Sin. (3d cor.), with Chrys. Theodt. Damasc. and others, Lachm. Tisch. and Alford (with C. D. (1st Cor.) F. G. and Sin.), have συνιστάντες. B. with two cursives and one MS. of Dumasc. have συνιστανόντες. This text is in nearly the same state as chap. iii. 1, which see.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VERS. 1, 2.—**We then, as workers together with Him, also exhort you that ye receive not the grace of God in vain.**—Connected with the exhortation and entreaty (chap. v. 20) in which he had spoken of an interest in God's work of reconciliation by Christ, was another consideration with respect to their continuance in the grace thus attained. There is no indication that σύν in συνεργοῦντες has reference to the church of Corinth (comp. i. 24); for had such been the Apostle's idea, ὑμῖν would have been inserted; still less can it be referred to the Apostle's associates in the ministry; and least of all can the whole word be made equivalent to ἔργῳ συμπράττοντες with reference to ver. 3 ff. in contrast with the λόγος in chap. v. 20. The only doubt is whether it implies a coöperation with God or with Christ. If ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ in ver. 20 signifies *in behalf of* Christ, and not *in the place of* Christ; then the preceding passage in which all things had been traced to the hand of God, and especially the phrase, *as though God were beseeching by us* (chap. v. 20), would be in favor of referring it to God, comp. also 1 Cor. iii. 9. In the admonition itself, the whole stress must be laid upon the words, *not in vain*, inasmuch as these stand at the commencement of the sentence. They here signify to be without fruits, as in Gal. ii. 2; Phil. ii. 16; 1 Thess. iii. 5. The word *receive* (δέξασθαι) is to be taken not in a preterite (as if it meant *that ye will not have received*), but in a present signification, in accordance with the uniform usage. We have here the moral side of the exhortation, which he had said (chap. v. 20) the ministry were urging, *viz.*, Be reconciled to God. God's work of reconciliation would be in vain to them, if in receiving it they did not become new men. The grace of God is the grace which had been shown in the work of reconciliation, for God had exhibited in that work special love to sinners. He gives a reason also for his admonition in a parenthetical form in ver. 2 (for ver. 3 is grammatically connected

with *παρακαλοῦμεν*), by introducing a prophetical expression (Isa. xlix. 8, in the words of the LXX.), which he implies had a fulfilment while he was writing—**for he says: In an accepted time I heard thee, and in a day of salvation I succored thee: behold, now is the well accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.**—God must be regarded as the speaker in this quotation. In the original passage God was addressing the servant of the Lord, and through him as their head the whole people of God. BENGEL: The Father speaks to the Messiah, in whom are included all believers. The hearing which was indicated by the succor, the prophet implies was to be shown in the deliverance of the people from the calamities into which they had fallen (Isa. xlix. 7); but it is here made to refer to the salvation which God gives by Christ, and which the Apostle exhorts the Corinthians not to receive in vain. The accepted time (*καιρὸς δεκτός*, Heb. עֵת רָצוֹן), is a time of favor, (the grace); the same as the "day of salvation" (the time for the communication of salvation to Israel (Mark i. 15; Gal. iv. 4). It becomes *accepted*, in consideration of the impression it made upon the people. The same idea is intended, only more forcibly expressed, in the words, well accepted (*εὐπρόσδεκτος*, used in chap. viii. 12; Rom. xv. 16, 31). The phrases, *I heard thee* and *I succored thee*, imply that when God was making this promise, He looked upon the future as already past. In Paul's application of the passage, the words, *Behold, now*, (*ἰδοὺ νῦν*), present the reason for the admonition in ver. 1, *q. d.*: let not the opportunity pass unimproved; for if ye allow the grace now given you to be in vain, there are no other means of salvation for you (comp. Heb. iii. 13 ff.; Luke xix. 42). The word, *now*, embraced the brief period until the second coming of Christ (Meyer). A paronomasia is perceptible in the use of *δέξασθαι* and *δεκτός*. [HODGE: "The Scriptures contain abundant evidence that inspiration did not interfere with the natural play of the powers of the sacred writers. Although they spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, yet they were probably in most cases unconscious of His influence, and acted as spontaneously as the believer does under the power of the Spirit in all His holy exercises. Hence we find that the sacred writings are constructed according to the ordinary laws of mind, and that the writers pass from subject to subject by the usual process of suggestion and association. So here the use of the word *δέξασθαι* brought up to the Apostle's mind the word *δεκτῷ*, as it occurs in the Greek version of the beautiful passage in Isa. xlix. 8." STANLEY: "Let not your *receiving* of the favor of God be in vain; for the language of God in the prophet is true: 'In a time *which I receive* I heard thee.' This view is confirmed by the stress the Apostle lays on the word *δεκτός*, carrying it out and amplifying it in his own comment which follows: God has so spoken, and look! (*ἰδοὺ*) the present is the time which He so receives. You ought to receive Him, for He has received you. *Εὐπρόσδεκτος* is a favorite word of the Apostle; and as such, and also as being more emphatic, is substituted for the less familiar and less expressive term of the Sept."]. With reference to *ἰδοὺ*, consult the notes on chap. v. 17. [Trench remarks (*Synn.* P. II. § 7) that "*καιρός* signifies time (*χρόνος*) bringing forth its several births, the critical epoch-making periods when all that has been slowly ripening through long ages is mature and comes to the birth in grand decisive events, which constitute at once the close of one period and the commencement of another. It is the nick of time; but whether, as such, to make or to mar, effectually to help or to hinder, the word by itself does not determine." According to this, the *καιρός* of which both the prophet and the Apostle spoke was an epoch of great importance in consequence of the great events transpiring, but rendered favorable and acceptable (*δεκτός*) by the turning of the people to the Lord. (See also WEBSTER'S *Synonymns*, p. 215)].

VER. 3–10. **Giving no occasion for stumbling in any thing, that the ministration have not a reproach cast upon it.**—Luther incorrectly regards this participial sentence as a part of the Apostle's admonition or entreaty to the Corinthians; as if he was exhorting them not to receive the grace in vain, and to give no offence lest, *etc.* But had such been the Apostle's mind he would have written *διδόντας* instead of *διδόντες*. This word is rather to be connected directly with *παρακαλοῦμεν* before the parenthesis, and it shows how the conduct of the admonishers corresponded with and gave force to the admonition. In this verse he resumes his apology for himself. The words *ἐν μηδενί* (in nothing) are neuter like *ἐν παντί* in ver. 4. Μή is not here in the place of *οὐ* [for it implies the intention and desire of the writer]. Comp. 1 Cor. x. 33. Προσκοπή is used only here in the New Testament, but it is equivalent to *πρόσκομμα* 1 Cor. viii. 8. It implies that Paul and his companions would do nothing to lead others into error, or to impair the proper effect of their work or of their admonition, and so they would give no occasion for unbelief and unchristian conduct. (Meyer). In saying that the ministration have not a reproach cast upon it, he intended to say that they subjected themselves to so much pains, in order that their efforts as Apostles to reconcile men to God, might be saved from bitter reproaches (for *μωμηθῇ* implies that he had in his mind no common or slight reproaches). Probably he had reference to those opponents who were inclined to make, or perhaps had already indulged in such reproaches.—**But in all things, as the ministers of God, commending ourselves in much patience.** (ver. 4). In *συνιστάντες* (chap. iii. 1), we have the positive side in contrast with the negative side, which had been given in ver. 3, and it is placed before *ἑαυτοὺς* because it contains the emphatic point. (Meyer). The idea is not that they were commending themselves *as ministers* [as our English A. V. *may* be understood and is usually punctuated] for then the expression would have been *ὡς θεοῦ διακόνους*, but we commend ourselves as the ministers of God commend themselves; or, as is appropriate for such ministers. [ALFORD: "When these words signify to recommend *ourselves* in a bad sense (chap. iii. 1; v. 12), *ἑαυτοὺς precedes* the verb; but here and in chap. iv. 2, where used in a good sense and without any stress on *ἑαυτούς*, it *follows* the verb. This is only one of many

continually occurring instances of the importance of the collocation of words with regard to the emphasis."] The points on which they commended themselves, are introduced by ἐν. They are, in the first place, Christian virtues, such as patient endurance (ὑπομονή, ver. 4)—pureness (ἁγνότης κ. τ. λ., ver. 6). In connection with patience (perseverance, steadfastness, in contrast with despondency and reluctance) he mentions a variety of states in which he had exhibited much patience, such as *in affliction, etc.* Augustine quotes vv. 4–12, to show that Paul possessed those qualities which Cicero makes necessary to an orator, *viz., magna granditer et ornate loquendi.* In proof of what he had said he now adduces principally the trichotomy contained in vv. 4, 5, in which he specifies how he had exhibited patience in three triplets of conditions. Bengel says the first triplet of trials, afflictions, necessities and distresses (straits) were *general;* the second, stripes, imprisonments, and tumults were *specific;* the third, the labors, watchings, and fastings were voluntary. These evils consist of oppressive, hampering circumstances in general, such as drove him into straits; and they are probably mentioned in the order of a climax. [Stanley divides the Apostle's enumeration into four clauses, all amplifying ἐν παντι. The first is an expansion of ἐν ὑπομ. πολλῇ. The second enumerates the virtues which accompanied these outward hardships, arranged in two divisions, not so much by the meaning as by the form of the words, the first consisting of one, the latter of two words. In the third the words are held together merely by the word διά, and by their antithetical form. The fourth expands the words, through evil report into a long list of the contrasts between his alleged and his real character, at once showing his difficulties and his triumphs. The first section gives three triplets of evils, each growing out of the last word of the other. The first describes his hardships generally. In crushing afflictions (θλίψεσιν) in pressure of difficulties (ἀνάγκαις), in narrow straits (στενοχωρίαις). The prevailing idea is of pressure and confinement: each stage narrower than the one before, so that no room is left for movement or escape].—**In afflictions, in necessities, in straits.**—Στενοχωρίαι are mentioned also in chap. xii. 10, and are the highest degree of θλίψεις. Comp. chap. iv. 8. Ἀνάγκαι are necessities, calamities of various kinds, and also mentioned in chap. xii. 10 and in 1 Cor. vii. 26. (Some interpret the word as referring to want, poverty). ["The three words here used are cognate in derivation, θλίβω to press, squeeze; ἀγχω to press tight; στένος strait, *angustus.* The θλίψ. is the tribulation itself of whatever kind it may be, ἀνάγκ. is the result in circumstances, and στενοχ. (as used by Paul in ver. 12; iv. 8; and Rom. ii. 9) the result in feeling or apprehension." Webster and Wilkinson.—"The idea of 'narrow straits' suggests the thought of *actual persecutions,* of which he gives the three to which he was most frequently exposed." (Stanley), *viz.*].—**in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults.**—On the word πληγαῖς (stripes) comp. chap. xi. 23; Acts xvi. 23 f. Ἀκαταστασία according to the prevailing usage in the New Testament (chap. xii. 20; 1 Cor. xiv. 32; James iii. 16), has the sense of disorder, or in particular, tumults, insurrections. (Luke xxi. 9). With respect to such things in Paul's life, comp. Acts xiii. 50; xiv. 19; xvi. 19 f.; xix. 23 ff. Others interpret the word of expulsions from society, restless wanderings from place to place, comp. ἀστατεῖν in 1 Cor. iv. 11.—**In labors, in watchings, in fastings.**—The labors here mentioned relate, not at least exclusively, to labors for his own support (1 Cor. iv. 12), but to the cares and toils of his Apostleship, chap. xi. 23, 27; 1 Cor. iii. 8; xv. 58. In like manner on watchings, comp. chap. xi. 27; Acts xx. 31. Others, however, think that this word has reference to his sleepless cares and anxieties for the churches. More particularly it refers to his public teachings, journeyings, meditations and prayers (the whole frame of his mind). Fastings also include not those which his circumstances rendered unavoidable (1 Cor. iv. 11; Phil. iv. 12), and which he especially distinguishes from fastings under the name of hunger and thirst in chap. xi. 27, but those fastings which were voluntarily endured and connected with prayer. (comp. Acts xiv. 23; xiii. 2 f. ix. 9). There is no reason, however, to regard these as ascetic acts of self-righteousness. In ver. 6 additional items of *moral qualifications* for his office are given, viz.—**in pureness, in knowledge, in long suffering, in kindness, in the Holy Ghost, in love unfeigned, in the word of truth, in the power of God.**—["There is no reason for exchanging the *in, in, etc.*, before each of these expressions for *by, by, etc.*, as is done in our English A. V., inasmuch as the same preposition is used from ἐν ὑπομ. to ἐν δυνάμει implying not the instrument but the sphere or element in which his ministry moved." Fausset. It is rendered by the English word *in* in Wiclif's, Tyndale's, Cranmer's, and the Rhemish versions, and in the translation of the American Bible Union]. At the head of the series in this second section stands ἁγνότης, moral purity (comp. Phil. iv. 8; 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Jno. iii. 3), or chastity in a more special sense. It would, however, be too confined a signification to restrict the word to the sexual passion, and above all to the opposite of avarice or a love of gain. W. F. Besser says: "As patience had been shown in the nine proofs which had already been mentioned, so purity (in heart and intention, as a cardinal virtue) runs through the eight virtues and gifts which are now to be specified." Γνῶσις is either that practical knowledge which quickly recognizes the Divine will *i. e.*, true Christian wisdom (comp. 1 Pet. iii. 7) or evangelical knowledge, *i. e.*, a vivid perception of Divine truth. The latter corresponds best with the prevailing usage in Paul's writings. Besser: "Not intellectual learning is here meant, but that sagacity of the heart with respect to Divine truth, which enables a minister in all cases to bring out that mind of the Spirit which is best suited to the wants of his hearers (Phil. i. 9); and especially that casuistic wisdom which is so indispensable to the cure of souls." This knowledge has also an ethical aspect, and includes that faith which surrenders entirely to the truth of God. Μακροθυμία and χρηστότης are virtues which belong to the sphere of love (comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 4). The former signifies that long en-

durance or perseverance which is exercised under griefs or mortifications; the latter is the same as gentleness or kindness in social life and the pastoral work. Trench (*Synn.* P. II. § 3) makes *μακροθ*, a long holding out of the mind before it gives room to action or passion (generally anger) against persons (*ὑπομόνη*, ver. 4, being the same self-restraint with respect to things. The Rhemish renders *μακρ.* by *longanimity*, a word which even Bp. Taylor's and Archbishop Whately's authority has not been sufficient to naturalize in our language. *Χρηστότης* is rendered by Wycliffe, in Gal. v. 22, *benignity*, and by the Rhemish in our passage, "*sweetness.*" Trench, P. II. § 13]. Before the Apostle speaks of the original grace of love itself, he refers to the source of all moral excellence, the Holy Ghost, with which this fundamental virtue is appropriately connected as its source. This *πν. ἁ.* should be regarded, not merely as a charism, but as a power always dwelling and acting in the Christian, and manifesting itself in all his conduct. *Ἀνυπόκριτη* (unfeigned) occurs also in Rom. xii. 9, as an attribute of love. In ver. 7 he passes on to notice his work as a minister, and that which commended him to his hearers. As in the words, *love unfeigned*, he probably had some reference to his insincere opponents who affected the appearance of much love, so in the word of truth he had a similar reference to impurity of doctrine. (comp. chap. ii. 17; iv. 2). The want of the article shows that he must have meant, not as in Col. i. 5. and other places, the Gospel objectively considered, but subjectively that which was spoken or proposed to men, the substance of which was truth. The power of God in like manner is not to be limited here to the working of miracles, but referred to the Divine power which was seen in all his discourses, and proved that God was with him. (comp. iv. 7; 1 Cor. ii. 4f.; i. 18, 24).—**By the armor of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by glory and dishonor, by evil report and good report**—We have here a change in the preposition (*διὰ*) in conformity with the *ὅπλα* with which it is connected. The Apostle now takes up the figure of a conflict, and hence *ὅπλα* must mean not any instruments in general by which one is aided or protected, but, strictly speaking, weapons. *Διὰ τῶν ὅπλων* here stands independently, like all the other clauses introduced by *διά*, and is not subordinate to *ἐν δυν. θεοῦ*, as if it implied that the power of God was furnishing all these weapons ("*Dei virtute nobis arma subministrante.*" Grotius). The armor of righteousness means not merely such weapons as are lawful for a righteous man to use, or still less, good works (in the Roman Catholic sense); but such weapons as are given a man by his righteousness. Neander: "weapons which would be useful to a good man." Among these we may understand either moral blamelessness (Billroth), or the righteousness of faith which makes a man strong and triumphant against all opposition in attack or defence, comp. Rom. viii. 31–39 (Meyer); or that righteousness of our daily life which proceeds from faith. Its weapons are, the spirit of confidence, a joyful consciousness that our prayers are heard, the strength of a pacified and assured conscience, the unanswerable testimony of a holy life, a delightful enjoyment and power in every work, *etc.* (Osiander). Or, as the Apostle had just been speaking of the power of God, perhaps he was here thinking of God's righteousness operating through him, giving him weapons for every conflict, and directed especially to the establishment and development of good order in the world. The object of this Divine power was, on the one hand, to preserve in action all that was originally beneficial, and on the other to destroy all that was injurious; and especially in the department of redemption to preserve and develop all that new life which corresponded to the Divine will, and to remove all which was in opposition to it. (comp. Beck *Chr. Lehrw.* pp. 551 ff.). In this way probably *δικαιοσύνη* is used in Rom. vi. 13, 18 ff. In respect to *ὅπλα* comp. Eph. vi. 11 ff.; 1 Thess. v. 8. The Apostle, however, speaks of two kinds of these weapons: those on the right hand and those on the left. The former were for assault (sword, lance) and the latter for defence and protection (shield). [Alford thinks this would have required *τῶν δεξ. καὶ τῶν ἀριστ.*: whereas now no article being inserted before *ἀριστ.*, it is implied that the panoply (*τὰ ὅπλα*) is on both sides of the person. But even without such a specification by the article the complete armor for the whole person might yet imply that he had the sword and spear (*ξίφος καὶ δόρυ*) in the right, and the shield (*ἀσπὶς*) on the left hand, so that he was called *ἀμφιδέξιος*]. Both imposed upon the Apostle as the organ through which God's righteousness acted among men the duty of contending against all forms of error and immorality which were so injurious to good order, and of repelling every kind of assault which might be made upon such order and upon himself as its representative. (comp. chap. x. 4). As he commended himself to men by his use of these weapons, and of all the means supplied by God's righteousness for the advancement of God's cause in the world, the result was of course that he had to pass through glory and dishonor. (ver. 8, *διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀτιμίας, etc.*). At this point he proceeds to mention the opposite judgments which were passed upon his conduct in these struggles. *Δόξα* is the glory or honor which was awarded him by the friends, and *ἀτιμία* the dishonor awarded him by the enemies, of God's cause. The latter as well as the former, and not merely his conduct under both, were naturally the means of commending him to those who had spiritual discernment. (comp. Matth. v. 11; Luke vi. 22; 1 Pet. iv. 14). *Διά* stands here in a different position from that in which it stood before *τῶν ὅπλων*, and means passing through honor and dishonor, *i. e.*, in the midst of honor and disgrace. (comp. Meyer; the remarks of Osiander in opposition to this do not seem appropriate). The same is true with respect to *διὰ* before *δυσφημίας καὶ εὐφημίας* (through evil report and good report). [Alford: "Once adopted by the Apostle the *διὰ* was kept for the sake of the parallelism, though with various shades of meaning. I would understand it in *διὰ δοξ., etc.*, as in *διὰ πολλῶν δακρύων* (chap. ii. 4) as pointing out the medium through which. Thus understood these two pairs in ver. 8 will form an easy transition from the instrumental, through the medial

to the passive characteristics which follow."]—**As deceivers and true, as unknown and well known.**—These two clauses are connected with the two immediately preceding, and not with συνιστάν. ἑαυτοὺς ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι [*i. e.*, the author means, it was as deceivers and true, that they went through evil report and good report (ver. 8), and not that they commended themselves (ver. 4)]. We may notice, however, that what is detrimental is mentioned in the first part of each couplet, as it had been in some of the preceding clauses (δυσφημίας, εὐφημίας). *As deceivers* (ὡς πλάνοι) expresses what was the nature of the dishonorable reports respecting him, the false estimate placed upon him (comp. Matth. xxvii. 63; Jno. vii. 12; 1 Tim. iv. 1). *And true* (καὶ ἀληθεῖς), on the other hand, expresses what was the tenor of the good reports respecting him, and at the same time what was the actual state of the case. But καὶ has not, therefore, the meaning of, *and yet* [as in the English A. V.], for ὡς qualifies both words in each clause, and the two have reference to εὐφημία (and δόξα).—In ver. 9 ἀγνοούμενοι has the sense of, obscure people, persons whom no one knows [BLOOMFIELD: "obscure nobodies"], and not those who are misunderstood, or for whom no one cares. In contrast with it stands ἐπιγινωσκόμενοι: those who are well known, those who have the good report. It refers, therefore, to the knowledge of men, and not of God (as in 1 Cor. xiii. 12), to the knowledge which true believers had of him in opposition to the judgment of opponents who undervalued him.—**As dying and behold we live, as chastened and not killed.**—In the first members of the several antitheses which he is about to enumerate, he properly refers still to the evil report and dishonor of which he had just spoken; and in the second he brings forward the actual state of the case, having reference to the glory and good report of the earlier clauses. It is for this reason that he indulges in a greater freedom of expression, as when he says, *and behold, we live.* His opponents had passed a contemptuous judgment upon him, and upon the constant danger of death in which he was said to stand; they say we are dying, and that we are near our last (ὡς ἀποθνήσκοντες, but he describes the case very differently when he gives his own view of it, chap. iv. 10 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 31), "*and behold we live.*" This last is said in a tone of triumph in opposition to the depreciation of his opponents. Contrary to all their expectations God's wondrously saving power brings us out of our most imminent perils, not only uninjured, but with ever renewed powers of life (chap. i. 10; iv. 10 f.). The phrase *as chastened* (ὡς παιδευόμενοι) does not mean that he was actually purified by this discipline. On the other hand, as Neander says: Paul confesses that he was always needing a chastening discipline. The putative meaning of ὡς is still to be retained. It was one part of the evil report through which the afflicted Apostle passed, that he was always looked upon as one punished or chastened of God (comp. Isa. liii. 4). As to the mode in which this was accomplished, we need not imagine that it was by a literal scourging. *And not killed* (καὶ μὴ θανατούμενοι) means that he was not so severely chastened as to be slain." The discipline was never carried to an extreme (comp. Ps. cxviii. 18).—**As sorrowful yet always rejoicing, as poor yet making many rich, as having nothing, and possessing all things** (ver. 10). In this verse ὡς λυπούμενοι signifies, we are looked upon as afflicted and sorrowful, and hence as men of a melancholy temperament; but in contrast with this distorted judgment, he declares that they were in reality always rejoicing and happy (comp. Phil. iv. 4; Rom. v. 3; xii. 12; 1 Thess. i. 6). The last sentence refers to the contrast between their poverty and their wealth. In the wealthy city of Corinth, it was a very uncommon thing to find a Christian possessed of riches (1 Cor. xi. 21). We are commonly ked upon as poor, and yet we make many ri , as men who have nothing, and yet we have all things. When he says that they were rich and had all things, we need not suppose he had reference to the collections by means of which he had at his disposal all the wealth of the Christian community, but we must understand it of those spiritual blessings to which he had already referred when he said that they were always rejoicing (comp. chap. viii. 7, 9; 1 Cor. i. 5; Rom. i. 11; xv. 29). Having nothing (comp. Matth. viii. 20) indicates a high degree of the previously mentioned poverty (πτωχοί), and it alludes to the fact that Paul was sustained by the labor of his own hands [WORDSWORTH: "κατὰ in κατέχοντες adds strength to the meaning of the latter." See 1 Cor. vii. 31. Though we *have* nothing, we have *firm possession* of an eternal inheritance, yea, of "*all things.*" STANLEY: "ἔχοντες" is simply "*having,*" κατέχοντες is "*having to the full*"]. This having all things and being rich must also be understood of spiritual possessions, and not of earthly property in addition, nor probably of the everlasting inheritance (κληρονομία). He speaks in a similar, though not in precisely the same, manner in 1 Cor. iii. 22. NEANDER says: "The whole world belongs to the Christian, because the principle which now governs him is one day to control everything on earth. What the Stoics once said of their wise men, was never completely true except of the Christian; for they alone have that true greatness which is founded upon humility, and they can never be overcome, for they are always in harmony with the will of God."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The more exalted the benefits of the atonement, the more important is it that we should not receive them merely as something brought to us by force to pacify our conscience: but without a sincere repentance and a thorough renovation of our own hearts. Such a participation in God's greatest gift throws upon us a tremendous responsibility; for if we abuse it we bring upon ourselves an irreparable injury, since we not merely lose the opportunity of a great salvation, but we can hope for no other means of deliverance. Hence those who commend the atonement should earnestly invite those who hear them, not

only to accept of it, but to bring forth all the appropriate fruits of such amazing grace. They should be exceedingly active in offering God's mercy to men, and as fellow-laborers with God, earnestly beseech men not to receive the grace of God in vain, but diligently to bring forth and present to God the fruits of righteousness.

2. But to this word of exhortation, all that we are and do should correspond and give power. God's ministers should not only give no such offence, that those who hate their work, may take occasion to insult and reproach it; but conduct themselves so as to gain the approbation of all well disposed persons. They should never become weary, hesitating, indolent, or desponding in their work; but under every discouragement and opposition, even under personal abuse, tumults, and loss of liberty, they should remain patient and undismayed. For the sake of such a work they should be willing to renounce with cheerfulness those conveniences and enjoyments which would otherwise be lawful to them. But whatever may be their exertions or endurances, they should maintain that purity of heart which longs for and thinks of nothing but the honor and glory of God: that familiarity with the economy of grace which readily and clearly discerns the Divine purposes and ways for saving men; and that forbearance and kindness, which can be learned and enjoyed only in the school of the Friend of Sinners. In all their course they should be controlled by the Holy Spirit shedding continually into their hearts that love of God, which produces and maintains a sincere love to men. Whatever they propose to their fellow-men will then bear the stamp of truth; and whatever they do will be accompanied by tokens of Divine power. In this manner they will prove themselves true champions of the Lord, boldly using the weapons of righteousness, now fearlessly assailing whatever opposes Christ's cause, and now rigorously defending the truth and laws of God against every form of sin and error. Everything will then also become subservient to their cause, and will more and more compel men to confess that they are from God. Honor and dishonor, good and evil report, will be equally in their favor. If they are sometimes represented as deceivers, it will not be hard to prove themselves true men. If their adversaries disparage them as unknown, (obscure) they will soon prove themselves well known. If they are vilified as sinking, and devoted to death and ruin, they will ere long show themselves living monuments of saving and glorious grace. If they are pointed at as guilty objects of God's frowns, they will soon prove that their chastisement was not unto death. If they are sometimes looked upon with pretended sympathy, as men overwhelmed with sorrow, poor wretches, who can only starve for want of the necessities of life, they will soon show that they are not merely joyful in themselves, and rich in spiritual blessings, but able also to enrich all their fellow men.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—VER. 1. Since God has chosen ministers to be his helpers in the work of the Gospel, let no one think himself too well taught and holy to need the services of those who seem to be inferior in endowments, for he can never know what instrument, or slight occasion God may have chosen for a work of grace in his heart.—HEDINGER:—Make use of the time you have, for the brief hour will soon be past. Whoever thrusts aside God's grace, or loses it to secure some worldly advantage, draws down upon himself the severest judgments of God (Heb. ii. 3, xii. 15).—SPENER:—Ver. 2. God sometimes plentifully dispenses to men a grace, which will soon give place to wrath, if they fail to recognize and improve the time of their gracious visitation (Luke xix. 42 and 44.) Thoughtless persons say: "We shall have time enough to-morrow, and we can turn to God even in death;" but are they sure that God will then give them true repentance; that He will accept of the forced repentance of a dying hour; or that he will ever permit them to see another day?—Ver. 4. A minister's whole life should be a practical illustration of what he enjoins upon others. (Tit. ii. 7 f.) He who preaches to others that they must enter the kingdom of heaven only through much tribulation, must not expect to go before them upon roses. An effeminate weakling who can bear no trouble is not fit to serve Christ. In Christ's service we shall be called upon to endure hardness and to stand by Christ and His word, under all the assaults of the devil and the world. But although such things are sometimes hard to bear, with Divine grace they become light. (Chap. iv. 8).—Ver. 5. Blessed are the peacemakers; cursed all rebels. Every hour has its work: God's word is to be searched; our own house is to be built, the sick are to be visited, and earnest prayer is to be offered for ourselves, and for all the world! Think you this will disturb your peace? Never fear. For God the Lord will be thy rest and thy strength.—Ver. 6. A minister must cleanse himself from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit (chap. vi. 1.) or he will pull down rather than build up. He who would teach others must know God, and be well acquainted with himself and his people (John x. 3 and 14.)—A patient spirit is the inward light, and kindliness the outward beams of this sun.—Ver. 7. Behold, the true way to have the power, and the near presence of God: It is to be so familiar with His word, that it shall become thoroughly implanted in our hearts, and engrafted into our spiritual life (James i. 21.) As a well-armed warrior carries weapons in both hands, is watchful on every side, and uses his weapons against every assault, we should bring our spiritual weapons to bear against every kind of temptation (from Satan or the world; from the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye and the pride of life; from fears, tribulations, persecution). Where Christ is, God's power is; and with this we can triumph over all things. Through God we shall do valiantly (Ps. lx. 12; cviii. 13).—Ver. 8. Stand firmly in God's grace when men revile and seek to injure thee, and they will soon find that they dishonor themselves more than thee.—Ver. 9. In severe sickness men will say, "He is dying," but with God's help we cry, "Behold I live!" Look well, that you may be able to say, "Christ liveth in me," *etc.* (Gal. ii. 20.)—HEDINGER, VER. 10. God's people have reason to mourn over their

sins, their sufferings, the buffetings of their deadly enemy, their fellowmen, the abominable crimes of their day, the perdition of thousands, and the general blindness and hardness of men's hearts. But they can always rejoice in the Spirit, in God and in Christ, in a blessed hope, in foretastes of future glory, and that their names are written in heaven (Luke x. 10.) While we continue in God's grace, we always truly participate in, though we may not always be equally conscious of, its consolations. These, however, may always be increased by constant prayer. They are spiritual, pure, uninterrupted, and the offspring of the spirit of God through spiritual graces. If they are sometimes connected with visible things, they are never dependent upon these, but are intended to lead us directly to God. It is for this reason that the enjoyment of them is so sanctifying. God's true ministers, as spiritual fathers, enrich their people by their instructions, their example, their prayers, and their admonitions to good works and liberality (comp. 1st Tim. vi. 17 f.). He who has God has everything, for God will provide every needful temporal blessing.

Berlenb. Bible:—Ver. 1. A man must make a holy use of that grace by means of which he is first anointed with the Holy Spirit, justified, sanctified and turned to God; for if he makes it subservient to his fleshly lusts, or to his security in sin, and perverts it to his own pride and self-righteousness, instead of using it for his growth in grace and especially for being born into the kingdom of God, even that which he has already received will be withdrawn.—Ver. 2. The only proper result of grace already received is the hearing of our prayers, the healing of our backslidings and the salvation of our souls. When Satan is most aroused, then is the time for plucking souls from his grasp.—There are times in which God sees fit to give us more than common manifestations of His grace. Great will be our blessedness if we make a wise improvement of such seasons.—The deeper our impressions are, the greater the injury, if they are despised and resisted, and so our hearts are hardened against God. Every one should observe whether, and in what way Divine grace is acting upon his heart. If we walk not in the light while it is yet day, darkness will come upon us, and our perverted hearts will lead us to ruin.—When Satan can find an occasion for reproaching God's children, and especially those who have the care of souls, he will be sure to make a mountain of it, and will corrupt the work of God. [illegible] never is he more insulting than when he find[illegible] them feeble and dispirited. Then he points [illegible] them and cries: "These are the Lord's heroes!" An occasion for offence is thus given, not merely when we commit some great crime, but when we make no advances, when we are slothful, cold-hearted, and indolent, and when the people do not see us in earnest.—Ver. 4 f. Where Christians are really zealous, they must expect to suffer. They must then beseech God for patience, and their prayers will keep them from falling.—God's true messengers, and even Christians in general, may be distinguished from the world by their sufferings, and by their being looked upon by those who are esteemed in society, as the offscouring of all things and as a curse. There is no way in which they will not be assailed, in mind and body, in reputation or in property. They will be perplexed, crushed and beaten (afflictions).—Circumstances will arise when the servant of God will be in extreme distress, that as a good soldier of Jesus Christ, he may be an example to others of a firm trust in God.—Whoever is preparing for the pastoral office, must make it his first object to attain a degree of patience, which nothing but Divine power can give him.—Many have found evangelical fasting, when entered upon voluntarily at suitable times, and without affectation, very profitable, but any other will be found quite useless.—To abstain from an improper use of even those things which belong to us, will be an excellent means of purifying and disciplining us.—Ver. 6. The best protection against impure thoughts and desires, is to lgive ourselves thoroughly up to our ordinary emp oyments. Those who have once known how pleasant a holy life is, must have an insatiable hungering after purity of heart. The best way to know and properly appreciate all things around us, is to gain such a familiarity with them as God gives us in the midst of Christian activity, and the trials and temptations to which it subjects us.—He is truly *kind* who is willing to give up himself when occasion calls for it, and to renounce his own enjoyments at the call of distress and love. This can be done, in a pure and blameless manner, when the heart has been thoroughly awakened and renewed so as to be holy before God, angels and men (by the Holy Ghost).—Many a thing comes to us under the semblance of *love*. But the Apostolic spirit was in truth also. The very nature of love is such that it makes brethren speak the truth.—Ver. 7. Truth must be defective if love is wanting. Where a man is actuated by love, he will honestly speak the truth, and of course will neither flatter nor needlessly offend or injure any one.—If a man faithfully pursues his calling, thoroughly renounces the world, and by the aid of the Holy Spirit gives no offence, is sincere, pure, chaste, kind and true, he will possess power, ("by the power of God") which no one can resist, and his faith will be the victory which overcomes the world. No one can do this who does not make good use of the weapons of righteousness. With these he can defend himself against all mischief from within or from without. God is wonderful in His resources!—Ver. 8. In itself it is a matter of indifference to a Christian, whether men receive or reject him, if he only has the testimony of a good conscience, and has grace always to own his Lord.—Ver. 9. The dealings of God with His people are so fatherly, that, with all the humiliations and chastisements to which He subjects them, they are never given over to death. Ver. 10. Christians are not without tender feelings when they are in affliction, but they are so refreshed by supplies of grace that they can endure with cheerfulness.—None can understand how wonderful God's goodness is but those who seek for and love Him; but so abundant will be the riches of knowledge which He gives, that many besides their possessors will be enriched. To have nothing, neither gold, nor possessions, *etc.*, and yet to have all things so as to be unwill-

ing to exchange conditions with the wealthiest of this world, are things so hard to be united, that nothing but Divine power can combine them together.

RIEGER:—VER. 1 f. If thou hast besought men to be reconciled to God, fail not to admonish them also, for even those who have been brought nigh to God by the word of reconciliation are still in danger. How often is grace obstructed, and the heart hardened rather than benefited.—"I have heard thee," *etc.* Such a promise was not for our great High Priest alone during the single hour of His soul's travail (Isa. xlix. 8), but for those of every age and condition in whose behalf he then acted. His prayer for His disciples and for all who should afterwards believe on Him through their word, has been heard. The present, therefore, is an acceptable time, *etc.*—Ver. 3. Men are ingenious in contriving pretexts for receiving the grace of God in vain, especially if they can detect something in those who preach the Gospel inconsistent with their messages.—The minister of Christ must not expect entirely to escape scandal; but when the conscience of a hearer has been offended, so that the Gospel has no power over him, the cause is not unfrequently one which could and ought to have been avoided. The minister's work should be to him as the very apple of his eye, to be kept most delicately from every contact with vice. Many of the judicial proceedings of the present day fail of success on both sides on account of the contempt and reproach which rests upon the ministerial character (Mal. ii. 7-9). The salt which has lost its savor will be sure to be crushed under the feet of men. But even those who thus tread upon it must one day answer for being so easily deprived of that which might and ought to have been salt to them, and for being so speedily reduced to a carcass of corruption in God's sight.—Ver. 4 The best eye for judging all we do is acquired by having a desire in all things to act worthy of a servant of God.—A stupid, hesitating and timid spirit knows nothing of real *patience.* None but those who fear no terrors can maintain such a spirit under severe trials.

HEUBNER:—Ver. 1. To receive the grace of God (*i. e.*, all that could save us) in vain, is the surest way to injure ourselves and to lose what we have. What an honor and blessedness to be God's helpers, and to give Him back the tongues and powers he gave us!—Ver. 2. The acceptable time is the whole period of the Christian dispensation, for salvation is now free to all, especially all who hear the Gospel in its clearness and power. For every one it is now a day of salvation. LUTHER:—"The word of God moves along like a passing shower; wherever it comes it must be received at once, or it will be gone." —How soon a man's "not now" becomes a "never." How many are lost because they put off the day of their conversion!—Ver. 3. Christianity has always been much dishonored by the unfaithfulness and faults of some ministers whose scandalous walk pulls down faster than their preaching builds up. Most carefully, therefore, should they guard their conduct, for every defect in this will surely be noticed. No wonder, therefore, that the world is full of objections to those who preach the Gospel.—Vers. 4, 5. In performing the duties of your office, seek not to please yourself, or the world, but God. Faithfulness to Him will be seen principally in the patient and persevering performance of the difficult duties you have to do. Nothing is more indispensable to a minister of God, driven as he often must be into straits and with none to counsel him, than patience.—Ver. 6. The severer the opposition, the more honorable the virtues which are shown in encountering it: such as purity of heart, the ready tact and familiarity with Divine things which always hits upon the right thing; the good will and courage which perseveres even when the results do not correspond to our expectations; the unwearied earnestness to benefit those who make no returns of gratitude and continually thwart our pains; the kindness (the outward form of love) which endeavors to win all to Christ; the holy zeal which remains at all times equally constant, and has a heart for God's work and man's salvation; and the sincere love to all men which is the soul of all our graces.—Ver. 8. The equanimity of the Christian under the ever varying judgments of the world.—Honors do not dazzle him, dishonors do not trouble him.—Ver. 9. To be known by a few faithful friends, is better than to have a name with the multitude.—Ver. 10. The Christian, though poor in the eye of the world, has an inexhaustible treasure to dispense. With no earthly house or grounds, or possessions, he has a rich inheritance in heaven. With rapture he can cry: "My heart leaps!" *etc.* (Luke vi. 23).

W. F. BESSER:—Ver. 1. God has seen fit to communicate to men the blessing of reconciliation through the medium of His word and the preaching of the Gospel. Though He alone can impart the spirit of faith, and so work upon the heart that we shall come to Christ and find justification and salvation, He dispenses His gifts and influences in connection with the outward word, and calls those who preach it His helpers or fellow-laborers (1 Cor. iii. 9).—Ver. 2. When Paul exclaims: "Behold, now," *etc.*, he must be understood as saying: "Open your eyes and behold that Gospel which has filled the world with the precious assurance that God is no more angry or punishing men, but is gracious and ready to save them; for our Lord Jesus, who has conquered all our enemies, and now intercedes for us, has purchased us for Himself, and entreats us to be reconciled to God." The whole period of the New Testament is an acceptable time (Luke iv. 19); when the buds of promise are bursting, and every day is a day of salvation. We are continually receiving and appropriating the results of our Saviour's sufferings and victories. Every Christian may therefore apply to himself the prophetic word, "I have heard thee;" for if one is heard for all, then all are heard; and if one is succored for all, then all are succored.—Ver. 6. Among the virtues and gifts which distinguish God's servants, we ought especially to remark the Holy Spirit. From this Source flow the streams of life, of virtues and of gifts both backward and forward in our text. He it is who washes the soul from every defilement, and then it begins to shine with intelligence, long suffering and kindness, and He it is who crowns these virtues with martial glories

and entwines them together in a bond of peace. —Ver. 7. One part of the work to be accomplished by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, is to strip from us the motley garment of our own righteousness, and triumphantly to maintain the genuineness and everlasting suitableness of the beautiful and glorious garment of Christ's righteousness.—Ver. 9. When it is objected against the servants of Christ that they are obscure and insignificant, that they have no place among the wise, and no reputation or power in the world (1 Cor. i. 26–28), they are more than compensated by being well known in heaven (Luke x. 20; Phil. iv. 3; Heb. xii. 23) and in the Church below by all whom they have served with patience and with the humble graces of the Holy Spirit.—Ver. 10. Every thing on earth is subservient to the welfare of God's servants; and the future dignities of the meek who inherit the earth (Matth. v. 5) may be traced even in this life, when heaven and earth are nothing but a vast storehouse, the key to whose treasures is continually given to faith by prayer. Away with pride and vanity! Let us dread poison when pious people praise us, and learn to find honey among the nettles of calumny and lies; for we have the assurance (Matth. v. 11, 12).

Ver. 1–10 (Pericope on Invocavit Sunday):—The Lord glorified by His Apostles: 1, by their blameless deportment (vers. 1–4); 2, by their patience in sufferings (vers. 4, 5); 3, by their holy walk (vers. 6-7); 4, by the benefits they confer.—The Apostles are like their Lord: 1, in their work as preachers and their holy walk: 2, in sufferings, not only under positive inflictions, but under privations; 3, in their excellent influence, inasmuch as they make use of none but honorable means —A season of Fasting a time of salvation: 1. For we should regard it as a time: *a.* to awake to the reception of God's grace, as we contemplate the story of Christ's sufferings (vers. 1-2); *b.* to become more holy in our daily lives (vers. 3-4); *c.* to make use of the trials of life, for the exercise of every Christian virtue (vers. 4-6); *d.* to receive the spiritual aids which are offered us. 2. Beneficial influence of the truths then contemplated: *a.* for our amendment of life and our confirmation in holiness; *b.* for our real comfort and peace; *c.* for the increase of our influence among our fellow-men.—Our whole life on earth is a season of fasting; for it is a time: 1, of suffering; 2, of many privations; 3, of discipline in holiness; 4, of preparation for the great Easter, when we shall be raised from the dead and saved forever (Heubner).

L. Hofacker (pp. 80 ff.):—In the midst of all their outward afflictions, their insignificance and their vileness in the eye of the world, those who follow Christ and labor in His vineyard must expect to be reviled; but in spite of all their sufferings and shame, a Divine greatness and majesty will break forth from them, amply sufficient to prove the reality of the kingdom for which they are contending.—The hidden glories of God's kingdom: 1. That kingdom has a glory. 2. But it is now concealed: *a.* in Christ Himself; *b.* in His Church.

XII.—AN EARNEST APPEAL TO THE CORINTHIANS; APPLICATION OF THE EXHORTATION IN VER. 1.

Chapter VI. 11–17. VII.–1.

11 O *ye* Corinthians, our mouth is open unto you, our[1] heart is [has become] en-
12 larged. Ye are not straitened in us, but ye are straitened in your own bowels.
13 Now for a recompense in the same [by way of recompense in the same kind, *τὴν δὲ*
14 *αὐτὴν ἀντιμισθίαν*] (I speak as unto *my* children), be ye also enlarged. Be ye not unequally yoked together [become not united as in a strange yoke, *μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες*] with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?
15 and [or][2] what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ[3] with Belial [Beliar]?[4] or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel
16 [unbeliever]? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye [we][5] are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in [among] *them;* and I will be their God, and they shall be my[6] people.
17 Wherefore come out[7] from among them, and be ye separate [separated] saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean *thing* [anything unclean]; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my [to me for, *μοι εἰς*] sons and daughters saith the Lord Almighty.

VII. 1. Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness [every defilement] of the [*om.* the] flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.

[1 Ver. 11.— For the second ἡμῶν D. has ὑμῶν. Tisch. in his Cod. Sin. gives ἡμῶν in the text, but ὑμῶν as a var. lect.].

2 Ver. 14.—Rec. has τίς δέ, but ἤ τίς has stronger support [B. C. D. E. F. G. L. Sin. with the majority of versions and Fathers]. The δέ being more usual was probably a correction.

3 Ver. 15.—Rec. has χριστῷ, but it was probably a correction to conform to φωτὶ and the other datives in the connection. B. C. *et al.* [Sinait. D. L. the Vulg., and Copt. the Latin fathers] have χριστοῦ. [Lachm., Tisch., Meyer, and Alford also adopt it; but Bloomfield inclines to χριστῷ under an impression that the other was suggested by the Latin copies or to facilitate construction].

4 Ver. 15.—The best authenticated form of this word is βελίαρ; but some copies have βελίαν and βελίαβ. The βελιὰλ of the Rec. is feebly sustained. [It has no MSS. and little more than the Vulgate, which adopted it from the original Hebrew form. All Greek MSS. of importance have βελίαρ. Sept. treated the word as a common noun and translated it. The Vulgate and our English version sometimes give it as a proper noun, but they often translate it by the word *wicked*, or some equivalent term. The Hellenistic Jews often changed λ into ρ, as in the Doric φαῦρος for φαῦλος. The form βελίαρ often occurs in the *Test. of the* 12 *Patriarchs*, in the interpolated *Ignatius*, in the *Apost. Canons*, and in the Greek Fathers generally. As the Greeks never ended their proper names in ρ, they were not likely to change βελιὰλ into βελίαρ, while the Latins were quite likely to conform the βελίαρ to their Vulgate].

5 Ver. 16.—The Rec. has ὑμεῖς—ἐστε instead of ἡμεῖς—ἐσμὲν. It was probably a reminiscence of 1 Cor. iii. 16, and an attempt to conform to vv. 14 and 17. The authorities, however, are about equally balanced. [B. D. L. Sin. and some versions and Fathers have the Rec. but C. D. (3d Cor.) E. F. G. K. the Vulg. Syr. Goth. verss. and most of the Greek Fathers have the other. No reason can be imagined for changing the ὑμεῖς into ἡμεῖς equally strong with that which has above been suggested for the opposite course].

6 Ver. 16.—Rec. has μοι, Lachm. has μου. The testimony for the latter is not strong, and it is probably an attempt to conform the text to the preceding αὐτῶν. [And yet B. C. and Sin have μου, while D. F. K. L. with the verss. and most Fathers have μοι].

7 Ver. 17 —Rec. has ἐξέλθετε but εξελθατε is better suited to the sense and is more strongly sustained. [The former is better conformed to linguistic usage, but the latter was for this very reason less likely to be altered to it. it is better sustained by the best MSS. of the Sept., has B. C. F. G. Sin. and Damasc. in its favor, and has the sanction of Lachm., Tisch. and Alford].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VERS. 11–13. **Our mouth is open toward you, O Corinthians, our hearts are enlarged.**—Before particularly applying to the Corinthians in their various relations (ver. 14ff) the admonition he had given them in ver. 1 f., the Apostle pauses to pour forth to them the feelings which had been rising in his heart. We have first a continued expression of the emotions called forth by the preceding representation, and then the earnest exhortation which commences with ver. 14. The words *to open the mouth*, signify properly, to begin to speak, but they are here especially emphatic (in consequence of their connection with what had been said in ver. 3ff. and what follows regarding the enlargement of his heart). The idea thus becomes, to speak openly and without reserve (comp. Eph. vi. 19 and Ecclus. xxii. 22). [CHRYSOSTOM: "we cannot be silent; we long to be continually speaking and conversing with you"]. By such language, he shows how confiding was his love towards them. A similar thought is expressed when he adds, our heart is enlarged. [CHRYSOSTOM: "As that which warms is wont to dilate, so also to enlarge the heart is the work of love. It opens the mouth and enlarges the heart, for he loved not with the heart only, but with the heart in unison. He says with great emphasis, we have not only room for you all, but with such largeness of room, as he that is beloved walketh with great unrestraint within the heart of him that loveth"]. As Paul had been opening his inmost soul to his brethren in the free and confiding manner of the last few sentences he had himself become conscious of the extent of his affection for them (Meyer, comp. Osiander). This is the reason that no γάρ was needed in the second sentence. The words should not be understood to mean simply (comp. ver. 12 f.) that he felt happy and comfortable, or that he had now disclosed his whole heart and unbosomed himself to them.—The special address to them (*καρίνθιοι*), without either article or adjective, is a mode of speaking which occurs only in one passage beside (Phil. iv. 15), and indicates the profound sincerity of the speaker.—The same idea is presented in a negative form in ver. 12, and so makes the contrast on the part of the Corinthians more striking—**ye are not straitened in us but ye are straitened in your own bowels** (ver. 12).—The *οὐ* shows that the verb cannot be taken as an imperative even in the first clause. [WEBSTER (p. 138): "*οὐ* conveys a direct and absolute, *μὴ* a subjective and conditional, denial." Winer, § 59, 1]. It is not of anxiety or sadness, the reason of which is in themselves, that he is speaking. The meaning of 'straitened' is determined by its connection with the subsequent idea of enlargement: ye are not straitened, *i. e.* ye have no contracted space in our hearts; but in your hearts it is not so with respect to us; *i. e.* ye have no small room in us, but ye have very small room for us in yourselves. While our hearts are enlarged in love for you, it is very different with you, in respect to us. [CHRYSOSTOM: "This reproof is administered with forbearance, as is the manner of very great love. He does not say, 'ye do not love us,' but 'not in the same measure,' for he does not wish to touch them too sensibly. He implies that they have some affection for him, that he may win them to more. Ye are straitened while I am enlarged. Ye barely receive one and even him with small space, but I a whole city, and with abundance of freedom."] Σπλάγχνα (bowels) is here used, as in chap. vii. 15; Phil. i. 8; ii. 1, and even in classical writers, in the sense of *καρδία* (heart), for the seat of the emotions, such as love, sympathy, *etc.* [The Apostle in this passage uses both words, *καρδία* and *σπλάγχνα* for the affections. In modern languages the latter word has been entirely superseded by the former. Among ancient nations, however, it expressed the whole interior structure of man, including especially the heart and liver as opposed to what are now technically called the bowels (*ἔντερα*, Stanley). In classical Greek the word is used for the feelings generally, and in Hebrew the corresponding רַחֲמִים was used to designate the seat of the gentler emotions and affections. The name itself in Hebrew was derived from a root which signifies to love. Comp. Stanley].—**Now by way of recompense in the same (I speak as**

unto my children), be ye also enlarged (ver. 13).—In close connection with what he had just said, he now proceeds to demand of them that their hearts should also be enlarged, that they should "open widely their hearts in love and confidence for him as he had opened his for them. The motive for this he derives from the nature of children, when he adds, I speak as unto children (comp. 1 Cor. iv. 14); inasmuch as children are bound to make a return of love for a father's love (comp. 1 Tim. v. 4). This idea is more distinctly brought out when he directly calls upon them for their love as an appropriate recompense (*ἀντιμισθία*, comp. Rom. i. 27; but in our passage the word is strengthened by the use of *τὴν αὐτήν*). The construction is here abrupt (Meyer calls it a rhetorical anacoluthon [Kühner § 347, 5, Winer § 64, II. note]). In order to fill out the expression, however, we must supply neither *ἔχοντες*, nor *εἰσενέγκατε*; nor must we connect the words together by *λέγω* (*q. d.* I am speaking for an adequate recompense), but we must regard it as an Accus. absol., an anacoluthon, occasioned by the parenthesis in which he had paused to say he was speaking as to children. Others regard it as the Accusative of the remote effect: that by which ye should make recompense. In *τὴν αὐτὴν ἀντιμισθίαν*, the two ideas of the same thing (*τὸ αὐτὸ*) and of remuneration (*ἀντιμισθία*) are blended together by way of attraction. They may be separated thus: *τὸ αὐτὸ* (*ὡσαύτως*), *ὅ ἐστιν ἀντιμισθία*. [FRITZSCHE: "With his accustomed celerity of thought Paul says, *τὴν δὲ αὐτὴν ἀντιμισθίαν* instead of *τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ, ὅ ἐστιν ἀντιμισθία, πλατύνθητε*, enlarge your minds to the same remuneration, instead of, to the same thing (love) in which a remuneration might be found." Comp. JELF, *Gram.* § 581, 1, § 700, Obs. 1 and 2].

VERS. 14–18. [*An admonition to separate themselves from unbelievers.* Stanley calls this passage a remarkable dislocation of the train of argument. On the one hand, the passionate appeal begun in vi. 11-13 is continued without even the appearance of an interruption in vii. 2, where the words *χωρήσατε ἡμᾶς* (make room for us) are evidently the prolongation of the metaphor expressed in vi. 12, 13, by *στενοχ.* and *πλατύνθητε*. On the other hand, the intervening passage (vi. 14–vii. 1), while it coheres perfectly with itself, has no connection with the immediate context either before or after. Such an introduction of an earnest warning in the midst of an affectionate entreaty, need not, however, suggest the idea of an interpolation of some passage from one of Paul's lost Epistles, or by some other hand; for it is the very nature of a love so ardent, so aroused at the moment, and now touched with some jealousy, to make sudden transitions, and to draw towards itself by warnings of danger as well as by expressions of endearment]. Probably not without reference to his demand that they should be enlarged toward him (ver. 13), the Apostle now proceeds earnestly to warn them against a kind of *false* enlargement of heart which had been shown in an improper fellowship with Gentiles, and in consenting to heathenish customs.—**Become not united heterogeneously with unbelievers.**—It is possible that he had reference especially to sacrificial festivals and to mixed marriages. *Ἑτεροζυγεῖν ἀπίστοις* implies unquestionably a *communion* (it is joined therefore with the dative); but it involves also the idea of an *unequal* union. It is taken from the figure, not of a balance, where there is an inclination toward one side, representing a disposition favorable to unbelievers (Theophylact, *et al.*), nor of oars which are not paired or properly mated, but of a yoke in which animals are intended to draw together. Comp. *ἑτερόζυγα* in the Sept. of Lev. xix. 19; Deut. xxii. 10. Two animals of a different nature, harnessed together in the same yoke, are a type of Christians having fellowship with heathen. W. F. Besser says that Paul here derives a spiritual lesson from the legal precept which prohibits the putting of clean and unclean animals in the same team, to the effect that Christians should not be joined with others. The *ἕτερον*, however, should not be made to refer to the yoke itself, as if it meant "put not on a foreign yoke, one which unbelievers have put on, and therefore one which does not belong to Christians" (Meyer). The admonition evidently points to something habitual, and probably was intended to imply that their conduct had tendencies in that direction. Neander says that "Paul evidently would not have spoken in this way of that unavoidable intercourse with the heathen which only served to make Christianity better known to them; but he referred merely to a participation with them in social usages and excesses. Nothing in this text confines the application of it to marriages with the heathen."—The Apostle now proceeds to justify his admonition by a series of five questions, in which he endeavors to convince his brethren of the incompatibility of the Christian and heathenish systems. Such an accumulation of questions is very emphatic and impressive. In the first place, he inquires—**For what participation hath righteousness with unrighteousness?**—He thus characterizes these systems by the opposite words, righteousness and unrighteousness (*δικαιοσύνη* and *ἀνομία*) The former signifies, not the righteousness of faith in the theological sense of the expression, but the active disposition to a Divine life which springs from a vital union by faith with Christ; and the latter signifies that complete want of such a righteousness which is seen in the heathen world, where the living God is unknown, and where there is no Divine life. The same idea is expressed figuratively in the second question—**What communication hath light with darkness?**—in which *φῶς* and *σκότος* are contrasted. Comp. Eph. v. 8. W. F. BESSER: "These five casuistic questions are so arranged that the two first relate to the separation between salvation and destruction, the third to the separation between the Saviour and the destroyer, and the two last to the separation between the saved and the destroyed." Light is the figurative expression for truth and purity (the intellectual and the moral element united); and darkness, is the common metaphor for error and wrong conduct (Greg. Naz. makes *φῶς=γνῶσις καὶ βίος ἐνθεος, σκότος=ἄγνοια καὶ ἁμαρτία*). *Μετοχή* has the same meaning as *κοινωνία* (Luther translates it *Geniess=Genossenschaft, i. e.*, enjoyment in the sense of fellowship. [STANLEY: "Of the five words used to express the idea of union,

μετοχή, κοινωνία, συμφώνησις, μερὶς, συγκατάθεσις, only the third and fifth have any *special* appropriateness, and those chiefly by their etymology; συμφώνησις, 'harmony of voice,' is appropriate to persons, and συγκατάθεσις, 'unity of composition,' to buildings. The multiplication of synonyms implies a greater copiousness of Greek than we should expect from the Apostle's usual language. WEBSTER and WILKINSON: "Believers are here spoken of, first in the abstract (light, righteousness, Eph. v. 8), then in their Head, then individually, then as a community (ναός). The use of καὶ represents the act of communication as mutual, of πρὸς as offering a connection, of μετὰ as accepting it"]. For the meaning of κοινωνία by classical writers and by Philo, consult Meyer.—**And what concord hath Christ with Beliar?** (ver. 15). This question, which follows the first pair, is introduced by a δέ, which shows that it is an emphatic continuance of what had gone before it. [Alford: "After a question beginning with πῶς, τίς, and the like, a second question is regularly introduced by a δέ"]. We here rise to the two great chiefs of the opposing departments (comp. 1 Cor. x. 20; Eph. ii. 2).—Βελίαρ is the same as Satan, by which word the Peschito translates it; the same also as πονηρός, Heb. בְּלִיַּעַל, worthlessness, wickedness. Even in the Sibylline books and in the Apocryphal writings of the Old Testament it was used as one of Satan's names. In the common Hellenistic dialect, in the "Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs," and in the writings of the Eccles. Fathers the letters λ and ρ were frequently interchanged. [Jerome derives the word from "בְּלִי=*non*, and עֹל=*jugum, i. e., absque jugo, quod de collo suo Dei abjecerit servitutem.*" It is, however, more generally derived from the former word, and יַעַר=usefulness, *i. e.*, without usefulness, and hence, wickedness. Jerome's derivation of the word may account for Paul's use of it in connection with ἑτεροζυγοῦντες. But with the other derivation we have a still better connection. On the stand-point of the Jews and the N. T., idolatry was a worship of demons (1 Cor. x. 20), and the name Beliar, both on its negative and positive side, fits this view, inasmuch as an idol was a dead and useless thing, and the system of idolatry was the concentrated effect of the devil's art and power. Bengel thinks that Paul here calls Satan Beliar, but that Satan, as opposed to Christ, denotes all kinds of antichristian uncleanness (*omnem colluviem antichristianam*)]. Συμφώνησις occurs only here in the N. T., and never in the Septuagint. In the classical authors it has the form of συμφωνία πρός. It has the meaning here of, agreement *together*, accordance of sentiment and feeling, harmony in opinions and efforts.—**Or what part hath he that believeth with an unbeliever, and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?**—In this last pair of questions the Apostle comes down from the heads of these two great departments to those connected respectively with them, and assumes that one who has faith in Christ can have no part (μερίς) with such as have no such faith. Μερίς here, as in Acts viii. 21, has the sense of share, portion or property. The two parties have no common advantages; one has nothing in common with the other, and their possessions are entirely different, the one from the other. In ver. 16, however, a question is asked which sets in the clearest possible light the holiness of Christianity in contrast with the impurities of heathenism. The Christian community is there represented as a temple of God, and surely there could be no agreement between it and idols! Such a contradiction was there between them, that all fellowship would seem impossible and all contact a desecration. Συγκατάθεσις has generally the meaning of assent, acquiescence, but here it has the more particular signification of agreement. Comp. συγκατατίθεσθαι μετά in Exod. xxiii. 1; Luke xxiii. 51. With respect to the temple of God, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 16. It is certainly most natural to make this passage refer to such participations in idolatrous customs as are censured in 1 Cor. viii. 10. Christians should as soon think of allowing idols to be set up in the sanctuary of God, as to permit such things among those who had been consecrated to the Lord. These should be looked upon as profanations like some which took place during the most corrupt periods of the Old Testament.—**For we are the temple of the living God.**—From the figures he had employed, and from the language used in the Scriptures, it was evident that believers were a temple of God. Neander remarks that "The particular, external relations of the Old Testament are here applied in a spiritual manner to each Christian." The γάρ implies that the admonition involved in this question (τίς δὲ συγκατάθεσις, *etc.*) is applicable to us; for we are indeed the temples, *etc.* Θεοῦ ζῶντος is a designation of the true God who will in contrast with dead and powerless idols be always truly active to vindicate the honor of His sanctuary and to communicate living power to all His people (comp. 1 Thess. i. 9.) The same expression occurs also in chap. iii. 3; Heb. iii. 12; ix. 14; x. 31, *et al.*—**As God said, I will dwell in them, and walk among them; and I will be their God, and they shall be to me a people.**—The Apostle here shows that his representation of the Church as a temple of God was justified by a passage in Levit. xxxvi. 11 f. (comp. Ezek. xxxvii. 27), which is here cited freely from memory. He uses the word ἡμεῖς very naturally in the most enlarged sense, and we find nothing strange in the fact that he should address them in the parenthetic clause before he communicates the instruction). The Apostle considers the idea of a temple involved in the expression, I will dwell (have a habitation, ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς) in them. In the Sept. the passage reads: θήσω τὴν σκηνήν μου ἐν ὑμῖν. Although ἐν has primarily the sense of: among, in the midst of, as it afterwards has in ἐμπεριπατήσω, the Apostle probably had reference to the presence of God in the individual believer (comp. John xiv. 23), inasmuch as the idea of ναὸς θεοῦ was in his mind, and the word ἐνοικεῖν most naturally implies this. The word ἐμπεριπατεῖν which was at first used to describe the movements of God's residence (the sacred tabernacle) among the Israelites, is here probably applied to the presence

of God Himself in His Church in all parts of the world (comp. Rev. ii. 1). The promise contained in this quotation contains the sum of God's covenant with His people, comp. Ex. vi. 7; Jere. xxiv. 7; xxx. 22; xxxi. 1, 33; Heb. viii. 10; Rev. xxi. 3, 7. On God's part there is the communication of Himself and the benefits of His salvation; and on the part of the people there is fellowship with God and the enjoyment of His blessing. W. F. Besser remarks that "God *dwells* in His Church when He fills it with His Spirit, through the instrumentality of His word and Sacraments; and as He thus finds an acceptable rest among them (Ps. cxxxii. 14), their spiritual influence proves that He is present in their midst and acknowledges as His own all who are reconciled to Him by Christ's blood. God *walks* in His Church when He acts there as its God through the gifts, offices and powers which He bestows upon it; and when he receives His people into living fellowship and applies to them all the benefits of His gracious covenant." In Levit. xxvi. this promise is conditional and even here the admonition is itself a hint that their safety depended upon their fidelity, and especially upon their separation from ungodly persons and all impure practices; ver. 17, comp. ver. 14. This admonition He expresses in a free quotation of a passage in Isaiah lii. 11, in which the people were commanded to leave Babylon.—**Wherefore come out from among them, and be separated, saith the Lord, and touch not any thing unclean.**—W. F. Besser says that "The departure of the Israelites from Babylon was a redemption, a type (like that of the departure out of Egypt) of the great redemption of which the Apostle speaks (Gal. i. 4), when he says that Christ gave Himself for our sins, that He might deliver us from this present evil world." The admonition here is that they should come out in the most decided manner from the whole sphere of heathenish worldly life, should separate themselves in spirit from their heathen neighbors, should avoid all heathenish practices which might defile men consecrated to God, and especially should abstain from all idolatrous festivals.—**And I will receive you.**—This is an obvious reminiscence of Ezek. xx. 34; Zech. x. 8 (not a free quotation of *καὶ ὁ ἐπισυνάγων ὑμᾶς κύριος*, Isa. lii. 12), and has reference to the adoption, of which he is about to speak further in ver. 18. Bengel makes it a correlative to *ἐξέλθετε*, those who should *come out* would be *received* as if into a new family or home.—**And I will be for a Father unto you, and ye shall be sons and daughters unto me saith the Lord Almighty** (ver. 18).—This is probably a free and amplified quotation of 2 Sam. vii. 14 (hardly of Jer. xxxi. 9, and still less of Isa. xliii. 6). The words sons and daughters are a hint at the religious equality of the sexes under the reign of Christianity. Grotius thinks that these words (ver. 16–18) are taken from some hymn. The whole citation is solemnly closed with the affirmation, saith the Lord Almighty (*λέγει κύριος ὁ παντοκράτωρ*), taken from the Sept of 2 Sam. vii. 8. The expression occurs frequently in the Apocalypse, but only here in the writings of Paul; and it corresponds in the Septuagint to the Heb. יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, the Lord of Hosts.

["The concluding verses of this chapter are an instructive illustration of the way in which the New Testament writers quote the Old. 1. They often quote a translation which does not strictly adhere to the original. 2. They often quote according to the sense, and not according to the letter. 3. They often blend together different passages of Scripture, so as to give the sense, not of any one passage, but the combined sense of several. 4. They sometimes give the sense, not of any particular passage or passages, but, so to speak, the general sense of Scripture. There is no such passage in the Old Testament, for example, as that contained in this last verse, but the sentiment is often and clearly expressed. 5. They never quote as of authority any but the canonical books of the Old Testament" HODGE].

CHAP. VII. 1.—**Having therefore these promises, let us purify ourselves from every defilement of flesh and spirit.**—In this passage the Apostle, in a more conciliatory tone (and with the Corinthians associated with himself as brethren in the first person plural) connects with the promises he had quoted in chap. vi. 16–18, an earnest exhortation that they would aim at a course of conduct worthy of such exalted promises. [The inference he thus makes is applicable not merely to some part of God's people which had become involved in unhallowed associations, but to all; and hence he includes even himself in the exhortation. He introduces also a word of endearment (*ἀγαπητοί*), which perceptibly indicates that he was subsiding into his usual calmness of spirit]. The promises to which he had been speaking had been given to the whole body of the Church; and as members of that Church they already possessed them (present *ἔχοντες*) by faith, inasmuch as even those which referred to the future were really as certain as those which were already realized. The main substance of them related to a personal communion with a God of absolute purity. A full realization of them would require on man's part a complete renunciation of every thing inconsistent with the Divine nature, and an earnest pursuit after perfect holiness. *Καθαρίζειν* signifies, not, to remain free from contamination after having once been purified (Olshausen), but, as the uniform usage of the N. T. shows, to purify. [For the original idea involved in *καθαρὸς*, comp. Trench. *Synn.* p. 175]. The object of this purification, which could never be accomplished without the aid of an indwelling Divine Spirit (comp. Rom. viii. 13; comp. ver. 9; Gal. v. 16; Phil. ii. 13), was, every defilement of the outer and inner man. The former includes every kind of voluptuousness, intemperance, *etc.*, by means of which the body would be corrupted; and the latter includes thoughts, desires, affections (anger, pride, *etc.*) by means of which the human spirit (*πνεῦμα*) is defiled. In actual life these two classes of defilements are never separated, for as the mental very easily become the fleshly, the seeds of the fleshly are found originally in the mental. He uses the word *σαρκός*, and not *σώματος*, because it is only as *σάρξ* that the body is the *sedes et fomes*, the seat and the igniter of sin, and hence the flesh (*σάρξ*) is that to which every bodily defilement ethically adheres (Meyer). The spirit (*πνεῦμα*) as we have often seen in 1

Cor., denotes that spiritual nature which is kindred with God, and which in Christians is under the influence of, and is more or less directed by, the Holy Ghost. But as the action of this spirit may be much impeded or arrested by the defilements here spoken of, the work of purification was rendered continually necessary by the perpetual presence of the flesh, and any want of earnestness in the work of purification was an urgent reason for admonition (Osiander). Ancient as well as modern commentators (even Osiander) assume that the Apostle had a particular reference to crimes of which the Corinthians had been actually guilty (comp. chap. vi. 14 f.; xii. 20 f.; 1 Cor. v. 6). In this case the pollutions of the flesh would refer to unchastity, and those of the spirit to connections with idolatry. Both of these were intimately related (comp. Acts xv. 29), and in fact may be referred to idolatry, which is so often named in the Old Testament spiritual harlotry. But not only the addition of *παντός*, but the positive contrast implied, induces us to adopt the more general application; though we do not deny that the Apostle may have had some reference to the particular sins to which this interpretation alludes. The positive part of the exhortation is—**perfecting holiness in the fear of God.**—*Ἁγιωσύνη* (holiness) is here, as in Rom. i. 4; 1 Thess. iii. 13, and in the Sept. of Ps. xcvi. 6 and xcvii. 12, the same as *ἁγιασμός* (comp. on 1 Cor. 1 30); with the sense of the quality, and not merely the action, of holiness. [Webster: "*ἁγιωσύνη* differs but little from *ἁγιότης* (2 Cor. i. 12; Heb. xii. 10), except perhaps it represents more the condition than the abstract quality; while *ἁγιασμός* (1 Thess. iv. 3, 4; 1 Pet. i. 2) points primarily to the process and thence, with the gradual approach of the termination in-*μός* to that in-*σύνη* which is so characteristic of the N. T., the state, frame of mind, or holy disposition, in which the action of the verb is evinced or exemplified"]. The great moral business of the Christian (comp. Rom. vi. 22) is to complete (*ἐπιτελεῖν*, chap. viii. 6) the work of holiness or consecration to God which was begun in faith as its principle, and must be actualized, developed and perfected during the whole life. The correlative of this is the Divine perfection which is referred to in Phil. i. 6. This perfecting of holiness is the attainment of complete holiness, and is a work of the whole life which we live in the flesh (Gal. ii. 20); and can never reach an absolute completion until the close of life. It must, however, be accomplished in the fear of God. The spiritual ground of all this moral activity, this earnest pursuit of holiness on which depends all fellowship with God, is a profound veneration or reverence for that Holy One who is continually present with us, and from whom nothing is concealed. "This," as Meyer says, "is the ethical and holy sphere within which righteousness is perfected."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

The absolute purity of that God who enters into such intimate relationships with his people that he completely belongs to them, walks among them, is a Father to each one of them, and will regard them all as his sons and daughters, requires that they should be unreservedly consecrated to Him. By their very connection with Him they must continually receive a stream of influences by which the grossest or the slightest impurities whether of the flesh or Spirit must be washed away. Those who have entered into the great scheme of God's mercy, should therefore have no part with those who entirely reject or practically abjure it. They have covenanted to walk with a God who is nothing but light, and they should have no fellowship with darkness, *i. e.* with the corrupt practices of men estranged from the life of God. They belong to Christ, and they should abhor and renounce every thing which looks like partnership with the Belial who is the very ideal of all worthlessness and vileness. They in whom God condescends to dwell should have no semblance of harmony with the world's idolatry. Every attempt to unite together what is so unlike is an abomination to God and hurtful to souls. Under no circumstances can it really promote the cause of God, for it tends always to obliterate the distinction which God has taken pains to make prominent, and to make the requirement of a renovation of heart seem needless. How could those who are in the broad road be alarmed, if they were to see that believers had the same spirit with themselves. The work of God would thus be hindered by a false liberality. Let any one on the other hand consider what God is doing for the welfare of His people, and what an exalted thing it is to have fellowship with God, and he will have such a sense of God's holy presence and of the gracious privileges of adoption, that he will carefully abstain from everything inconsistent with this sacred relationship. If he should at any time contract external or internal defilement, he will strive by every means to purify himself from it, and to bring his entire heart and life into conformity with his true dignity as a follower of Christ. Never will such a one remit his efforts to attain perfect holiness until he shall become a complete man after the likeness of Him who could say, "I do always those things which please the Father" (Jno. viii. 29).

[Nothing in this section should be used, as it often is, to justify or require a separation from those portions of the visible church in which some degree of corruption is found to prevail. The Apostle had reference only to communities which were essentially unchristian, yea, as opposite to Christianity as light is to darkness, idolatry to the true religion. He would never have sanctioned any separation from the visible church (1 Cor. i. 10; iii. 3; xii. 25), but that which was *involuntary* as *e. g.* when one had no access to her pale, or when she exacted as a term of membership something in faith or practice which a Christian could not yield with a good and enlightened conscience. In this latter case, whatever guilt there is belongs to the portion of the church which made such a term of communion (3 John x.). In such a way Rome is responsible for much of the present division in the ecclesiastical world. But we find nothing in our section or in other portions of the Scriptures to justify any increase of this division by a state of voluntary isolation or withdrawal from any established

branch of the church on account of minor imperfections. "It only justifieth our withdrawing our communion from idolaters, and from notorious scandalous sinners in such duties and actions, or in such degrees, as we are under no obligation to have fellowship and communion with them in." *Poole's Annotations*].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—VER. 11. We here see the source and nature of a true and ready eloquence: a living faith and a friendly confidence in those whom we address.—Ver. 12. Comp. chap. xii. 15. Alas! we have many ministers with hearts open and enlarged enough to embrace all their hearers, but their hearers have hearts which are too generally closed and too narrow to admit them and their messages (Isa. li. 1; Ps. cix. 4).—Ver. 14. HEDINGER:—Who can love a society which costs him the love of God?—Let us have God, our God, God in us and with us, and all else may go! Little then, O world, do we care for your company or your friendship (James iv. 4)!—Ver. 15. In Christianity we have the mind and the likeness of Christ; can we think of having these along with our carnal lusts? There can be no agreement between Christ and Belial, for the great object of this unclean spirit is to ruin men, but Christ's object is to destroy the works of the devil and to raise men to heaven.—Ver. 16. God's holy and good spirit, and the spirit of uncleanness and wickedness, can never dwell at once in the same heart (Matth. vi. 24). No one can be a temple of the living God, until the living God gives him spiritual life.—Ver. 17. Sins and vices of all kinds are impurities in God's sight, and all Christians, as God's spiritual priests, should be without blemish.—Ver. 18. What can be more comforting than to have God for a Father, and to be in Christ His beloved sons and daughters? Not only will such be filled with joy and peace, but they will endeavor to walk worthy of their high vocation and to be truly devout in all their intercourse with God (Gen. xvii. 1).—Chap. vii. 1. We become pure only as we exercise true repentance and are renewed day by day; and this can be only as we allow the Holy Spirit to accomplish in our hearts without obstruction his proper work of purification (John xv. 2), and as we use every possible means for putting off old corruptions (Eph. iv. 22; Gal. v. 24), and to exercise ourselves unto godliness (1 Tim. iv. 7; Col. iii. 10–12).—From the garment of the old man, one piece after another has to be gradually taken or rather torn off (Spener). The renewed man must therefore: 1. Examine himself in every way to find what sins most easily beset him, and when they are most dangerous; 2. Guard against them as much as possible; 3. Observe carefully what states of mind usually precede his besetting sins, that he may in due time suppress the evil desire before it has acquired ascendancy; 4. Resist every evil passion and overcome it with the weapons of faith, prayer, and clear representations of his duty and of his baptismal vows; 5. Continue to smite the enemy even when he seems slain, *etc.*—The fear of God should make us diligent in the pursuit of holiness, for we should remember that only thus can we please Him whose eye is never off from us.—HEDINGER:—The Gospel should make us never inactive but always vigorous and lively to advance in godliness. The pure and thriving are the only ones who persevere. And why should any one stand still?—Are these our thanks for such precious promises?

BERLENB. BIBLE:—VER. 11. The love of God and of our neighbor, mercy, hope and joy, wonderfully enlarge our hearts; and since the Lord, who makes a man His habitation, fills immensity, and knows no limits, He must of course expand the contracted heart and give it some degree of susceptibility.—Ver. 14. Animals of a different nature were not allowed to draw in the same yoke; and Christians should abstain from all companions who will not work in Christ's yoke. No heart can be at the same time darkened, ensnared and polluted by sin, and enlightened, emancipated and purified by Christ. Darkness hates the light and flees before it.—Ver. 16. Whoever is not a temple of God must be a temple of idols and of Satan. Surely no one can be a temple of God who makes an idol of the world, and seeks his profit, honor and pleasure in the world. To be the Lord's and to be His sanctuary involves the possession of a divine life and a direct fellowship with God. God is willing to rest, rule and walk in the heart. Turn to Him with all thine heart and thou shalt know what this is by experience.—Vv. 17, 18. No self-denial can be acceptable to God, if it is merely external and not in the heart. And yet by these external acts we give practical evidence to the world that its own works are evil, and that we have no communion with the works of darkness but rather reprove them. The *separations* which have always taken place under the preaching of the Gospel have been produced, not from a factious spirit on the part of God's people, not because they despised their fellow-men, not because they fancied they were better than others, but simply because they were anxious to avoid what is wrong. God is willing to dwell in His people, and if they would dwell in Him, they must continue steadfast and touch no unclean thing. If we desire to be children of God, we must completely separate ourselves from everything opposed to Him. And yet, unless we intend that the world shall have equal power over us, we must cast ourselves wholly upon the help of the Almighty.—Chap. vii. 1. The power by which our hearts are renewed is principally derived from God's own precious promises. These are an essential part of God's covenant with us, but He demands that we also should heartily observe the conditions of the covenant (Jer. vii. 3–10). We are continually assailed by evil, and yet we are required at all times to be pure. This we ought to be and have power to be, but not by any strength of our own, but by the aid of our risen Saviour. It is important to be freed not merely from gross vices, but from those spiritual wickednesses with which the foul spirit sometimes besmears the soul (covetousness, arrogance, envy, anger, *etc.*); and the more spiritual these are the more abominable are they in God's sight. Indeed, unless the work of purification extends to the most secret thought (Heb. iv. 12), we shall cherish something which will be false,

selfish and impure in His eyes. It is the great business of the new life to be continually becoming pearls of the purest lustre. If we follow as God leads us, and as he gives us power to walk; if we submit cheerfully to His discipline, we shall doubtless reach at least the complete maturity of Christ (Eph. iv. 13).

RIEGER:—VERS. 11ff. No minister should hope to win the hearts of men by the esteem and the respect which he commands in society, if he does not also freely open his heart to them in love. —Ver. 14ff. Whatever may be the consequences to ourselves, we should never think lightly of the separation from a world lying in wickedness and the superiority to it which faith in Christ and the possession of God's Spirit gives us. Unless we receive in vain the grace of our high calling, we shall find connected with it the largest promises. Compared with these, what has the world to offer?—Chap. vii. 1. Why is it that some times it takes a long time to fix and tranquilize our hearts, or to become calm after the excitement which some arrogant treatment or some offence has awakened in our bosom? How much prayer has thus been hindered? How many hours, which might have been spent in a Divine peace, have been spoiled by the torment of our own thoughts? All this comes from that filthiness of the flesh and spirit which we still allow to remain in us. Sanctification begins by forsaking the promiscuous multitude, by drawing near to God and by giving ourselves to His service. But it must be continued and completed. The fear of God is our strong fortress and security; let us see to it that we do not presumptuously venture away from it!

HEUDNER:—VER. 11. It is not like a Christian to maintain a perpetual reserve toward those around him, for by his renewed nature he must long to open his heart to those he loves. Between friends there must necessarily be a freedom of expression, and one of the benefits of those associations into which only a few are admitted is, that the heart may be more freely exposed there.—Ver. 12. The enlarged and full heart of a Christian must not unfrequently experience much sorrow when it is misunderstood and not appreciated by those in whom it confides. —Ver. 13. The love which never gives by halves demands the whole heart in return.—Vv. 14, 15. Christianity claims that our hearts should be shared by nothing else, and that not only the desires but the whole mind and heart should be pure. It calls for the expulsion of all foreign elements from our natures, and insists upon an absolute intolerance of everything inconsistent with its principles and the word of God. Distinguish here between that disposition to live peaceably with others, which springs from benevolence, and that which accommodates itself to them, approves of their course and imitates their conduct from fear. Whoever joins with others in what is sinful, from a love of their society, accepts the yoke which they received from a love of sin. See the diametrical opposition between truth and error, goodness and wickedness. Impure and weak men would gladly unite these together, but Christianity says to them: Either receive the good as a whole, or decline it altogether: there must be no mingling of them together. Christ is determined to be our only Master; He calls for the whole heart or none of it. To receive the maxims and customs of the unbelieving world is the same thing as to pay court to Satan. The Christian is always at open war with everything not of God, and there must be no temporizing, no yielding. Keep thyself pure!—Ver. 16. When a man yields up his heart to sin, he sets up an idol there. But God can have possession only where nothing else is tolerated.—If God dwells in us, it is by the continual influence of His Spirit producing an inward life which is entirely Divine. If God walks among us there will be a common form of life in which the mind of the Spirit will be clearly expressed, and an impression will be made upon others that God is in the midst of us. Whoever enters such a community will feel the animation of a Divine breath, and will be moved to spiritual activity.—Ver. 17. Though we were born and grew up in the world, and though we have caught much of its spirit, the moment we forsake it we forsake it entirely, and henceforth feel a contempt for everything in it, in which God has no part. This is a separation of which all must approve. In such a world we may be looked upon as exiled from God, but in leaving it we find in Him our Father.—Ver. 18. The whole Christian world ought to be one holy, divine family. Oh, how far is it from being so now!—Chap. vii. i. The sanctifying power of God's promises (1 Jno. iii. 3). Great promises, great demands; great expectations, great warnings! Every sin is a vile spot upon a Christian, whose whole body and soul ought to be a pure temple of God. Sanctification begins with conversion, but it continues through the whole life. God is determined to make something of us, but not all at once. To the accomplishment of His purpose it is indispensable that we should cherish for Him a holy reverence (1 Pet. i. 17).

W. F. BESSER:—VER. 13. Christians have the warmest love and regard for us when they admonish us not to receive the grace of God in vain by a careless association with those who despise religion.—Ver. 14. The yoke in which unbelievers toil is that of carnal will, carnal reason, carnal inclinations; in a word, everything dear to the natural heart. But to the believer this is a foreign yoke (Matth. xi. 29). Righteousness is the Christian's royal badge (Matth. vi. 33), the richest of all his possessions (Matth. vi 21); but unrighteousness is the greatest reproach, the greatest injury and the greatest guilt of the ungodly man, however splendid may be his worldly virtues. To be truly righteous is to be truly saved, for life and bliss must be where forgiveness of sin is. On the other hand, to be truly unrighteous is to be really lost, for he is condemned already on whom lies the imputation of sin. Righteousness must therefore be forever separate from unrighteousness, in doctrine as well as in practice!—Ver. 15. It would keep us from intermingling our thoughts and efforts with those of unbelievers if we would think much of the mighty chasm which there is between heaven and hell. Labor not in the same yoke with men, unless you would be willing to remain with them forever. The very heart of all idola-

try is a disposition to glorify man, and the prime article of the unbeliever's creed is to make a god of the creature, and to exalt the flesh to honor. —Ver. 16. The temple of the *living* God is a Church of living saints, a spiritual house pervaded by the life of the Triune God, and composed of living stones (1 Pet. ii. 5). This inscription: "The Temple of the living God," should call us away from the disorders of an idolatry which conceals a real death under the appearance of life, and from the discord of a heathenism which is cut up into a thousand forms of worship, to a Christian unity whose best representation is that of a spiritual temple (Eph. ii. 21).—Vv. 17, 18. Christians are no longer the mere *bearers* of the Lord's vessels, as were the priests and Levites of an earlier day, but they are *themselves* the Lord's vessels; their bodies and souls belong to Him, and they are sanctified by the Holy Spirit as members of the body of Christ. Of course, then, it would be unbecoming for such vessels to remain in a world lying in wickedness. The union of pure and impure doctrine is the very worst kind of desecration. Our Father, the Lord Almighty, has assured us that we shall always possess abundant satisfaction all along the way of self-denial and suffering; but he has also wisely provided that we should be pervaded by a holy fear of offending Him (1 Pet. i. 17; comp. 1 Cor. x. 22).—Chap. vii. 1. Even though we have been partially cleansed from sin, the grace will not continue with us unless we remain united with Christ by a true faith, and separate ourselves from sin. The Christian is called continually to aim at perfect sanctification, though he daily finds that he comes short of it (Phil. iii. 12). He must, therefore, persevere in this effort until he shall reach the rest which God has prepared for them that love Him. That fear of God which urges him forward is not one which is cast out by love and has torment (1 Jno. iv. 18), but one which love itself inspires, because it dreads the torment of a defiled conscience.

[F. W. Robertson, *on the whole section*:—We have here—1. The exuberance of the Apostle's affection (ver. 11). He had received a multitude of provocations from the Corinthians, and yet *his love was deep;* our heart is enlarged. It was partly compassion for them as his children, for whom he had suffered; and it was partly from a regard to them as immortal beings, who should be, and who might become, exceedingly eminent. Then *he was eloquent*, his mouth was open to them. He might have shut his lips and in dignified pride have refused to plead his cause. But he speaks freely, not even cautiously, but like a man who has nothing to conceal or to fear. 2. The recompense he desired. This was, first, *unworldliness*, or separation from the world. Independent of the impossibility of agreeing in the deepest sympathies, and of there being no identity of tastes or antipathies, the first ground was immorality, unrighteousness, profligacy, and the second was irreligion, unbelief. This separateness, however is not merely outward, but in spirit. It was, secondly, *Personal purification* (chap vii. 1). The *ground* on which this request was made was "these promises (the indwelling of God, his free reception of us, and His Fatherhood and our sonship, chap. vi. 16, 17, 18); the *request* itself was for personal purity; and the *means* were, the "fear of God," realizing the promises and perfecting holiness.—Lectt. XLIX. and L., abridged].

XIII.—STATEMENT AS TO THE EFFECT OF HIS FIRST EPISTLE, A CORDIAL APPEAL TO THEM, AND THE COMFORTING REPORT TITUS HAD BROUGHT HIM OF THE IMPRESSION PRODUCED BY THAT EPISTLE.

Chapter VII. 2–16.

2 Receive us; we have [*om.* have, ἠδικήσαμεν] wronged no man, we have [*om.* have]
3 corrupted no man, we have [*om.* have] defrauded no man. I speak not *this* to condemn *you*,[1] for I have said before, that ye are in our hearts to die and live with *you*.
4 Great *is* my boldness of speech [*om.* of speech, παῤῥησία] toward you, great *is* my glorying of you: I am filled with [the] comfort, I am exceeding joyful [made exceed-
5 ingly to abound with the joy] in all our tribulation. For, when we were come into Macedonia, our flesh had no rest,[2] but we were troubled on every side [in every way];
6 without *were* fightings, within *were* fears. Nevertheless God, that comforteth those
7 that are cast down, comforted us by the coming of Titus; And not by his coming only, but by the consolation [comfort] wherewith he was comforted in you, when he told us your earnest desire, your mourning, your fervent mind [zeal, ζῆλον] toward me; so that
8 I rejoiced the more. For though I made you sorry with a [the] letter, I do not repent though[3] I did repent: for[4] I perceive that the same epistle hath made you

9 sorry, though *it were* but for a season. Now [I do not regret it: although I did regret it (for I perceive that that epistle made you sorry though but for a season), yet now] I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance: for ye were made sorry after a godly manner, that ye might receive damage by us in nothing.
10 For godly sorrow worketh[5] repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the
11 sorrow of the world worketh death. For behold this selfsame thing, that ye[6] sorrowed after a godly sort, *what* carefulness [diligence, *σπουδή*] it wrought in you, yea, *what* clearing of yourselves, yea, *what* indignation, yea, *what* fear, yea, *what* vehement desire, [longing, *ἐπιπόθησιν*] yea, *what* zeal, yea, *what* revenge [infliction of punishment]! In all *things* ye have approved yourselves to be clear in[7] this matter.
12 Wherefore, though I wrote unto you, *I did it* not for his cause that had done the wrong, nor for his cause that suffered wrong, but that our care for you [your earnest
13 care for us][8] in the sight of God might appear unto [with, *πρὸς*] you. Therefore we were comforted in your comfort;[9] yea, and exceedingly the more joyed we [comforted. But in our comfort, we joyed the more exceedingly] for the joy of Titus, because his
14 spirit was [has been] refreshed by you all. For if I have boasted any thing to him of you, I am not ashamed; [was not made ashamed, *οὐ κατῃσχύνθην*] but as we spake all things to you in truth, even so our[10] boasting which *I made* [*om.* which *I made*] before Titus, is [was, *ἐγενήθη*] found a truth. And his inward affection is more abundant toward you, whilst he remembereth the obedience of you all, how with fear and trem-
16 bling ye received him. I rejoice therefore [*om.* therefore][11] that I have confidence in you in all *things*.

[1] Ver. 3.—Lachm. instead of *οὐ πρὸς κατάκ. λέγω* has *πρός κατάκρισιν οὐ λέγω* with B. C.; but against much stronger evidence. [Sinait. has since added its testimony to that of B. C., but even such authority is doubtful against all the versions and nearly all the Greek and Latin Fathers.]

[2] Ver. 5.—Lachm. has *ἄνεσιν ἔσχεν* instead of *ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν*, with pretty strong but not decisive authorities. [The Rec. has *ἔσχηκεν* with C. D. L. and Sin. with Chrys., Theodt. and Damasc. The perfect (hath had) is much more likely to be genuine, as expressive of a continued and not a momentary feeling. The position of *ἄνεσιν* before *ἔσχ.* is sustained principally by C. F. G. the Ital. and Vulg. Theodt. and the Latin Fathers.]

[3] Ver. 8.—Lachm. has *εἰ καί* instead of the second *εἰ καί*, with only B. The *δέ* was interpolated in order to make the contrast with the preceding sentence more prominent.

[4] Ver. 8.—A number of MSS. leave out *γάρ*, though in opposition to superior authorities. The Vulgate has *βλέπων* [*videns quod*]. This last was a correction to show that the inference or conclusion commenced with *νῦν χαίρω*; and *γάρ* was left out to show that the inference commenced with *βλέπω*. [The Rec. will thus best explain all the variations; all agree that a new subject is introduced with *εἰ καὶ μετεμελόμην*; then *δέ* was introduced for the sake of contrast and connection; then *γάρ* was left out by some because the apodosis was supposed to commence with *βλέπω*; and by others *βλέπων* was substituted for *βλέπω γάρ*, because they thought the apodosis should commence with *νῦν χαίρω*. Tischendorf (agreeing in sense with the Vulgate and Luther) punctuates as Dr. Kling does in his version, with a colon after *μεταμέλομαι*, and a comma after *ὑμᾶς*. The punctuation in our Eng. Vers. makes the sense very tame.]

[5] Ver. 10.—For *ἐργάζεται* Rec. has *κατεργάζ.* in opposition to the best authorities. It was so made that the word might conform to its form in ver. 11. [*Κατεργάζ.* does not seem demanded here, as it does at the close of ver. 10, even if the simple verb had been used in the first half of that verse].

[6] Ver. 11.—Rec. has *ὑμᾶς* although opposed by the best MSS. It was evidently inserted to complete what was understood. [Inserted by D. K. L. and the Greek Fathers, but omitted by B. C. F. Sin. and the Lat. Fathers].

[7] Ver. 11.—Rec. has *ἐν* before *τῷ πράγματι*, but it is thrown out by some of the best MSS. It was probably an explanatory addition. [It does not appear in B. Ch D. (1st Cor.) F. G. Sin. the Vulg. and Goth. verss., and some of the Fathers]. In like manner, in the first part of the verse, *ἐν* is sometimes put before *ὑμῖν*, and Lachmann has received it though in brackets. [It is omitted by B. D K. L. Sin., with the Copt. and Goth. verss., and Clem., Damasc. and Oecum.]

[8] Ver. 12.—Some MSS. have *ὑμῶν τ. ὑπ. ὑμῶν*, some *ἡμῶν—ἡμῶν*, and some *ἡμῶν—ὑμῶν*. The decided preponderance of testimony, however, is in favor of *ὑμῶν—ἡμῶν*, which also is to be preferred as the more difficult reading. [Alterations from the original may have taken place either designedly to remove a difficulty, or undesignedly from the resemblance in appearance and sound. Our author's rendering is adopted by Griesbach, Lach., Tisch. and Alford, and they are sustained by B. C. D. (2d and 3d Cor.) K. L. and many cursives with the Syr., Arm., Copt., Ethiop., Damasc. and Oecum. The Sinait. has in the orig. cod. *ὑμῶν—ὑμῶν*. B. and Sin. (3d Cor.) also insert *ἀλλ'* before *οὐδέ*.]

[9] Ver. 13.—Rec. has *παρακεκλήμεθα ἐπί τῇ παρ. ὑ. περισσοτέρως δέ* in opposition to the best MSS. The same may be said of *ὑμῶν* which it has instead of *ἡμῶν*. The latter was a change on account of the *ἐπί* occurring twice in different senses. [Alford: "The *δέ* was placed after *περισ.* apparently to conform to the *ἐχαρήμεν ἐπί* below, by joining *παρακεκλ. ἐπί*: then also the change of *ἡμ.* into *ὑμ.* became necessary." The reading adopted by Lach., Tisch. and Alford is *παρακεκλήμεθα. Ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ παρακλ. ἡμ. περισ. μᾶλλον*, after B. C. D. F. K. L. Sin. with the Lat. Syr. and Copt. versions.]

[10] Ver. 14.—Lachm. has *ὑμῶν* instead of *ἡμῶν* after *καύχησις*, but it is feebly sustained. The same is true of the omission of *ἡ* before *ἐπὶ Τίτου*, [although it has for itself the important testimony of B. and Sin.]

[11] Ver. 16.—We have sufficient authority for throwing out the *οὖν* which the Rec. inserts after *χαίρω*. [It is absent from every uncial of much authority, and from most of the cursives, and it is an evident correction to assist the connection].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 2-4.—Receive us.—[In this passage we have Paul's feelings toward his fellow-Christians presented with more liveliness than in almost any other passage. His restless anxiety to possess their love, his solicitude at having grieved them, and his delight on being reassured of their affection, show the warm friendliness of his nature. The same cause makes this one of the most rhetorical of all his writings; as may be seen in his repeated anaphora (vers. 2, 4, 11, 12), the extreme delicacy of many of his allusions, the overflowing and struggling energy of his expressions (vers. 4, 7, 13, 15), his periphrastic designation of God (ver. 6), and the freedom (*παῤῥησία*) with which he runs from one suggestion to another. See Stanley's note on Paul's delight in human intercourse, and freedom from the

ascetic spirit, p. 461]. The demand, *Receive us*, is probably a resumption of the idea thrown out in the similar demand, *be ye also enlarged*, in chap. vi. 13, and in it the Apostle intended to call on the Corinthians for their affectionate confidence. The original word (*χωρήσατε*) signifies, give us room in your hearts; like *χωρεῖν τι* in John ii. 6, and *χωρεῖν*, so far as it referred to personal objects in Mark ii. 2. Others would render it: understand us rightly: [Tyndale and Cranmer: "Understand us"]; comp. *χωρεῖν*, Matth. xix. 11, 12. This certainly could refer to nothing in the preceding admonitions, for these had contained nothing likely to be misunderstood; but sufficient attention has not been given to the possible relation of this passage to the severity shown in 1 Cor. v. Nothing but love and confidence would be needful to insure their acceptance of what he then said and did.—**We wronged no one, we corrupted no one, we defrauded no one** (ver. 2 *b*).—In these brief sentences he presents in an animated style, without a *γάρ*, the reason for this demand. That he had an exclusive reference to the incestuous person, is as improbable as it is that he had no such reference whatever (comp. vers. 8 ff.). Even if such a denial of doing injustice, or of having corrupted any one, could be made to fit such a reference (the former by signifying to inflict injustice through extreme severity (1 Cor. v. 5), and the latter by signifying to ruin one, through the deliverance of him over to Satan), certainly the idea of fraud contained in *ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν* could not be understood (as Rückert suggests) to refer to an improper assumption of spiritual powers, and therefore would not admit of such an interpretation. It is, however, very likely that in the first denial (*ἠδικήσαμεν*) he had his eye principally upon that case, and that he intended to repel the imputation of his having violated any one's rights by a needless severity of discipline; that in the second (*ἐφθείραμεν*) he had some reference to the charges made by the Judaizing teachers, of his having seduced the people by false doctrines, and especially by his doctrine of Christian liberty (comp. *ὡς πλάνοι*, chap. vi. 8; also ii. 17; iv. 2 *et al.*); and finally that when he said he took advantage (*πλεονεκτεῖν*) of no one, he was repelling the insinuation noticed afterwards in chap. xi. 14, 16ff., with respect to his management of the collections and other matters (comp. Meyer and Osiander).—**I say not this to condemn you** (ver. 3 *a*).—He here turns aside for a moment to notice a possible misapprehension of what he had just said, as if he had denied that they had any affection for him, and so had utterly condemned and cast them off for their ingratitude, their suspicions and their outrageous offences against him. It would not have been very difficult to give an offensive turn to his emphatic demand that they would receive him into their hearts. And yet it would by no means come up to the Apostle's aim if the only condemnation which he wished to deny was supposed to be involved in his denial of such a defrauding as would be implied in accusing them of covetousness because they had contributed nothing to his support. After *κατάκρισιν* we must understand *ὑμῶν* (not *ἐκείνου*, as Rückert suggests with reference to the incestuous person).—**For I have said before that ye are in our hearts to die and live with you** (ver. 3 *b*).—The Apostle here proceeds to show that he could not have intended to condemn them, inasmuch as such a design would have been inconsistent with what he had said. The place in which he had said what he here speaks of must have been in the present Epistle (comp. Eph. iii. 3), and especially in chap. vi. 11f. The substance of this he now repeats, when he says that they were in his heart (*ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν ἐστε*); comp. Phil. i. 7. [He uses the perfect instead of the aorist, because what he had said was still said and remained true up to the time of speaking]. The sincerity of the affection and fellowship here professed he further shows by adding: *to die and to live with us* *εἰς τὸ συναποθανεῖν καὶ συζῆν*). The subject of this infinitive sentence must be supplied. It must be either *με*, in which case, he intended to say: so that I would desire to die and live with you (though we could not then understand why *συναπ.* is placed before *συζῆν*); or *ὑμᾶς*, in which case he intended to say: in order that ye may die and live with us. The *ἐστέ* of the previous sentence is in favor of the latter, but we must remember that he is not here speaking of their sympathy with him in his extreme perils, his deliverances and his welfare. The main proposition had reference to the love which he had toward them, not to that which they had toward him. The expression refers either to the inseparable fellowship which he felt with respect to them (subjectively) in his own heart, in consequence of which they would never be absent from his heart, whatever might be his lot, whether to live or to die (just as we bear within our hearts those whom we love in life or in death) (Meyer), or (objectively), to such an intimate connection with him, that their life and death would be necessarily involved in his, *i. e.*, that they would share in his death and his life, and in all his sufferings for Christ and his deliverances from them (possibly also in his eternal blessedness). Comp. i. 7. With this latter interpretation, the idea would be that the love which made him bear them on his heart would make every thing common between him and them, and hence that they would be brought into complete fellowship with him in life or in death. [Meyer: How natural it was for Paul, in continual danger of dying, to put the *συναπ.* emphatically before the *συζῆν*. There is therefore no necessity of supposing that *συζῆν* must refer to the future life because it comes after *συναπ.* Paul may or may not have known of the "sacred band" who had agreed to live and die with each other, or of Roman proverbs of a like nature with what he here says; but he was doubtless uttering simply the extreme devotion of every good shepherd to the welfare of his flock (John x. 11). Grotius: "*egregius χαρακτὴρ boni pastoris*]. The *εἰς* would imply that such would be the object he would have in view, and not merely that such would be the result. This explanation probably deserves the preference, not only to the former, but also to another, which makes *συν* imply a reciprocity of fellowship, and thus combines the subjective and the objective interpretation together.—**Great is my boldness toward you, great is my glorying of you** (ver. 4). In this verse the

Apostle goes on to show that his disposition and conduct toward them were such that there ought to be no such misconstruction of his language. Παῤῥησία here signifies not liberty or plainness of speech (Luther [the English version] *et al.*), but inward confidence [Vulgate: *mihi, fiducia est apud vos*] (Eph. iii. 12; 1 John ii. 28; iii. 21; iv. 17; v. 14; comp. Bleek on Heb. iii. 6). The outward expression of this inward disposition was the καύχησις. NEANDER: "When Paul was with others he boasted much of the ample and thorough results which the grace of God had produced among them." To regard (with Osiander) this boasting as something entirely within the Apostle's own heart is not indispensable to the symmetry of the discourse, nor accordant with the Apostle's usual style. It was more probably the exulting way in which the confident spirit of Paul usually expressed itself when his heart was elevated. The object of this boasting was the Corinthians themselves (comp. ver. 14; ix. 2), the results of his labors among them, and their subsequent spiritual progress. We may remark here a climax with reference to the preceding clause. So with respect to the following sentences—**I am filled with comfort, I am exceeding joyful in all our tribulations** (ver. 4 *b*).—we have παράκλησις—χαρά, πεπλήρωμαι—ὑπερπερισσεύομαι. [HODGE: "So far from having any disposition to upbraid or to recriminate, his heart was overflowing with different feelings. He had not only confidence in them, he was proud of them; he was not only comforted, he was filled with exceeding joy." Instead of the third member of the anaphora, the Apostle has, by way of a stronger and climactic expression, πεπλήρωμαι]. Πεπλήρωμαι here, as also in Rom. i. 29, and sometimes in the classic writers, is used with the dative. Ὑπερπερισσεύομαι signifies: I am made rich, overflowing with, *etc.* Περισσεύειν is used transitively also in chap. iv. 15; ix. 8, and passively in Matth. xiii. 12. The article implies that the Corinthians were the source of both emotions (as in ver. 7): the special consolation which is from you and the joy which is in you (Osiander); or it indicates the particular consolation and joy which he needed (Meyer). The ἐπί here signifies, not as in chap. i. 4, *concerning* (so as to express the relation or object of χαρά), but *in, in the midst* (simultaneously), and it expresses the relation of both the preceding clauses. The frequent change of the singular to the plural, and of the plural to the singular in this section, shows that the Apostle's own feelings were predominant in all that he was saying of himself in common with his fellow-laborers. [In this verse the change was to indicate that he bore the *suffering* in common with them, but that the *joy* was wholly a matter of his own experience. Alford also notices that "the present tense indicates the abiding of the effect"].

VERS. 5-7. **For even as we went into Macedonia, our flesh had no rest, but we were troubled in every way.** (ver. 5).—The Apostle now enters into some details; and, in the first place, with respect to the tribulation. Καί has reference to what he had said in chap. ii. 12f. He had there informed them that on his arrival at Troas he could not rest, but that he had gone immediately to Macedonia. He now adds that even when he came to Macedonia he was unable to find rest. Ἔσχηκεν is here the same as in chap. ii. 12, and its accordance with the verb in that passage suggests the suspicion that ἔσχει may have been the original reading. The reason that our flesh (ἡ σάρξ ἡμῶν) is substituted for my spirit (τῷ πνεύματί μου) as in chap. ii. 12, may be found in the difference of circumstances on the two occasions. At Troas the unrest had its source and seat within, and consisted of anxious thoughts, *etc.*; but in Macedonia it was one which affected the flesh. And yet we must not suppose it exactly confined to the body (as Rückert supposes, *e. g.*, a sickness), nor that it means his whole person, and so the same as *we;* but it means the whole natural life in its infirmities, its susceptibilities and its sensibility to suffering; in a word, the whole sensuous nature, internal and external (comp. Matth. xxvi. 41), every thing which can be influenced not only by the conflicts of the world around him, but by those cares and temptations of the inward spirit of which he was about to speak. In positive contrast with this he now says we were troubled in every way (ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι). He uses the participle, as if he had written οὐκ ἡμεῦα ἀνεσιν ἐχοντες τῇ σαρκί (comp. Meyer). What he means by ἐν παντί (in every condition, in all possible circumstances) is more fully developed when he says,—**without were fightings, and within were fears.** (ἔξωθεν μάχαι, ἔσωθεν φόβοι). The latter phrase is more forcible without ἦσαν). Ἔξωθεν and ἔσωθεν have reference not to those who were Christians (weak brethren and erroneous teachers), and those who were not; but in the one case to those opponents with whom he came in conflict, whether in the Church or out of it, and in the other to various difficulties within the Christian community, some of which, especially those which pertained to the Corinthian Church, occasionally became quite formidable. [It seems more natural to understand these particles with reference to the Apostle himself, since he was narrating his personal restlessness and troubles]. —**Nevertheless He who comforteth the downcast, comforted us. even God** *comforted* **us, by the coming of Titus**—(ver. 6). Having considered the trouble to which he had been subjected, he now turns to notice the Divine consolation he had received under it. This had been sufficient to allay the storm in his soul. He mentions God in this connection [not at first under any of the ordinary names of the Deity, for at the moment he was so full of this peculiar aspect of God, that he deems it sufficient to designate him] as the One whose peculiar office it is to comfort them who are cast down (ὁ παρακαλῶν τοὺς ταπεινούς, comp. chap. i. 3). [The present indicates that this is what is always taking place. In classical and Hellenistic usage ταπεινοί means not only those who are humble, but those who are humbled, stricken down; and it refers not merely to the outer condition, but to the feelings of the heart, the disposition, and probably to both united (cast down). In the present case it should probably be taken in the most extensive sense. In the conclusion of this part of the sentence God must be regarded as especially emphatic. Ἐν signifies, as usual, *in,* the sphere in which the

comfort took place, but it also means *in consequence of*. The arrival of Titus was the reason for his consolation. With great delicacy he speaks of himself as bowed down on account of the misconstruction of his brethren, and as if nothing could relieve his mind but the personal return of his beloved associate. He intimates also that one essential element in the comfort he experienced, sprung from the delightful frame of mind which Titus exhibited on their account. **—And not by His coming only, but also by the comfort wherewith He was comforted concerning you** (ver. 7 *a*).—Ἐπί has here, as in 1 Thess. iii. 7, the sense of: *on account of, in relation to*. We conclude, therefore, that Titus also had been much disturbed and anxious on account of the state of things at Corinth, and that he had been reassured by what he had seen during his visit there. The close connection between the participial sentence and παρεκλήθη, suggests that the Apostle was here speaking of the tranquilizing effect which the visit at Corinth had had upon Titus' own mind. This was so perceptible, that during the recital of what Titus had witnessed, the load of care was removed also from the heart of the Apostle himself. Of course this implies that Titus had previously had all his anxieties allayed by what he had seen of the disposition of the Corinthian Church. (Osiander thinks that the Apostle in the tumult of his joy had completely amalgamated into a single thought the consolation of Titus, his own perception of that consolation, and the account of the whole which he was then writing). [It is implied that Titus was comforted *while* he was reciting the story in the ears of Paul himself, for the participle ἀναγγ. is given to explain *how* Titus was comforted. The Apostle was comforted while hearing, and Titus while telling such news]. The comforting things which Titus announced respecting the Corinthians, are given in the succeeding sentence,— **when he told us your longing, your mourning, your zeal respecting me, so that I rejoiced the more.** (ver. 7 *b*).—This implies: 1, their longing to see the Apostle once more, increased, as it doubtless was, by his delay in coming to them; 2, their ὀδυρμός, *i. e.*, the extreme sorrow which they had expressed in bitter lamentations, when they became aware of the anxiety their sad state had caused him, and when they had received the severe reproof contained in his first Epistle; 3, their zeal in behalf of the Apostle, the interest awakened in the Church (as a whole, though not without some important exceptions), in behalf of his person and his authority (others say: affectionate zeal to repair the injury they had done him, to allay all his apprehensions, and to give him joy by their amendment). The phrase ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ (your zeal for, or in behalf of me), is so essentially and immediately connected with ζῆλον, that it seemed needless to repeat the article in order to define it more perfectly. The power of the impression made upon him by the account is shown in the sentence: ὥστε με μᾶλλον χαρῆναι. If we regard μᾶλλον here as equivalent to: *potius*, we must place the emphasis upon χαρῆναι, and the sense then would be: 'so that instead of being troubled, I rather rejoiced.' But from the order of the words we are induced to place the emphasis rather upon μᾶλλον, or at least upon παρεκάλεσεν, which, indeed, contains essentially the idea of joy, and may be regarded as the climax of this joy [so that the sense would be, so that I rejoiced or was comforted more than before]. Others suggest in addition that the increased joy was in consequence of the arrival of Titus [*i. e.*, my usual joy was much increased]. Such a meaning would be much the same in its essential result. [In the old Oxford Paraphrase, the expression here is: so that I rejoiced now the more exceedingly from the occasion of my former grief. Chrysostom: "On these (before mentioned) he abounds in joy, and was filled with consolation, because he had made them feel. These things seem to me to be said, not only to soften what has gone before, but to encourage those who had acted well. For although we doubt not that some among the Corinthians were obnoxious to his former accusations, and unworthy of these praises, he did not wish to distinguish them, but makes both the praises and the accusations common, leaving it to the consciences of his hearers, to select what respectively belonged to them."]

Vers. 8–11. **Because even though I made you sorry in the Epistle, I do not regret it: although I did regret it (for I perceive that that Epistle made you sorry, though but for a season), yet now I rejoice.**—[The word ὅτι compels us to treat this sentence as a reason for the rejoicing of which he had just spoken. The phrase εἰ καὶ occurs three times in this single verse, and in each instance admits a fact without encouraging a doubt respecting it: 'I admit I made you sorry, that I regretted it, and that the sorrow was but for a season.' And yet it is implied that notwithstanding those facts, there were qualifying circumstances: 'Even though such things were true, he did not then regret the sorrow, *etc.*'] The painful impression his former Epistle had produced, did not prevent his present rejoicing. He refers, when he speaks of making them sorrowful, to the effect of the severe reproofs he had administered in his first Epistle, especially in the fifth chapter. [And yet many cannot discover anything in the first Epistle answering to such representations. The severity there refers mainly to a private wrong of an individual. They think, therefore, that an Epistle which had been so severe that the Apostle shrinks from reminding the Corinthians that it was his own (τῇ ἐπιστολῇ), must have been a brief and lost one which was confined to public censures, see Introd., § 6.]. There is some dispute regarding the way in which the following sentences should be taken. If we adopt the reading, εἰ καὶ μετεμελόμην (without the δέ, which is contained only in Cod. B.), two different constructions are possible. In the first place, we may connect this expression with what precedes, as if he had intended to say: 'I do not regret it, though I did regret it;' in which case βλέπω γὰρ, ὅτι ἐλύπησα ὑμᾶς is simply a practical confirmation of the preceding ἐλύπησα: 'I see, from what Titus has told me, that the Epistle made you sorrowful, though only for a season; or we may regard it as giving the reason for his regretting that he had written (μετεμελόμην).

When he says: *although for a brief season*, he informs them of a circumstance which had diminished his regrets, and he probably implies also that his own regret had been only a transient feeling (and yet it is in the imperfect). Meyer, however, correctly remarks that *βλέπω γάρ, etc.*, could not be construed as the reason for any but the *οὐ μετεμελόμην* of the preceding clause (with which, however, on this construction it could have no suitable meaning [for why should he give what he *now* sees as a reason for his *former* regrets]) ? In the second place, we may commence a new sentence with *εἰ καὶ μετεμελόμην*, as we may also, and even must do, if we accept of the reading *εἰ δὲ καὶ*. Those also who leave out *γάρ* after *βλέπω*, find in the clause beginning with *βλεπω* the apodosis of the whole sentence beginning with *εἰ καὶ μεταμ.: q. d.* "though I did regret it, I now perceive that the Epistle made you sorry only for a season." Even this construction gives no better specimen of reasoning than the other. It remains that we should make the clause commencing with *νῦν χαίρω* (ver. 9) the apodosis of the whole sentence in which *εἰ καὶ μεταμ., etc.*, is the protasis. [The Vulgate renders it: *Quoniam etsi contristavi vos in epistola, non me pœnitet: et si pœniteret, videns quod epistola illa, etsi ad horam, vos contristavit, Nunc gaudeo, etc.* This is translated by the Rhemish, "For, although I made you sorry in an Epistle, it repenteth me not: albeit it repented me, seeing that the same Epistle (although but for a time) did make you sorry. Now I am glad," *etc.*] If we adopt the reading which the Vulgate must have used [*i. e., βλέπω γὰρ,*] the participial sentence will very conveniently connect with, and form a part of, the protasis, to which the apodosis is, '*now I rejoice.*' The reading *βλέπω γὰρ* is, however, so well established that we are compelled to receive it into our text. We may then regard the sentence commencing with these words as a logical parenthesis, thus: "Though I did at one time regret it—(and not without reason) for I perceive (from the account of you by Titus) that that Epistle made you sorry—now I rejoice" (Meyer.) The regret of which he spoke had been experienced some time before that in which his feelings changed and he became joyful. On this construction, we are struck with the difficulty, that the Apostle used the present *βλέπω*, rather than the past *ἔβλεπον* to correspond with *μεταμελόμην*; but the reason probably is that what the Apostle perceived on a former occasion continued still before his mind, and the peculiar nature of the parenthesis had introduced some confusion into the strict logical connection. The actual course of thought was probably something like the following: From the first account brought by Titus he had perceived that the Corinthians were much troubled by the contents of this first Epistle, and for a while he had been sorry that he had reproved them so severely. But when Titus had brought further information [on a second return from Corinth] he perceived not only that the disturbance had been essentially only temporary (*πρὸς ὥραν*, Gal. ii. 5, for a season), but that it soon gave way to a feeling of joy, and was productive of many important benefits. Their sorrow was therefore so far from being a source of regret to him, that he never recollected the effects which that Epistle had produced without joyful emotions. [The word *βλέπω* is more expressive than *ὁρῶ*. It refers to the mental contemplation which his paternal spirit had of them while he was absent from the scene. The abrupt and disconnected form which the Apostle's language here assumes gives us a vivid picture of the inner workings of his heart. Wordsworth remarks: "that the language is beyond the rigid rules of ordinary grammar, and belongs to a higher science, the grammar of nature and even of inspiration; and impart an indescribable grace of tenderness and truth to these impassioned outpourings of his full heart. If they so touch the soul when read now, what must have been their effect when they sounded forth in all their original freshness, with the living voice, in the public recitations of these Epistles in the churches of Corinth and Achaia." It is not implied that the Apostle's regret involved any moral self-reproach. Dr. Campbell says it denotes simply "that uneasiness which a good man feels, not from the consciousness of having done wrong, but from a tenderness for others, and a fear lest that which, prompted by duty he had said, should have too strong an effect upon them."] Accordingly the hesitation which some writers have felt in admitting that an inspired writer would be the subject of such regrets, springs from a mistake with regard to the human element in inspiration, *i. e.*, the variable disposition of the inspired person. As the nobler human feelings are still supposed to be in exercise, notwithstanding the essential divinity of the power which moves them, there is no call for those arbitrary attempts, which some have made to interpret our passage (com. Meyer and Osiander). From what we have already said, it is evident that *νῦν* in ver. 9, should be taken in a temporal and not in a logical sense. **Not because ye were made sorry, but because ye were made sorry unto repentance.** (ver. 9 *b*). In *οὐχ ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε*: (not because ye were, *etc.*) his design was to prevent the misconstruction which might be put upon what he had said, as if it were a pleasure to him to remember that he had given them pain, (cold severity, com. Lam. iii, 33). The matter which gave occasion to his joy was that they had been troubled in such a way as to produce a change of their feelings, especially with respect to the sad case mentioned in the former Epistle (1st Cor. v.). The result of such a change was that they had made a great advance in Christian morality and seriousness, and that they had been deeply humbled. He proceeds to speak still further on this point when he adds: **For ye were made sorry according to God, that ye might receive damage from us in no respect** (ver. 9*c*). In accordance with Paul's usage *κατὰ θεόν* must be designed to direct our minds to the efficient author of the sorrow. (*Deo efficiente.*) It means: according to God, *i. e.*, according to the mind or will of God. Thus in Rom. viii. 27. BENGEL says: "The sorrow of penitents renders their minds conformable to God," and "*κατά* signifies the feeling of the mind which has regard to and follows after God." Such a one "is grieved because he has done what God abhors." (AMBROSIUS). *Ἵνα* is here expressive of the

divine intention, with respect to their sorrow according to God; and it implies, even if it had not been implied in *κατὰ θεόν*, that God had had a hand in producing their sorrow. The object God had in view was, that they might in no way suffer injury from their teachers, not even by their sorrow. NEANDER: "It is agreeable to the theological view every where predominant in Paul's writings to say that what he had written with an upright intention should not result in injury to them." OSIANDER: *ἐν μηδενί* has the sense of, *in no part, i. e.*, neither in your joyful confidence nor in the purity of the Church." But is such a meaning quite appropriate or consistent with the context? *Ζημιοῦσθαι* occurs in 1 Cor. iii. 15, in the sense of, *he shall suffer loss*. The preposition *ἐκ* shows the source of the injury which is denied (Chap. ii. 2). He does not mean that they would thus be saved from punishment. He merely implies that they might have been injured if they had experienced no change of mind, especially if their feelings had become alienated from him and embittered toward him. On the contrary he rejoiced to find that the result had been salutary.—This idea is further carried out in ver. 10, where a reason is assigned for what had been said in the preceding final sentence: "Ye have been troubled by God that ye might receive injury from us in nothing.—**For the sorrow which is according to God worketh out repentance unto salvation not to be repented of,** (ver. 10 *a*),—*i. e.*, a change of heart which leads to salvation." The apostle here refers back to *εἰς μετάνοια*, (unto repentance) in ver. 9, and he describes this as the effect of a right kind of sorrow. When a man is conformed to the mind of God, or is troubled by a regard to God on account of his sins, he will turn from those sins with all his heart; and he will become totally opposed to all that once was pleasant or seemed indifferent to him (*μετάνοια*). But this change of heart which was the result of the sorrow spoken of, and which in the actual experience of believers always included faith, was especially the fruit of the sorrow according to God and conducted to salvation.* If we connect *ἀμεταμέλητον* with *σωτηρίαν*, the idea will be that when a man is delivered from his sinful corruption he thereby attains everlasting life and must of course be forever satisfied. It would be absurd to suppose that such a one would ever regret his course or have the slightest wish that he had never come into this state or into the way which leads to it. It must be conceded therefore that this epithet is quite suitable to *σωτηρίαν*, and the order of the words favors such an application. But Luther and others connect it with *μετάνοιαν*, and *pœnitentiam non pœnitendam* is an expression which makes good sense. [Calvin also with fine critical discernment remarks: The play here upon the word *penitence*, when he says *not to be repented of*, is elegant, for however unpleasant at first taste a thing may be, it renders itself desirable by its usefulness. For though the epithet (*ἀμεταμέλ.*) may refer as much to the salvation as to the penitence, it appears to me to agree better with the latter word: *q. d.*: We are taught by the very event that no sorrow ought to be grievous or troublesome to us; so that though repentance have something bitter in it of itself, it is described as not to be repented of because of the sweet and precious fruit which it produces." The Vulgate renders the phrase thus: *pœnitentiam in salutem stabilem operatur*, which the Rhemish translates: worketh penance unto salvation that is stable. This use of *ἀμεταμέλητος* in the sense of *unchangeable* is perhaps sanctioned by its use in Rom. xi. 29. It is commonly supposed that our English Version favors the reference of the word to repentance. This however does not seem quite clear.] It is true we should more naturally have expected that *ἀμεταν όητον* would have been used in application to *μετάνοιαν*, but *ἀμεταμέλητος* brings out better that part of the sorrow which is painful, and no one can justly say that it creates any halting or feebleness in the course of thought. We may therefore, with Osiander give the preference to such a connection. There is an evident reference to the *οὐ μεταμέλομαι* in ver. 8. As this epistle had drawn forth their sorrow and this had produced a change of heart which could never be regretted, it had

[*In this passage (vss. 8–10), the words *μετανοέω* and *μεταμέλομαι* are translated indiscriminately by the English word: *repent*. The latitude with which this English word is popularly used may perhaps warrant this, and yet such a fact only shows how inadequate the word is to express the particular meaning of at least one of these Greek verbs. The more precise meaning which Theology has assigned to the term Repentance, is certainly not quite suitable to either of them. Divines have attempted to show that the original words were uniformly distinguishable in sense, and yet passages from the Bible have been quoted to show that each of them has sometimes borne every meaning which has been given to the other. It must however be conceded that the *predominant usage* of each word arose naturally out of its original meaning, and differs very essentially from that of the other. Bengel, (on 2 Cor. vii. 10), Bishop J. Taylor, (on Repent. Chap. ii. § 1), Campbell, (Diss. VI. part III. § 9), Archbp. Trench, (*Synn.* Ser. 2 p. 90 ff), and Webster, (*Synn.* p. 221 f.), have described this meaning and difference with the greatest care. Both words have reference to a knowledge or feeling *after* (*μετά*) the event. *Μεταμέλομαι* is from the simple *μέλω*: to be an object of care; *μετανοέω* from the simple *νοέω* to see, to think. There was from the first a gradual change in the meaning of both words; the latter signifying first, after knowledge, then a change of views, then regret, and finally a complete change of the whole mind. Often it was used irrespective of all moral feeling, but when it came into New Testament language, it gradually came to mean a change to a *better* mind. The noun (*μετάνοια*) occurs there some five and twenty, and the verb (*μετανοεῖν*) some five and thirty times. The noun (*μεταμέλεια*) does not occur in the N. T., the verb, (*μεταμέλομαι*) only five times; once for the beginning of a true repentance (Matt. xxi. 29), once of the Jews who "did not repent" (Matt. xxi. 32) once of Judas (Matt. xxvii. 3), twice (once also as a verbal adjective) in our passage, and once of God (Heb. vii. 21). *Μετάνοια* then evidently signifies what Coleridge expressively calls, "transmentation" in a good sense, *i. e.*, to come to a right understanding, *conversion* so far as it relates to the mind: whereas, *μεταμέλεια* is simply: *after care*, in a good or indifferent sense, sorrowful retrospections, and leading to a good or bad result. OSIANDER: "*μετάμελ.* has reference simply to a change of *care* or effort, *μετάν.* to a change of the whole mind and course of thought; that concerns an individual thing, this everything; that refers principally to the feelings and is therefore usually translated sorrow, while this is the *fruit* of a true sorrow, and hence (as what is perfect embraces the whole) is also frequently used to designate the whole process of repentance. The moral nature and worth of repentance is represented in *μετάν.* inasmuch as it includes a change of the entire mind, and hence Valla with many others much prefer the Greek to the Latin word *pœnitentia*, (and the Germ. Büsse). In the N. T., *μετάν.* is sometimes and *μετάμελ.* is never, employed to designate this entire change." Paul's *λύπη* when it was *κατὰ θεὸν* worked out a *μετάνοια* which was *ἀμεταμέλητον*, *i. e.* the sorrow which was according to God would work out in the soul a mental revolution, which could never give rise to unhappy regrets; on the other hand, the *λύπη* which was *τοῦ κόσμου* would at some period of existence work out a *μεταμέλεια*, a painful regret which will continue to eternity, and be in itself a *θάνατον μεταμέλητον*.]

been followed by such fruits and had led to salvation (*σωτηρία*), he could of course have no regrets on account of the effect of his epistle, and he could only rejoice in the recollection of it.—**But the sorrow of the world worketh death.** (ver. 10 *b*).—He here brings up as an illustration of what he had said, a striking contrast. To the divine sorrow of which he had spoken he now opposes the sorrow of the world, *i. e.*, the sorrow which the ungodly multitude sometimes experience. As Thomas says: "as is the love so is the sorrow." Τοῦ *κόσμου* is the genitive, not of the object, *i. e.*, a sorrow on account of worldly things or possessions, but of the subject, and it must be interpreted with reference to the contrast. It here signifies such a trouble about the apostle's reproofs as would have produced no change of mind, but rather an irritability and a depression of spirit on account of wounded pride. As this could only harden the heart, it would lead to the death which was equivalent to perdition, and of course the reverse of salvation. Death is here not merely moral corruption, nor a fretting of one's self to death, and above all not a mortal sickness or suicide. Comp. Elwert. Stud. der Würt. Geistl. IX. 1 135ff.—**For behold this very thing, that ye were made sorry according to God, what great diligence it wrought in you** (ver. 11).—The apostle here points out the way in which the good results of the sorrow had been exhibited among the Corinthians themselves. He shows by actual facts the proof (introduced by *γάρ*) of what he had been saying. Behold! (*ἰδού*) is here the utterance of a lively emotion. (Osiander). Τοῦτο indicates in advance and in a very emphatic manner, the matter on which he is about to speak, and the particulars of which he immediately proceeds to specify; and by *αὐτό* he designed to say that it was that precise thing, and that alone which had had such an influence. The simple dative *ὑμῖν* (in you) is more forcible than *ἐν ὑμῖν* would have been, and it must here be regarded as the Dative of relation, but closely approximating the dat. commodi. The substantive *σπουδή* signifies originally haste, then diligence, activity, and it is here applied to the case of discipline then in hand, in contrast with the previous inactivity (Starke: diligence in recognizing your defects, in complying with my exhortations, in removing offences, and in making up for past neglects).—**Yea, clearing of yourselves; yea, indignation;** The *ἀλλά* which is so many times repeated and with so much emphasis (comp. 1 Cor. vi. 11), is not only climactic, but corrective; equivalent to: yea, rather. He intended to say that *σπουδή* was perhaps too feeble a word to express the change which took place in their minds in consequence of their godly sorrow. Ἀπολογία here means, not their defence of the Apostle against his opponents, but in accordance with the context, their own justification before Titus and so before the Apostle. It signifies their answer to the charge of having apparently given countenance to sin, and their solemn disavowal of all fellowship with crime. It was not, however, their practical justification of themselves by the actual punishment of the offender, for this would have anticipated the idea expressed afterwards by *ἐκδίκησις*. The *ἀγανάκτησις* (indignation) was more than the *ἀπολογία*; for it implies that they were indignant that such a thing should have taken place among them, and perhaps at themselves that they had so long tolerated it and had been so careless of the honor of the church.—**yea, fear; yea, longing desire.**—The *φόβος* was in this case a fear not of Divine judgment and still less of apostasy, but of the Apostle lest he should come to them with a rod (1 Cor. iv. 21). (Heubner thinks incorrectly that it was an apprehension that new offences might arise, and hence that it signifies an increased watchfulness and jealousy of themselves). To this reference of the fear of the Apostle corresponds the succeeding word, in which he passes suddenly to the very opposite; for *ἐπιπόθησις* signifies not a joyful longing for their own improvement, but as in ver. 7, an earnest desire to see the Apostle himself, whose love for them they felt even while he reproved them so severely, but to whom they turned with confidence as soon as they had removed the offence.—**yea, zeal; yea, infliction of punishment.**—If (with Bengel and Meyer) we divide the series of six things here mentioned into three pairs, in which *ἀπολογία* and *ἀγανάκτησις* relate to the Corinthians themselves; [*φόβος* and *ἐπιπόθησις* to Paul], and *ζῆλος* and *ἐκδίκησις* to the offender, we must regard *ζῆλος* as signifying something different from what it means in ver. 7. It must signify in such a case a zeal to punish the offender, which attains its end in the *ἐκδίκησις*, but which is essentially a zeal in behalf of God, the Apostle's authority, and the church's reputation. Bengel makes both of these refer to the incestuous person, and with a rather excessive refinement he explains *ζῆλος* as *pro bono animæ ejus*, and *ἐκδίκησις* as *contra malum ejus*. Ἐκδίκησις is the infliction of punishment in consequence of which the law (in this case the Divine) is carried out, maintained and satisfied in its demands upon the holiness of God's people. (The attempt to find in this place the Romish doctrine of satisfaction is purely arbitrary). If (with Osiander) we regard the members in the several pairs as contrasted with one another and rising in each case towards a climax, *ζῆλος* would be zeal for the Lord, *etc.*, that the Divine law might be maintained through the *ἐκδίκησις*, *i. e.*, the punishment of the guilty one. [Doddridge: "Some divines have taken it for granted that this verse contains seven distinct marks of true repentance, to be found in every sincere penitent, whereas these are not the characters of the temper of each, but of different persons in different circumstances, according to the part they respectively acted in the affair in question."] The result of all this was—**In every respect ye have commended yourselves as clear in this affair.** (ver. 11 *b*).—In accordance with the lively and emphatic style in which the Apostle was here writing, this is introduced without an *οὖν* or anything of the kind. Ἐν *παντὶ* signifies here in every respect. Συνεστήσατε is equivalent to *ἀπεδείξατε* (Osiander makes it a collateral idea in connection with what he had said of their conciliatory and just course). With this meaning the word has sometimes an accusative of the object in connection with it (Rom. v. 8), sometimes *ὅτι*, and sometimes as in the present case an accus. *cum infin.* Ἁγνος signifies pure, inno-

cent. In other places it is used with a genitive of the offence, but here it is with a dative signifying with reference to, like *ἐλεύθερος τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ* (free from righteousness) in Rom. vi. 20. *Τῷ πραγματι* is a lenient general phrase to avoid anything more specific. BENGEL: "He speaks indefinitely because the thing was unpleasant." Neander uses this passage to confirm his view, that Paul has reference in this epistle nowhere to the case of the incestuous person, but to some individual in personal hostility to himself. ["If the case alluded to here had been that of the incestuous person, the Corinthians would have had no need of showing their innocence in the matter, for no one could have supposed them to be sharers in such a crime; but if we suppose that it was the case of some individual in personal opposition to the Apostle, we can easily see how they might have shared in this offence, and how they might have shown themselves clear in this matter."]

VERS. 12–16. **Accordingly, though I wrote unto you, I did it not for his sake who had done the wrong, nor for his sake who had suffered wrong.** (ver. 12 *a*).—We have here an inference [*ἀρα*, consequently] from the effects which his first Epistle had produced, with reference to his object in writing it. [The same phrase (*εἰ καὶ*) occurs here which had occurred thrice a few sentences before (ver. 8), and in the same sense: "Even though I wrote unto you; conceding, as I do, that I did so"]. His first inference, as to what must have been his motive in writing, is stated negatively as to what was not his object. From the results which he had recounted in their own experience, he wished them to infer what must have been his true design, and to give up all unfounded surmises with respect to his motives. He doubtless had reference to his design in writing that portion of the Epistle (1 Cor. v.) which treated of the matter in hand, and its contents; not to the severity or sternness of its spirit. The latter could not be alluded to without some more specific designation of his object. MEYER expresses it thus: "Though I have not been silent, but have opened my heart to you by letter on this matter." From *ἔγραψα* we may readily conclude what verb must be supplied in the final sentence It must be, of course, "I wrote." Neander thinks that *ἔγραψα* refers not to the first Epistle to the Corinthians, but to one which has been lost, and which, being confined to a single object, may have contained some severe expressions. *Οὐκ—ἀλλά* in this place also should not be enfeebled in its meaning, for the Apostle intended to say that his object in writing had not been to do justice to either of these persons, but one far higher. MEYER: "He must, indeed, have written in opposition to the wrong doer (*ἀδικήσας*), and to the same extent in favor of the injured one (*ἀδικηθείς*), and yet the determining cause which had prevailed upon him and had induced him to write, was not the case of either of these persons, but the interest of the Church in general." Most expositors understand *ἀδικήσας* as having reference to the incestuous person. But who is the *ἀδικηθείς*? We are not surprised to find it in the Masculine, for this seems demanded by its contrast with *ἀδικήσας*. The neuter=*ἀδικήματος* would have been not only inconsistent with grammatical usage, but without a consistent meaning, for he had nowhere said any thing of the crime itself. That the Corinthians were not meant is evident from the use of the singular number. He must, therefore, have meant either himself, who, as an Apostle, had been deeply injured by such a blot upon the reputation of one of his churches, or the father of the incestuous person whose conjugal rights had been so severely violated. But not only chap. ii. 5 (*οὐκ ἐμὲ λελύπηκεν*), but the entire absence of any more particular designation (as *ἐμοῦ*), argues very strongly against the former view, even though we leave out the improbable extension some have given it, by reminding us that the man may have become especially vindictive against the Apostle, and may have drawn others into his party. In behalf of the second view we may also suggest that in other places *ἀδικεῖσθαι* is employed with reference to a violation of conjugal relations. As a reason for the silence of the other passages (1 Cor. v. 2, 5 ff.) with respect to the father, we may remark that there was no occasion, or at least no necessity, for a reference to him there. If we make the word apply to him, the Apostle must be understood to deny that his object was to procure satisfaction for him. Neander regards the Apostle as the one who had received a *personal* offence (comp. ii. 5). If this were so, Paul would have been the *ἀδικηθείς*, and we must understand him to deny that he wrote under the irritation such an injury might be supposed to produce. His real object in mentioning the matter at all in a letter to them, is brought before us in the next clause (which, according to the best established reading of the text, is):—**but that your diligence in our behalf might be made manifest among you in the sight of God** (ver. 12 *b*)—*i. e.*, that your care for us and our work, to help us in accomplishing our aims and purposes, and in attaining the great objects of our mission, might be brought into the light (comp. ver. 11; chap. ii. 9). Very likely *πρὸς ὑμᾶς* appeared inappropriate in this place, and hence the various reading: *ἡμῶν τὴν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*. But he intended to say that by their means or under their direction, in the church and in consequence of their active exertions in this matter, their zeal in his behalf had become apparent. *Πρός* appropriately designates what direction this manifestation had taken. The purity or uprightness with which this had been done is pointed out by the phrase, in the sight of God, which evidently was intended to show the presence in which the manifestation took place. This intimates that they ought to make trial of their zeal as in the presence of God, and see to it that it was no mere pretence or vain form.—**Therefore we have been comforted: but besides** (*ἐπί*) **our comfort we have rejoiced more abundantly in the joy of Titus** (ver. 13).—He means here to say: On this account, *i. e.*, since this was our object, and inasmuch as this object has been attained (ver. 9ff.), we have been comforted. [The perfect indicates a continued comfort]. If we adopt the reading of the Receptus: *ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει ὑμῶν περισσοτέρως δὲ*, we must take *ὑμῶν* not in an active sense, so that the idea

would be: "in consequence of the consolation afforded me by you;" but in a passive sense, according to which the meaning would be: in consequence of the comfort you enjoyed after the temporary. (*πρὸς ὥραν*, ver. 8) sorrow my epistle caused you, you have found peace by means of the repentance (*μετάνοια*). The word *παράκλησις* in this connection has the sense of comfort, not as Reiche maintains, of an admonition, as if Paul was comforted on account of the favorable result of the severe admonition he had given the Corinthians. But the best established reading places the *δέ* immediately after *ἐπί*; in consequence of which a new sentence must commence with *ἐπί*, and the preceding three words form a beautiful, impressive and brief sentence by themselves (Osiander). We may then regard *ἐπί* as indicating the condition or state in which the speaker was with the sense of either, *in*, or still better, *in addition to* what had been possessed before, as in Matth. xxv. 20, and Luke xvi. 26. That which is added is thus regarded as based or resting upon that which before existed (Passow i. 2, p. 1038 b). [There is a general unity, with a particular diversity, in the meaning which *ἐπὶ* bears in this section. Its general signification (*upon*, Jelf. § 633, Webster, pp. 174–6) is obviously at the basis of each instance of its use, and yet this branches out into the special meanings, with a dative; on account of (vv. 7, 13, second time), in addition to (ver. 13, first time), and with a genitive: before, or in the presence of (ver. 14). Comp. Ellicott on 1 Tim. v. 19]. By *περισσοτέρως μᾶλλον* (comp. ver. 7) the Apostle intended to say that this new joy which is added to the previous comfort was more abundant than that of the comfort itself. The double comparative [for even in the positive a comparison is implied, and *μᾶλλον* (found also in Mark vii. 36) therefore doubles it] increases the force of the expression. The object or reason for this joy was the joy of Titus. The latter is more definitely described when it is added—**because his spirit had been refreshed by you all.** (ver. 13 *b*).—These words are not dependent upon *ἐχάρημεν*, as if Paul rejoiced because the spirit of Titus had been refreshed; and of course they are not parallel with *ἐπὶ τῇ χαρᾷ*, to define more distinctly what the joy of Titus was; but they are added to inform us with more precision respecting the cause of Titus' joy. The position of *ἀναπέπαυται* at the commencement of the clause shows that it was intended to be emphatic. We had *ἀναπαύειν τὸ πνεῦμα* (they refreshed my spirit) once before, in 1 Cor. xvi. 18. The source from which the refreshment came is pointed out by *ἀπο*. Another reason for his great joy on account of Titus' joy he proceeds to assign in ver. 14.—**For if in anything I have boasted to him of you I was not made ashamed, but as we spake all things to you in truth, so also our boasting before Titus was found to be truth.**—Ἐι τι does not signify any doubt as to the fact asserted, but it is a delicate mode of expression, common also in classical writers, and equivalent to *ὅ τι* or *ὅσον*. The dative *αὐτῷ* should be explained by means of the *λαλεῖν* implied in *κανχᾶσθαι*. To the negative, I was not made ashamed, he adds the positive, our boasting was found to be truth. Ἐγενήθη, in its logical signification, means here: turned out to be, proved to be in accordance with facts. Ἐπὶ has here, as 1 Cor. vi. 1, the sense of, *before, in the presence of*. His object was, by way of comparison, to put by the side of what he had said to them what he had boasted before Titus when he sent him to Corinth and when he was anxious to encourage him. All that he had said to them and to him was now proved to have been said uprightly. The whole passage is apologetical (comp. i. 17 ff.). Πάντα must be taken in a general sense, and not applied merely to the favorable things he had been saying to them respecting Titus. Ἐν *ἀληθείᾳ* has an adverbial signification (truly), as in Col. i. 16 and Jno. xvii. 19. One result of this confirmation of the Apostle's boastful assertions, by means of Titus' own experience among the Corinthians, is mentioned in ver. 15, where it is said —**And his inward affection is more abundant toward you while he remembers the obedience of you all.**—Σπλάγχνα occurred before in chap vi. 12. Περισσοτέρως signifies: even more than before. Εἰς *ὑμᾶς ἐστιν* means that he was inclined or attached to them. In the phrase *ἀναμιμνησκομένου, etc.* (recalling to himself, Jelf. § 363, 6; Winer, § 39, 3), he refers to that which awakened and perpetually sustained his earnest love toward them, viz: their *ὑπακοή*, their obedience to Titus, his deputy to them. This sprang up in his heart when he learned the spirit with which they had received Titus, and it was sustained more especially by his lively recollection of the same event.—**How with fear and trembling ye received him.** (ver. 15 *b*.)—With respect to fear and trembling, comp. on 1 Cor. ii. 3. The phrase here signifies that profound reverence which they entertained for one who had been delegated by Christ's own Apostle, and which made them exceedingly zealous lest they should fail in any duty they owed him (Osiander, Meyer). He concludes this section with an expression of his joyful confidence in them.—**I rejoice that I have confidence in you in all things** (ver. 16).—[He here gives the conclusion of the whole discussion. The first seven chapters had been occupied with subjects of a personal nature between him and the Corinthians, and as he is about to leave the subject] he gives the result at which he arrives in an abrupt appendix (asyndeton, without *οὖν*). The proper signification of *θαῤῥῶ* is simply, I am of good courage, not I *may* or can be of good courage, as if he had meant merely, that he had ground for encouragement. As in other passages *θαῤῥεῶ* is never construed with *ἐν*, when the *object* of confidence is referred to. Meyer is inclined to consider *ἐν* as expressive of the original cause or source of the confidence. (I am of good courage *through* you), and yet the analogy of *πιστεύειν, ἐλπίζειν* and other words of a similar meaning, favors the interpretation which seems here most natural, viz: with respect to the object: I have confidence concerning, with regard to, or in you. [Dr. Hodge thinks that if *θαῤῥῶ* cannot, when joined with *ἐν*, be rendered, I have confidence, "*ἐν* had better be rendered *before*: I stand full of confidence before you, *i. e*, in your presence," and he refers to 1 Cor. xiv. 11. He, however, with our author, prefers the translation

given in the common English version. Stanley renders the passage: "I am bold through your encouragement."] The comprehensive ἐν παντὶ, which must here signify, in all things, forms a suitable transition to the following section.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

[1. The inspiration of the sacred writers was not inconsistent with the free exercise of all human feelings (ver. 8). Even assuming that Paul was fully inspired when he wrote the lost Epistle, he appears afterwards to have had misgivings respecting it, whether he had acted under an infallible Divine influence. Conceding this, we may still maintain that every thing which has been actually preserved as holy Scripture is infallibly true and Divine. Men who claimed to be, and doubtless were, infallibly inspired in all that concerned their official duties, seem to have been left to doubts and infirmities at other times and in their private relations, like other men (Gal. ii. 11; 2 Cor. xii. 7; i. 15f.; Phil. ii. 23). "Holy men," whose free human faculties were "moved," informed and directed to any requisite extent "by the Holy Ghost," appear to have been allowed, even in the moment of inspiration, to express themselves according to their individuality of character. Paul's style and manner of expression is unmistakably unlike John's, or David's, or Jeremiah's. Different instruments of music, even when played upon by the same hand, and with equal power, will give forth each its peculiar tone. The most plenary inspiration was probably consistent with the freest possible play of human thoughts and feelings. Comp. Lee. *on Inspiration*, Chap. VI., p. 176ff. Hodge: "Inspiration simply rendered its subject infallible in writing and speaking as the messenger of God. Paul might doubt whether he had in a given instance made a wise use of his infallibility, as he might doubt whether he had wisely exercised his power of working miracles. He never doubted as to the truth of what he had written."]

2. Godly sorrow, or the sorrow which is conformed to the will of God, is one which directs the man wholly and only to God. He is troubled because he has violated God's law, has injured God's cause, has dishonored God's name, and has made himself utterly unworthy of God's holy love. In this mere act of renouncing sin there must be involved such a radical change of heart as must remove all hindrances on man's part to his participation in God's salvation. It is in itself such a thoroughly purifying fire, as necessarily implies that its subject is in the way to everlasting life. By such a change of disposition, which every one must recognize as the work of God's Spirit, he becomes susceptible of, and prepared for, every blessing proffered to him by Divine grace, and purchased for him by Christ's expiatory work. But there is another kind of sorrow which is sometimes felt by men who are alienated and estranged from God. They are often indignant and offended when their misdeeds are brought to light, because they apprehend that their reputation and standing among men may be injured, when they are brought by providential discipline into various kinds of trouble, and when their honor, their earthly possessions, or their enjoyments are impaired. They are not disturbed at the thought of sin itself, in its relation to God and His kingdom, nor as a violation of their duty to their fellow-men, and an impediment or a complete destruction to all intercourse with God. They who have only this kind of sorrow are still in the way of death, of eternal perdition, and of everlasting banishment from God's kingdom.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Starke:—Ver. 2. Ministers are bound not to injure their hearers (*e. g.*, by excessive severity), nor to corrupt them (by false doctrines or wrong conduct), nor needlessly to molest or trouble them; but their hearers are equally bound to love, honor and imitate their ministers.—Ver. 3. Those who have great success in preaching, and have affectionate hearers, may have obtained them without any violation of conscience or of the duties of their office.—Those who are faithful are willing to lay down their lives for the salvation of their people (chap. xii. 15).—Ver. 4. To be afflicted for Jesus' sake, and yet to be joyful and confident, implies something above human power.—Hedinger:—Ver. 5. The life, the work and the love of the Christian may sometimes bring him much anxiety; and yet how calm can he be in the midst of commotion! The flesh may bo in the conflict while the spirit is calm! Blessed indeed are they who know what this is! John xvi. 33. Spener:—God afflicts His people in many ways, and we must not suppose His saints to be insensate blocks; they are obliged to endure much inward suffering, and to feel that they are still men.—Ver. 6. Thou who sittest in the dust and art troubled, listen to a good friend, whose counsels will cheer and enliven thee again! God sent him to comfort thee! Ver. 7. Blessed indeed are they who make such a use of their spiritual chastisements! It is the mark not only of a good spirit, but of an upright minister, when nothing troubles a man more than offences among his people. or rejoices him more than the removal of them (Jer. xiii. 7; 3 John 4).—Hedinger:—Ver. 8 ff. It is never a pleasure to a minister to reprove and disturb his people. But when his words reach their hearts and produce excellent fruit, it is a blessed offence and the beginning of a glorious conversion. Hedinger:—That godly sorrow in which the sinner repents of his wickedness, not because it brings upon him punishment, torment, fears, shame and disturbance, but because he has offended the God who loves him and does him good, and in which he would willingly suffer a thousand deaths, if he could thereby blot out the reality of his guilt, has its source in a union of sorrow with filial love, and in a faith which recognizes the goodness of God and the inconceivable abomination of sin (Examples in 2 Sam. xii. 13; Luke xv. 21; xviii. 13; Matth. xxvi. 75; Luke vii. 38). Such a sorrow frees us from sin, brings us nigh to God, and makes us partakers of eternal glory. We can never regret such a repentance, even though it occasions us some temporary pain, if in the end it leads us to great glory.—The sorrow of the world (on account of

worldly losses, fear of punishment, or dishonor) will never know any thing of mercy from God, but it will drive the soul to despair, to new and fretful complainings, on account of its condemnation, and finally to actual hardness of heart.—Spener:—Ver. 11. He who is troubled after a godly sort will have his carnal slumbers driven from him; and having thus become conscious of the power of sin, he will be more watchful against it, and will press forward more vigorously in the way of the Lord.—The marks of true repentance are: horror and disgust at sin, delight in goodness, and diligence in the pursuit of it.—Ver. 13. True love rejoices with those who rejoice, and weeps with those who weep (Rom. xii. 15). Blessed are they of whom their ministers can testify and boast much which is good. But alas! for those over whom their ministers can breathe forth nothing but sighs! (Heb. xiii. 17). Uprightness becomes any man but especially one who preaches the Gospel.

Berlenb. Bible:—Ver. 3. People are very quick in their rage to take what they hear as a condemnation of themselves; but if our own hearts condemn us not, no man can condemn us. —Ver. 4. Within a single hour a pious soul may be in deep affliction and overwhelmed with joy.—Ver. 6f. It is one of the mysteries of God's way that Christians must be comforters to one another. They will thus be joined together as one body.—Ver. 8f. (Cassian): "The sorrow which worketh repentance is obedient, humble, gentle, loving and patient; for it comes from the love of God, and under many and severe trials it will never grow weary in following after perfection. But the sorrow which the devil gives is harsh, impatient, severe, selfish, full of fears, and it is sure to drive the man in his ignorance in an opposite direction." Can God then be served only in brooding sorrow? The great point is, what reason we have for sorrow, and whither our sorrow tends? A true child of God cannot but grieve that, during his whole life, he has done so little which can be pleasing to his heavenly Father.—Ver. 10. Sorrow is usually looked upon as something disagreeable, and even spiritless and dull; and hence most persons strive to be merry and drive away sad thoughts by worldly pleasures and luxuries. But while such miserable expedients leave our nature infected with the evil, they bring down upon us additional judgments, and afford no protection against the gnawing tooth of conscience. Still less can false comfort and mere fancies give us relief. We must search deep within our souls for the true cause of our sorrow, or we shall derive no permanent benefit from it. God never afflicts us willingly; but such is our present state, that he can do us good in no other way; He is obliged to kill before he can give us life. Before we can have any true joy, we must sorrow unto repentance. By making light of repentance, we only plunge deeper into an eternal melancholy. The godly sorrow which springeth from God and his love leaves nothing behind it but blessedness, for the repentance to which it leads is unto salvation. The sorrow itself, and all that legitimately flows from it, must correspond with the spirit and purpose of the Being who produced it. Hence, if our sorrow comes from God, it must awaken within us a salutary humility, and a repentance which excites us to the exercise of true godliness, and makes us prayerful, obedient to God, patient under trials, kind to our fellowmen, and rich in good works; while the sorrow of the world will make us sullen and unfit for any useful work; and yet in this latter state, sad and dark as it is, (melancholy), are all those who live without God. Even pious souls are not without temptations to this worldly sorrow. They are liable to melancholy (the sorrow of the world) when they are discouraged under the torments of sin and corruption, under the disorders and distractions of spiritual and bodily trials, and under the afflictions incident to an inordinate love of the world. He who has been a murderer from the beginning, and grudges every happy hour the willing soul spends with its God, conceals himself behind all these depressions of the believer's spirit, and aggravates them when he pretends to remove them. That dark spirit often induces men under extraordinary afflictions to forsake that which is good, and deprives them of all desire or capacity to enjoy it. The recollection of sins committed before conversion frequently contributes much to such a state of mind; and hence Christians should pay no attention to those representations, in which the serpent, under the guise of humility, reminds them of abominations, which God himself has blotted out and cast into the depths of the sea. In like manner we should never despair on account of those sinful remnants of former habits which continue to beset us even after our conversion. —Ver. 11. When a man first obtains a correct idea of his own corruption, and is properly humbled for his sins, his whole heart is aroused, and everything there is in confusion. One emotion only gives place to another. We set about correcting everything at once; the thought of former sluggishness and security makes us indignant at ourselves; we tremble under apprehensions of God's wrath; we are so anxious to clear ourselves in the minds of those whom we have offended, that we lose no opportunity to do them good; and we burn with zeal to be revenged upon the enemy of our souls, by a true repentance and a hearty renunciation of every sin. Every possible method is resorted to to cast off this hated evil of sin, and if we are not as successful as we hoped to be at once, we are apt to be perplexed, and at a loss what to think or do. Though this shows our utter weakness, it is a good sign that we have truly repented of sin. It indicates that we are thoroughly in earnest, and it is a thousand fold better than the tranquil state of the hypocrite or the self-deceiver. We need not doubt that God will be very patient with persons in such a state. "*That ye are clear!*" Past offences are easily forgotten when the parties are thoroughly reconciled. Our Lord himself said to those who had miserably sinned against Him, that they were already clean from a regard to Him and through the Gospel which He was speaking to them (John xv. 3.). Wherever the heart is right, He will be satisfied, although He is obliged to overlook many improprieties in the outward life of His disciples.

Rieger:—Vers. 2–7. If we are under the direction of the Spirit of love and of power and of

a sound mind, we shall never be at a loss to conduct ourselves so as to avoid showing undue fear or favor toward those around us, to meet with composure whatever they inflict upon us, and at the same time to maintain as far as is in us lies their confidence, and to show them that in other respects we esteem them, and are satisfied with them. "The Comforter of those who are cast down!" what a precious name for God!—Ver. 8 ff. How the spirit of a father, yea, of God Himself, is apparent here! For although God does not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men, yet when He cannot do them good in any other way He brings them into trouble; and, like Joseph before his brethren, turns away and weeps. We are in continual danger not only of being too tender with our brethren, and of withholding from them the needful salt of Christian reproof, but of exercising the authority given us with such severity as will overwhelm them in overmuch sorrow. Ours is the delicate work of assisting them in bringing forth godly sorrow. Blessed are they who can bring about a harvest of joy from a sowing of tears! Those whom God's Spirit makes sorrowful, because they have lost God, His grace, His way, and the hope of being with Him forever, must see to it that their sorrow does not stop short of that repentance unto life, which can never be repented of. The sorrow of the world must end in death and corruption, because it not only fosters erroneous views and wrong motives, but engenders powerful, though often secretly indulged lusts which mutually strengthen one another.

Heubner:—Ver. 2. We should receive those who love us and are sincerely endeavoring to do us good, with the most enlarged affection.—Ver. 3. The affectionate minister never puts forth a severe expression merely to wound, or reprove, or condemn any one, but to do him good. To accomplish this he is willing to risk every thing else.—Ver. 4. Those who are free and candid with us, give the best proof that they have confidence in us.—Ver. 6. God bestows His consolations only upon the lowly, because they trust not to themselves and their own powers, but in God alone; and because they know their own wretchedness, and sigh and weep over it before God. The Lord always looks kindly upon such. Often when they are in the deepest affliction He is preparing to help and comfort them.—Ver. 7. How precious the joy of benefiting others.—Ver. 8. The purer and the more considerate all your conduct is, the less reason will you have to apprehend future regrets respecting it. A brief sorrow which leads to amendment saves us from eternal torment.—Ver. 9. The new birth cannot be effected without pain.—Ver. 10. The distinction between a holy sorrow and the sorrow of the world, springs from their different sources. The latter is merely a feeling of mortification or chagrin under the injuries or the dishonor of which sin has been the occasion. The man complains very little of himself; but against God and Divine Providence he not only complains, but sometimes exhibits extreme malice and spite. On the other hand godly sorrow lays all the burden of guilt upon the sinner, and is full of shame and grief for the dishonor which belongs to sin itself. The former only makes the man worse, hardens his heart, drives him away from God, and lands him in despair; while the latter turns him from his sins, strengthens his powers, and gives him peace with God. The world's sorrows and the world's joys are equally worthless. The joys it vaunts in society, and the sorrows it endures all the remaining time.—Ver. 11. The repentance of a whole congregation for some offence it has committed, should not be a merely transient emotion of sympathy, but it should lead to earnest efforts to remove the offence, and to withstand the evil. It is no true love which fears to disturb offenders, and is only anxious to make their repentance as easy as possible.—Ver. 12. Every minister should strive to convince his people that he has no interest at heart but theirs.—Ver 14. A minister should be very cautious about boasting of his people or of his work among them. He is very liable thus to prepare occasions for subsequent mortification. Should we afterwards find ourselves deceived, the reaction will be painful and the great enemy never feels happier than when he finds us indulging in such boastings.

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 3. The Christian life extends beyond the present world, and does not attain its perfection until after death. Blessed is that fellowship in which each one has all others in his heart to live and to die with them.—Ver. 4. Deeper than the pain God's ministers suffer from a persecuting world, is the pain they feel for straying brethren and unthankful children; but they have a joy which no earthly sorrow can destroy, a joy which is exceeding abundant, when these lost sheep return to the fold of the Good Shepherd.—Ver. 13. Godly comforts are never wanting where there is godly sorrow. It is by the way of repentance that God graciously brings to Jesus Christ those who sorrow after a godly manner over their fallen state.—Ver. 15. How unfounded the common impression that a Christian's love to a brother will grow cold in proportion to his knowledge of that brother's sins and imperfections! On the contrary, the more it does for him, the warmer it grows.

[Vers. 2–8. I. Paul's claim to a cordial reception: 1. Its ground; (a) he deserved it, for his blameless life (ver. 2) and for his self-sacrificing love (ver. 3 b); 2. The way in which he urged it, (a) so as to give no needless pain (ver. 3 a), (b) with open unsuspecting confidence (ver. 4). II. His former experience with reference to them: 1. He had been compelled to reprove them, 2. He had been depressed by great trials (ver. 5, comp. ii. 12 f.), 3. God had comforted him (ver. 6 f.).—Vers. 9, 10. Power of sorrow: I. The sorrow of the world: 1. It has no moral basis; 2. It is irreparable; 3. It engenders corrupt passions. II. Godly sorrow: 1. Its source (God in Christ) proves it right; 2. It estranges from all which really can injure us; 3. It works out a positive love of goodness; 4. It shuts us up into the faith of Christ; 5. It secures everlasting salvation.—On the whole section: A minister's joy in his people: 1. When he has a large place in their hearts; 2. When they heed his admonitions; 3. When their sorrows are not entirely worldly; 4. When their sorrow is according to God; 5. When this works among

them all spiritual graces; 6. When he can safely boast of them, and hope confidently for the future. Comp. F. W. Robertson. *Serm.* VIII., Series II. Lectt. L. and Ll., and Lisco's *Entwürfe.*]

THE COLLECTION. CHAPS. VIII AND IX.

XIV.—AN EXHORTATION TO FINISH IT. MOTIVE: THE EXAMPLE OF THE MACEDONIAN CHURCHES: AS A PROOF OF THEIR LOVE IN GIVING THEMSELVES TO CHRIST. PRINCIPLE OF EQUALITY. COMMENDATION OF TITUS, AND HIS COMPANIONS IN THIS WORK.

Chapter VIII. 1–24.

Moreover, brethren, we do you to wit of [we make known to you] the grace of
2 God [which has been] bestowed on the churches of Macedonia; How [*om.* how] that
in a great trial of affliction, [was] the abundance of their joy [;] and their deep poverty
3 abounded unto the riches of their liberality. For to *their* power, I bear [them] record,
4 yea, and beyond[1] *their* power *they were* willing of themselves; praying us with much
entreaty that we would receive the gift, and *take upon us* [with much entreaty beseeching of us the favor (τὴν χάριν) and the participation in] the fellowship of the minis-
5 tering to the saints.[2] And *this they did*, [*om. this they did*] not as we [had] hoped,[3]
but first gave their own selves [their own selves gave they first] to the Lord, and unto
6 us by the will of God. Insomuch [so] that we [have] desired Titus, that as he had
7 begun[3] so he would also finish in you the same [this] grace also. Therefore, [But] as
ye abound in every *thing*, *in* faith, and utterance, and knowledge, and *in* all diligence,
8 and *in* your love to us,[4] *see* that ye abound in this grace also. I speak not by commandment, but by occasion of [*om.* occasion of] the forwardness of others, and to prove
9 [to prove also] the sincerity of your love. For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus
Christ, that though [when] he was rich, yet for your sakes[5] he became poor, that ye
10 through his poverty might be rich. And herein I give *my* advice, for this is expedient for you, who have begun before [them] not only to do, but also to be forward a
11 year ago [to will last year]. Now therefore perform the doing *of it;* that as *there was* a readiness to will, so *there may be* a performance also out of [according to] that
12 which ye have. For if there be first [*om.* first] a willing mind, *it is* accepted
[acceptable] according to that a man hath [it may have][6] and not according to
13 that he [it] hath not. For *I mean* not that other men be eased, and[7] ye burdened:
14 But by an equality, *that* now at [burdened, but by an equality at] this time your abundance *may be a supply* for their want, that their abundance also may be a *supply* for
15 your want; that there may be equality: as it is written, He that *had gathered* much had
nothing over; and he that *had gathered* little had no lack. But thanks *be* to God, which
put [who is putting, διδόντι][8] the same earnest care into the heart of Titus for you.
For indeed he accepted the exhortation; but being more forward, of his own accord he
18 went unto you. And we have sent with him the brother, whose praise *is* in the
19 Gospel throughout all the churches; And not *that* only, but who was also chosen of
the churches to travel with us with[9] this grace, which is administered by us to the
glory of the same [*om.* same][10] Lord, and *declaration of* your [our][11] ready mind:
20 Avoiding this, that no man should blame us in this abundance which is administered
21 by us: Providing [for we provide][12] for honest things, not only in the sight of the
22 Lord but also in the sight of men. And we have sent with them our brother, whom
we have oftentimes proved diligent in many things, but now much more diligent
23 upon the great confidence which *I have* [he has] in you. Whether *any do inquire* of [As to] Titus *he is* my partner and fellow helper concerning you: or [as to] our brethren *be inquired of*, [*om. be inquired of*] *they are* the messengers of the churches, *and*

24 the glory of Christ. Wherefore shew ye to them, and before the churches the proof of your love, and of our boasting on your behalf. [Since ye will show[13] toward them proof of your love and of our boasting on your behalf, ye will show[14] it before the churches]·

[1] Ver. 3.—Rec. has ὑπέρ, but the predominance of testimony is in favor of παρά. Meyer thinks the former an explanatory gloss. [Bloomfield defends ὑπὲρ here as in 2 Cor. i. 8, on the ground that it is the more difficult idiom and so likely to be corrected to make it purer Greek.]

[2] Ver. 4.—Rec. has δέξασθαι ἡμᾶς, but it was unquestionably an addition, and should be thrown out.

[3] Ver. 5.—Lachmann following Cod. B. has ἠλπίκαμεν instead of ἠλπίσαμεν. He also has on similar authority ἐνήρξατο instead of προενήρξατο. His authority however is quite insufficient.

[4] Ver. 7.—Lachmann has ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν instead of ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐν ἡμῖν. His authority however is feeble, and his reading is probably an attempted amendment of the text. [He is sustained only by Cod. B with 10 cursives and the Syr. and Arm. versions and one Slav. MSS. Origen has in the Lat.: *nostra in vos*, and Ambrst. has: *in nobis et vobis*. The common reading is sustained by C. D. E. F. G. K. L. Sin. *et al.* It was more to the Apostle's purpose to speak of the love awakened by *him* in the Corinthians.]

[5] Ver. 9.—The authorities for ἡμᾶς instead of ὑμᾶς are much the feeblest.

[6] Ver. 12.—Rec. has τις after ἔχῃ, against the best authorities. It is an interpolation. [For ἐὰν we have ἀν in B. F. G. L. Sin., one MSS. of Chrys. and Damasc.]

[7] Ver. 13.—Lachmann following B. C*. and some other less important MSS. throws out δὲ after ὑμῖν. Meyer agrees with him on the ground that it was inserted to bring out the contrast with the preceding. [The authority of Sin. (1st Cor.) has since been added in favor of δὲ. Tisch. in his 7th ed. inserts it. Alford puts it in brackets.]

[8] Ver. 16.—Many MSS. in some respects of importance have δόντι instead of διδόντι, but the change can be explained by an attempt to match the following aorists (Meyer). [C. also adds ἡμῖν.]

[9] Ver. 19.—Rec. has σύν for ἐν, but it is not well sustained, and it is doubtless a gloss. [And yet it has for it D. E. F. G. K. L. and the more powerful Sin. and it is defended by Reiche and Osiander as the more free and appropriate but more unconmon word.]

[10] Ver. 19.—Rec. and Tisch. have αὐτοῦ before τοῦ κυρίου. The weight of authority however is against it. Meyer thinks it has come in by writing the τοῦ twice [It has Sin. in its favor, with D. (2d and 3d Cor.) K. and L. the Syr., Chrys., Theodt. and Damasc. Some cursives have αὐτην.]

[11] Ver. 19.—Rec. has ὑμῶν, but it is not well sustained, and was probably so written because ἡμῶν seemed unsuitable.

[12] Ver. 21.—Rec. has προνοούμενοι, but it is rather feebly supported. Tischendorf after C. and some MSS. of less weight gives προνοούμενοι γαρ. But the best evidence is in favor of προνοοῦμεν γάρ. [Alford: "Meyer thinks that προνοούμενοι was originally a mere mistake, arising from στελλόμενοι above; and thus the γάρ which was at first retained from oversight, as in C., was at last erased. Probably προνοούμενοι was introduced from Rom. xii. 17, where the same words occur." Bloomfield still defends Tischendorf's reading, as the simplest and best confirmed by internal evidence. Wordsworth also thinks the first person plural too direct a self-condemnation.]

[13] Ver. 24.—Rec. has ἐνδείξασθε for ἐνδεικνύμενοι. It is doubtless a gloss. [It is sustained by C., Sin., many cursives of considerable authority and the Vulgate. Wordsworth defends it.]

[14] Ver. 24.—Rec. has καὶ before εἰς πρόσωπον, but it is an interpolation [for it has only an ancient Slav. MS. in its favor. And yet it is edited by Griesb. and Scholz.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1–6.—But we make known unto you, brethren, the grace which God has granted among the churches in Macedonia.—The particle δε is here, as in many other places (1 Cor. vii. 1; viii. 1; xii. 1; xv. 1), merely transitional, as the Apostle is passing to a new section; for although the present section is introduced by the concluding sentence of the last chapter, it is not directly joined with that sentence. [We may even question whether the word has not something of an adversative signification. He had confidence in the Corinthians, he had now sufficiently discussed the subjects already brought up, and he was now of good courage in their presence, *but* he had another matter to introduce to their attention. He wished to present before them the important matter of the collections which were occupying the attention of the Macedonian churches. Stanley endeavors to show that γνωρίζω has always in Paul's earlier Epistles the sense of, to *remind*, to call attention to (1 Cor. xii. 3; xv. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 1; Gal. i. 11), but that in his later Epistles and when the word is in the passive (including Rom. xvi. 26) it has the signification of, *to discover*. The evidence he adduces hardly proves this, and we see no sufficient reason for making this word an exception to verbs of this termination, which are causative and carry out the act which is proper to the noun from which they are derived. According to this, the active meaning of our verb would be, to make or cause to know. The word is used in Eph. vi. 21 *et al.* What Paul wished to make known to them for their encouragement was [not a matter of which they were already informed, and needed only to be reminded of, but] the great liberality of those Macedonian churches (Philippi, Beroea, Thessalonica) among which he was then laboring, in contributions for the impoverished Christians at Jerusalem. He says that this was altogether beyond their ordinary ability, and he gives the honor of it to the Divine Author of every grace. In calling it the grace which God had bestowed on these churches, he does not mean that the donation was extraordinarily large, nor to magnify the generosity which had been enkindled, but simply to awaken admiration for the grace which had enkindled it. Nor are we to suppose that he wished to imply that this was a grace confined to those churches, for it was the same general grace which was acting in other churches, but was especially powerful among them. We should not supply an ἐμοί after δεδομένην, nor take ἐν in the sense of a dative. The idea is that Divine grace (χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ) was liberally communicated in the midst of these churches. Meyer confines the expression to the influence of grace in its distinctive character; as if the Apostle's object had been to point out how gracious God had been in bestowing upon them such a generous spirit. [The word χάρις has in this section a special application doubtless to the gifts or contributions of the people, but these are so named always with reference to the Divine favor manifested in them. Every enlargement of heart among the people of a place may properly be characterized as a put-

ting forth of Divine grace. And yet it requires some constraint to render the word as Stanley does in every instance of its occurrence in our section by the English term *grace* (see especially ver. 16). In some instances it refers to human kindness, and some additional words (as τοῦ θεοῦ) are used to define the subject of its exercise. Chrysostom suggests that Paul here makes prominent its Divine origin to avoid all invidious human comparisons, and to stimulate the Corinthians by the hope of being sharers in the common grace. We may also remark that the use of the word ἐκκλησίαι instead of the more common ἀδέλφοι suggests that even at this early period Paul was aiming at an ecclesiastical unity. He attaches an importance to this collection in the churches quite disproportionate to its immediate relations. He evidently views it as an expression of the common fellowship of Jewish and Gentile Christianity. As such he uses it and urges it to break down the false views and exclusive prejudices which had sprung up on both sides. He here informs the Corinthians that the Macedonian Christians who had suffered much from the Jews (Acts xviii. 5ff.), had surmounted these prejudices. In this way, too, he lets them see that he had not been a disappointed man or forsaken of God in his recent labors, and that he had some other work than that of correcting abuses and vindicating his Apostolic authority].

—That in a great trial of tribulation they had an abundance of joy, and their deep poverty abounded to the riches of their simplicity (ver. 2). The Apostle here specifies in greater detail what he had only asserted in ver. 1. As his object was not to prove what he had there said, we must make ὅτι equivalent not to *for*, but to *that*. Critics, however, have been at a loss whether to construe this verse as two distinct sentences (supplying ἦν after περισσεία τ. χάρ. αὐτῶν [Syriac, Vulgate, *fuit*], so that the idea shall be that in a great trial of affliction there *was* an abundance of joy); or as only one [our English version]. The insertion of ἦν to complete the first of these sentences is by no means unnatural; and if we attempt to unite ἡ περισσεία τ. χάρ. αὐτῶν and ἡ πτωχ. αὐτων, so as to form one subject of a sentence, the whole appears harsh and stiff. We prefer the former construction. We are partially induced to do so because the two subjects harmonize so well with the two predicates which are then presented, and because the other construction requires us to combine together two such contrary things in a single subject, and to make such a word as περισσεία the nominative to a verb so cognate with itself as ἐπερισσεύσεν. But these are not our main reasons for this preference. For even if, by adopting the latter construction, we must unite such expressions as περισσεία τῆς χάρας and ἐπερισσεύσεν as subject and predicate (making the χάρα either the joyful preparation for the collection, as Meyer does, or the happy enjoyment of religion after conversion, as Osiander does), it seems nevertheless more appropriate to find expressed in the double subject of a single sentence those factors which complete one another in the περισσεύειν, and which unite and cooperate to prove that the grace of God and something higher than mere human kindness was moving the actors. This will be still more apparent as we proceed to explain the individual expressions. The first thing to which the Apostle draws attention is the condition or state of the congregations in which this liberality so abounded. They were in a great trial of affliction (ἐν πολλῇ δοκιμῇ θλίψεως). This word δοκιμή which Paul uses in a number of other places in his Epistles (chap. ii. 9; ix. 13; xiii. 3; Phil. ii. 22; Rom. v. 4), in the sense of *verifying or proving a thing to be real*, has here rather the sense of *subjecting a thing to a trial or test*. It is true, indeed, that the verification or proof might be looked upon as the moral basis of their joy (Meyer), but it is more natural here to regard the affliction as that which tended to prevent their joy, and hence as showing that their joy must have been the result of a mighty faith triumphing over such hindrances. The δοκιμή, therefore, would be properly the trial which subjected them to a test. We allow, however, that in all other passages of the Apostle's writings, the context requires that the word should mean, *a verifying or proving a thing to be true*. The idea is the same as that contained in chap. vii. 4, *viz.*: "in all our affliction." With respect to this affliction, comp. I Thess. i. 6; ii. 14 ff.; Acts xvi. 20 ff.; xvii. 5. Περισσεία τῆς χαρᾶς signifies, the overflowing or abundance of their joy, *i. e.*, of the joy they had in the fellowship of Christ and in the assurance of their salvation (chap. vii. 10; Phil. iv. 4). This opened their hearts to contribute liberally for the relief of their brethren (comp. Melancthon in Osiander, p. 299), and so completely raised them above all thought of their persecutions and the poverty of their own means, that they went far beyond those who possessed a greater abundance. There was energy enough in this joyful faith to make deep poverty an abundant source of benevolent action. In the following words the joy and the poverty are represented as conspiring together for this result. The plural ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία signifies properly a poverty which goes down to the very depths, and it presents us the figure of a vessel which is almost empty and into which we must reach down deep. And yet this vessel is made to overflow as if it were full. [Adam Clarke: "Poverty and affliction can scarcely ever be spoken of in an absolute sense; they are only comparative. Even the poor are called to relieve those who are poorer than themselves; and the afflicted to comfort those who are more afflicted than they are."] It abounds εἰς τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς ἁπλότητος αὐτῶν. The word ἁπλότης signifies not exactly goodness of heart, benignity generosity, but the disposition which includes true charitableness, or gives it an external form. Comp. Rom. xii. 8 (ὁ μεταδιδοὺς ἐν ἁπλότητι). It is the simplicity which is superior to all selfish considerations or interests, and confines its attention entirely to the wants of our brother, gives itself completely up to the will of God, delights to be the instrument of His merciful providence, and has no fears that God will ever allow such a one to be in want [comp. Trench *Synn.* 2 Part, p. 23]. The simplest explanation of ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς is that which makes it assert that the riches which in their simplicity they possessed, and the liberal contribution

which in their simplicity they had made, was in reality the overflowing stream of their deep poverty transformed by a joyful faith into an abundance. In vv. 3–5 we have an explanation of this *περισσεύειν*. [STANLEY remarks that "this sentence is completely shattered in passing through the Apostle's mind. If restored to order it would be, 'how that to their power and beyond their power, they voluntarily gave, not as we trusted the gift (or grace, *τὴν χάριν, i. e.*, of their possessions), but their own selves.'" But as the Apostle wrote this, his mind glowed more and more as it proceeded, and he attached to each phrase some additional thought, until the whole completely breaks down under the weight of extraneous matter.]—**For according to their power, I bear witness, and beyond their power, of their own accord, with much exhortation beseeching of us the grace and fellowship of the ministration to the saints**—(vv. 3, 4). We might, indeed, regard *ὅτι for* as parallel to the same word in ver. 2; "that they," *etc.* But we think it better to regard ver. 3ff. as an explanation (a proof) of the way in which their deep poverty had abounded. *Ὅτι* would then be equivalent to, *for*. He proves that they gave *κατὰ δύναμιν* by inserting *μαρτυρῶ* in a parenthesis, thus implying that he was well acquainted with their pecuniary ability. The reason they were so reduced in circumstances probably was, that they had been the victims of persecution and had found it difficult successfully to pursue their ordinary callings on account of the hatred of unbelievers. W. F. BESSER: "They were poor for Christ's sake, because the Macedonian Christians had been obliged to renounce all dishonest arts of trade (1 Thess. iv. 6), and had been persecuted with the loss of employment, dismissal from service and apprehensions of complete destitution (Phil. i. 28). [Dr. Arnold mentions that Macedonia was the especial theatre of three successive civil wars not far from this time, that the people were heavily taxed by their conquerors, and that the mines from which much of their wealth was derived were in the possession of the government. So desolate had their fine country become, that it was fit only for pasturage. On the petition of the people for relief, they were transferred from the senatorial to the imperial jurisdiction that they might escape taxation. In the meantime Corinth, under the special favor of the emperors, since its revival under Julius Cæsar, had been growing rapidly in wealth. Comp. Stanley and Hodge]. And yet these Macedonian Christians had gone not merely up to, but beyond the ordinary measure of their power. *Παρὰ δύναμιν* has the same meaning as *ὑπὲρ δύναμιν* in the Textus Recep. (comp. i. 8), *i. e.*, beyond their power (*παρά* signifies first, one thing going along by the side of another, then something not in contact with another, or rather something remaining external to another, and finally in opposition to another. *Passow* and *de Wette*). The only correct construction assumes that *ἔδωκαν* of ver. 5 is the principal verb, to which all the other clauses form only a detailed qualification (and not *αὐθαίρετοι* with *ἦσαν* understood, since with this the preceding expressions would not agree; nor *δεόμενοι* with *ἦσαν* understood; nor yet *καθὼς ἠλπίσαμεν* with *ἐγένετο* or *ἐποίησαν* understood). After these quantitative phrases (*κατὰ—καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν*) we have those which are qualitative, *i. e.*, describing the way or manner in which the gift was made: *αὐθαίρετοι*, freely, in opposition to over-persuasion or necessity [excluding all human, but not Divine influences]. Such an assertion is not inconsistent with what is said in chap. ix. 2ff. For he does not, in this latter passage, say precisely that he had requested them at first to contribute, but that his boasting of them the year before had been the occasion which God had used (*διὰ θελήμ. θεοῦ*, ver. 5), for exciting the churches of Macedonia of their own accord to resolve upon their action, and then that the zeal of these churches had reacted upon the Corinthians. The proof and the more full explanation of *αὐθαίρετοι* is given in ver. 4. "We prayed not them, but they us." CHRYSOSTOM. *Δέομαι*, with the genitive of the person entreated, and the accusative of the thing asked for, occurs not unfrequently in the classic writers, (among whom, however, the accusative is always a pronoun). The object of the prayer was the *χάρις*, by which was intended the favor or kindness. This is immediately defined more particularly by the phrase *κοινωνίον τῆς διακον.—ἁγίους*, which is connected with it by *καί* ("even"). The Apostle might have written: *χάριν τῆς κοινωνίας*, but this would have been too great an accumulation of genitives. *Διακονία* has here the sense of, ministration, support (comp. Acts vi. 1 and xi. 29); and it is the same as the *λογία* spoken of in 1 Cor. xvi. 1, where *εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους* is subjoined, and reveals what must have been the motive of the prayer here (Meyer). But the *κοινωνία* indicates a participation in the service. [The main idea of *κοινωνια* undoubtedly is that of a common unity in sympathy, labors and responsibilities. But the ancient Greek expositors make especially prominent the idea that in all communications of assistance there was a mutual benefit. Thus THEOPHYLACT: "as if it were a common gain for both the givers and receivers;" and OECUMENIUS: "he calls almsgiving a *κοινωνίαν* because those who give and those who receive are joint participants in a divine blessing."] If we govern these accusatives (*τ. χάριν κ. τ. κοινωνίαν*) by *ἔδωκαν* (Bengel) the construction becomes unnecessarily confused, and we have no definition of the object of *δεόμενοι*. The true object of *ἔδωκαν* is easily understood from its own idea.—The free self-determination of the Corinthians is brought into very clear light here when it is said that they entreated with much importunity (*μετὰ πολλῆς παρακλήσεως*) as if it would be a favor or kindness to them, that they might have some part in the common work of relieving the impoverished members of God's church (*ἁγιους*).—If we receive the reading of the Receptus: *δέξασθαι ἡμᾶς* (after *ἁγίους*); the meaning of *χάρις* (the favor) would be: the contribution; and in the subsequent sentences it will be shown to consist of collections taken up also in other congregations. —Finally, the apostle says—**And not as we expected but themselves they gave first to the Lord and to us by the will of God.** (ver 5).—They gave beyond his expectations

[The middle and aorist ἠλπίσαμεν refers to the feeling as "belonging to the inner world of the agent" (WINER § 39. 3. JELF. § 363. 5, 6), and shows in a lively manner how the apostle, after granting their prayer, had been busy in forming expectations and desires respecting the manner in which they would participate in the work. The verb expresses more than an anticipation (Crosby) or expectation (B. Bible Union); and it is not incorrectly translated in the English, the German (hofften), and the Vulgate (speravimus) versions. The positive reason for this surprise was, that "they gave their own selves." This refers not to their conversion, which must have taken place some time before; nor does it imply that they then proposed themselves as the bearers of their alms; but it simply asserts that they surrendered themselves and all that they possessed to the disposal of God and the apostles. This was a self-dedication which involved a complete renunciation of all personal interests. They gave themselves, first to the Lord and then to His apostle; for they were anxious above all things thus to show their grateful love to Christ, their Redeemer. With this was inseparably united a desire to honor the man who had brought them to Christ and had originally suggested to them this charity (καί here means simply: *and*, and it implies the intimate connection of the two acts; comp. Ex. xiv. 31, Acts xv. 28). Πρῶτον (first) is not designed to say that they did this before he asked them, for this had already been said in ver. 4, and would require that πρῶτον should stand before ἑαυτούς; nor does it mean [as seems implied by the position of the word "*first*" in our Engl. A. V.] that they gave themselves before they gave their alms, and then left it to the apostle to determine the amount they should give; for to bring out such an idea something more needed to have been said. Moreover the Apostle does not mean that they gave themselves first to the Lord and then to him, making καί equivalent to ἔπειτα; for not only would this imply an unsuitable separation of the two objects of the action, but no instance can be found in which καί stands for ἔπειτα. It is to be taken as in Rom. i. 16 and ii. 9f. in the sense of a gradation. If anything is to be supplied it must be expressive of some relation to the objects of the bounty, [OSIANDER: "who were unknown and of no interest to them except through the Lord and the apostle."] Διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ is added, not merely to explain καὶ ἡμῖν (as if he had said: God, who made me an Apostle, required them to give themselves to me also); but as a reason for the whole transaction, to show that they had been induced thus to surrender themselves by a regard for the will of God. Such a meaning of διά implies also the sense of κατά.—**So that we have besought Titus, that as he had before begun, so he would complete among you the same grace** (*charity*) **also** (ver. 6).—In this verse the apostle passes from the Macedonian to the Corinthian church, and shows how he was induced by what he saw among the former, to request Titus, *etc.* Εἰς τό does not designate here a continuation of what the Macedonians were praying, for there is no probability that they had any such design in their surrender of themselves. Nor need we even suppose that the apostle intended thereby to signify what was the divine will in the case. Εἰς merely expresses the product and the result; that which proceeds from or is reached by something (*Passow*, εἰς v. 1, 4); it is therefore equivalent to ὥστε, and is much the same as ἵνα. The thing requested, of Titus, and which is expressed here as if it was the object intended (ἵνα) was, that Titus would complete what he had commenced when he was before in Corinth, *i. e.*, that he would complete this grace, this charity, or demonstration of their love. The καί before τὴν χάριν refers not to ταύτην, as if there was some other χάρις which Titus had begun and now needed to finish, but to this among other proofs of love which he was to bring to perfection. The προ in προενήρξατο has reference not to a priority to the παρακαλεῖν, nor to a priority to the efforts made to collect funds among the Macedonians and the earlier commencement of the Corinthian collection (for the latter idea would need to have been more distinctly expressed.) [OSIANDER: "but it probably contrasts the present journey of Titus bearing the epistle, with the former. Osiander also calls attention to the fact that "ἐναρχ. with its simple verb and several of its other composite forms, as ἐπαρχ., καταρχ., *etc.*, is like the corresponding words connected with ἐπιτελεῖν, familiarly in use as sacrificial language. This would be appropriate to the idea here of a complete surrender of themselves to the service of the Lord and his church.] Εἰς ὑμᾶς either must mean, *with respect to you*, or must be equivalent to ἐν ὑμῖν, a concise expression for ἐλθὼν εἰς ὑμᾶς. The request must therefore refer to the time when the Apostle sent Titus again to Corinth with this epistle. [In 1 Cor. xvi. 1, the Apostle had spoken of making collections for the saints, and it is probable therefore that Titus had then commenced a fund for this object among the Corinthians. This work had therefore been started in Corinth some months before it had been acted upon in Macedonia (2 Cor. v. 10.). This request of the apostle to Titus could not refer to a former but to the present visit of Titus at Corinth. CHRYSOSTOM: "When the Apostle saw the Macedonians so vehement and fervent in all things even under great temptations, he sent Titus to quicken the action of the Corinthians, that they might be made equals. He does not indeed say this, but he implies it, and thus shows the greatness and delicacy of his love, which could not allow the Corinthians to be inferior."]

VERS. 7–15.—**But as ye abound in every thing, in faith, and utterance, and knowledge, and all diligence, and your love to us, abound also in this grace** (ver. 7). The ἀλλ' is not intended here to have the sense of *but* (Ger. *sondern*) which separates the following from the former part of the sentence, and negatives it (*q. d.*, I knew, however, when I made this request that I should not be disappointed, but that you would be distinguished in this matter also); nor has it the sense of, *rather* (let not Titus be under the necessity of exciting you to activity, but *rather*, *etc.*), for both of these ideas are arbitrary interpolations. It is a sudden turn of expression, abruptly leaving the topic before spoken of, and it is equivalent to the

Latin, *at* (Ger. *aber*). As if he had said: "But we need not assign reasons of this kind: for as ye have been remarkable in all that ye have done, so will ye be in this exhibition of your benevolence." (The emphasis should be placed upon *ταύτῃ*; in this, as in other manifestations of your charity). There are other places in which *ἀλλά* makes a transition to a summons (Mark xvi. 7; Luke vii. 7; Acts ix. 6; x. 20). No longer insisting upon those encouragements which the conduct of others supplied, he turns now to them, and calls upon them to show in this business also the preëminence they had exhibited in other things. *Ἵνα περισσεύητε* is a circumlocution for an imperative [Vulg.: *videte ut*], as in Eph. v. 33; Mark v. 23. (In like manner we have in the older Greek more frequently *ὅπως* with a conjunction [WEBSTER, *Synt.*, p. 129]. To the Apostle's thought it is necessary that we should supply here a summons to duty. It is therefore not indispensable that we should connect this expression with ver. 8, for it is rather contrary to Paul's manner to begin his corrections of others' misapprehensions with an *οὐ λέγω* (chap. vii. 30; 1 Cor. iv. 14). He makes his appeal to their sense of honor as Christians; though it is self-evident that such general commendation must be understood with individual exceptions. *Ἐν παντί* is a general phrase, which is explained immediately afterwards (MEYER: It is the general relation in which they had been distinguished for faith, *etc.*). *Πίστις* means here, not as in 1 Cor. xii. 9, but as in chap. i. 24, a faithful adherence to Christian truth. Their abounding in this was their animation, assurance and activity in faith. With respect to *λόγος* and *γνῶσις* see on 1 Cor. i. 5. [HODGE: "The former is Christian truth as preached, the latter truth as apprehended or understood]. The word *σπουδή* occurs in chap. vii. 11f., and signifies an ardent zeal in the work of Christ. *Πάσῃ* here means not that which is complete, but, in manifold aspects (it is extensive, not intensive). *Ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐν ἡμῖν* signifies that which proceeds from you, fastens upon us, and is received in our hearts; *ἐν* is not exactly equivalent to *εἰς*, comp. chap. vii. 3. In ver. 8 he meets in advance an objection which might be urged against the preceding demand—**I say this not by way of commandment, but by means of the forwardness of others to prove the sincerity of your love.**—A similar expression (*οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγήν*) is used in 1 Cor. vii. 6, and it here refers primarily to what he had said in the previous verse, but the positive details, beginning with *ἀλλά*, *etc.*, refer back to vers. 1–6; for he must naturally have had the Macedonians in view when he spoke of the forwardness of others. *Δόκιμαζειν* does not signify here *comprobare* (to approve, or to establish by proof), nor is it equivalent to *δόκιμον ποιεῖν* (to make display), but, as in 1 Cor. xi. 28, it signifies, to make trial, to test, or examine. The zeal of the Macedonians ought to stimulate the Corinthians to a similar zeal, and thus it should be proved whether their love was genuine. The participle *δοκιμάζων* depends upon *λέγων*, which should be understood again after *ἀλλά* (but I speak as one who is making a trial of, or putting to a test your love); comp. 1 Cor. iv. 14. To show that he was justified in this *δοκιμάζειν*, and that he had good reasons for making such demands upon their fraternal liberality, he adduces the example of Christ, in that great act of mercy in which he gave up all things for their sakes. **—For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor** (ver 9). This reference is very significant; but in this connection forms a logical parenthesis; and while it was designed to incline them also to deny themselves for their brethren, it was intended to make their most self-denying charities appear utterly insignificant. The idea of an example is certainly subordinate in this place to that of the merit of Christ's love, through which a corresponding love might be awakened in them. But the meaning is certainly not that Christ had made them spiritually rich (in love), and thus they had become possessed of the inclination to contribute and had been prepared to contribute of their (earthly) abundance (Olshausen). For *πλουτεῖν* cannot here signify that they were enriched in this sense, but that they possessed an abundance of those saving benefits which Christ had acquired for His people by His becoming poor (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 22; Matth. v. 5; xix. 29). [The ancient Greek expositors took *γινώσκετε* as an imperative, and Chrysostom makes this prominent: "For, have in mind, says Paul, ponder and consider the grace of God, and do not lightly pass it by, but aim at realizing the greatness of it," *etc.* The *γὰρ* shows that this is inappropriate. The choice of this verb, and especially of the present, instead of the customary *οἴδατε* or *ἐγνώκατε*, seems strange, and almost implies a direct act of recognition, but it thus signifies that their apprehension of the fact must have been especially vivid and continued, instead of being indistinct and finished]. The Apostle reminds them of the spirit which, as they well knew, Christ had shown toward them, in that free (unmerited) act of grace, in which for their sakes He had become poor. To make this grace appear in a clearer light, its subject is here designated *τοῦ κυρίου*, in which the Divine dignity of Christ and His absolute right to His people (*ἡμῶν*) is expressed. The way in which this gracious, self-renouncing love was exhibited to men is presented in the epexegetical sentence: that for our sakes He became poor. The example is placed before us in a light corresponding to the object the Apostle had in view, and substantially agreeing with what is said in Phil. ii. 7. *When He was rich* (*πλούσιος ὤν*, part. imperf.), must refer to His existence before He came to this world, when He was in possession of the Divine glory and had an abundance of possessions; and not to His existence on earth as the God-man, as the *λόγος ἐνσαρκος*; for in the latter case the *ὤν* and the *ἐπτώχευσεν* would have been in the same tense. The reference is not to the state in which He was humiliated, but as the aorist certainly makes more probable, to the act in which He divested Himself of His riches. Although the idea of "*becoming* poor" is not involved in the meaning of the verb itself [for it may possibly signify simply "*being* poor." JELF. (§ 330, 2, a.): "Verbs in *εὐω* have *generally* an intransitive signification of *being* in some state, or in possession of some quality"], yet the aorist by its own nature essentially involves the idea

of an intransitive action or state, like ἐπίστευσα and similar words. Πτωχεύειν in classical authors has the same sense of to beg, then to be a mendicant, and in all cases it implies a deep poverty in which one has nothing. [Webster *Synn.* under πένης and πτωχός, p. 227]. The word itself has reference neither to the comparative nor to the absolute poverty of Christ during His earthly life (Matth. viii. 20), but to the relation which the human life He then entered upon bore to the life of glory which He was leaving. We recognize in it a κένωσις, by virtue of which He renounced His riches, not merely in the use (κατὰ χρῆσιν) but in the possession (κατὰ κῆσιν) of them. His incarnation was a becoming poor in the strictest sense, an entrance upon the state of a human creature, who possessed nothing in himself, but had to receive everything from God. This act was even repeated in His earthly condition when He submitted to receive the ministrations of His grateful disciples that He might live respectably with His people and yet share in their necessities. That the appellation [κυρ. Ἰης. χρ.] would not be unsuitable to the being who thus became poor, is manifest from what is said of the same exalted personage in Col. i. 15 f. The ethical signification of such an instance is just as natural as it is in Phil. ii. 6ff.: but certainly the idea of an example is not here exclusively presented (see above). Πλουτεῖν is found in 1 Cor. iv. 8. Ἐκείνου is emphatic. Although the act here spoken of was for all men, the Apostle makes it more impressive by using the words, for your sakes (δι' ὑμᾶς), and so giving it a special reference to those who were to read his words. **—And I give an opinion in this matter; for this is expedient for you** (ver. 10 *a*).—In these words he proceeds to give the detailed statement which had been interrupted by the motive presented in ver. 9. In contrast with the command he here presents his opinion as in 1 Cor. vii. 25. The collocation of the words shows that the emphasis should be placed upon this word. In the causal sentence which follows it, we must therefore understand *this* (τοῦτο) as referring to γνώμην δίδωμι, although ἐν τούτῳ must have referred back to the collection. As it stands at the head of the sentence it must be emphatic, but next to it the emphasis must be laid upon ὑμῖν. By means of συμφέρει (not=decet) he intended to say that this advice was better for them than a command would have been, inasmuch as they had for some time shown themselves willing to act as he wished without a command. Such persons could derive greater moral advantage from a word of counsel than from any injunction. If τοῦτο is referred to the act of charity proposed, then συμφέρει would have to be understood as relating to the benefits which result from every good action, to the advantages of a good reputation, and to the moral gain which might be expected, or finally the reward which God will give at the last day (*promerere Deum*).—**Who began before them not only to do but also to be willing the last year.** (ver. 10. *b*)—With οἵτινες (here, as in Rom. i. 25, equivalent to *ut qui, such as*), he introduces the reasons for saying that this was more profitable to them. It is remarkable that the *doing* should be mentioned before the *willing*, for we should naturally have expected the words in the reverse order. To attempt an inversion of the terms so as to make the sentence read: *not only to will but also to do*, would be arbitrary and plainly inadmissible. Some have endeavored to aid us by making θέλειν have the sense of, *to be inclined to do;* but this would make it inconsistent with ver. 11, where, in the first place, the exhortation to complete the doing must of course be not simultaneous with, but subsequent to the willing (Meyer), or even the greater and more important of the two (Fritzsche); and secondly, the willing and the practical performance (ὅπως καθάπερ κ. τ. λ.) are so related that we must infer that the willing was an independent thing, by itself, and not equivalent merely to an inclination to do, and it must be an inherent element in the doing. Others have suggested that ποιῆσαι might refer to an actual commencement of the collection before the time of writing, and θέλειν to the disposition to give still further (the infinitive present, which on the previous explanation seemed strange, would be appropriate to this). Others still make the meaning to be, that many had then actually begun to make contributions, while some had declined to do so, and ver. 11 would then be a calling upon them to carry into actual execution their further intentions, and so to complete the collections which had been commenced. But on this interpretation we are obliged to give to θέλειν a fulness of meaning which it will not bear. The true way is probably that which makes the προ in προενήρξασθε refer, not to some time before the Apostle's writing, but to the period of the collections in Macedonia. The idea then would be, that the Corinthians were in advance of the Macedonians, not only in the accomplishment, but also in the original purpose; in the preparation of those arrangements for the collection (comp. chap. ix. 2), the continuance of which seems implied in the infinitive of the present. Thus de Wette, Meyer, et al. Neander suggests, that "the will of a person may sometimes far exceed what he does, for he may desire to do more than he is able to perform. In this case the will is greater than the doing." In ἀπὸ πέρυσι (*from last year*), the Apostle doubtless referred to the mode of reckoning yearly time which was customary among the Jews, and was also common and well known in the churches. This differed very little from the Macedonian method, for both commenced their year in September. The Apostle means not a year ago, but "the last year," *i. e.* in the present case probably six months before.—**But now complete the performance of it also; that as there was the readiness to will so there may be the performance according to what ye have** (ver. 11).—Having thus disavowed any wish to command but only to counsel them in this matter, he here proceeds to call upon them at once to complete a work which he regarded as no less important than at first. The νυνὶ δέ in contrast with ἀπὸ πέρυσι, as also the aorist imperative, implies that the matter was rather pressing and urgent.—The final sentence also implies that such a course would be becoming in them, for otherwise the doing would not correspond with the willing. But for willing (θέλειν) he now substitutes the readiness to will (προθυμία τοῦ

θέλειν), in which he more precisely expresses the completeness of their purpose (inclination, zeal), and encourages them with an avowal of his confidence. In like manner, for ποιῆσαι he substitutes ἐπιτελέσαι, which involves the entire performance or practical completion of what had been intended. The whole is more particularly defined by the subjoined phrase *out of what ye have* (ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν), which is further explained afterwards. The ἐκ designates in this place the particular respect in which a thing is to be measured or regarded. It has the sense of: according to, or in conformity with, as in such phrases as ἐκ τῶν παρόντων, *according to what a man has; according to his ability.* Either ᾖ or γίνηται must be understood (an ellipsis of the subjunctive of εἰμι which is very uncommon with Greek writers). The Corinthians would probably have said: we would contribute to this cause very willingly; and he now tells them that their performance should correspond with such a willingness, and that they should contribute according to their ability. —Further light is thrown upon ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν in ver. 12, where the Apostle defines how far an act of kindness is acceptable to God, *viz.*—**For if there be the willing mind, it is acceptable, according to what it may have and not according to what it has not,**—*i. e.* in proportion to the degree in which the free consent which the Apostle had all along presupposed, is actually in the heart. The preposition πρό in πρόκειται has here no reference to time [as is implied in the E. V.], but it simply signifies: lies before us, is present, is in sight. In the apodosis of this sentence προθυμία is the personified subject, and there was no need of inserting a τις. In εὐπρόσδεκτος, with ἐστιν understood, God was unquestionably in the writer's mind. [Osiander: the word shows the sacrificial nature of the act.] Καθὸ ἐὰν ἔχῃ. κ. τ. λ. signifies: according to that it [*i. e.* ἡ προθυμία: the disposition] may have, and not according to that it hath not, *i. e.* God judges of them and has pleasure in them according to that which they had, *etc.*, he does not call for what is beyond our power; but the small gifts of the poor man who would gladly give more, are as acceptable as the large gift of one who possessed an abundance (comp. Mark xii. 44).—Ἐάν (—ἄν) signifies that certain conditions are supposed to be out of the question in the case of him who has not, which are implied in the case of him who has.—The idea expressed in ver. 12 is further illustrated by what he proceeds to say in ver. 13, with respect to the object of the collection proposed. In the first place he declares negatively:—**For it is not that others may be eased and ye burdened but by an equality**—He means that his object was not that others (here: the Christians of Jerusalem, not other churches, with whom he had nothing to do) should be relieved while they might be, or would be burdened (with ᾖ or γίνηται understood as in ver. 11) *i. e.* that others should not be called upon while they were burdened with such contributions. These were probably expressions made use of by those who disliked him at Corinth.—He then declares positively, that the principle from which the whole proceeding was derived, or the rule by which the whole scheme was governed (ἐκ in ver. 11) was, that there might be an equality. Of course his aim was to adjust an even measure to all. These words have been variously construed and punctuated. The colon may be placed either after θλῖψις, or after ἰσότητος; and in either case the subject alluded to will be τουτο (=ἡ λογία) γινεται (1 Cor. xvi. 2). According to the second mode of constructing the sentence, ἵνα γένηται (*that there should be*) must be understood in connection with ἀλλ' ἐξ ἰσότητος. Or this whole sentence may be joined with what follows, without any words understood to complete the sense thus: but according to the law of equality your superabundance at this present time may extend (*i. e.* γίνεται) to their deficiency (Meyer). This construction is the easiest, inasmuch as very little needs to be supplied to complete the sense. But Osiander very correctly remarks that the sentence would thereby become much extended (two sentences with ἵνα before and after the principal sentence, and yet a third would be introduced by an ὅπως in connection with ἐξ ἰσότητος) notwithstanding its occurrence in the midst of a context more than usually lively and sententious. We therefore decide in favor of placing the colon after ἰσότητος. The word ἄνεσις probably meant, especially in the mind of a murmuring contributor, release, loosening from restraint, a careless freedom of enjoyment; whereas θλῖψις, on the other hand, meant that oppression of care which was the result of giving beyond their means. Ἰσοτης has not only the sense of equality, but also of equity or righteousness. Both significations here amount to very much the same thing. The point on which the Apostle speaks is not the equality between the gift and the ability of the giver, but the equality which should prevail between the givers and the receivers. The contribution should be so adjusted, that it might promote a general equality; that each one should have what he needed, without a superfluity in one portion of the church and a deficiency in another, but a communion of Christian love.—**At the present time your abundance may extend to their want, that their abundance may also extend to your want, that there may be equality.** (ver. 14).—Ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ is not to be connected with what precedes, but it intimates that a time might come when the state of things would be reversed. It does not apply to an earthly in opposition to a heavenly state (comp. ver. 14). The words to be understood must be derived from the leading sentence, and they should be γίνεται or ἵνα γένηται, signifying: *should be;* or, in this place: *should become*, or *should amount to.* According to common usage, γίνεσθαι εἴς τι would signify to become something, or to arrive at a place, and εἰς τινα would signify to fall to one's share (thus Gal. iii. 14). Here the deficiency is, as it were, local, and it is to be reached by the superfluity. The word ἐκεῖνοι applies to the same persons as ἀλλοίς. Not only in ver 13, but also in ver. 14, the περίσσευμα and ὑστέρημα must be understood of earthly possessions (the Catholics understand them of spiritual blessings). Gentile Christians had already been made partakers of the spiritual benefits of the Jews, comp. Rom. xv. 27. Nothing but a preconceived prejudice could have suggested the idea that

Paul was here attributing to the Jewish Christians the performance of works of supererogation. With respect to the possibility of such a state of things as the Apostle here supposes, there is no necessity of referring what he says to any event immediately connected with Christ's advent as, *e. g.*, the restoration of Israel, for when that event shall take place we can hardly imagine that such inequalities of condition will exist; but we refer the words rather to those catastrophes which were expected on the near approach of the Parousia, when such a change of circumstances might be possible (comp. Osiander). If we adopt Meyer's method of constructing the text, the phrase, *that there may be equality* (ὅπως γένηται ἰσότης) must refer exclusively to the member of the sentence which immediately precedes it (ἵνα—ὑμῶν ἰσότης, in order that if such an event should take place, there might be an equality between those who have much and those who have little); but if the text be arranged according to our construction, it must be referred to the two members of the sentence which precede it. This principle of equalization is illustrated in ver. 15, by a quotation from the Scriptural account of the collection of the manna in Ex. xvi. 18.—**As it is written, He that gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered little had no lack.**—The quotation is from the Sept.; only the position of the clauses in the sentence is reversed, and συλλέξας is taken from the context of the passage there for the completion of the sentence ὁ τὸ πολὺ—ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον. The meaning is: Every one found in the collection what was proportioned to his wants; he who had collected much [who had the most] had nothing more, and he who had collected [the] little, had nothing less than what he needed. [On the ellipsis and the force of the article here, S. Winer § 66. 4, and Bengel]. God had thus given his sanction, when he supplied the wants of His people by miracle, to the law of equality, *viz*, that no portion of the people was to have a superfluity while another portion was destitute. [Wordsworth: "By the command of God, the manna, which the several members of the same tent (συσκήνιοι) had gathered, was to be put together (Sept.: συνηγμένον, συλλελεγμένον) into one common stock, and then be meted out with an homer. It was so ordered by Almighty God, that when the whole was measured out, each person had exactly an homer, neither more nor less." "By ordering it to be measured out," says Theodoret, "God provided that none should abuse his gift through selfishness," and "by turning all superabundance into worms," says Jerome, "He showed that what God gives, should be for the equal enjoyment of all." Dr. A. Clarke, in his comment on Ex. xvi. 18, endeavors to show that each Israelite collected as much manna when he went forth to gather it as he he was able; but that on bringing it home and measuring it, if he found he had a surplus, he would send it to the supply of some larger family which had not been able, during the limited time, to collect enough, or which might be unable, through sickness or infirmity, to collect for itself. If, however, this distribution were not made, it could not be enjoyed, but it soon turned to corruption. A more striking illustration of a true Christian communism could scarcely be found; according to which, as Neander suggests, the distinction of property is abolished not by violence, but is equalized by the power of love].

Vers. 16–24. **But thanks be to God who is putting the same zeal for you into the heart of Titus.**—[Having thus spoken of the example of others and of the principle of the collection] the Apostle now comes to speak of the *persons* whom he had sent to Corinth on the business of the collection. He first commends (vers. 16, 17) the zeal of Titus in their behalf, but he gratefully gives the honor of awakening this zeal in Titus' heart, to God. The words, *the same* (τὴν αὐτήν) cannot mean the same earnest care with that which the Corinthians had felt, since ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν shows that they themselves, their honor, their welfare, and the advantages which would result from such a charity (comp. chap. ix. 8 ff.) were the objects of Titus' activity and care. Nor can it mean the same earnest care which the objects of their emulation, *i. e.*, the Macedonian Christians, had exhibited, or the saints at Jerusalem might exhibit; for such a reference would have required a more distinct mention. It only remains therefore that we should refer it to the Apostle himself (the same earnest care which I have shown). The phrase διδόντι ἐν is a concise but significant expression (comp. ver. 1). The *present* participle implies that the Divine influence and the consequent zeal was continued [and it was "as though the Apostle had before his eyes the working of Titus' eagerness" Stanley]. The evidence of this zeal is given in ver. 17.—**For he accepted indeed the exhortation; but being himself more zealous, he has gone of his own accord unto you.**—The τὴν παράκλησιν is the exhortation which had been mentioned in ver. 6. Having spoken of the delicacy and discretion which Titus had shown in giving so much time and attention to the matter involved in the Apostle's request (τὴν παράκλησιν ἐδέξατο), he is careful to notice that Titus' decision was entirely spontaneous and was not dependent upon his suggestion. These various aspects of the case are brought forward by means of such particles as μέν and δέ, which are not of the same force as οὐ μόνον—ἀλλὰ καί, since no climax or gradation of the thought was intended. Σπουδαιότερος implies that Titus was too zealous of himself to need any suggestion from another. [The comparative signifies either, more zealous than the Apostle, or more than the Apostle was to prompt him, or more than he had been before the suggestion. Probably the idea was, more zealous to engage in the service than I to put him upon it (Bloomfield)]. Both here and in subsequent parts of the Epistle, ἐξῆλθεν is used in the preterite, as was common in a concise style, because it anticipated the moment when the Epistle should be in the hands of the Corinthians. The whole idea intended was the following: Titus had not indeed opened his mind to Paul, and he had modestly allowed the Apostle to present to him the request to undertake this work; and yet it was evident that he needed no such request, inasmuch as his own free will was already inclined to undertake the affair. He now passes

from Titus to those deputies who accompanied him. These are not named (vers. 18ff.), but they are shown to be persons well adapted to their mission. The one first spoken of is designated by a reference to some work in which he had already been employed—**And we sent with him the brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches** (ver. 18): *οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, i. e.*, whose reputation in the promulgation of the Gospel is spread throughout all the churches. His reputation was universally recognized wherever churches had been planted. The importance of such a commendation was proportioned to the value one might attach to the opinion of all these churches; but to give force to this, the Apostle subjoins another reason for his commendation in connection with the business now in hand. This was the confidence which the (Macedonian) churches had exhibited when they chose him to accompany the Apostle in his journey to Jerusalem, with the contributions they had made (**and not that only, but who was also appointed by the churches as our fellow traveller with this grace which is ministered by us** (ver. 19). Instead of *χειροτονηθείς* we should naturally have expected the accusative. It is to be construed as if the Apostle had previously written: *who is praised*, or, not only is he praised, but has also been chosen, *etc.* (*οὐ μόνον δε ἐπαινούμενος ἐστιν, etc. ἀλλὰ καὶ*—comp. Rom. ix. 10). The choice must have been made, either by the overseers of the churches on the nomination of the Apostle, or, as *ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλ.* rather intimates, by the general body of the members themselves when they were assembled in their churches, and (as the original meaning of the word perhaps implies) showed their choice by the uplifting of hands [Osiander suggests that the Apostle speaks of the choice of the people as though it were the only thing essential to the act. It is not an election to a permanent office, for these were only *ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν* for a temporary purpose, and yet the case shows how thoroughly the democratic element pervaded the ecclesiastical life, especially in Greece]. The preposition *ἐν* specifies the object of the proceeding (in this case of the journey), in this work of charity, in the management of this benevolent enterprise. Although *σύν* has considerable authority in its favor, it is probably a gloss; but if it be accepted as genuine, *χάρις* (the grace or charity), in connection with it, would signify the money contributed. *Διακονεῖν* is used here as in chap. iii. 3.—**For the glory of the Lord and the manifestation of our zeal.** (ver. 19 *b*).—This clause expresses the object they had in view and must not be joined with what immediately precedes it; inasmuch as *καὶ προθυμίαν ἡμῶν* (which must here be taken as equivalent to: *for the showing of our earnestness*) would be plain enough by itself, and it would therefore seem feeble. Its proper place seems rather to be in connection with the main sentence commencing with *χειροτονηθείς*. It would follow from this choice and the coöperation of these men that the honor of Christ and the inclination of the Apostle (as well as of Titus) would be enhanced, inasmuch as the burden of cares spoken of in ver. 20, would be lightened and the whole business would be more easily accomplished. If we read *αὐτοῦ* before *τοῦ κυρίου*, the effect will be to make *κύριος* more prominent, in contrast with his instruments.—The honor of God would be promoted in proportion to the degree in which his love was made known among the churches and in which he as their head inspired them with energy and a common active sympathy in this work; and because all danger of suspicion with respect to the management of the mission would thus be obviated.—**Avoiding this; that no one should reproach us in this abundance which is ministered by us** (ver. 20).—In this verse he makes a more direct reference to such suspicion *Στελλόμενοι* must be connected with *συνεπέμψαμεν* in ver. 18 (not with ver. 19 instead of *στελλομεθα γαρ*). In this way ver. 19 forms a parenthesis. *Στέλλεσθαι* does not signify to depart, as if *τοῦτο* were equivalent to *ἐπὶ τοῦτο*, but rather, to attend to this matter especially. And yet such a meaning does not here seem quite appropriate to the context. It has also the sense of: to withdraw one's self (2 Thess. iii. 6), to guard against something, to shun or to avoid it, comp. Mal. ii. 5 Sept. (The reading *ὑποστελλόμενοι* is manifestly a gloss). [The Vulg. is: "*Devitantes hoc*," and Erasmus suggests that the word is taken from nautical language, and refers to the act of sailors when they take in sail and turn their course lest they should strike upon rocks. Such is the meaning in the only other passage where the word is used in the New Testament, 2 Thess. iii. 6. Paul about this time was making several voyages by sea, and was writing to a maritime people. Comp. Acts xx. 20]. *Τοῦτο* is an emphatic word in anticipation of what was about to be said. *Μωμεῖσθαι* (to reproach) has been used before in Chap. vi. 3, and it signifies here, the imputation that he had embezzled the funds, or that he had been unfaithful to his trust in the transaction of his business. *Ἀδρότης* presents us the idea of an abundance of the charitable contributions (*ἀδρός* is applied to fruits, children, trees, so as to mean that they are ripe, large, big; *ἀδρὸν πινεῖν* is to drink in full draughts) not of the *χάρις* in ver. 19, nor of the zeal of those who contributed (Rückert). *Ἐν* has the sense of: *in*, and has reference to the object or reason for the reproach. Meyer: in puncto.—**For we provide for what may be honorable not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of man** (ver. 21).—He here gives us the principle by which he was guided in this matter (*γάρ* makes what follows a reason for *στελλόμενοι*). *Προνοεῖν* is equivalent to *ἐπιμελεῖσθαι*, and signifies to bear care, to be anxious about; it is generally found in the middle voice, as in Rom. xii. 17; Prov. iii. 4 (*προνοοῦ καλὰ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων*), a passage which the Apostle evidently had before his mind when he wrote. The Receptus therefore has *προνοούμενοι*, a combination of this passage and the original reading. In cod. C. (Tischendorf) we have *προνοούμενοι γάρ*. *Καλά* signifies *honestas*, that which is morally beautiful, noble, honorable. As he took care, to appear blameless and becomingly in the sight not only of that God before whom he was always manifest (Chap. v. 11), but of men, he had adopted this precautionary measure.—**And we have sent with them our brother whom we have many times and in many things**

have proved diligent but now much more diligent for the great confidence he has in you (ver. 22).—He here proceeds to commend the other deputies. He says *συνεπέμψαμεν αὐτοῖς*; and in ver. 18 he had said *μετ' αὐτοῦ*; but both expressions have the same object. In ver. 18 the *συν* in *συνεπέμψαμεν* cannot refer to Timothy (we have sent with another). When he says in this place *τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν* he no more means a natural brother of his, than in ver. 18, a natural brother of Titus. In both instances he implies a relationship not merely as Christians but as united in the same office. He represents him whom he had sent with Titus and the others, as one whom he had often found to be zealous in many things but whom he had now found much more zealous (than before), inasmuch as his great confidence in the Corinthians had intensified his earlier zeal.—The various opinions which have been advanced with respect to these two men are more or less unworthy of confidence. Mark, Luke, Epenetus, Trophimus, Apollos, Silas, Barnabas* and others have been mentioned as each likely to have been one of them. For the last three a subordinate position, as associate deputies with Titus, would not seem appropriate. In favor of Luke is the subscription to our Epistle, but we know that this has no original authority. In behalf of Mark is sometimes quoted the expression, *ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ.* in ver. 18, but a written Gospel could not have been here meant. W. F. Besser says that "this brother must have been among the seven companions of Paul mentioned in Acts, xx. 4." Both must have been introduced to the Corinthians by Titus, in case they had been unknown before the reading of Paul's Epistle; and yet the name of the one first mentioned had probably been previously known to them, since he had been chosen by the Macedonian Churches to take charge of the collections.—**as to Titus, he is my partner and fellow worker toward you; as to our brethren, they are the messengers of the churches and the glory of Christ** (ver. 23).—In this verse the Apostle commended the three brethren collectively. The manner in which he speaks of them is here changed: *εἴτε ὑπὲρ Τίτου —εἴτε ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν.* Whether I speak in behalf of Titus, he is, *etc.*; whether our brethren be spoken of (*εἰσιν ὑπὲρ ὧν λέγω*), they are, *etc.* The intercession in favor of Titus was justified by the intimate relation in which he stood to the Apostle himself: he is my companion (in office); but particularly by the intimate relation in which he thus stood to the Corinthians: he is with respect to you my fellow-laborer (chap. vii. 7). That they were bound to hold the other two in high esteem, he shows by adverting to the fact that they were the messengers of the (Macedonian) Churches, and were to be honored therefore in proportion to the honor which such representatives deserve. [Alford's imputation (*Sunday Mag.*, May, 1864) that the translators of our English version had some private reasons for rendering "*ἀπόστολοι*" by the word "messengers," is not very clear. Even "the more general sense" of the word to which he refers as including apostolic men is not demanded here, for the persons are mentioned, not as sent of the Lord in any sense, but simply as *ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν*, with reference to a single benevolent mission or journey. It can surely have no reference here to a permanent office, and is used simply as a common noun, as in the instances to which he refers beside our passage (Phil. ii. 25, and Acts xiv. 14; comp. with Acts xiii. 2)]. Indeed, their relation to Christ Himself was sufficient to entitle them to respect, for they were an honor to Christ (by their influence and probably by their daily life) inasmuch as Christ's love and power were manifested in them and by their means (comp. *δόξα* in 1 Cor. xi. 7). [Calvin: —Whoever excels in piety is the glory of Christ, because he has nothing which is not Christ's gift.] Having thus introduced ver. 23 without a conjunction (for *οὖν* is not genuine), he proceeds with an *οὖν* to derive a practical inference from his commendation of the three brethren, or (more correctly) of the two last as *ἀποστ. τῶν ἐκκλ.*—**since ye show toward them the proof of your love, and of our boasting on your behalf, ye will show it before the churches** (ver. 24).—The sentence, *τὴν οὖν ἔνδειξιν—ἐνδεικνύμενοι* (a way of speaking which may be found in Plato), stands in need of some verb to supply the ellipsis, and this may be either in the imperative, or (better) in the indicative (present or future) of the same verb: "since ye give to them the evidence of your love, and of our boasting in your behalf, ye thus show it, or ye will show it, in the face of the churches. Even if the future tense is preferred, an indirect exhortation is implied. [If the part. *ἐνδεικνύμενοι* is construed as an imperative, as Alford and Stanley contend it frequently may be in St. Paul (Rom. xii. 9-19; Eph. iii. 18; Col. iii. 16), the English rendering of the passage will be the same as if the reading were that of the Recep. Meyer thinks that this throws the emphasis upon *εἰς πρόσωπον τῶν ἐκκλ.* more strongly than is required by the context, and that an indirect admonition, representing the thing as an affair of honor, but without making a formal demand, was more forcible: "since ye therefore will give a demonstration to them of your love, and that which we have boasted of you, ye do it, *etc.* In this way *εἰς αὐτούς* and *εἰς πρόσωπον τ. ἐκκλ.* correspond with respect to em-

[*Chrysostom speaks decidedly for Barnabas, as the brother mentioned in ver. 18, but we have no evidence that he ever travelled with Paul after the separation mentioned in Acts xv. 39, and his age and position forbid his subordination to the much younger Titus. Origen and Jerome give us a much more ancient and prevalent tradition in favor of Luke. Indeed, probabilities are all in favor of this. The use or absence of the pronoun "we" in the Acts indicate that Luke was with Paul on his first journey through Macedonia as far as Philippi (Acts xvi. 10, 11), but not with him again until Paul returned from Troas to Philippi, when we find him accompanying Paul in his later travels (Acts xx. 5, *etc*). It seems fair to conclude, therefore, that Luke was employed in evangelical labors in Macedonia and Greece, and thus acquired a reputation "in the Gospel" among the Macedonian Churches. Jerome tells us that Luke composed his Gospel "*in Achaiae Boeotiaque partibus.*" (Cat. Scr. Ecc. c. 7). We do not thus assume that Paul had necessarily any reference to *a written Gospel* in our passage. Wordsworth's idea that Paul had by inspiration a proleptic reference to the future celebrity of Luke's written Gospel seems to us unworthy of serious defence. If all reference to a written Gospel be removed, we have no occasion to think of Mark, who was not probably Paul's companion after his separation from Barnabas. We never read of Apollos as under Paul's direction or influence after Acts xix. 1. Beyond Titus and Luke, then, we have no means of determining with any probability who among Paul's company (Acts xx. 4) were these deputies].

phasis, and after the part. ἐνδεικν. we have supplied the second person of the present Indicative of the same verb]. Εἰς πρόσωπον, if the Indicative is used, will signify, *in conspectu*, presented to the face, or since the churches are looking upon you, this proof of affection will be seen by them; if the Imperative is preferred, that phrase will be equivalent to: εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας, and will mean towards the churches personally present, *i. e.*, you should, or will give this proof to the churches themselves in the person of those representatives of whom I have just spoken (ἀπόςτ. τῶν ἐκκλ.). The last is preferable. NEANDER: —"So that the Macedonian Churches may perceive that what Paul had said in praise of the Corinthians was true." Ἀγάπη here means their love, not merely to Paul, but to the brethren generally. On καύχησις ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν comp. chap. vii. 14 (chap. v. 12; ix. 3). Εἰς αὐτους is to be construed with ἐνδεικνύμενοι, and has εἰς πρόσωπον τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν for its correlative.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. The profoundest inducement Christians can have for denying themselves to assist their fellow-men, is derived from the example of the Son of God when He gave up all things and became poor that we might become rich by His poverty. We were completely destitute of spiritual good, and altogether unable to extricate ourselves from our poverty. In His equality with God He was infinitely blessed and glorious in the possession of spiritual riches. But so completely did He renounce all this, and enter into the absolute poverty of sinful beings, that He was dependent upon others and was obliged to pray the Father through the Spirit which was given Him, for light, strength, courage, consolation, refreshment and whatever He needed each moment of his earthly career. This was entirely for our sakes, for no necessity of His own required it. It was to recover for us those spiritual possessions which we had lost by aspiring to independence. And now since His self-sacrifice, as our Head and Surety, has recovered them, we have a rich abundance to use as if it were our own. All who will honestly forsake the sins which occasioned our loss and made us unworthy of riches, all who will confidingly surrender themselves to Jesus, the source of their wealth, shall be put in full possession of this. But those who know this act of grace and consider how great it was and how vast are the benefits which condemned sinners have derived from it, will cheerfully deny themselves in like manner; the joy they feel in the possession of such a salvation will open their hearts to communicate freely to those whom Jesus regards as His brethren, that they may thus make some return of joy to Him who gave himself for us. Nothing they can do will be looked upon as too much, or enough, as a token of their grateful remembrance. The greatest favor they can ask will be, to be allowed to participate in the common work of beneficence. No one will find it needful to plead long for their assistance, and when they contribute to a great work, they will first give their own selves and make no nice calculations as to their own ability. They will be ready to go beyond their power and deprive themselves of ordinary comforts, when another's greater necessity seems to require it.

2. In the department of Christian fellowship, there must be a consciousness of equality, for all are as sinners, poor; and, as God's children, rich. This equality in spiritual things would be disturbed by a great inequality in worldly possessions, if one brother exalted himself above another and if the latter brother should to the same extent depreciate himself or become envious of his favored neighbor. But where the spirit of Christ prevails those who possess much will strive to equalize this matter, for they will allow none to be in want. By a simple style of living they will secure the means of helping those who need assistance. This may be so done that the recipients will not feel that they are receiving an alms, but an act of grateful love to Christ which finds its own satisfaction in ministering to his brethren. It will be much easier to do this if these recipients indulge in no spirit of envy for what God has bestowed upon their more favored brethren, and accept of the gift in the same simplicity with which it is given. It came from the infinite riches of their divine Master but through such hands and by such instruments as were calculated to strengthen the bonds of love and fellowship.

[3. "The sacred writers constantly recognize the fact that the freest and most spontaneous acts of men, their inward states and the outward manifestations of those states when good are due to a secret influence of the Spirit of God which eludes our consciousness. The believer is most truly self-determined when determined by the grace of God. The liberality of the Corinthians was due to the operation of the grace of God." "The zeal of Titus was the spontaneous effusion of his own heart and was an index and element of his character, and yet God put that zeal into his heart. So congenial and congruous is divine influence, that the life of God in us is in the highest sense our own life." HODGE.

4. A high excellence in one or more graces of the Christian character only makes more startling a serious deficiency in others (ver. 7). To have great knowledge of divine truth, and a free utterance as to duties and privileges, only exposes our inconsistency, when we lack practical benevolence. And it is one great aim of divine and pastoral discipline, to effect this completeness of character in all believers. Afflictions are sent by God (ver. 1), and opportunities and examples will be used by a skilful pastor, so as to prove (ver. 8) and to draw forth all graces in their season.

5. We have here a true system of Christian socialism. In the divine kingdom the *Liberty* of each citizen is so perfect, that its rulers and the Sovereign King himself will receive nothing from compulsion or by the dictation of authority; the *Fraternity* of all citizens is secured by a recognition of each believer and especially of each suffering believer as a brother of our Lord, and the sympathy of each Christian with his fellow Christians is the measure of his love to Christ; and universal *Equality*, not in outward circumstances which would be delusive, undesirable and impossible, but in the common poverty from

which all are rescued and the common riches which are the inalienable birthright of every one. Each one has his peculiar capacity of enjoyment, beyond which he can enjoy nothing, whatever he may have in possession, and short of which he has a claim upon our assistance. The rights and duties of each individual may not be precisely defined by outward law, but the love of Christ and the Spirit of Christ universally diffused, will secure an equality, in which the rich bestow freely as much as the poor and suffering are willing to receive. Such an equality springs from "the feeling of a true and loving brotherhood; which makes each man say: My superabundance is not mine, it is another's: not to be taken by force, or wrung from me by law, but given freely by the law of love." F. W. ROBERTSON.

6. The whole system of mendicancy, which has been derived from this chapter by ancient and modern ascetics (v. especially Estius), has really no support. Not a word can be found there implying, "that the less sanctified believer can derive assistance, even in another world, from the merits of the saints," or that there is "such a virtue in almsgiving as to make the giver a participator in the merits of the receiver, (vv. 9, 14). Christ became poor not because poverty was in itself more meritorious than riches, but because it was the only condition in which He could reach the special object He had in view. Nor did He ever become strictly a mendicant. The evils of poverty and self-sacrifice were never chosen for any virtue He saw in them for their own sake. No outward condition, separate from the motive with which it is sought and the spirit in which it is endured was desirable to Him. The whole history of mendicant orders is a striking illustration not of the "higher perfection" of voluntary poverty, but of the injurious influence of such a state when chosen from self-righteous and unspiritual motives. And yet poverty and self-sacrifice are noble, when they are encountered for a noble object, or as a necessary discipline of providence, and are sustained in a Christian spirit.

7. The Apostolic system of charitable collections is admirably developed in this and the following section. The *Duty* of giving was pressed upon every Christian with earnestness and importunity. It was evidently no unimportant part of the church's care. It was extensively used as a test of character and a means of usefulness and fellowship. The *Motives*, by which it was urged, were love to men as men, to Christians as brethren in Christ, and to Christ Himself. But although in the *Collection* of contributions, this duty and these motives were pressed with all the art and urgency of the most ardent benevolence, every one was scrupulously left to make his gift a token of his own conscientious conviction and affection. "There are several higher degrees of the acts of charity and other Christian virtues that are not *in præcepto*, and may be omitted without sinning, yet are *in consilio;* and the performance of them most highly acceptable to God" (*Oxford old Paraphrase* on ver. 10.). We ought indeed to do for Christ all which is in our power and hence we can never exceed the measure of *duty*, but yet neither Christ nor his apostles would force by authority the higher tokens of our affection which derive all their preciousness from their freedom. In the persons selected for *managing* and *disbursing* these collections the utmost wisdom and the best characters were put in requisition. It is plain that if giving is an admirable test of a Christian's benevolence, the management of charitable funds is one of the severest tests of his integrity and discretion.

8. "God's government is an equal and just and good government (ver. 12). What can be more equitable than the principle that a man is accepted according to what he has?" BARNES.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—VER. 1. We should copy after the good examples of our fellow Christians, for one reason why our Lord would have His people do good works, is that others may have the benefit of their light, and that God may be glorified (Matth. v. 16). When our hearts burn with Christian love, and we are prepared to assist those who need our aid, it is the special gift of God.—SPENER:—Not only he who receives, but far more he who confers a favor is blessed, for what can be a greater benefit than to be filled with love, and to have the power to do good (Acts xx. 35).—VER. 2. HEDINGER:—Much tribulation, much joy! The Lord lays on us crosses, but fills us with pleasures. The faith of the pious poor works by love, and opens their hands to give cheerfully what they have. The three main elements in real goodness, are: to give cheerfully, without being importuned; liberally, according to ability; and sincerely, without a selfish motive (chap. xii. 3; ix. 7; Tobit iv. 9; Rom. xii. 8).—Ver. 3. It may sometimes be a Christian's duty to give alms to his own suffering. Even if you have no more than your neighbor, if his distress is greater, and your relief is speedier, easier and surer, you ought immediately to help him. HEDINGER:—Though poor, yet rich! rich to give, rich to bless. Others lay up much; and it proves only as the foam of a boiling vessel. Grudge not the sweat of thy brow!—Ver. 5. To give nothing but yourself when collections are made for the poor, proves that thou neither knowest God, nor doest His will (1 Jno. iii. 17).—Ver. 6. A good work in one place should encourage the hope that it will stir up a similar activity in another place. Every Christian needs to be stimulated to benevolence, for the best will sometimes become dull. —Ver. 7. Faith and God's Word are as inseparable as food and health, and bodily strength. The only sure evidence that our knowledge of God and of Divine things is correct, must be in the fact that God's Word is our standard, faith its medium, and practical beneficence its fruit. —Ver. 8. God Himself condescended to minister to the poor, and His people should be enjoined to do the same, but to what objects, at what time, or how much they shall give, must be left to every one's conscience. One of the first objects of a good minister should be to induce every one to perform his duty, but from his own free will, and from evangelical motives. God's people are not left entirely to their own freedom with respect to doing good. It is a matter of command that they must love their fellow men, and they

are enjoined to love in the only way in which true love can exist.—Ver. 9. HEDINGER:—Christ became poor to make others rich. Many become rich by making others poor. Can such persons have the Spirit of Christ.—Ver. 10f. We are never the poorer for the giving of alms. Be not weary in well doing, when God bids thee on.—Ver. 12. If Christians have but little to give, even that little will be acceptable to God; a loving God will be pleased with little, even if it be but a cup of water, Matth. x. 42.—Ver. 13. HEDINGER:—Christ's command is not that beggars should be rich, and the rich beggars; nor that one should have every thing while his brother has nothing. Love can impart, but it cannot receive too much. The rich and the poor should live together, that they may serve each other; but especially when famine threatens, lest the poor should perish. Thank God, there are always some kind and faithful ones who are ready to give help, and are bountiful to the poor, sometimes even to their own apparent loss.—Ver. 17. Follow no man blindly. God's Spirit in thine own heart will be thy guide. A willing heart will always please Him.—Ver. 18f. None but well tried and honest men, who walk honestly before God and men, not merely those who have a fair show and a glib tongue, are fit to have the control of our charities. Better than every thing else is, a good name for faith and the fear of God. If others praise us, we should never be lifted up, but let it pass, and be stimulated to greater goodness.—Ver. 20f. HEDINGER:—Avoid not only the reality, but even the appearance of evil! Strive to have an honorable name as well as a good conscience; thy neighbor demands that, God this.—Ver. 22. In matters of importance we cannot watch ourselves too carefully. In pecuniary affairs we should be so especially circumspect, that malice itself can find no occasion to reproach us. Men who have been tried and have passed through great varieties of experience, should be held in great esteem, for they can be profitably employed in almost any station.—Ver. 23. Those who are employed in the same church are partners and brethren, but even the most exalted and most accomplished should never despise their fellows.

BERLENB. BIBLE:—The church consists of many members who are bound to assist one another, according to their ability and wants. God has left the actual performance of this duty almost entirely to every one's free will; He actually requires it, but in such a way as best to exercise our faith and love. This is especially true of the care of the poor.—Ver. 1. The obedience which grace produces, is especially cheerful and free from mercenary views. It will always be the fruit of a genuine conversion. Opportunities for it will seem to a Christian a personal favor from the Giver of all good (James i. 17).—Ver. 2. In urging the example of others we should guard against a servile imitation. We should be careful to present not merely the outward action, but the true spirit and idea of it — It is astonishing how much good may be concealed under a little suffering. It is altogether beyond the sight of the thorough man of the world, who is unworthy of it; but such suffering only clarifies the spiritual man's eye to recognize the wonders of the cross. None but the spiritual man can know what it is to rejoice and to suffer at the same moment. In these very troubles, which give no pleasure, and are ominous, only of destruction to the flesh, the spiritual Christian not unfrequently finds nothing but joy (Jas. i. 2; Rom. v. 3). A covetous man is poor even in his riches, for he is the slave of his own possessions, and can make no profitable use of them, either for himself or others. A poor man, living in simplicity, is rich, for he is satisfied with what he has, and can share even a little with a neighbor. This is a delight to him, for all he has is sweetened by the Divine hand from which he receives it. The ancients used to say that "the angels rejoiced when one poor man did a kindness to another."—Ver. 3. The works of the Spirit must be spontaneous and unconstrained by authority.—Ver. 5. Those are truly good works which are the fruit of an entire consecration of soul to God. The alms which are of this nature, are therefore called charitable *offerings*, because they are entirely surrendered to God's hands. It is something for a man to give what he possesses to God or for God's sake. But far more is it for him to give up his entire self as a living sacrifice to God. There may be men who condemn it, but in the sight of God it is of great price. Though men may condemn it, is of much value.—Ver. 6. The true apostolic spirit presses on toward perfection in every thing. The word *grace* shows: 1, that we are by nature covetous, and would never perform acts of goodness without Divine grace; and 2, that what we give is ours only by free grace.—Ver. 7. We cannot accept of one part of Christianity without another. When we commend any thing in it, we must except nothing in connection with it.—Ver. 8. No man must be forced to give in charity, but there is no man who does not need sometimes to be admonished and stimulated to give of his own free act.—Ver. 9. If we know aright the grace which had compassion on us, we shall proportionately know the grace which sanctifies us; for such love will fill us with shame, and draw us to true repentance, and to a corresponding love and duty. How can a knowledge of such amazing love fail to awaken within us a similar spirit of self-sacrifice? The Christian, as such, with nothing but Christ is rich.—Ver. 10f. It is no easy thing to admonish a brother well. Much wisdom and skill are needful to select and present those motives which are likely to produce the best result. Good works which are merely external and forced, differ essentially from those which spring from evangelical principles, and come spontaneously from the heart. Those who know what it is to work, are the ones to have something for the needy (Eph. iv. 28).—Ver. 12. Where love is in the heart it will do nothing without consideration, and its gifts will be accepted by God and His people with pleasure. The Gospel demands only what has been received.—Ver. 13ff. We must help those who are in distress now, for our turn may soon come. Such a stroke is not unfrequently needful to drive indolent slumbers even from the believer's heart. God allows men to live side by side, some with superfluities and others in want, that they may be bound together by offices of mutual kind-

ness.—Ver. 16. Fix not your eye entirely upon the instruments, but look beyond to the God who gives all things, and thank Him.—Ver. 18. It is essential to Christianity that all its places should be arranged with careful foresight and order. It should provide especially that its ministers should be pure and blameless before men, and avoid everything which might awaken suspicion. —Ver. 22. Every form of goodness, even such virtues as diligence, zeal and watchfulness, must be encouraged and thrive under the influence of Christianity.—Ver. 23. Every Christian might be a glory to Christ, if he would have Christ formed within his heart, and would honor Christ especially in works of charity. —Ver. 24. We should do it for the glory of God, and for the awakening of our fellow men.

RIEGER:—VER. 1ff. Divine grace is always in the heart when we are inclined to acts of charity, and those who thankfully enjoy the gift will not forget the Divine Giver.—Our own wants, and perilous times will often be an excuse for neglecting works of kindness, but God's word reverses this, and makes them a motive for activity in them. Let any man become aware by experience of the little comfort which earthly things can give, and of the mighty aid which grace can give under every variety of condition from sources he never dreamed of, and he will never settle down under the pretence of holding together what he has, but will let it go to the relief of others, and with heartfelt simplicity commit himself to the wonderful care of God.—Ver. 4. The name of *saint*, is always a sufficient motive to give liberally and cheerfully.—Ver. 9. The whole earthly life of our Saviour was as lowly as it was different from everything which the world loves. And yet at every step He was cheered by the tokens of His heavenly Father's love (Matth. iv. 4). He thus showed that there are better treasures than can be found on earth; that we can be rich in God, but poor on earth; that one may have every bond which binds him to this world sundered and yet be rich toward God, and that our highest nobility consists in a title to a Divine inheritance.—Ver. 10ff. Everything we have should be looked upon as committed to us in trust that we may give to those who need it. Why should not the profitless penny laid up for a wet day be invested in the Lord's fund (Prov. xix. 19)?—Ver. 14f. In an unfallen state when men loved God and one another with a pure heart, God's gifts were enjoyed by all creatures alike. But since man has fallen and mutual envies and wrongs make it needful that each one should have his peculiar possessions and rights of property, great inequalities have been produced by the right of inheritance and other arbitrary arrangements. And though the mingling of the rich and the poor in common society has been overruled for many advantages, we should strive to prevent great inequalities in human condition, and by offices of mutual love equalize as much as possible the bounties of Providence.—How happy would it be, if every man would regard and use his earthly goods as the Israelites did their manna, rather as a Divine gift than as a product of human toil, for the supply of his absolute wants rather than for the indulgence of his passions, and for consumption along his journey rather than for a permanent accumulation!—Ver. 21. O God, give me an honest heart, a pervading desire to perform every duty under the direction not merely of some prescriptive forms and outward letter, but of an enlightened conscience, and as nearly as possible according to that image of love which belonged originally to man, and which is renewed by grace in his heart!

HEUBNER:—VER. 2. Persecutions and crosses give life to the church. They impart to us that firmness and courage which are so indispensable to offices of fellowship and charity. Melancholy and gloom on the other hand contract the heart. —Ver. 3f. Christian love regards the gifts which it bestows, as of small consequence compared with the spiritual benefit it derives from the objects of its bounty. Hence it "prays with much entreaty."—Ver. 5. True love when it gives, gives as it were its whole self.—Ver. 7. The richer one is in moral excellence, the nobler should he appear in kind consideration for all around him. Penuriousness and selfishness would bedim all his virtues, as rust will destroy the lustre of the most brilliant metal. Where real benevolence is wanting among a people, there can be no true life.—Ver. 8. Example is far more effective than precept, and every work of love should stimulate to something higher.— Ver. 10. The tenderer a Christian's heart is the freer his soul should be; he needs the less your commands, and only hints and opportunities. Precise precepts are for children, but a freer choice is better for the mature youth. We have a right to expect that a congregation of Christians will be of a mature age.—Ver. 11. The good purpose should never waver when we come to the performance. To fail in doing is especially disgraceful to him who has willed it.— Ver. 12. Love is never so unreasonable as to demand what is impossible, but neither will it refuse compliance from some apprehension of a remote and only possible danger.—Ver. 13ff. The inequalities which God permits should be adjusted only in His own way. True charity is a practical recognition of man's equality. But where inequalities exist, as they will, we should never murmur against God, even when they burn with indignation against the oppressor.—Our highest enjoyment of life depends not upon the possession of an abundance; a very moderate portion is enough.—Ver. 20f. Even those who are conscious of moral purity, should never be indifferent to that which might draw upon them the suspicions of their fellowmen, but strive to maintain an untarnished reputation before the world.

W. F. BESSER:—VER. 1. "To do good and to communicate" are of grace (Heb. xiii. 16). This idea stands at the head of all that the Apostle says in this section, and he thus closes the door against all foolish fancies about human merit. Every blossom of the tree of life is thus protected against the poisonous blight of self-righteousness.—Ver. 2. This gracious source from which the stream of charity flows to the world is also a source of joy to the heart.—Ver. 3f. Seldom do we meet with those who give according to their ability: for we seldom find those who calculate with simplicity what their ability

is; but still more uncommon are those who give beyond their power, for very uncommon is that love which seeks not its own, which cheerfully bears its own wants, and which therefore can spare anything from its means of self-gratification.—Ver. 9. May each of us have the mind which was also in Christ Jesus (Phil. ii. 9)! Our Lord's grace in becoming poor is set before us that we may imitate Him.—The Scriptures never speak of voluntary poverty as a merit, but they rather commend that voluntary service in which a man uses what he has and of course ought to have, as though he possessed it not (1 Cor. vii. 30).—Ver. 10f. There is such a thing as the outward performance without the hearty willing of an act of charity especially among those who have an abundance. They may give from a sudden excitement of sympathy, from the example of the multitude, or from the necessity of their position.—Ver. 12. Even the widow's mite (Mark xii. 43) should not be kept back from God's treasury. If there be a willing mind it is acceptable to God and will be estimated in each case according to what it has, and not according to what it has not. God's pleasure in the free offerings of his people is not proportioned to the extent of their possessions, for some of them have small possessions but large hearts. In such cases the willing among the rich would be more acceptable than the willing among the poor. "In God's sight," says GREGORY THE GREAT, "no man's hand is without a gift who has a treasury of good desires in his heart."—Christ's example should be imitated by doing, not what its outward form might seem to require, but what Christ's Spirit taught His disciples (John xiii. 15).—Ver. 13f. The system of communism and socialism which some have devised are only servile imitations of the true fellowship of the saints, and wherever they have been carried out there are no traces of that equality which Christian love produces. As a stream by its own law, must necessarily descend, so the essential spirit of Christian love inclines the heart of the rich toward them who are in want. Those inequalities of social life, in which the rich and the poor must dwell together, give employment to the love of the members of the Christian household, as they endeavor to equalize the comforts of all and to give enough to all. To this extent the community of goods among the first Christians is an authoritative example for all subsequent ages.—Ver. 15. The wonderful arrangement which the heavenly Householder ordained for His great family in the wilderness, should be affectionately imitated by His stewards upon earth, that there may be no inequalities in the house of God. As the manna which was carefully kept in store, was soon filled with worms, so the superfluous abundance which is kept back from the supply of a brother's wants will have no blessing.—Ver. 19. Those who would banish from the church all such things as a choice of spiritual officers, on the ground that they are too secular and legal, may have a great appearance of spirituality, but the Scriptures know nothing of a spiritualism which proudly exalts itself above all external and necessary order, generally to introduce tyranny instead of love, and finally to degrade the body of the church to a machine in the hands of a few.

[Christian beneficence: I. Its proper incentives. 1. It is an indication of divine grace (ver. 1). 2. It has an admirable example commended by the Apostle himself. The Macedonians gave without solicitation (ver. 3), to brethren in some respects opposed to them, (Jewish Christians), when tried by deep poverty (ver. 2) and yet up to and beyond their power (ver. 3), with overflowing joy (ver. 2), without an overvaluation of what they did (ver. 4), and with a complete surrender of themselves (ver. 5). 3. It is like Christ (ver. 9), who, unlike the Macedonians, was rich, but gave Himself and all His wealth to enrich guilty men. 4. It is needful to our own consistency, for a clear faith, and much knowledge and power (ver. 7), a sincere love (ver. 8), and an already announced purpose (ver. 10), should be carried out into benevolent action. 5. It is needful to an equal distribution of providential favors (vv. 13–15). II. Its needful precautions. Not to present before men a false show of goodness nor to silence vain talkers, but, 1. Against giving from wrong motives, as under authority (ver. 8), and without inward conviction (ver. 12). 2. Against intrusting the work to weak or dishonest men (vv. 18–24). 3. Against plausible objectors (ver. 21). 4. Against unequal burdens (ver. 13).]

XIV.—ADMONITION TO GIVE SPEEDILY, ABUNDANTLY AND CHEERFULLY; THE DIVINE BLESSING UPON THEM AND THE RESULT OF THE THANKSGIVINGS WHICH WOULD FOLLOW. THANKSGIVING.

CHAPTER IX. 1–15.

For [indeed, μὲν] as touching the ministering to the saints, it is superfluous for me
2 to write to you: For I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago [from last year, ἀπὸ πέρυσι]; and your zeal [the zeal which proceedeth from you, ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν ζῆλος][1] hath provoked

3 very many [the majority, τοὺς πλείονας]. Yet have I sent the brethren, lest our boast-
4 ing of you should be in vain in this behalf; that, as I said, ye may be ready: Lest
haply if they of Macedonia [any Macedonians, *Μακεδόνες*] come with me, and find you
unprepared, we (that we say[2] not, ye) should be ashamed in this same confident boast-
5 ing [with respect to this confidence].[3] Therefore I thought it necessary to exhort the
brethren, that they would go before unto[4] you, and make up beforehand your bounty,
whereof ye had notice before, [which I have before announced, προεπηγγελμένην][4]
that the same might be ready, as *a matter of* bounty, and not as[5] *of* covetousness.
6 But this *I say* [as to this], He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he
which soweth bountifully [with blessings, ἐπ' εὐλογίαις] shall reap also bountifully [with
7 blessings]. Every man according as he purposeth [hath purposed, προῄρηται][6] in his
heart, *so let him give;* not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful
8 giver. And [But, δὲ] God *is* able[7] to make all grace abound toward you; that ye, always
having [having always] all sufficiency in all *things*, may abound to every good work:
9 (As it is written, He hath dispersed abroad; he hath given to the poor: his right-
10 eousness remaineth forever. Now [But, δὲ] he that ministereth seed[8] to the sower
both minister bread for *your* food [supplieth seed to the sower and bread to the eating,
will supply], and multiply your seed sown, and increase[9] the fruits of your righteous-
11 ness:) Being enriched in everything to all bountifulness [simplicity, ἁπλότητα], which
12 causeth through us thanksgiving to God.[10] For [Because, ὅτι] the administration of
this service not only supplieth the want of the saints, but is abundant also by many
13 thanksgivings unto God; While by the experiment of this ministration they glorify
God for your professed subjection [since they glorify God on account of the proof
which this ministration gives of the subjection which flows from your confession] unto
the gospel of Christ and for *your* liberal distribution [the simplicity of your commu-
14 nion, ἁπλότητι τῆς κοινωνίας] unto them and unto all *men;* and by their prayer for you,
which long after you for [with prayer also for you, as they long after you on account
15 of] the exceeding grace of God in you. Thanks *be* unto God for His unspeakable
gift.

[1] Ver. 2.—In some good MSS. [B. C. Sin. Vulg. Syr. *et al.* and some Lat. fathers] ἐξ is wanting before ὑμῶν. [It seemed superfluous and was not understood. [Tisch. (7th ed.) inserts it, but Lachm. and Stanley omit it, and Alford puts it in brackets.]

[2] Ver. 4.—Some important but not sufficient authorities have λέγω instead of λέγωμεν.

[3] Ver. 4.—Rec. after ταύτῃ adds τῆς καυχήσεως, but the words are an explanatory gloss and in opposition to the best MSS. [B. C. D. (1st Cor.) F. G. Sin. (3d Cor. has it), several cursives, with the Ital. Vulg. and Copt. versions. They are cancelled by Lachm., Tisch. and Alford, but Bloomfield thinks they cannot be dispensed with either here or in Chap. xi. 17.]

[4] Ver. 5.—The predominance of authorities are for πρὸς, though the Rec. has εἰς [And yet Tisch. and Alford retain εἰς, and are sustained by C. K. L. Sin. and some Greek fathers.] Rec also has προκατηγγελμένην instead of the much better sustained προεπηγγελμένην.

[5] Ver. 5.—Rec. has ὡσπερ for the second ὡς, but its evidence is feeble.

[6] Ver. 7.—Lachm. after B. C. F. G. [Sin.] *et al.* has προήρηται instead of Rec. προαιρεῖται. It was probably a correction, because the preter. seemed more appropriate (Meyer). [It is not surprising that the subsequent addition of Cod. Sin. should have determined the more recent critics in favor of Lachmann's reading.]

[7] Ver. 8.—Lachm. has δυνατεῖ with important MSS.: but if this had been the original reading a gloss would have naturally changed it into δυνατός ἐστιν or δύναται. [Alford still prefers δυνατεῖ, and sees no force in the above suggestion. The authority of B. C. D. F. Sin. is certainly strong in its favor.]

[8] Ver. 12.—Lach. has σπόρον instead of σπέρμα, but it was probably occasioned by the following σπόρον. The MSS. [B. D. F. G.] are not very conclusive in its behalf.

[9] Ver. 10.—Rec. has χορηγήσαι, πληθύναι and αὐξήσαι instead of-ει-εῖ-ει, but the weight of authority is against them. The future was turned into an optative because it was supposed to be a wish. Comp. Rom. xvi. 20. Perhaps also there was a reminiscence of 1 Thess. iii. 11f.; 2 Thess. ii. 17; iii. 5 (Meyer). The fut. form is sustained by B. C. D. Sin. and several Lat. fathers.]

[10] Ver. 12.—Lachm. has χριστῷ for θεῷ. He is sustained only by B. [and perhaps the Vulg.: *in Domino.*]

[11] Ver. 15.—Rec. has δέ after χαρις, but contrary to much superior authorities.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

VERS. 1–5. **For indeed concerning the ministering to the saints, it is superfluous for me to write to you.**—The use of γάρ, connecting what is here said with the preceding chapter, and περὶ μέν (instead of περὶ δέ), shows that this chapter could not have been a distinct Epistle, and that the Apostle was not here beginning as it were a new subject (in consequence of a long interruption). It is possible indeed that he had been reviewing what he had written, and now saw that something was needed to complete his thought. However this may have been, he now introduces with most refined delicacy a number of additional particulars, with the remark that he really had no need of writing to them with respect to the collection, for he was well aware of their readiness of themselves. The connection seems to be: "I have no occasion to write to you with reference to a ministration to the necessities of your brethren, but the point to which I would draw your attention is, a kind reception of the messengers from me." If μέν should be taken as a *solitarium* [*i. e.*, without a δέ following it], its design must have been to give special prominence to the idea of the ministration (διακονία), in contrast with his com-

mendation of the persons who were to have charge of it. But we see no reason why the δέ in ver. 3 should not be construed in correspondence with this μέν. This ministration, as in chap. viii. 4 (Meyer), signifies, a service of love, including the idea of something which was, a just debt, (a *debitum ministerium*), Rom. xiii. 8; Heb. vi. 10; 1 Pet. iv. 10, in conformity to Christ's example, Matth. xx. 28, comp. Gal. v 13. Περισσόν means superfluous, for the object I have in view. [What does the Apostle mean was superfluous? It was either: 1. The writing on the whole subject, notwithstanding the fact that he had written on it and was about to write more; 2. The writing, in contrast with his sending the brethren (ver. 5); 3. The writing on the collection itself in contrast with his having written to commend the brethren, and his being about to write of the manner and spirit of the collection]. De Wette enfeebles the expression by making it mean: "I regard it as superfluous." Τὸ γράφειν is here the subject of the sentence.—**For I know your forwardness of which I am boasting concerning you to the Macedonians, that Achaia was ready from last year** (ver. 2*a*). The mention of this readiness (προθυμία) was not a mere fiction of the Apostle for present effect. The commencement of the collection the preceding year (comp. chap. viii. 10f.) had shown that it was an actual fact, and that the Corinthians only needed encouragement to complete the work as soon as possible. The use of the present tense (καυχῶμαι) shows that the Apostle was still in Macedonia. Ἦν is an accusative with καυχῶμαι as in chap. xi. 30; Prov. xxvii. 1. The subject matter of his boasting was that Achaia had been ready the preceding year. The word Ἀχαΐα intimates the extent of his boast and the general prevalence of the Gospel throughout the province which was so called. It shows how confident he was that the whole province was virtually the Lord's (comp. Osiander). The Apostle implies that they were already prepared to commit their contributions to his hands. On ἀπὸ πέρυσι, comp. chap. viii. 10. He adds—**and your zeal hath provoked the majority of them.** (ver. 2*b*.)—The phrase ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν ζῆλος properly signifies the zeal which *proceeded from you*, and is a kind of attraction [WINER's *Idioms*, §63]; as if he had said, the zeal which commenced with you, hath provoked, *etc.*, comp. Matth. xxiv. 17 *et al.* The majority (τοὺς πλείονας) indicates that only a small part of the Macedonians remained unaffected by it. In relation to this matter, comp. chap. viii. 3.—**But I have sent the brethren, that what we have boasted concerning you might not be made vain in this respect; that as I said, ye may be ready** (ver. 3). The Apostle intended here to say, that while he had no need to write any thing with reference to the collection itself, inasmuch as he well knew that the Corinthians were entirely willing to contribute, he had nevertheless sent the brethren (chap. 16ff.) that they might have every thing in actual readiness, and that he might not be ashamed of what he had been confidently boasting of them among the Macedonians. Neander: Paul had doubtless said in Macedonia that the Corinthians were prepared to contribute the year before; this had inflamed the zeal of the Macedonians, and he now felt that it was needful to exhort the Corinthians not to disappoint his hopes concerning them. The words τὸ καύχημα—ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν are in themselves general, and include everything of which he had boasted of them, but it is afterwards confined to the matter in hand by ἐν τῷ μέρει τούτῳ (in this respect). This limitation of the possibility of failure to that single point shows how confident he was that his general boast respecting them could not be broken down. Estius very properly calls this "*acris cum tacita laude exhortatio.*" *That ye may be ready* contains the positive, and *lest our boasting should be in vain*, the negative part of this sentence.—**Lest perchance, if any Macedonians should come with me and should find you unprepared.** (ver. 4*a*)—Ἵνα is here used as in Rom. vii. 13, and twice in Gal. iii. 14. The anxiety he had just intimated he here expresses more definitely, but in a very delicate manner, by the adverb μήπως, which is in this place equivalent to *ne forte* in ver. 4. He means, if any Macedonians should come as his companions (chap. i. 16). [The persons here spoken of are evidently not those whom he had described in chap. vii. 16-23 and ix. 3, and hence some have concluded that these last could not have been Macedonians. It was yet uncertain whether any would accompany him. But as Corinth was then a great commercial as well as religious centre, some might reasonably be expected to go]. On ἡμεῖς comp. ver. 3. **We, not to say you, should be put to shame in the matter of this confidence.** (ver. 4*b*).—We are not to regard this little parenthesis (*we say not ye*, ἵνα μὴ λέγωμεν ὑμεῖς), as a mere pleasantry, but on the other hand as a delicate attempt to stimulate their feelings of self-respect; since the shame would indeed be theirs if the Apostle's expression of confidence in them should not be borne out in fact. W. F. BESSER:—"In this little sentence we may discover the extreme delicacy of Paul's feelings, and the affectionate civility which characterized his intercourse, but which are especially prominent in this most personal of all his Epistles." The ὑπόστασις is simply the confidence which had been expressed in the boasting. Comp. chap. xi. 17; Heb. xi. 1, and frequently in the Sept., but the word has not here precisely the sense of, business, thing. The Corinthians would be put to shame should they not come up to what the Apostle confidently expected of them. [He had stimulated the Macedonians by saying that the Corinthians had *begun* the collection, and then when he found that the Corinthians had not finished their contribution according to his expectation and his boast of them, he very properly stimulated the Corinthians by telling them that the Macedonians had *completed* their collection. He had boasted that the Corinthians were "prepared" the last year for the collection, and yet now he found it necessary to send deputies to have them "prepared" for delivering it up]. In all this there is surely no ground for suggesting that Paul was acting a cunning part, or was conforming to the shrewd policy of the world (Rückert); or that he here exhibits something of human infirmity (de Wette) Comp. Meyer, Osiander. And yet we may properly

concede and maintain that he here shows most consummate art.—**I therefore thought it necessary to exhort the brethren that they would go before to you, and make up beforehand the bounty I have already promised** (ver. 5*a*).—The Apostle here brings out with more particularity the business of the deputies he was sending. Οὖν, in accordance with what he had just said, signifies, *in order to prevent our being ashamed.* The πρὸ in προέλθωσιν signifies, before the arrival of myself and the Macedonians. Προεπηγγελμένην signifies, before promised by me (comp. ver. 2 ff.) not announced to you [as in the Eng. vers.] or promised by you. [Dr. Hodge thinks it means what the Corinthians had promised. We are nowhere told of such a promise, though the confident expectations of the Apostle had *some* reasonable foundation. As we suppose this to have been his *information* respecting them, and as we are informed of the Apostle's promise to the Macedonians respecting them, we prefer to refer προεπηγ. to what he had said in ver. 2. The thrice repeated προ (in composition) shows the Apostle's extreme forethought]. Ταύτην ἑτοίμην εἶναι designates the result aimed at in the προκαταρτίσωσι τὴν εὐλογίαν—**that the same may be ready in the manner of a blessing, and not as a covetousness.** (ver. 5 *b*.)—With this designation of their gift or their benificence as a εὐλογία in the sense of an act of love produced by Divine grace, after the example of God and directed to the welfare of men, in which one gives cheerfully and with full hand, according to ability, he now connects an admonitory hint, that it should be so given as to appear a blessing, and not an act of covetousness. As εὐλογία includes essentially the idea of an abundance, so does πλεονεξία that of scantiness; but of what these consist is not necessarily implied in the words themselves. Neander takes εὐλογία as if it corresponded with the Hebrew בְּרָכָה (blessing) and signified, a communication of some good, and then a token of affection; and πλεονεξία as meaning covetousness, extortion, something extorted. W. F. Besser:—"This contribution to the common benefit of the Church may be called a blessing in two respects: first, as a gift from God, inasmuch as it was the result of His grace in the hearts of His people (chap. viii. 1), and secondly, as an offering to God, but deposited in the hands of His poor." [In the English version εὐλογία is translated "bounty," but this fails of bringing out the idea of good will on the part of the giver. The Greek word signifies etymologically, a blessing by word, and to this was added, by Hellenistic usage, the idea of a blessing by action, by a present (Gen. xxxiii. 11; Judg. i. 15; comp. Prov. xi. 25). Οὕτως is not redundant, but draws attention to the following εὐλογίαν, as if it were to be taken in its peculiar signification; with ὡς it signifies, so as, in the manner of]. The whole phrase, οὕτως ὡς, etc., relates to the special character of the gift: *i. e.*, it should be an act of real benevolence, liberally dispensing what it has, and not of covetousness, withholding as much as possible, from a regard to self alone. [The context shows that the givers and not those collecting the gifts are here alluded to (inasmuch as these collectors might be actuated by a covetous spirit and extort from the people). If we take the expression in its utmost strictness, it signifies the laying down of a small amount, because the giver wishes to reserve more than he needs for himself. [Theophyl:—"As if he were over-reached by some one, or cheated out of it." Dr. Clarke thinks there is an allusion to the two kinds of chests which were set for alms in the Temple: the one for what the law required as necessary for every one, the other for the free-will offerings. To the one all men gave, because they were obliged to do so, but to the other those only gave who had pity on the poor]. But the Apostle explains his meaning more fully in vv. 6, 7, where he traces the course of each giver to its proper result, and reminds his readers that even the costliest gift has no value in the sight of God, if it is not given with a benevolent and cheerful spirit.

Vers. 6, 7. **But as to this, He that sows sparingly shall reap sparingly, and he that sows with blessings shall reap with blessings.**—The τοῦτο has sometimes been referred to ὁ σπείρων, as if it designated this kind of seed [he who sows *this* sparingly, Meyer]; but this would require an inappropriate emphasis upon τοῦτο. Others, therefore, [as our English version does] supply λέγω, or φημί; but every where else the Apostle in similar cases gives us the verb itself (1 Cor. vii. 29; xv. 50; Gal. iii. 17). Others supply ἐστιν in the sense of *this is as if,* (οὕτως ἔχει). But to avoid a feeble construction, it seems better to take it (with Meyer) as an *accus. absol.* "as to this, *viz.*, that it ought to be ὡς εὐλογία and not ὡς πλεονεξία, he which," *etc.* He connects φειδομένως in sense with καὶ μὴ ὡς πλεονεξίαν, and places it at the beginning of the sentence. On σπείρειν—θερίζειν, comp. 1 Cor. ix. 11; Gal. vi. 7ff.; Prov. xix. 17. [In almost all recent copies of the English authorized version, the word *also* has twice crept into this verse as a gloss]. He who does good sparingly shall have a corresponding recompense, a participation but sparingly in the blessings of salvation, *i. e.*, an inferior (it is not said, no) reward of grace. In contrast with this stands ἐπ' εὐλογίαις σπείρειν and θερίζειν, where the second ἐπ' εὐλογίαις, for the sake of emphasis, follows immediately after the first. Ἐπ' εὐλογίαις has the sense of, abundantly [though this misses the idea of its being a gift of love, Alford], either: *with* blessings (the relation being in the thing itself), the blessings which he gives and receives; or: *for* blessings, with a view to blessings, and the blessings which he shall receive, [Alford: "this will not suit the second ἐπ' εὐλογ."] Neander (on the ground that εὐλογία involves the collateral idea of a voluntary gift of affection), paraphrases it, "he who sows in such a way, that it is seen to be a gift of love." [Stanley: 'Επ', *on the condition,* these are the terms on which we give, as in Luke vi. 38, comp. 1 Cor. ix. 10]. The plural gives increased force to the idea of abundance. A similar contrast may be noticed in Prov. ix. 24. [Beza notices a triple Hebraism in the phrase ἐπ' εὐλογίαις: 1, in the use of ἐπὶ with a noun when the whole has an adverbial signification, as "in *justitia,*" for justly; 2, in calling the act of charity εὐλογία, with reference to the Heb. נְדָבָה free-will offerings; 3,

in using the plural for emphasis. We may also notice the variety of euphemisms by which the contribution is designated in this whole section according to the side from which it is viewed. With reference to its *source*, it is *χάρις*; in its relation to the church's life, it is *κοινωνία*; in its relation to public servants, it is *διακονία*; in its beneficial purposes, it is *εὐλογία*; and as a public act of piety it is a *λειτουργία*]. The Romish doctrine of merit is one entirely foreign to our text, and totally inconsistent with Paul's spirit.—**Let each one give as he hath before purposed in his heart, not grudgingly, nor of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver.** (ver. 7.)—The verb *δότω* must be supplied from *ὁ σπείρων* and *δότην* as the predicate of *ἕκαστος*. *Καθὼς προῃρεῖται*, as his heart freely prompts him. The definite purpose with respect to the amount each one would give, the Apostle supposes to be already formed when he comes to give, though in ver. 6 he had spoken of it as in the future (Meyer). In contrast with this cheerful, free self-determination, he places another which springs *ἐκ λύπης, ἐξ ἀνάγκης*. Ἐκ indicates the source from which the gift proceeds: a morose, gloomy frame of mind, properly a sadness at parting with what it gives; or, from compulsion, as when a man gives from necessity, because he cannot avoid it (comp. Philem, ver. 14). W. F. Besser: It is one of the secondary results of the factions which prevailed at Corinth, that Paul was thus induced to warn us against all undue compulsion in charitable collections, and to admonish us in such matters to give with sincere pleasure; for nothing more completely poisons an act of charity than a manifest spirit of rivalry or a mere love of distinction." To encourage them in this cheerful contribution, he reminds them of a Scriptural expression which, however, is not fully quoted. By way of emphasis, and for a more striking contrast with *λύπη* and *ἀνάγκη*, the *ἱλαρόν* of the concluding sentence is placed at the commencement (comp. *ἐν ἱλαρότητι* in Rom. xii. 8). The passage here thus freely quoted, is an addition to the original by the Septuagint in Prov. xxii. 8: *Ἄνδρα ἱλαρὸν καὶ δότην εὐλογεῖ* (var. *ἀγαπᾷ*) *ὁ θεός*. Comp. *ἀγαπᾷ* with *εὐπρόσδεκτος* in chap. viii. 12.

Vers. 8–11.—**And God is able to make all grace abound toward you, that ye having always all sufficiency in everything, may have an abundance for every good work.** (ver. 8).—Having admonished them to be bountiful and cheerful in their contribution he here assures them, that God could and would amply bless them in it, and that they had abundant reason to be of good cheer and confide in Him. It was ver. 8 which induced Francke to build the Orphan's House at Halle.* *Δυνατός* is emphatic at the commencement of ver. 8: He can, and of course he will do it. *Δέ* introduces another element in the matter *viz*: the power of Him who takes pleasure in a joyful giver, to provide for him abundantly. It is a question whether *χάρις* includes merely bodily or only spiritual benefits, or whether it may not embrace both. *Πᾶσαν* is in favor of the latter view, and the detailed statements which are given seem to demand some reference to bodily things. Besser: "God can bestow upon us abundantly, not only the grace which makes us rejoice in the Lord and so prepares us to give with joyful hearts (Chap. viii. 2), but the grace which bestows on us that abundance of earthly blessings and that prosperity which enables us to give so liberally." *Περισσεῦσαι* as in Chap. iv. 15 must be taken in a transitive sense. The accumulation of such words as *ἐν παντὶ, πάντοτε* and *πᾶσαν* in this sentence is very emphatic, and is similar to another in Phil. i. 3 ff. *Αὐτάρκεια* must here be construed in an objective sense as meaning a sufficiency. *Πᾶσα αὐτάρκεια* signifies a condition which warrants us in being perfectly contented, a sufficient subsistence even for corporeal comfort. Meyer makes it have reference to a subjective habit of the mind, *i. e.*, the ethical condition which prepared them to abound unto every good work; such a satisfaction with their condition as would make them always contented, comp. 1. Tim. vi. 6, Phil. iv. 11. The more particular definitions, however, which he proceeds to give (*ἐν παντὶ—πᾶσιν*, as well as *ἔχοντες*) seem more agreeable to the objective explanation; and the "abounding to every good work," (which cannot mean, in an ethical sense, merely a growth in benevolence, but beneficence in an abundant degree), is that to which the full sufficiency could and should lead; indeed it was precisely that state in which notwithstanding its deep poverty a *περισσεύειν* was said to take place (chap. viii. 2). The correct way seems to be, to take all these expressions, grace, sufficiency and good work, in a general sense, so as to include even the corporeal or earthly condition. Every good work would therefore mean any act which tends to accomplish the divine purposes, and to promote the kingdom of God; and which dispenses benefits of a corporeal nature to brethren in distress. This ought to be the outflowing of that complete sufficiency, which is secured by divine grace in every department of life, even in respect to corporeal affairs.—In ver. 9 he illustrates what he had thus said by another Scriptural passage from Ps. cxii. 9.—**As it is written, He scattered abroad, he gave to the poor, his righteousness abides forever.**—The person respecting whom this had been said was the pious man. *Σκορπίζειν*, which occurs also in John x. 12, xvi. 32, signifies to scatter, here to scatter abroad (as in sowing), and it has the sense of abundantly distributing on every side. Bengel: "Without anxious thought in what direction every grain may fall." *Πένης* signifies one who works for his daily bread (*πένομαι*) [one not so poor as *πτωχός*, who lives on alms, but one who has nothing superfluous, Webster p. 227] therefore one who is poor and needy. It occurs no where else in the New Testament. *Δικαιοσύνη* is not the merit which is gained as the result or the reward of well doing, but the righteousness or good conduct itself. It signifies here especially that which is seen when one does good (not immediately, beneficence, at least not in the sense of that which is the cause of justification, since

[* In order to procure means to assist the poor of Halle, Francke placed a charity-box at the door of his own house inscribed with 1 John iii. 17 and 2 Cor. ix. 7. One day (about Easter 1695), on opening this box he found a sum (only 7 gulden) so much larger than he had before been able to devote at one time to works of charity that he resolved immediately to found a free school for poor children.]

it is rather the result of justification; comp. Gal. v. 6, 22, Col. iii. 12 ff.). Beneficence is called *δικαιοσύνη* (comp. ver. 10 and Matt. vi. 1), "because it is an act of justice, not to retain for our own exclusive use, what God has given to all in common" (Ambros.). Ewald: "To the extent in which our free alms is the fruit of a higher feeling of love and righteousness, it is no doubt called צְדָקָה in Prov. x. 2 xi. 4." To remain forever implies not merely a permanent reputation among men, but the everlasting continuance of righteousness, blessing us with its loving spirit not only in the present life, but glorifying us and blessing us with the same spirit as a gracious reward through eternal ages (comp. 1 John ii. 17). [On *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, consult Trench, *Synn.* 2d Ser. pp. 35–41.]—What Paul had described in ver. 8 as only a possible thing on God's part, he speaks of in ver. 10 as though it were surely to be expected.—**But he who supplies seed for the sower, and bread for the eating, will supply and multiply your seed sown, and increase the fruits of your righteousness**;—In these words of Isaiah (in which only *ἐπιχορηγεῖν, to furnish, to grant*, is substituted for the *διδόναι* of the Sept.) he describes God as the source from which these things were to be expected. He leads us to expect in the economy of grace and in the government of the church something analogous to what God is continually doing in the economy of nature. [Wordsworth: *χορηγέω* was properly said of a wealthy person supplying the requisite funds for the equipment and training of a tragic *χορός*. Hence with the accus. and the dat., it came to mean to supply anything for a purpose. Ἐπί sometimes implies a supply of one thing after another. Comp. 2 Pet. i. 5. Dr. Clarke thinks the verb here has some allusion to its early meaning: to lead a chorus, and that God is represented as leading up the grand chorus of causes and effects, and providing for the whole host of benevolent workers in His kingdom.] The participal sentence extends not merely to *τῷ σπείροντι* but to *βρῶσιν*, for not only does the symmetry of our sentence demand this, but the passage in Isaiah requires it. [Our English translators have generally followed the received Greek text, which reads *χορηγήσαι, πληθύναι* and *αὐξήσαι* in the optative instead of the futures *χορηγήσει, πληθυνεῖ* and *αὐξήσει*. They have also followed the Vulgate and joined *καὶ ἄρτον εἰς βρῶσιν* with the subsequent verb. In this way the whole becomes a prayer of the Apostle for his Corinthian brethren: "May he who ministers seed to the sower both minister bread for your food, and multiply your seed sown." This seems unsupported not only by external but by internal evidence; for Paul was aiming to supply reasons and motives to liberality, on the ground that no one would lose or be straitened on account of large contributions. Not a prayer, but a promise was needful for this.] Corresponding with the supply of the seed to the sower is the assurance that the same Being would bestow upon them and multiply for them that which would be necessary to their sowing, *i. e.* to their work of beneficence. This has reference not merely to their future doings as a consequence of; or as a Divine blessing upon; their present liberality (Rückert); but, as the context and aim of the writer evidently require, to the benefaction then in progress (comp. *δι' ἡμῶν* in ver. 11). It is not till we come to the second member of the sentence, that we find the blessing upon the future action exclusively referred to: *and will increase the fruits of your righteousness.* This corresponds to the bread for eating, and the whole signifies: As God makes the scattered seed grow until it brings forth fruit and so gives bread for the eating (*βρῶσις* signifies the act of eating), so will He bless your sowing, your work of beneficence, and cause the fruits of your good conduct to increase. The fruits of righteousness correspond to the bread before spoken of, in the enjoyment of which the reward of diligence in sowing is acquired. The expression (in the sense of *καρπὸς δικ.*) occurs also in Hos. x. 12. But are we here to regard it as applicable to spiritual or worldly blessings? In the latter sense it would correspond with the interpretation we have given above to ver. 8. With great propriety the ancient church selected vv. 6–10 for being read on the day appointed for the commemoration of St. Laurentius (Aug. 10).*—**Being enriched in everything unto all simplicity which works out through us thanksgiving to God.**—In this verse the Apostle gives some additional particulars which may assist in determining his meaning. We have an anacoluthon, in which the participle stands as a nominative, like *εἰδότες* in chap. i. 7, as if *ἡμεῖς* had been expressed in ver. 10. A similar construction may be seen in Col. iii. 16.—There is no need of supplying *ἐστέ* [so that the sentence shall read: ye shall be enriched, *etc.*] for the connection with ver. 8 would not be suitable. As vv. 9 and 10 have an obvious connection with ver. 8, they cannot be taken as a parenthesis. [Our English A. V. regards ver. 9f. as a parenthesis, but inserts no *ἐστέ*, for it regards *πλουτιζ.* as an independent nominative. It is better to connect it (not with ver. 8 but) with the verse immediately before it: "God will increase the fruits of your righteousness (*i. e.* your resources), being enriched" (*i. e.* so that ye shall be enriched) *etc.* Hodge.] Ἐν *παντί* shows that their being enriched was in the most comprehensive sense of the word, and it is implied that *πᾶσα ἁπλότης*, in the sense of perfect simplicity (chap. viii. 2) was to be the result (though not precisely the designed object)

[* Laurentius was one of the seven deacons at Rome, and had the care of the treasury for the poor. When his master Pope Sextus II. was led forth to martyrdom, L. begged to accompany him in this as he had done in other sacrifices, but he was told that he would not have long to wait. The governor of the city demanded that he should surrender the treasures which he so liberally dispensed to the poor. At the end of three days he made his appearance, followed by a vast train of miserable, lame and crippled persons, to whom he pointed, saying, "These are our treasures." The governor, feeling insulted, immediately had him slowly roasted upon an iron seat or gridiron until he died (Aug. 9. A. D. 255). His dying words were, "Enter not into judgment with thy servant," *etc*, Ps. cxliii. 2. The Church in after time observed Aug. 10, in his memory, and as his speech and life were looked upon as an admirable illustration of 2 Cor. ix. 6–10, that passage with profound judgment was assigned for the Scriptural reading of that day (harvest time). Whatever uncertainty rests upon the precise details of this story, Augustine has given his sanction to its general verity when he says: "As easily might you hide the glory of Rome itself as that of the crown of Laurentius."]

of the enrichment. The Divine blessing upon those who sincerely loved their brethren and cheerfully assisted them in time of trouble, would be seen in their becoming rich in all spiritual and temporal blessings. The final result would be such a perfect simplicity or singleness of heart, and such a pure benevolence as knows nothing of selfish interests or painful forebodings, and manifests itself in a free and ample supply of others' wants. [The word "*bountifulness*" in our version hardly expresses this.] Such a simplicity is not only the fruit of an abundant spiritual life, but is an actual experience which blesses even with temporal benefits those who kindly endeavor to alleviate the distresses of their brethren. In the relative sentence *which works through us, etc.*, the Apostle comes back to the collection which had its origin and support in this *ἁπλότης*, and he gives prominence to one result of this simplicity which admirably corresponded to its origin, (chap. viii. 1), inasmuch as it produced a spirit of thanksgiving to God. Ἥτις is here probably not causal, in the sense of *quippe quæ*, but equivalent to *ἥ*. It is thus like *ὅστις*, as commonly used in the later prose; or it is equivalent to: something which was working. In *δι' ἡμῶν* Paul refers to himself and his assistants in the work of collection, since it was through their hands that the gift would be communicated and the receivers would thus be induced to give God thanks. Τῷ *θεῷ* is by some made dependent upon *κατεργάζεται* (for, or in behalf of God), but it is better to make it dependent upon *εὐχαριστίαν*, inasmuch as the construction of the verb will then be preserved (Meyer: a dative of appropriation).—The reason for this thanksgiving he finds (ver. 12) in the collection then in progress.

Vers. 12–15.—**Because the ministration of this service supplieth not only the wants of the saints, but also abounds through many thanksgivings unto God.**—Neander: "The Apostle here brings forward another motive for their cheerful contribution, in the material and moral benefits which the saints at Jerusalem would derive from it." The ministration spoken of was not the service which Paul and his associates performed when they took charge of the collection, but as in ver. 13, the service of those who took part in the contribution itself. Τῆς *λειτουργίας ταύτης* shows more particularly that it was something done for the Christian community (comp. Rom. xv. 27; Phil. ii. 25). The ministration, therefore, which consists in such a service must be of the same nature (Meyer: the work of distributing the alms). Whether such a word implies that this friendly service was an act of worship, or such a sacred performance as to deserve the name of an *oblation* (comp. Phil. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 16), may be left in doubt.* In this inference the Apostle intended to say that the ministration of which he was speaking would not only supply a want of the saints (*προσαναπληροῦσα* being strictly equivalent to: supplying by addition, chap. xi. 9), but would overflow through many thanksgivings toward God, or would cause such thanksgiving to ascend in great abundance. Here also *τῷ θεῷ* is governed, not by *περισσεύουσα*, but by *εὐχαριστιῶν*. [See T. Lewis' explanation and illustration of this text in *The Divine and Human in the Scriptures*, p. 339.—**As they glorify God on account of the proof which this ministration gives of the subjection which flows from your confession of the Gospel of Christ** (ver. 13 *a*). The Apostle here does nothing more than to define with more particularity what he had just said, but with a connection of the participle similar to that which we have seen in ver. 11; as if he had written in ver. 12: *in consequence of the fact that many give thanks, etc* Διά points out the external medium (*i. e.*, the occasion) of a thing; in this place of the *δοξάζειν, etc.* [They (the thankful recipients) glorifying God when they saw the proof which this ministration gives, *etc.*]. The attempt to bring this word into immediate connection with ver. 12 is arbitrary and unnatural (comp. Osiander and Meyer). By *δοκιμῆς* (chap. viii. 2) we must understand either the evidence which this service would give that the *Corinthians* were approved, or the evidence which this service would give that the distribution itself was right and just, *i. e.*, that it was such as might be expected from the Christian standard of benevolence (Meyer after Theophylact: *διὰ τῆς δοκίμου ταύτης καὶ μεμαρτυρημένης ἐπὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ διακονίας*). In behalf of the latter view may be alleged the most natural signification of the words, and the fact that with *ἐπί* is introduced a reason for thanksgiving which related to the Corinthians. It may be added that the *δοκιμή* of the *διακονία* must have been also a test of the Corinthians. That which was the object of their thanksgiving is said to be the *ὑποταγὴ τῆς ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν*. In Hellenistic Greek, *ὁμολογία* signifies: confession (not: agreement, comp. 1 Tim. vi. 12; Heb. iii. 1; iv. 14; x. 23), and it is the word for the way in which faith is outwardly expressed or made known (comp. Rom. x. 9 f.). *Εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* may therefore be joined with it, analogously with *πίστις εἰς χριστὸν, πιστεύειν—εἰς τὸ φῶς*, and similar phrases. We should indeed have expected the article (*τῆς*) before *εἰς τὸ εὐαγ.* to give it more definiteness, but we ought not to regard this as indispensable, inasmuch as we find every where great liberty in the use of it. Comp. Winer, § 19, 2. The same is true with respect to *τῆς*

[* The word *λειτουργία*, by which the Apostle designates once more the contribution of the Corinthians, was derived from the old Greek, and especially the Attic language. Etymologically it was from *λεῖτος*, of or belonging to the people, and *ἔργον*, a work, a public work in the service of the people. At Athens, it was any public service (as the conducting of the public shows, or theatres, or choirs (ver. 10), or the supply of food for the people on public occasions) which the wealthier citizens discharged at their own expense, and usually in rotation. The word passed over into Scriptural and ecclesiastical language, retaining principally the two ideas of a work or service, and a service of the public. In the New Testament, sometimes one and sometimes another of the historical ideas connected with the word is most prominent. It is sometimes a secular employment, though still in the service of God (Rom. xiii. 6, comp. Eccles. vii. 30), sometimes a service done to a public servant of the Church (Phil. ii. 30) sometimes a ministry of instruction, but more usually it was applied to the priestly or sacrificial services (Luke i. 23; Heb. viii. 2, 6; ix. 21; x. 11). The more ethical idea is appropriate in our passage, *viz.*: a voluntary act of benevolence for the public good, but for God's service, and hence an offering to the Lord of the Church. Comp. Oslander. The Art. *Liturgie* in Hertzog's Encyc. by Palmer].

κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτούς, where the article is in like manner absent, and the same would still be true if we were to join εἰς τὸ εναγγ. with ὑπακοῇ, so that the phrase should mean a complying or obedient disposition toward the Gospel; in which case τῆς ὁμολογίας would appear to be the source of the ὑπακοή: on account of the obedience which results from your confession. On the other hand, by joining ὁμολογίας with εἰς τὸ εὐαγγ., the ὁμολογία may be regarded also as the object of the ὑπακοή, so that the idea shall be: since ye are obedient to your confession. [Beza, whom our A. V. follows, gives to the genitive the force of a participle, and renders τῇ ὑποτ. τῆς ὁμολ. ὑμῶν: "your professed subjection." Doddridge, however, well remarks, that "the words express not merely a *professed*, but a *real* subjection to the *Gospel* which was professed"]. But the confession towards, or with reference to, the Gospel (=the confession directed to the Gospel), is the confession of a faith in which love completely sacrifices itself for another's good (comp. chap. viii. 9), and it therefore essentially requires that those who make it should cherish and put forth a similar love (comp. 1 John iii. 16). Correspondent with this confession is the ὑπακοή of which the Apostle here speaks. Another reason for this thanksgiving is given in the words—**And for the simplicity of your communion with them and with all.** (ver. 13 *b.*)—Κοινωνία, as in chap. viii. 4, means the practical communion which is shown in the communication of aid. Εἰς shows the direction in which this proceeds. The addition of εἰς πάντας was probably intended to suggest that it was well known generally and possibly among the Christians at Jerusalem, that the Corinthians were in the habit of sympathizing, in a practical way, and especially by a hospitable reception in their city, with Christians of every country. That those Jewish Christians should have concluded that the Corinthians were equally liberal to all simply because they were liberal to such distant brethren, does not seem equally probable. The connection of εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον and εἰς αὐτοὺς, *etc.*, with δοξάζοντες in the sense of: they glorify God, with reference to the Gospel, to themselves and to all (Meyer), has something very feeble and forced about it. Such a connection is required neither by the want of the article (see above) nor by the εἰς, inasmuch as this preposition fits very well here as expressive of tendency or direction; and might, according to the analogy of other words, be very properly substituted for the dative after ὁμολογίας and κοινωνίας. [The sense of the whole would then be: "they who receive such a proof as this ministration gives, will give glory to God for your obedience to the confession you have made with respect to the Gospel of Christ, and for the common fellowship with them and with all Christians which your single-hearted liberality displays."]—**Since they also, with prayer for you, long after you on account of the exceeding grace of God toward** [*among*] **you** (ver. 14). It is somewhat difficult to decide with which of the previous sentences this verse ought to be connected. Against its connection with ver. 12, it may be objected, 1, the extreme length of the intervening ver. 13; 2, that διά does not stand before δεήσεως as it does before εὐχαριστιῶν, *etc.*; 3, that αὐτῶν stands emphatically at the head of the sentence, but on this construction has no special emphasis. If we connect it with ver. 13, supplying ἐπί before δεήσει as previously before ἁπλότητι, it seems strange that they should be said to give glory to God for their own prayers; and to obviate this the language can hardly be made to signify the *hearing* of their prayers. We should prefer to connect it with δοξάζοντες in such a way as to point out the manner in which they give glory to God: not only by their thanksgiving (vv. 12, 13) but by their intercessions. It must be conceded, however, that such a construction is somewhat harsh. The best way, therefore, probably is to take αὐτῶν ἐπιποθούντων together as a genitive absolute, (for we find this common enough with classical writers, where there is no distinction of subject), so that the meaning should be: "they, also, with prayers (*i. e.*, in the midst of prayers) for you, longing after you, *etc.* There is nothing really forced or impertinent in this definition of ἐπιποθεῖν by δεήσει; it is rather a delicate way of hinting at the pious spirit which prompted this longing. There is an apparent inappropriateness in this word ἐπιποθεῖν, inasmuch as the churches could never be expected to come personally together. Some have, therefore, given it the meaning, *cordially to love;* but no example of such a meaning has been adduced. Nowhere else in the Scriptures is a meeting together of Christians in the future world (αἰὼν μέλλων) spoken of in this way as an object of Christian yearning. Neander takes ἐπιποθεῖν to be the ardent longing which is prompted by Christian love to have a better personal acquaintance with other Christians, and hence the final aim of this benevolent contribution may have been, to bring these Jewish Christians to acknowledge the Gentile Christians as their brethren in the kingdom of God. We must, however, remember that in the present case the more complete fellowship and the more animated enjoyment of common spiritual blessings in the church were actually brought about by means of personal intercourse through deputies. This is hinted at in the reason which is immediately subjoined: διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν χάριν ἐφ ὑμῖν. Ἐπί here designates them as the persons among whom Divine grace was active, and it is to be connected with ὑπερβάλλουσαν. The idea then would be: on account of the grace of God which superabounds towards you, *i. e.*, because the grace of God is superabundant among or upon you. The charitable contribution was only one out of many streams flowing from this riches of grace (Osiander). As the Apostle contemplated this abundant result of Divine grace in the Corinthian Church, there arose from his deepest soul an outburst of holy thankfulness, to which he now gives expression. —**Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift** (ver. 15).—in this exclamation we need not suppose that he was endeavoring to repress some feeling of self-gratulation which he apprehended might spring up in the hearts of the Corithians on account of what he had just said. The "unspeakable gift of God" was not strictly or exclusively the fortunate result which God had brought about by means of the collection,

for the expression is rather too strong for such an application. The Apostle's mind was evidently upon the great gift of redemption with all its rich results; (especially) in the church where was found that simple spirit of benevolence, on which depended all the good results of which he had been speaking. But the entire spiritual blessing which he expected from God's grace included the particular effect of Divine grace or the especial blessing which God's love had conferred on them. (The difference between Meyer's and Osiander's exposition on this point is not essential).

[STANLEY: "In these four last verses the Apostle throws himself forward into the time when at Jerusalem he should receive the thanks of the Jewish Christians for this contribution, and thereby witness the completion of the harmony between the Jewish and Gentile Churches. Hence the impassioned thanksgiving for what else seems an inadequate occasion. Compare the abrupt introduction of similar thanksgivings in Rom. ix. 5; xi. 33–36; 1 Cor. xv. 57; Gal. i. 5; Eph. iii. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17"].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. As God looks upon the heart, the acceptableness of an act of benevolence in His sight depends upon the cheerfulness with which it is rendered, upon the degree in which those who are filled with Divine love find a real pleasure in relieving those who are in want. This inward delight will be shown in the pleasant manner with which the outward act is accompanied, and the receiver will thus be satisfied that the giver is glad to be called upon, and to be able to perform a duty which a God of goodness has committed to him. Where this spirit is wanting, and it is evident that the man gives with a painful reluctance, from a regard only to the expectations of others, from a vain ambition not to fall behind those of equal or less wealth, or from the urgent importunities of others, the gift will have no value in God's sight, however costly it may be. But a cheerful heart will always make an open hand; whatever the man has will be freely dispensed, with no close or anxious calculations of the amount, if he can only be sure of doing good, and of relieving or removing the necessities of his fellow-men. Accordingly God has declared that everything sown in this spirit shall bring forth a corresponding harvest, that those who give from necessity, sparingly, unwillingly, or half willingly, shall have a proportionate gain, and that those who give cheerfully and liberally shall have showered upon them an abundance not only of spiritual but of temporal blessings. As the result of both these kinds of blessing, the cheerful giver will acquire that noble and perfect simplicity which more completely surrenders everything to One who never fails to supply every want, and which is more and more unwearied in works of beneficence. And not only is he himself thus prospered, but (what is far more important) many hearts which are refreshed by his bounty will overflow with thankfulness, and will give glory to God; a loving fellowship will spring up between the giver and the receiver; and the spiritual life of each will be quickened and strengthened.

[2. It has sometimes been questioned whether this promise, (vv. 8-10) is fully borne out by observation and experience. Not to dwell, however, upon the fact that the Apostle is in this place only laying down what might be expected from God's *power*, and leaves undecided the question whether that power will always be put forth in every specific case, we may suggest that the Apostle is merely giving the general tendency and result of righteousness (Hodge). It will be, however, time enough to show that our passage will admit of exceptions, when a case of failure has been produced.

3. *The power of all active beneficence in promoting the Church's unity and common life.*—Paul's earnestness in the matter of this collection was quite disproportionate to its importance as an isolated fact. He was evidently looking far beyond it to the kind feelings and fellowship which such a work was fitted to promote. There had been, and there still was, great danger of a rupture between the Jewish and Gentile Christians. Paul evidently anticipated much from this collection, in smoothing down any asperities which had already become apparent.

4. It is evident that a community of goods (whatever it may have been) did not preserve the Church at Jerusalem from poverty and want. Clearly it had never been compulsory nor absolutely universal, and was only for the occasion on which so many strangers were in Jerusalem. As a *requirement*, it seems only to have been that each one should hold all that he had subject to the call of necessity. (See on Acts iv. 34-37). Probably then, and certainly ever since, the apostolic rule was, "not an absolute uniformity, but a mutual coöperation and assistance." (STANLEY).

5. The community of love laid down in this section would preserve the whole Church from want. In the great body there would be "*always an all-sufficiency in all things*," and with such a spirit it would be faithfully applied.

6. *The Apostle clearly distinguishes between spiritual and temporal blessings.*—The Corinthians might sow the one and not reap the other. We may sow much love and self-sacrifice, and reap abundantly the reward of such a sowing in kind, *i. e.*, in their spiritual results, but reap very little of pecuniary or temporal gain. "What Paul promised these Corinthians was: 1, the love of God (ver. 7); 2, a spirit abounding in every good work (ver. 8); thanksgiving on their behalf (vv. 11-13). A noble harvest! but all spiritual." (F. W. ROBERTSON). God might or might not give of His infinite sufficiency and ability (ver. 8), for their temporal wealth.]

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—Ver. 1. Confidence and admonition may very properly exist together, the one in view of an honorable and upright character, and the other because many need a preparation for their duties.—Ver. 2. A good beginning is not always sure of a good ending; we must therefore admonish one another and pray that we may continue diligent in every good work (1 Thess. iii. 2).—HEDINGER:—Commendable soli-

citude to observe accuracy in all we say; and to fulfil all we engage to do; without this, our words are only vain boasting. Away with this! —Ver. 4. We should be careful to have good reasons when we praise another, otherwise both parties may only be brought to greater shame. —*Ibid:* Support of the poor, and support of pastors. Plead and pray for them! Oh, if all who are in comfortable circumstances would but remember how much their doing good has to do with God's blessing! Their ability to do good is His blessing, and they ought to be the hand by which He blesses others, only that they themselves may be more blessed (vers. 6, 9). The covetous man only betrays himself by pretending to give liberally; for he gives only a little according to his ability, and this with evident reluctance and low motives.—Ver. 6. Every thing we have is from God; the more we have, the more readily, abundantly and joyfully should we communicate for the relief of others, with no expectation of a reward. And yet it is not wrong to have an eye to those promises which are a token of God's great love and readiness to help us in our weakness (Heb. x. 35; xi. 26).—*Ibid:* Alms given merely by commandment are a kind of forced sins, transferred and deposited to our account. Gifts bestowed with curses bring no blessings or reward.—Ver. 7. A generous love of our neighbor is like ripe clusters of grapes, whose sweet juices flow forth by their own force. It can scarcely be appealed to before its cheerful response is ready. Without such a love men must be hard pressed before they yield any thing, and the little that comes forth is soured by complaints and murmurings.—Ver. 8. Hedinger:—Nothing bestowed upon Christ's members is lost; and yet look well that no sighs adhere to your gifts! If it does not properly belong to you, it cannot be acceptable. To offer what rightfully belongs to another, is very fitly called, skinning your neighbor and hanging his hide up in the temple for God.—Christian virtues are joined together like the links of a chain. He is a perfect Christian who fails in no part of his duties. Ver. 9. Spener:—Genuine love is careful to bestow its bounty upon such persons and in such a way that goodness shall not encourage wickedness; but the hand which freely scatters must not be fettered with too many scruples, if only the worthy are not overlooked. Blessed are the merciful whose care reaches to the soul as well as to the body, to eternity as well as to time (Matth. v. 7).—Ver. 10. Hedinger:—The sower not unfrequently scatters on the soil what little seed he has, and with painful anxiety hopes for a plentiful harvest. Such a harvest God has promised to those who sow liberally (in well doing), and are moved by love to men and a desire to serve God.—Ver. 11. God is the true centre from which all lines of blessing diverge, and in which all benevolent actions again converge in grateful thanksgivings.—Ver. 12. How much good springs from love! It preserves the life of Christ's members, and turns their hearts into altars of incense where God is adored.—Ver. 13. The confession of a true faith and the overflowing of a genuine love are beautiful things, for which we have reason to rejoice and to praise the Lord.—Ver. 14. Those who receive kindness should heartily thank God for the spirit bestowed upon the giver, and pray that he may receive an abundant blessing.—Ver. 15. Let us never see or hear of a charitable work without rejoicing in it and praising God for it.

Berlenb. Bible:—Ver. 2. Whoever leaves what he must do to the last hour, will find himself confused and his good work put to shame (the foolish virgins).—Ver. 3f. Satan endeavors to strangle our good purposes at the birth, and we should take care faithfully to finish what we have begun well. Every one is in danger during his religious course of becoming cold in heart; it is always well, therefore, when God sends some one to stimulate our zeal.—Ver. 5. If nothing in the heart is pleasing to God, we may be sure that the outward act will have no blessing. —Ver. 6. God delights in what flows liberally from a loving heart.—Ver. 7. The Christian knows no joy without faith, or which proceeds not from grace. It is by the delight which the liberal man finds in giving, that God steals his heart and forces upon him a grace far richer than what he gave.—Ver. 8. In proportion as we apply to the poor those gifts with which Divine love has favored us will be the grace which we shall receive in their stead; only the returning stream will be the most abundant, that goodness and faithfulness may meet together.—Ver. 9. In scattering his blessings, the Christian must recollect that though his heart should be open and unreserved, he should also proceed as carefully as possible, for the work of love should be wise. Even righteousness demands this. But it will be like a regular growth, in which there is no decay; for as it is in harmony with the Divine nature, it must be eternal.—Ver. 10. God gives the seed, and He must give the harvest, but not immediately, for then we could not distinguish His several footsteps. When we open our hearts to God (by our alms) the blessings always return upon us in a thirty, sixty or an hundred fold increase of Christian graces.—Ver. 12. It is said that, "Love is the fulfilling of the law;" and we here see that obedience to the second table reacts upon the better fulfilment of the first, inasmuch as it awakens a spirit of praise.—Ver. 15. Whoever recognizes and accepts of Christ as a gift, will be thankful and strive to live to the Divine glory. Each attribute of God has a tendency to produce in us something like itself; and as He freely gives to us, we also are led freely to give.

Bengel:—Ver. 8. God gives us what we have, not so much that we may have it, but that we may do good. Every thing in life, even the best earned rewards, are seeds sown for a future harvest.

Rieger:—Ver. 5. A gift will be a blessing, for the supply it affords, for the cheerful kindness it displays, and for the thanksgiving of which it is the occasion.—When it is a matter of covetousness, it will be done penuriously and unpleasantly, and will be received without pleasure or satisfaction.—Ver. 6. The figure of sowing and reaping is very appropriate to the work of charity. That which is scattered, is something which we look upon as needful for our support, but which will not be as profitable if it is hoarded up. We must not be anxious about wind and

weather, but trust rather to God's providence than to our own prudence. Much seed will doubtless fall by the wayside, but that on the good soil will abundantly reward us for all we sowed. Ver. 8. God can turn to our advantage not only the increase of our worldly wealth, but every blessing of His daily providence. In this way He may give us health, peace, pious husbands and wives, pious children and faithful domestics, and make them an advantage to us. We often see those who are reluctant to do kind acts for their neighbors lose more by extravagant children and unfaithful servants, than would have formed a handsome contribution for the poor.—Vers. 11ff. Where we have true simplicity of character, we are not particular in the enjoyment of what God gives us, but we are satisfied and hopeful, even where we seem to be in want.—Ver. 15. Christ is indeed an unspeakable gift, but in Him is included the gospel, with all its power in the heart, and those works of charity to which it prompts us, a supply for every want, an overcoming faith, a thankful spirit, the common fellowship of prayer which He creates, and the prospect of a harvest of blessings through all eternity.

Heubner:—Ver. 1. An enlightened Christian needs no long exposition of his duties.—Ver. 2. Even for the sake of a good example, it may be a duty to give liberally.—Ver. 4. If a minister has done all within his power, and his people are without benevolence, theirs must be the reproach. Ver. 5. God's blessing depends not upon the amount, but upon the spirit with which we give. Ver. 6. The principles on which we shall be blessed are: the more active we are in doing good, the greater will be our blessing; the more we are emptied of earthly things, the more we are filled with God, and *vice versa*. Worldly prudence says: Do not make yourself a beggar! but Christian prudence says: Give all that thou hast! Ver. 7. The value of our charities depends upon their being given from a pure heart. God's great grace in the heart makes a glad heart.—Ver. 9. God can give abundantly, not only in earthly, but in spiritual things.—Ver. 12. The giving of alms is of an advantage even in the spiritual life; for it awakens and strengthens our faith in the reality of a Christian spirit in the church, and of course in the presence of God Himself, to help the poor through His children. When the heart of God's professed people are unmerciful and severe toward others, it becomes hard and bitter, inclined to unbelief, and a dishonor to our religion.—Ver. 14. A spirit of prayer is no slight recompense for doing good. Even those whom we never knew become interesting to us when we hear that Divine grace abounds in them.

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 5. It is better to give today than to-morrow, for no one knows how long he will be able to give. Reason, indeed, always gives reluctantly, from fear of some possible misfortune in the future; but the Bible says: "Give a portion to seven, and even to eight, for thou knowest not what evil shall be upon the earth" (Eccles. xi. 2, comp. Prov. iii. 27, 28). God always gives with a liberal hand; and if it is a blessing for us to give, let us not measure our alms with a penurious and covetous spirit. God also cheerfully lets us have the best He has; and if our alms are a sacrifice of praise, let us not corrupt it with the leaven of covetousness, but accompany it with the sweet incense of a complete dedication of our own selves to God (Chap. viii. 5, Mal. i. 14).—Ver. 6. The giving of alms is itself a blessing, and of course the giver must be blessed. As the sun draws the water, and as the clouds give back in showers what they before received, (Eccles. xi. 3) so will God graciously return what we bestow (in His name and in His hand) although it sometimes may seem like casting our bread upon the waters. A poor man gives only an insignificant mite, but it is a blessing, and he will have a harvest of blessings; blessings from God's children, and blessings from our heavenly Father in this world and in the next. He who sows in blessings (giving in the Lord and to the Lord), shall reap also in blessings: He will hear many exclaim, "God reward you!" and "Thank God!" and these shall rise up before God with his alms, and spring up in many full ears to form his harvest wreath in another, and even in the present world. If those who receive our gifts should be unthankful, and should have no share in our blessing, God is faithful to remember every seed sown, and to make it fruitful in blessings. Only see to it, therefore, that everything you sow is a bounty and not a covetousness, and then give over all care about the harvest, to the Lord who will not fail to make it exceedingly abundant!—Ver. 10. We have the same God in the kingdom of grace as in the kingdom of nature. In the latter our Lord once asked his disciples, "Lacked ye anything?" and they replied, "Nothing!" (Luke xxii. 35). In the former also we may be sure that all cheerful givers, when asked, "Have you ever been impoverished by your scattering?" will glorify that Lord who has taken upon Himself the debts of all His poor (Prov. xix. 17), by answering: "Never; we have always had the blessing Paul promised the Corinthians."—Just as a citizen shows his subjection to the civil law by a conscientious payment of all his legal assessments, so a Christian shows that his confession is subject to the gospel when he cheerfully assists in the collection of all church dues.—Ver. 14. The longing which God's people sometimes feel in every part of the general church on earth to enjoy each others' fellowship is not extinguished even if they have no prospect of meeting in the flesh, but we instinctively yearn for a fellowship face to face in the mansions of the eternal city.

[Stanley:—The Apostle presses upon them (1) speed, vv. 1–5; (2) readiness, vv. 6–7; (3) bounty, vv. 8–16. A Clarke: "The Apostle enumerates the good effects which would be produced by their liberal alms-giving: 1. The wants of the saints would be supplied; 2. many thanksgivings would thereby be rendered unto God; 3. the Corinthians would thereby give proof of their subjection to the Gospel; and 4. the prayers of those relieved will ascend up to God in behalf of their benefactors." See a Sermon of Dr. Barrow on the passage from the Psalms quoted in ver. 9, in which the subject of "Bounty to the Poor," would seem to be exhausted (*Works* Vol. I. Ser. 31)].

XV.—DEFENCE OF HIS APOSTOLIC ENERGY, POWERS AND ACTS AGAINST THE ASSAULTS OF HIS ARROGANT OPPONENTS.

Chapter X. 1–18.

Now I Paul myself beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, who in
presence [indeed] *am* base [lowly] among you, but being absent am bold toward you:
2 But I beseech [entreat] *you*, that I may not be bold when I am present with that
confidence, wherewith I think to be bold against some, which think of us as if we
3 walked according to the flesh. For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after
4 the flesh: (For the weapons of our warfare[1] *are* not carnal, but mighty through God
5 to the pulling down of strong holds:) Casting down imaginations, [reasonings, λογισμοὺς] and every high thing that exalteth itself [is raised, ἐπαιρόμενον] against the
knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought [every thought into
6 captivity] to the obedience of Christ; And having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, [every failure in obedience, παρακοήν] when your obedience is fulfilled.
7 Do ye look on things after the outward appearance? If any man trust to [in] himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think [conclude, λογιζέσθω] this again, that,
8 as he *is* Christ's, even so *are* we Christ's [*om.* Christ's].[2] For though [even if, ἐάν τε][3] I should boast somewhat more [abundantly, περισσότερόν] of our authority, which the Lord hath given us[4] for edification, and not for your destruction, I
9 should not be ashamed: That I may not seem as if I would terrify you by letters:
10 For *his* letters, say they,[5] *are* weighty and powerful; but *his* bodily presence *is* weak,
11 and *his* speech contemptible. Let such a one think this, that, such as we are in word
by letters when we are absent, such *will we be* [are we] also in deed when we are
12 present. For we dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with
some that commend themselves: but they, measuring themselves by [among, ἐν] them-
13 selves, and comparing themselves among [with] themselves, are not wise. But we[6]
will not boast[7] of things without *our* measure, [boast without measure, εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα]
but according to the measure of the rule which God hath distributed [apportioned] to
14 us, a measure to reach even unto you. For we stretch not ourselves beyond *our measure*, as though[8] we reached not unto you: for we are come [came foremost, ἐφθάσα-
15 μεν] as far as to you also in *preaching* the gospel of Christ. Not boasting of things
without *our* measure [boasting without measure], *that is*, of other men's labors; but
having hope, when your faith is increased, [that as your faith increases, αὐξανομένης]
having hope, when your faith is increased, that [as your faith increases, αὐξανομένης
that] we shall be enlarged by you [among you. ἐν ὑμῖν] according to our rule abund-
16 antly, To preach the gospel in the *regions* [as far as the parts, εἰς τὰ ὑπερέκεινα] beyond
17 you, *and* not to boast in another man's line of things made ready to our hand. But
18 he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. For not he that commendeth himself is
approved, but whom the Lord commendeth.

[1] Ver. 4.—Rec. has στρατείας, but its authority is feeble. [Internal evidence would seem strong in favor of στρατείας both here and in 1 Tim. i. 18, for *ordinarily* (though by no means uniformly) it is used for military service or warfare, while στρατιά signifies rather an army: but they are often used interchangeably, and the external evidence against it is too strong to be forsaken (Tisch.). Lachm. however (sustained only by Cod. B.) adopts it.]

[2] Ver. 7.—Rec. has χριστοῦ after ἡμεῖς; but it is thrown out by the majority of the best MSS. [Tisch. after rejecting it in ed. 3d, restores it in ed. 7th with the remark: "*at ut molestum omnino omissum videtur: addidisse quemquam vix credibile videtur.*" And yet the documentary evidence against it (B. C. D. (1st hand) F. G. Sin. many cursives, Vulg. Goth. Syr. Arm. with most of the ancient expositors) is very strong.]

[3] Ver. 8.—The predominance of evidence is in favor of τε after καί; it is easier to conceive of its omission than of its insertion. On the other hand καὶ before περισσότερον has the weight of authority against it, and it is probably a supplementary addition. [Tisch. now restores it and thinks it more likely to have been omitted than added by a foreign hand.]

[4] Ver. 8.—ἡμῖν after κύριος is uncertain. It might have seemed superfluous after ἡμῶν, and yet very appropriate after ἔδωκεν. The best MSS. do not have it.

[5] Ver. 10.—[ἐπιστολαὶ is placed before μέν by Lachm. after Codd. B. and Sin.]. φησίν is better sustained than φασιν; it is also the more difficult reading.

[6] Ver. 12, 13.—οὐ συνιοῦσιν· ἡμεῖς δὲ are thrown out by a number of critics, but on the sole authority of Occidental MSS., some of which have ἡμεῖς δέ, although these last words seem like an incomplete restoration when they stand alone. The transcriber's eye easily passed from οὐ before συν to οὐχ after ἡμεῖς δὲ, and it was difficult to explain the passage without omitting these words. See critical remarks [and Stanley's extended discussion.]

[7] Ver. 13.—καυχησόμεθα has satisfactory evidence in its favor; and is neither to be left out nor exchanged for καυχώμεθα nor καυχώμενοι.

[8] Ver. 14.—Lachm. has ὡς γὰρ instead of οὐ γὰρ ὡς, but his authorities are weak [only Cod. B. and two very recent cursives. As he places the mark of interrogation after ἑαυτούς, the sense remains the same.]

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

In passing to a new section (δέ), the tone of the Apostle's discourse becomes much altered. ["The conciliatory and affectionate strain of entreaty which pervaded the first part, is exchanged for that of stern command, and almost menace: there is still the same expression of devotion to the Corinthian Church; but it is mixed with a language of sarcasm and irony which has parallels in the First Epistle, but none up to this point in the Second. With this change in the general tone agrees also the change in details. Instead of the almost constant use of the first person plural, he here almost invariably (and in some instances with unusual emphasis) employs the first person singular; the digressions no longer go off to general topics, but revolve more closely round himself; the Corinthians are no longer commended for their penitent zeal, but rebuked for their want both of love and penitence. The confident hopes which he had expressed for the future are exchanged for the most gloomy forebodings. This change is not to be accounted for by supposing this section to be a distinct fragment between his First and Second Epistles; for, after all, the differences between the different parts are no greater than those between other portions of his writings: nor by supposing that he is addressing a different portion of the Corinthian congregation, for no intimation of this is given; but it is possible that some considerable pause, either of time or thought, now took place, during which additional news or recollections of an unfavorable character came before him, and gave a new turn to his discourse. As the time drew near also in which he was to visit and test his apostolic power among them, he was perhaps haunted by the fear that he should have to visit them in anger and not in love. Such a feeling is the basis of this, as that of gratitude was the basis of the first portion of the Epistle. It is from this that he starts (x. 1–7), from this the digressions fly off (x. 12; xii. 10), and to this his conclusion returns (xii. 11; xiii. 13)." STANLEY (abridged)]. His object now is to vindicate his Apostolic character and authority against those ill-disposed and arrogant opponents who had made light of them. The tendency of what he says is still to draw off the Church, with which he was anxious to deal tenderly, from those antagonists on whom he had determined to exert the Apostolic powers they had depreciated.

VERS. 1–6. **Now I Paul myself, beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, who in presence, indeed, am lowly among you, but being absent am bold toward you** (ver. 1).—[In no other part of his Epistles has he made his individuality so prominent. He usually says, "I Paul," (Gal. v. 2; Eph. iii. 1; Philem. 19), or uses simply the first person (singular or plural) of some verb]. Here *αὐτός* is added, and by way of emphasis is placed at the head of the sentence. It should be construed neither in the sense of *ultro* (of my own accord), nor in that of *idem* (always the same) in opposition to those who reproached him that he had been fickle or inconsistent in his conduct, nor in contrast with those who had charge of the collection, with the poor saints who were to be relieved, with his calumniators, or with him who hitherto had been associated with him in the composition of the Epistle (chap. i. 1). With respect to this last suggestion, we have nothing in the remainder of the Epistle which indicates that the Apostle wished to make prominent that he was sustaining any new relation to them, or that he was now more than before addressing the Corinthians with his own hand or especially authenticating what he was about to write. The word has reference rather to the prayer in ver. 2, which is brought out in a somewhat gentler form by the exhortation in ver. 1, and it relates to what is said in the relative sentence in ver. 1, as if he would say: I myself admonish and pray you; even I, who in personal appearance am so mean among you, but when absent am so bold toward you; *i. e.*, even I who, according to the disparaging insinuations of my opponents, (for these are evidently aimed at), am bold only when at a distance, and so submissive (cringing, fainthearted) when personally present with you, now exhort and pray you, to save me by your conduct the necessity of being bold and overbearing when I shall be present with you. With the words *ἐγὼ Παῦλος*, on which the main emphasis should be placed, he meets them in that Apostolic and personal character which was so familiar to them, to which they owed so much, and on which his admonition now depended for all its power. He strengthens this, however, by the addition: by the meekness and gentleness (*πραότης καὶ ἐπιεικεία*) of Christ. This gentleness and benignity or mildness (Acts xxiv. 4) of Christ (comp. Matth. xi. 29f.; Isa. xlvii. 2f.), ought to move them to comply with his exhortation. As this was the ordinary spirit and manner of Christ, they ought to see that Christ's Apostles might also be gentle, and they should not make it necessary for him to proceed against them with severity. Ewald takes it as an admonition to the Corinthians, that they should not, like his opponents mistake for weakness that meekness and humility which he carefully copied in all his conduct from the example of Christ. Neither does the scope of the passage nor analogy require that we should construe *διά* in the sense of a solemn protestation (Osiander). *Διά* with a genit. often indicates the means or accompaniments; as if the action were passing through them, and receiving a peculiar coloring from the medium. Paul's entreaty is here supposed to acquire a special tenderness by being *διὰ τῆς πραότ. κ. ἐπιεικ.* [JELF, § 905. 3 B. 1]. The distinction between *πραότης* and *ἐπιείκεια*, according to Melancthon, consists in this: the former means *non temere irasci*, and the latter *facile placari*. Bengel makes the former *virtus magis absoluta* (willingness to suffer and to forgive), and the latter *magis refertur ad alios*. According to Meyer the contrast is between what was actually experienced and what was strictly just. HEUBNER: Meekness endures the pain, but gentleness corrects the faults of others with forbearance. [WEBSTER AND WILKINSON say that "*πραότ.* is natural mildness of disposition; *ἐπιεικ.* a habit arising from considerateness, exemplified by our

Lord in Luke ix. 56, and Matth. xxvi. 41." Comp. TRENCH, *Synn.*, First Part, pp. 207–10]. The idea (of Rückert) that Paul felt especially touched by the insinuation contained in the relative sentence, inasmuch as he was conscious that notwithstanding all his vehemence he was really deficient in personal courage, must have originated in a sad misapprehension of the Apostle's character as presented in his life and Epistles. Those opponents who urged this objection in order to weaken the impression which his severe reproofs had produced, had found a plausible reason for their assertion in the fact that, for fear of aggravating the evil, he had spoken of some things within the Church itself with a degree of hesitation. It is possible, too, that after his second visit to Corinth (and before our first Epistle) the state of things had become so much worse, that he had felt obliged to write with more severity than he had displayed when he was among them (Meyer). It would be hardly correct to go back as far as his first visit among them (1 Cor. ii. 3), for the observation of his opponents had probably been made at some later period. But the matter on which the Apostle exhorts his readers is contained in the prayer (*δέομαι*) which follows in ver. 2.—**But I pray that I may not when present have to be bold with that confidence with which I think to be bold against some.**—[By translating *παρακ.* of ver. 1, and *δέομ* of ver. 2, by the same word (beseech) our common version fails to preserve the growing earnestness indicated by the latter word. For a similar interchange of these words see chap. v. 20, 21; vi. 1; viii. 4]. The *δέ* not only indicates that he was taking up again what had gone before, but it introduces a contrast to the sentence implied in the relative sentence. The prayer itself, as the context and the want of the accusative of the object shows, was directed not to God (for then *παρακαλῶ* in ver. 1 would have no significance) but to the Corinthians. ["The terms in which this is expressed are taken from the description which the detractors were accustomed to give of him (ver. 1), which, although apparently incidental, is the key note of all that follows, in which the ideas *ταπειν.* and *θαῤῥ.* in various turns of thought and phraseology continually and prominently recur." STANLEY.] The article *τό* serves to make the infinitive sentence especially prominent. *Παρών* corresponds in signification with *εἰς πρόςωπον* in ver. 1. The thing prayed for is, that they would not allow it to become necessary for him to be bold among them. The *πεποίθησις* was that confidence in his official authority and rights which was connected with good conscience, and whose dependence was indeed upon God, but need not be understood here. *Λογίζομαι* is not in the passive (I am reckoned) to express the way in which he was estimated by his opponents (Luther). Beza not only regards it as a passive, but takes *τολμῆσαι* as a preterite, which, however, would have called for some additional word (*ἀπών*) to imply this (comp. Meyer). It denotes here, as it often does in Euripides and Herodotus, the intention, the design or determination of the mind. [Chrysostom thinks the word does not imply a full or settled purpose. Paul "said not 'wherewith I am prepared,' but 'wherewith I *think*,' for he had not yet resolved upon this, though his opponents had given him occasion enough." Bloomfield notices a paronomasia in *λογίζομαι* and *λογιζομένους*, which if introduced into English might perhaps be best expressed by *reckon*]. As the case is different with *λογιζομένους*, the word there has the meaning of, *to reckon for, or as something*. *Ἐπί τινας* should be connected not with *θαῤῥῆσαι* but with *τολμῆσαι*, which must here be taken absolutely and in the sense of, to have courage, to be resolute, to step forth boldly (as in Homer, Pindar, the tragic poets and Thucydides). [It has also something of the signification, to venture, to have the heart, as if the agent endured or suffered something, because he acted in spite of natural feeling, or under great difficulties. This idea may be traced in the use of the word here].—**namely, those who think of us as if we walked according to the flesh.** (ver. 2 *b.*)—He does not name these persons, but he immediately characterizes them from the way in which they were in the habit of judging him. *Ὡς* is here used as in 1 Cor. iv. 1. [*Περιπατοῦντες* etymologically signifies, to walk about, hither and thither, and Stanley thinks that we have here a reference to this original meaning]. *Κατὰ σάρκα περιπατεῖν* here signifies, a course of conduct, characterized by the *σάρξ* (*i. e.*, by the psychic-corporeal life), destitute of a spiritual character, and not merely dependent upon external influences, and of course feeble, but in positive antagonism to the spirit, and of course sinful; *i. e.*, the organ and principle of sin (Beck, Christl., Lehrwiss, p. 278). The idea of weakness probably predominates, but the expression describes a course of conduct determined by the fear of men, or the desire of pleasing men, and hence a personal bearing disgraced by cowardice or servility (*ταπεινός*). The human nature referred to was therefore one enfeebled, not merely from the want of Divine support, but from sin (comp. on 1 Cor. xii. 17).—**For though we walk in the flesh, we do not make war according to the flesh** (ver. 3).—A reason is here given for the prayer in ver. 2, and at the same time he exonerates himself from what had been charged upon him by his opponents (*τοὺς λογιζ.*—*περιπατοῦντας*). I beg of you not to allow me to be placed in such circumstances that I shall be obliged to venture on an unpleasant part when I shall be present with you. For although we are walking in the flesh, we do not take the field, or carry on war according to the flesh, *i. e.*, we are not determined by fleshly considerations as those persons imagine. *Στρατεύεσθαι* (1 Cor. ix. 7), understood in the more comprehensive sense implied by its contrast with *περιπατεῖν*, designates the Apostles' whole ministry in its numerous conflicts with hostile powers, under the figure of a warfare. Comp. ii. 14; 1 Tim. i. 18. The emphasis lies upon the two contrasted prepositions *ἐν* and *κατά*. The flesh (*σαρξ*) is indeed the sphere in which we move, *i. e.* the psychical and corporeal life with all its sinful infirmities is the instrument by which and the department in which we act (comp. *ζῶ ἐν σαρκί* in Gal. ii. 20), but it is not the influence which determines our movements." The reason for this assertion is given in ver. 4. —**For the weapons of our warfare are not**

carnal but mighty before God for the pulling down of strong holds.—The Apostle here describes the kind of weapons he used, *i. e.* the means by which he carried on his ministry (ὅπλα chap. vi. 7) in contrast with those of his adversaries. As his weapons bore not the stamp of the flesh, there was no reason for saying that his action as a Christian warrior was under the direction of the flesh. W. F. Besser: "The text must certainly give a strong testimony against the mingling of ecclesiastical authority with the civil power of the sword (comp. Augsb. Conf. p. 64, Art. of Smalc. p. 344)."—The Apostle brings into positive contrast with the carnal (σαρκικά, comp. i. 12) not the spiritual (πνευματικα) but the mighty in God's sight (δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ). The fleshly is also that which is feeble, and especially when it is in conflict with the world for the cause of God, it is entirely powerless. Σαρκικός however is not precisely equivalent to, *feeble*, but the only thing which in this case is powerful is that which proceeds from, and bears the impress of the Spirit. For a notice of the spiritual panoply see Eph. vi. 11ff. Similar contrasts may be found in 2 Chron. xxxii. 8; Isa. xxxi. 3; Ps. lxxxviii. 39. Power is directly related to spirit also in 1 Cor. ii. 4; Luke i. 17. Δυνατά is more particularly defined by τῷ θεῷ to mean that which is powerful in God's esteem, before God. Comp. ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ in Acts vii. 20, and also Jonah iii. 3. And yet the phrase is not intended to be simply a superlative, but to signify the truth or the reality (Osiander: acceptable to God) of the power. Neander: mighty, because God gave them, and overthrows strong holds by means of them. In opposition to the explanation which makes this phrase mean: through or for God, it may be said that the former would be superfluous, being self-evident; and although the latter might seem appropriate in the sense of: to the honor, or, for the use of God, (*i. e.* to show forth his power) there is nothing in the context to call for such a remark.*—The end which these weapons were to subserve, and to which they were adapted, is announced in πρὸς καθαίρεσιν ὀχυρωμάτων. They are the instrumentalities by which the κόσμος, or its ἄρχων, the god of this world (τοῦ αἰῶνος chap. iv. 4), endeavors to obstruct the progress of God's cause and the work of salvation. Ὀχυρωμάτα signifies castles or fortresses. [They are things intended to serve in the mind as strong holds do in warfare. Comp. Prov. xxi. 22. Stanley (p. 500) thinks that the peculiar imagery here used was suggested by the Mithridatic and Piratical wars which took place in Cilicia; the latter only 60 years before the Apostles' birth. One hundred and twenty such strong holds are said to have been in existence and to have been taken in the war with these pirates. Each word here used strikingly carries out the metaphor]. The way in which this overthrow was effected is more particularly described in ver. 5.—**Casting down reasonings and every lofty thing which is erected against the knowledge of God.**—As the first and most prominent of these strong holds, he mentions λογισμούς, intellectual bulwarks which were probably not so much projects or hostile plans as unevangelical thoughts or fixed conclusions of human (Hellenistic or Judaistic) philosophy, in direct opposition to the Christian faith, 1 Cor. iii. 20. [Our English "*imaginations*" is hardly the proper word here. The idea is rather "*reasonings*." It refers to *theoretic* subtilties or argumentations]. Comp. the contrasted γνῶσις τοῦ θεοῦ. Καθαιροῦντες is anacoluthic; comp. chap. ix. 11. To connect it with ver. 3 so as to make ver. 4 a parenthesis, seems not only unnecessary but unallowable inasmuch as ver. 4 is essentially a continuation of the main thought, and καθαιροῦντες is most naturally referred back to καθαίρεσιν. [As all the prominent words of this passage are evidently military we must suppose the allusion in καθαίρέω was to the use of the "*crow*" which *pulled* (not cast) down the walls or towers of an enemy. Stanley gives several instances of such a use of the word in classic writers. (See also Cobbin)]. In καὶ πᾶν ὕψωμα, *etc.*, (every high thing, *etc.*) he reverts to the metaphor he had left in λογισμούς and which had been only hinted at in καθαιροῦντες. Ὕψωμα signifies an elevation, something made high, as a tower, wall or anything of the kind. In sense it is much the same as ὀχυρώματα in ver. 4 *i. e.* it is something by which the enemy strives to maintain his ground. By πᾶν it becomes a general term in which even the λογισμοί are included, and it then signifies every kind of human greatness which could be made use of in such a warfare; according to Osiander, wisdom, eloquence, power, righteousness, honor, wealth.—Agreeably to the metaphor, ἐπαιρόμενον [opposite of καθαιρ.] should be construed not in the middle but passive voice. That against which these high things were erected, and whose progress, and ascendency was thus to be prevented, was the knowledge of God (γνῶσις τοῦ θεοῦ); not (subjectively) as it existed in the minds of his opponents, and was opposed by the darkness of human wisdom, but objectively, something which met men in common life, and called forth their opposition: that revelation of the plan and work of salvation, in which Christ was proclaimed and God was manifested in Christ. In addition to the negative acts by which the fortresses obstructing the progress of Divine knowledge were overthrown, we have those which were positive, when the Apostle adds,—**and bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.** (ver. 5*b*.)—When the enemy is thus captured, the victory must be complete. This enemy is πᾶν νόημα; which is here not the same as design, and then to be joined with εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν, so as to mean every design in opposition to the obedience, *etc.*, for even if we do not take into consideration the want of the article (τὸ), and the use of εἰς instead of the foregoing κατά, we should find that νόημα in this

[* This seems hardly conclusive, for the Apostle might very properly call attention to the agency of God through which his weapons were so powerful. Is there any *greater* call for his mere assertion that his weapons were powerful in God's sight (*i. e.* truly)? The ancient Greek Expositors (whose opinions on such a question are entitled to weight, favor the meaning given in our common version, as *e. g.* Chrys.: "Paul here refers the whole power to God—he says not *we* are mighty, but *our weapons* are mighty through God." So also Bloomfield, Conybeare and Stanley (in his translation). Wordsworth less appropriately renders the phrase, *God-ward* in contrast with man-ward or in the direction of, in respect to, men. He refers to Acts vii. 20. Comp. Jelf, § 611, b.]

sense would be no proper object of captivity, and that a much better sense would be afforded by supposing *τὴν ὑπακοήν* the fortress to which they were carried. Thus obedience was as it were the place to which the captive enemy was brought and hence we have *εἰς* instead of a dative, as in Rom. vii. 23. As the intellectual element predominates in the whole context, we have no reason to take *νόημα* in the sense of intention [Alford] or disposition; and still less of the spiritual mind itself which exercises thought, *i. e.* the understanding; Luther: all human reason.* This obedience of Christ, in the sense of a subjection to Christ, is in other passages called the obedience of faith Rom. i. 5; xv. 18. The idea is: to bring every thought or understanding which is otherwise opposed to Christ, into subjection to Him. *Παρακοή* and *ὑπακοή* are contrasted in ver. 6. [The former signifies (strictly) a failing to hear or a hearing amiss, and so a want of obedience; the latter a listening to authority, and so a subjection to another. See WEBSTER, *Synn.* p. 225, also TRENCH, *Synn.* 2d Ser. p. 73.] Although the Apostle does not entirely forsake the line of thought which he had pursued in the preceding paragraph, *i. e.*, of contention generally with hostile powers, he now returns more decidedly to the affairs of the Corinthian Church. **And having in a readiness to punish every failure in obedience when your obedience shall have been fulfilled** (ver. 6).—He evidently regarded that Church as specially subject to his Apostolical authority, and it was only in their return to him that he expected the completion (*πληρωθῇ*) of their obedience to Christ. Upon that obedience he made to depend the time in which he should exercise his disciplinary power upon those Judaistic corrupters who might persist in opposing his authority. For this he was even then ready (*ἐν ἑτοίμῳ ἔχειν* = *in promptu habere*), and he was only waiting for the completion of the Church's obedience. Comp. chap. ii. 1; xiii. 10. A delicate hint seems here conveyed that he would make a distinction between these seducers and those who had been seduced; and an admonition is expressed that the latter would do well by their entire submission to his instructions, to escape the punishment he was about to inflict (perhaps excommunication, or at least something which would be a proof of his miraculous powers as an Apostle) on those who might continue disobedient. It would be incorrect to understand this fulfilment of their obedience as referring to the Apostle's call for a collection. He says that he was in readiness, in opposition to those who might suggest that he was not in earnest in the matter (comp. Osiander [also Jelf, § 622, 2]). [Stanley's paraphrase well expresses the idea of this passage: "I conjure you not to compel me to break the bounds of the gentle and forgiving character of Christ. But be assured that, if I do exercise when I am present, the authority which some think I shall never venture to exercise but at a distance, it will be a real authority. I shall come against you like a mighty conqueror, though with weapons, not of earthly, but of heavenly warfare; and every alien thought and imagination shall fall before me, like fortresses before a victorious army, and shall be reduced to submission, like captive hands: and those who resist shall be punished like the last remnants of a defeated insurrection. To effect all this, I wait only till I am assured of your submission, that I may not confound the innocent with the guilty, the dupes with the deceivers." He speaks as if his opponents were not members of the Corinthian Church, but foreign to it; and hence as if they were not addressed in this epistle, and were only awaiting the obedience of the Corinthians that he might exercise his vengeance on them].

VERS. 7–11. In this passage the Apostle maintains that his relations to Christ were of an intimate nature, in opposition to his opponents, who professed that they alone stood in such relations; and he adds the assurance that when he should come to Corinth in person, and not merely by his letters, as they asserted, he would give them a proof of his Apostolical authority.—**Do ye look on things after the outward appearance?** (ver. 7*a*)—The way in which we interpret this sentence must depend upon the sense we give to *τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον*. If it means things lying in sight before their eyes, from which the Corinthians might recognize, if they were disposed to do so, his Apostolical dignity, the idea would be that he was calling upon them to attend more carefully to things obviously before them. In this case *βλέπετε* would be construed in the imperative [: Look at what is before your own eyes]. The analogy of other passages, however, would require that this verb should have stood at the head of the sentence, comp. 1 Cor. i. 26; x. 18; Phil. iii. 2. If that expression, however, means that which is merely apparent, it may refer to something in his opponents which gave them an external advantage; or to something external in the Apostle himself, which made the Corinthians postpone him to them. In this case, *βλέπετε* must be construed in the indicative, either as a direct assertion, and a severe reproach to them [Vulgate, Stanley], or as a question (with Theodoret, Erasmus, Meyer [Alford, Hodge, and our English A. V.]) in accordance with the lively and earnest spirit of the general passage. The context (vers. 1-10), is certainly in favor of referring the expression to the Apostle himself. [In this case, however, many think that *βλέπετε* would be quite as much required at the commencement of the sentence, and to be preceded by a *τι* or some similar word. The signification finally attained is much the same, whether the indicative is taken annunciatively or interrogatively. Adopting the latter as the most probable, the Apostle] intended to speak of his outward manner, which, when he was at Corinth, had not been bold or confident, and hence had afforded ill-disposed persons an occasion for

[* This is one of those passages which became so important in the controversy with Rationalism. The etymological construction of the word is certainly in favor of the meaning: *a thought*, an intellectual perception as it is formed in the mind; and yet a very extensive usage in classic writers favors the meaning, *the faculty of the understanding*, or even *the mind itself*. The sense, too, if we adopt this meaning, would be highly appropriate; for while it is the λογισμοί, which were demolished, the mind itself which once entertained them, is here supposed to be taken captive to the obedience of Christ. We are compelled, however, by the connection which deals entirely with the products of human action against Divine knowledge, to adopt the etymological signification].

suspecting him of weakness and timidity. The question was directed not to his principal antagonists, but to the Church itself; at least, to that portion which had listened to the pretensions of these opponents. In the next verse, however, he changes his address and fixes his eye upon these opponents themselves.—**If any man trusts in himself that he is Christ's, let him conclude this again of himself, that as he is Christ's, so also are we** (ver. 7*b*). The word ἑαυτῷ makes the personal vanity and self-conceit of such a confidence very prominent, inasmuch as it is a confidence in one's own self. In χριστοῦ εἶναι we have the idea of belonging to Christ, but the context does not imply that this was in the sense of kindred (perhaps through James), or of a particular fellowship with Peter; nor does it refer merely to the general relationship of all believers, but to the special ownership implied in δοῦλος (which indeed a number of authorities add to the reading of this passage, though it is evidently a gloss), or διάκονος χριστοῦ (chap. xi. 23). To this ἑαυτῷ corresponds ἀφ' (Lachmann ἐφ'=*in*, though the reading is not sufficiently authenticated) ἑαυτοῦ, which is made emphatic by πάλιν, *again* (not, *on the other hand*). But this phrase, *of his own self*, may mean either, *proceeding from himself*, *i. e.*, referring to what he might see of himself, inasmuch as he would find the same evidences of this being Christ's in Paul as in himself; or *by himself*, without any suggestion or assistance from the Apostle; as if the meaning were: we should expect that those who assume such high grounds with respect to themselves, would need no suggestions from others, but that they would apply the same principles and come to a correct conclusion here. This last explanation seems the more probable. The first reminds us of the supposed Christ-party in Corinth which claimed a special relation to Christ on account of their Jewish descent (comp. chap. xi. 22), or on account of some intercourse with him by mysterious visions, such as are referred to in chap. xii. 1ff.; and according to it, the Apostle was maintaining that they would find the same marks of intimacy with Christ in him. But the alleged facts are altogether too uncertain to exercise any influence upon our exposition. There is no necessity of assuming that Paul had any where reference in Χριστοῦ εἶναι to such a party or its leaders, and the utmost that we can infer from what is here said is that he might possibly have some allusion to the name of that party. Neander thinks that Paul must have referred here to some opponents who claimed to belong exclusively to Christ on account of having received their Christianity directly from the Apostles of the original Church. The claim of these persons, whatever it might be, Paul met with the assertion that he also could speak of himself in the same terms in which those earliest Apostles said they were Christ's. The words, *as he himself is, so also are we*, are intended to be a conciliatory and a moderate presentation of his true claims. When he speaks unreservedly and tells the whole truth on this subject, he goes beyond what is implied in such a comparison (chap. xi. 23). Εἴ τις (delicately, instead of ὅστις) is not necessarily against the idea that his opponents were probably a number of persons. The equality or the title to an equality of position which he had claimed in ver. 7, he makes clear in ver. 8, by adding—**For even if I should boast somewhat more abundantly of the power which the Lord gave us for edification and not for your destruction, I should not be put to shame.**—He means to say, that if he should go much further in his claims of official authority, he would never be found an idle boaster. The particle ἐάν is not designed to concede that he was about to boast in this manner, and τε γὰρ has the sense of, *for even* as in Rom. i. 26; vii. 7. The object of τε is to indicate that some other member of a sentence stands in harmony with it or in a reciprocal relation to it. In the present case it points out such an agreement or correlation between ἐὰν—καυχήσομαι and οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσομαι (Passow, Tr. A. B. I. 2 a. bb. B.). [On the use of ἐαν with the Aorist subjunctive when something objectively possible is thought of in the future, but not conceived of as exactly certain, see Winer § 43, 3 b. We may here render καυχήσωμαι like the Latin *fut. exact.* and αἰσχυνθήσομαι as the *fut. simpl.* as in our common English version. The word "ἐξουσία includes both the ideas of power and of right or authority." Hodge]. Περισσότερον (*accus.*) should be taken in a comparative sense. According to some, the comparison has reference to what had been said in vv. 4–6; but according to others, it has reference to his opponents (*more than they boast*). It is most natural to suppose that he is putting himself on an equality with those opponents mentioned in ver. 7, and his meaning would then be: yet more than I just now did when I made myself the equal of such as claimed to be Christ's servants. In the words, for edification and not for destruction, the church is represented as if it were a house or a temple of God (1 Cor. iii. 16) [and Paul and his associates in the ministry are supposed to be artificers in the construction of the whole and of each part. It was no part of his mission to destroy, but only to save and put in order (a true conservatism). Howson calls attention to the fact that out of the twenty-two times in which the words edify, and edification are used figuratively in the New Testament, they are in every instance but one used by Paul; and the one exceptional instance (Acts ix. 31) is in a book composed probably under his superintendence, and by a writer of his school. It is possible that his predilection for the trope may have sprung from his craft as a Cilician tentmaker. But Howson is of the opinion that the word has always a *social* character, *i. e.*, that it is always applied to the progress of a community, not of an individual. Hence believers are not severally a building, but only parts (living stones) of a common structure (Metaphors of St. Paul in *Sund. Mag.* for Jan., 1867, pp. 257–63)]. The expressions here used incidentally also suggest that his opponents had not edified but had rather pulled down (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 17), and that they had arrogated to themselves powers which Christ had not bestowed upon them. The καθαίρεσις of ver. 4 had been of a different nature from that which is here spoken of, for the object of that had been to destroy only what obstructed the Christian faith, and to animate and assist

such as were living a life of faith (*οἰκοδομή* in 1 Cor. viii. 1). The communicative *ἡμῶν* indicates that there were others who shared in this power, and who were his genuine associates, and not unworthy intruders into this high office. The words *I shall not be ashamed*, are very concise and emphatic. They refer to what he was doing, or to the results of his labors as an Apostle, in consequence of which all his boasting on this subject would be proved to be the sober truth. With this is immediately connected a final sentence (ver. 9).—**That I may not seem as if I would terrify you by letters.**—This is introduced by no *τοῦ ὁ δὲ λέγω*, or anything of the kind. The aim which is implied in the *ἵνα* must be that of God who would not allow him to be put to shame. It was by an appeal to the results of his Apostolic power that he justified himself from the charge of using expressions in his Epistles which could never be carried into execution, and had been, therefore, thrown out for mere intimidation. There is no need, therefore, of commencing a new period with *ἵνα*, which, after a parenthesis in ver. 10, comes to a conclusion in ver. 11 (that I may not seem to terrify you by my Epistles, let such a one think, *etc.*). There would certainly be something abrupt in the way in which such a sentence would be introduced (and hence some manuscripts insert a *δὲ* after *ἵνα*), and the idea itself would be inappropriate (since nothing is, in fact, brought forward in ver. 11 to obviate the objection which ver. 9 supposes). ["A clause with *ἵνα*, as we have seen before in this Epistle (comp. also Gal. ii. 10), often depends on some word or words omitted, but easily supplied from the context. "This is the only instance in the New Testament where *ἄν*, after a conjunction, is used with the infinitive. Winer (§ 43 6) resolves it into *ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβοῖμι ὑμᾶς, as if I might wish to terrify you*, which agrees with our translation." Hodge]. In later usage *ὡς ἄν* has the sense of the simple *ὡς* with the *ἄν*, *i. e.*, of *tanquam quasi* (as if), and it is here employed to modify the force of *ἐκφοβεῖν*, or to indicate that Paul was acting *like* one who terrifies. The plural seems to imply that Paul had already written to the Corinthians more than one Epistle. Neander: "We may reckon up, first, an Epistle now lost; secondly, that which we now call the first; thirdly, that upon which we are now commenting, and, perhaps, finally, the one which was sent by the hands of Titus." [Barnes and Stanley think that the Corinthians might have seen some of Paul's Epistles to other churches, and been so well acquainted with them as to make this general remark respecting them. Four large Epistles (two to the Thessalonians, one to the Galatians, and one to the Corinthians) among those now extant had been written (the two first in the city of Corinth) before this time. Alford also suggests that Paul may have included the letter he was then writing, by way of anticipation].—**For his letters, they say, are indeed weighty, and powerful, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible** (ver. 10).—He here introduces his opponents, urging an objection founded on the objection which had been presented in ver. 9. The speakers who are the subject of *φησίν*, are his opponents, and this verb is equivalent to the impersonal *φασίν* of later usage (*Passow*, II. 2, p. 2258). There is no reason for confining this to some single person. *Βαρύς* has the sense of, gravis, significant, important, impressive, inspiring respect, the opposite of *ἐξουθενημένος*. While his letters were important and forcible (mighty), his bodily presence was feeble (not weak on account of disease or smallness of size, but on account of a personal presence which lacked power, the opposite of *ἰσχυραί*), and his oral discourse (instructions of all kinds, exhortations) commanded no respect, and were received with contempt (comp. 1 Cor. ii. 3 f.). There is no intimation that he was destitute of those bodily organs which were needful to a good oral expression, or of Grecian refinement and culture. **Let such an one conclude this, that such as we are in word by Epistles when absent, such are we also in deed when present** (ver. 11).—Those who insinuated such things respecting him, might be assured that he would exhibit the same character in all his apostolical conduct as in his writings, and that no one would have reason to reproach him for acting the double part ascribed to him in ver. 10 (comp. ver. 1). The omission of the conjunction (asyndeton), and the position of *τοῦτο*, at the beginning of the sentence, are emphatic. *Λογίζεσθαι* is here contrasted with the inconsiderate judgment mentioned in ver. 10, and it has the sense of, to weigh well. To *τοιοῦτοι τῷ ἔργῳ* we must supply *ἐσμέν*, not *ἐσόμεθα* as if he had intended to say that he would actually fulfil his threatenings (*λόγος*). What he meant was, that the influence which he exerted personally as an Apostle would seem to one who carefully observed it, and reflected upon it, quite as important and energetic as that which he exhibited in his writings.

[It cannot after all be denied, as Alford concedes, that *some* allusion is here made to a deficiency in the apostle's personal appearance and delivery. It does not seem that his opponents' objection was founded *wholly* on his reserve in the use of his apostolical powers. Without conceding that he was precisely *ὁ τρίπηχυς ἀνθρωπος καὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀπτομένος*, and even if we receive the descriptions given in Pseudo-Lucian, Malalas, Nicephorus and the Apocraphal Acts of Paul and Thecla as either caricatures or exaggerated traditions of a modern date, we are yet compelled to yield something to the almost universal agreement of antiquity. The general notion which the whole ancient church appears to have preserved of our Apostle was, that he was of a short stature, and that his body was disfigured by some lameness or distortion; that his head was long and bald, his complexion transparent, his forehead high, his nose aquiline, his eyes sparkling, and his eyebrows close and prominent. And yet that there was nothing in his person which amounted to a very unsightly deformity, we have a right to conclude from Acts xiv. 12, from his public influence before his conversion, from the power he often exhibited as an orator, and from the impression he appears everywhere to have produced. It is not improbable, however, from such passages as 1 Cor. ii. 3, 2 Cor. ii. 13, and others in the epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians, that his temperament was more than

commonly liable to nervous agitations; and it would not be strange if his enemies had seen something when he was at Corinth, which they could pervert to his disadvantage. See Conybeare and Howson, chap. vii. p. 224. Smith's *Dict.* Art. Paul; Ad. Clarke, and Stanley.]

Vers. 12–18. To show that his personal influence was as energetic as his epistolary discourses and exhortations, he now appeals to what he had actually done as an Apostle. He calls attention to the fact that, unlike his arrogant opponents, he had confined himself to those limits which were appointed to his calling, and within which the church of Corinth properly fell, *etc.*—**For we venture not to number ourselves among, or compare ourselves with, some who commend themselves** (ver. 12).—The words οὐ τολμᾶν signify either, *not to have a heart for something*, from a moral repugnance to such a proceeding (1 Cor. vi. 1); or, better, ironically, not to venture; [in this matter we are indeed timid], with a severe implication that his opponents were vain enough to do so. A paronomasia may be noticed in ἐγκρῖναι, signifying, *to place in a line with*, and συγκρῖναι, *to liken*, to place *by the side, to make equal.* The words τισὶ τῶν συνιστάντων signify *with certain* persons (comp. ver. 2) of the class that commend themselves. **But they, measuring themselves among themselves and comparing themselves with themselves are not wise** [*understand it not.*] In this sentence αὐτοὶ with all its subsequent qualifications, appears to apply most appropriately to the Apostle himself (comp. Gal. vi. 4). It then appears to be the regular positive expression, corresponding to the subsequent negative in ver. 13, [*they* measuring themselves, *etc.*, but *we* will not boast ourselves of things without measure,] and finds its further development in the assertion (ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ μέτρον κ. τ. λ.) but we will boast according to the measure, *etc.* It was for this reason that we are able to account for a reading of the text which arose in the earliest times, according to which οὐ συνιοῦσιν· ἡμεῖς δὲ was left out. It seemed difficult to apply what was said in connection with αὐτοὶ to Paul's opponents, and οὐ συνιοῦσιν would make no good sense if αὐτοὶ were applied to Paul himself (they commend themselves; but we, measuring ourselves by ourselves—*i. e.*, "by what we really find ourselves to be—and comparing ourselves with ourselves, not with those wise men, those pretended knowing ones; or, "comparing ourselves with ourselves, who are so unwise, in the opinion of our opponents"!). They also found that on this interpretation the words ἡμεῖς δὲ not only seemed superfluous, but injurious to the sense of the passage, and that on the other hand the sentence read smoothly and with an appropriate meaning if οὐ συνιάσιν· ἡμεῖς δὲ were left out ("they commend themselves; but *we* measuring ourselves by ourselves, *etc.*, will not boast as to things beyond our measure"). It is evident, therefore, that the reading of the Receptus which has those words is the most difficult reading, and hence was most likely to have been the true one and altered to get rid of the difficulty. This also accounts for the fact that the abbreviated reading is sustained only by Occidental manuscripts, and that even these are by no means in agreement, since some of them have ἡμεῖς δὲ. But even the reading of the Receptus which is much better sustained is capable of a very appropriate sense. Let αὐτοὶ be applied to Paul's opponents. Then the measuring themselves among themselves, is not the correct estimate which people form of themselves and their performances in contrast with a more uncertain one from a comparison with others, but a proud self-conceit springing from a constant fixing of the thoughts upon themselves and their fancied excellences and performances, and from never observing those who are superior to them, and who have distinguished themselves by more exalted achievments; in other words, it is an idle self-satisfaction and self-admiration. Nor is συνιοῦσιν to be construed as a participle in the dative plur. (anacoluthic), but a verb in the 3d pers. plur. Ind. of συνιέω, like συνιᾶσιν, the more common Attic form (adopted by Lachmann on the authority of B. and some other MSS.). The word stands here in an absolute sense: (they not understanding, not reaching a clear discernment, being deficient in understanding;) like the participle οἱ συνιέντες=those who understand, and ὁ συνιῶν Rom. iii. 11, and συνῆκαν Mark vi. 52. It implies either that the course they take is the reason for their want of intelligence, or that it is the way in which they exhibit this want. Others explain it: they do not observe or perceive that they are measuring themselves by their own selves; or they do so without being aware of it; but such a sense is agreeable neither to the order of the words, nor to the general sense of the passage. For the Apostle is speaking not of the way in which they were blinding themselves, but of the folly of their proceeding, in contrast with his own course. With that measuring of themselves by themselves which is sure to lead off into unbounded self-laudation, (inasmuch as no objective limits can be assigned to a man's exaltation of himself), the Apostle contrasts that boasting of one's self which is confined to the limits assigned him by God. Ἀλλά is to be taken in the sense of *but*, either like the Germ. *sondern*, completely reversing or giving the negative to the previous clause, or like the Germ. *aber*, only partially doing so. The former is preferable on account of the preceding οὐ. As he now wishes to carry out the contrast of *persons* which had been given already in ἑαυτούς τισι, he brings up in strong light the kind of conduct which is most opposed to the pretensions of which he had been speaking. But οὐ συνιοῦσιν offers an obvious explanation of οὐ τολμῶμεν (Meyer.) [It must be confessed that there is on this interpretation an appearance of defect in that sharp contrast which seems demanded by the ἀλλὰ at the commencement of the passage. That particle seems to require that what he was about to say should be in direct opposition to the self-commendation of those of whom he had just spoken. By referring αὐτοῖ to the Apostle, this would be clear, since he would oppose his way of proceeding to theirs; but if that word is referred to his opponents, we have the conduct of the same persons shown in contrast]. Osiander endeavors to avoid this difficulty, by making αὐτοὶ especially emphatic [giving it an exclusive power] equivalent to *soli* [they alone, by themselves, separate from all other men. Kuehner. *Gram.* Am. ed. § 302, 6; Jelf. § 656, 3. *a.*]. This

would make the Apostle say, that he would not venture to put himself among or even by the side of such persons, but that he would leave them to themselves and to their own folly. In this case a severe and bitter irony would be expressed: "but *they*, for their own special part, since they measure themselves, *etc.*, are not wise; but we," *etc.* Something of this kind was undoubtedly intended by the Apostle in whatever way his language is construed; but it is questionable whether it is implied in *αὐτοί*. [The contrast implied in referring *αὐτοὶ* to Paul's opponents is in the very spirit of this section, and seems demanded by the argument. The very object he had in view was to put himself personally in opposition to them. The complete meaning developed by such a construction may be expressed thus: "we confess we have not the boldness which some have shown; and hence we shrink from numbering ourselves, or even comparing ourselves with them. On the other hand, we think that they are far from showing wisdom when they resort to self-commendations, and seek for credit by comparing themselves not with true Apostles, but with one another, and with their ownselves at different periods. Their self-love is sure to flatter them when they look solely at their own and others' accomplishments, instead of comparing themselves with the standard which God has given us."—See a sermon on this text by Dr. Chalmers].—**Nay, neither will we boast without measure**—[as far as to things which have no limit] (ver. 13). The authorities are here in favor of *καυχησόμεθα* (Rec.) and are sufficiently strong to prove it genuine. The future [*absolute*, looking to indefinite time and to an ethical impossibility, WEBSTER, chap. vi. p. 84; WINER, § 41, 6] implies that such a boasting could never by any possibility take place (comp. Rom. x. 14). If we leave the word out of the text, we must suppose that the Apostle in ver. 15, by an anacoluthon (*καυχώμενοι*) turned back in his thoughts to *εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα*. Fritzsche, who prefers the shorter reading of the text in ver. 12, and who concludes that *οὐ συνιοῦσιν* originated in some marginal gloss, and then created a necessity for inserting *ἡμεῖς δὲ*, is in favor of such an explanation. But the Receptus has been triumphantly defended by Reiche (Commentar. I.) and Meyer.—**But** *we boast* **according to the measure of the rule which God apportioned to us.**—Opposed to *εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα* (on to the unmeasured, *εἰς* implying the extent or boundaries toward which the boasting tended, and which formed its measure or limit), stands here *κατὰ τὸ μέτρον* (according to the measure). This latter measure is more particularly defined by the additional *τοῦ κανόνος*, which signifies [properly, a reed, rod or staff, to keep anything erect, firm or upright, and then] the measure of the line, or the space determined by the measuring line [Robinson's *Greek and Eng. Lex. to the N. T.*]. We prefer the latter signification in the sense of a measured space accurately defined; and hence, in this place, in accordance with what follows, the department of influence, or of official duty, assigned him by God.*—**A measure reaching even unto you.**—In the words *οὗ ἐμέρισεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς μέτρον* we have an instance of a bold attraction in the use of *τοῦ μέτρου* (in apposition with *τοῦ κανόνος*) *ὁ*. The reason it is joined thus with *τοῦ κανόνο* probably was, because the Apostle wished to give prominence to the thought that the measure was precisely determined, inasmuch as the field of his activity had been marked out for him by God, as if by a surveyor's chain, when the Spirit within him, as well as external providential circumstances, had shown him in what direction and how far he should go (comp. Acts xvi. 6 ff.). In *ἐφικέσθαι ἄχρι καὶ ὑμῶν* (*to extend even unto you*) he meant to say, that in this distribution of parts (1 Cor. vii. 17), God had made his measure extend even to Corinth. The infinitive is connected with *ἐμέρισεν*, in which is contained the idea of an intention. *Ἄχρι, etc., i. e.*, to Corinth, which was then the extreme limit of Paul's preaching in the West. He proceeds, in ver. 14, to show that he might, without presumption, regard them as within the sphere of his influence, and to confirm what he had said in ver. 13.—**For we stretch** (*over-extend*) **not ourselves beyond our measure, as though we reached not unto you.**—The phrase *ὑπερεκτείνειν ἑαυτόν* properly signifies to stretch one's self over or beyond the measure which had been assigned him (by the measuring instrument); and in thus using it, the Apostle's object was to meet the objection that he had arrogated to himself in Corinth something which did not belong to him. We must not construe *ὡς μὴ ἐφικνούμενοι* (the readings *ἐφικόμενοι* or *ἀφικόμενοι* have very feeble authority in their favor), as if it were in the preterite, but take it as a designation of those who do not come, *i. e.*, do not reach to you. The *μή* denies the idea supposed, and implies that it was only an ideal case which he was supposing, *viz:* that he had not in fact reached to the Corinthians. He informs them what the real fact was, and confirms what he had before asserted, when he adds—**For even as far as you did we come foremost in preaching the gospel of Christ.**—*Ἐφθάσαμεν* suggests that the priority of influence in Corinth properly belonged to him, and that he had been before his opponents in preaching the Gospel and in establishing a Church there. Even if it were proved that *φθάνειν* in Rom. ix. 31; Phil. iii. 16; Dan. iv. 8, should have the meaning simply of *to come to* a place generally, we think its more fundamental meaning [in the aorist: we have already come, or have come beforehand] should be re-

[* There is no evidence beyond the vaguest tradition that before their separation at Jerusalem the Apostles portioned out the different provinces of the world to one another, and yet there was doubtless an understanding, perhaps silently acquiesced in by them all, that only one Apostle, or supreme authority, was needful on any one field. In some special sense, "the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed to Paul and that of the circumcision to Peter" (Gal. ii. 7); and in consequence of this, James, Cephas and John went unto the circumcision, and Paul and Barnabas unto the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 9). Paul appears also to have adopted the rule that he would leave the minor details of labor to inferior hands, when the Gospel had once been planted in a place, while he pressed forward to new countries. Hence he proposed to visit even Rome, where a Church had been formed by others, only by the way (Rom. xv. 20, 24). If, then, any persons came to Corinth in the character of Apostles, or professing to act under the authority of other Apostles, while Paul was still alive and active on that field, and especially if they resisted his authority, it was a decided infringement of this express or implied arrangement, or a plain denial of his right to the name of an Apostle. Comp. Stanley].

tained in this passage. Ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ implies that the announcement of salvation was the element in which he moved in all his apostolic journeys; or it simply means, *while we were preaching Christ*.—**Not boasting without measure in other men's labors** (ver. 15*a*)—These words must be joined to ver. 13, so as to make ver. 14 not merely the second half of ver. 14, but a parenthesis. He resumes the subject contained in οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα καυχᾶσθαι, and grammatically connects what he here says with καυχησόμεθα, which had to be understood in ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ μέτρον, *etc*, in ver. 13. The participial sentence must therefore be joined with καυχησόμεθα and not with ἐφθάσαμεν (Rückert).—**But having a hope that as your faith increases we shall be enlarged among you according to our rule abundantly** (ver. 15*b*).—We have here a further development of the Apostle's discourse. In the first place an object is given to the καυχᾶσθαι, which he had disclaimed for himself when he says: ἐν ἀλλοτρίοις κόποις. This contains an indirect allusion to his opponents, who in fact boasted of other men's labors, and arrogated as their own what had been done by others (κόπος, Jno. iv. 38; 1 Cor. iii. 8). With this negative he goes on to connect the prospect of an extension of his sphere of labor beyond Corinth, in consequence of an anticipated increase of their faith; αὐξανομένης τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν. [Ἐλπίδα ἔχοντες is a more forcible expression than the simple participle ἐλπίζοντες would have been, and it signifies a firm, habitual confidence. The present αὐξανομένης indicates not only that their faith would be increased (Engl. A. V.), but that it was then actually increasing. He had an assurance that their faith would have a steady, pure and vigorous progress, and hence that he would not much longer be contracted and held back by his care for them. On this assurance he entertained a confident hope in a short time, ἐν ὑμῖν μεγαλυνθῆναι, *etc*. Ἐν ὑμῖν does not belong especially to that which had just been said, as if the Apostle had intended to say that he hoped their faith would be increased either in their hearts (in distinction from their outward growth among the people) or in the common fellowship of believers; for in either case ὑμῶν would be superfluous. He hoped that when their faith had been increased, he would be magnified among them, and would be assisted by their growing congregations to accomplish further and more important results. There is evidently nothing in the language used to imply that the Apostle was thinking of the geographical position of Corinth or of the favorable opportunities which would be presented there for more extensive enterprises (ἐν is in the sense of *per*). [And yet, as Grotius and Rosenmueller suggest, such an idea would have been peculiarly appropriate to the Corinthians, who were great navigators, and had peculiar facilities for assisting him on his journey to countries farther West and South. Not unreasonably, Osiander concludes from this passage that no Apostle had before this been further West]. Even the metaphor of a man of extraordinary stature, who could therefore reach further without going beyond his measure (Meyer), is probably foreign to the passage. Still less appropriate is the explanation of μεγαλύνεσθαι, which makes it signify: *celebrari* (to be praised, although in other places the word may have that meaning), or rather: to be glorified among you. The context, however, favors the idea that the Apostle was thinking of an enlargement or exaltation of his power to perform his duties, in consequence of which he would be able to press further on, and enlarge the sphere of his labors. That this increase of his greatness would only be in conformity with his calling as an Apostle, he indicates by the words, *according to our rule* (κατὰ τὸν κανόνα ἡμῶν). This rule has no reference to the general principle expressed in Rom. xv. 20, for the connection (ver. 13) required him simply to say that he was confining himself to the limits God had assigned him (according to our measuring line, *i. e.*, never to go beyond the space God has distinctly marked off for me). He is careful, however, to inform his readers that these limits did not abridge his free action and did not make his very great enlargement impossible. This he lets us know in εἰς περισσείαν. He was well aware that he had been ordained to an Apostleship which was universal in its object (comp. Rom. i. 13ff.; xv. 23f., 28), and which called for an extraordinary energy. Rückert's idea, that αὐξαν.—εἰς περισσείαν has a tincture of irony about it, appears to be without foundation (comp. Meyer).—**To preach the Gospel as far as the parts beyond you** (ver. 16*a*). He here informs us more definitely what would be the result of the enlargement of which he had just spoken, and what he would become capable of. Εὐαγγελίσασθαι is here the infinitive either of the design or of the result to be accomplished by the enlargement; it is not simply epexegetical of what that enlargement was to be (*q. d., that is, to make known the Gospel*), but to tell us what would follow that enlargement, or why he hoped for it (*in order that*). As in 1 Pet. i. 25; 1. Thess. ii. 9; John viii. 26, εἰς is here used to imply the making known to, and bringing the Gospel into, those countries. Ὑπερέκεινα is a word used in a corrupted Greek style for ἐπέκεινα. In the next clause he proceeds to give us the negative description of the same result or design—**not to boast ourselves of things prepared for our hands in another's line** (ver. 16*b*.). In this additional qualification of what he had said, he intended to signify that in such an extension of his Apostolical influence he did not mean to boast like his opponents of something already prepared for him in the sphere of other men's labors, *i. e.*, to appropriate to himself the fruits of other persons' labors, and thus to acquire a false reputation for greatness. [In our common English version a comma should be placed after the word "line," so that no one should read the passage as if it were, "another man's line of things"]. The words ὁ κανών have here the sense of, *what is marked off by a measuring line;* properly, the extent of space intended for another and assigned to him by the measuring line. The meaning of the word is not changed here, though the general idea it conveys is affected by the context. In contrast with this false and censurable self-glorification, he now presents in a general sentence the glorying which is proper and commendable. The general rule with respect to this he announces thus—**But he that glorieth let him glory in the Lord** (ver. 17).

Comp. 1 Cor. i. 31. The reason for this glorying which is mentioned in ver. 18 makes it evident that κύριος (God) is here represented to be not so much the object of the glorying as the reason on account of which one glories. To a selfish and arbitrary self-commendation, to a false boasting, stands opposed a glorying in a fellowship with the Lord, as the true source of all ability, or on account of that approbation which God bestows upon us and which is revealed in the blessing attending our labors. Such a glorying is shown in the confession that whatever success we have comes from God (comp. chap. iii. 3).—**For not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth** (ver. 18). With respect to this commendation of ourselves, comp. ver. 12. The person who presumes to commend himself thus is brought before us with a special emphasis in ἐκεῖνος. Δόκιμος, in this connection, where the Apostle is speaking of Christ's ministers, signifies one who is approved or authenticated as a faithful minister of the Lord (2 Tim. ii. 15). Meyer draws from the whole passage a somewhat different sense; for in his view καυχᾶσθαι ἐν κυρίῳ is a glorying in God as the Being through whose grace and power he has and does every thing (comp. xii. 9ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 10). The opposite of this is the commendation of our own selves: "for not he who acts differently from this, and instead of glorying in the Lord, commends himself, is approved (tried experimentally by Christian tests), but he whom the Lord commends (by His blessing, and not by any literal or direct praise). NEANDER: "Only that which the Lord accomplished by the instrumentality of a man is really his commendation, not his own commendations of himself, or dead letters of commendation like those which the Judaizing teachers carried." [Comp. chap. iii. 1, and above ver. 12].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

[1. The Christian and especially the Christian pastor, should be a man of combined strength and gentleness. The one quality without the other produces a distorted character. Without strength there can be no real gentleness, to the very idea of which the conception of a reserved force is necessary, an energy which on occasion forbears to exert its appropriate qualities. The Apostle had been gentle and meek in the former part of this Epistle, but it was not from feebleness of character. He could be, like his Lord, a lion or a lamb, as circumstances called for such qualities. The Church needs heroes as well as martyrs; to contend sometimes for truth and rights, as well as sometimes to surrender themselves to the smiter. There may be more danger that God's people should fail in benignity or meekness, but there have been seasons where they have shown an equally painful lack of a magnanimity which sympathizes with great enterprises and with oppressed humanity, and a fervent zeal which cannot bear them that are evil (Rev. ii. 2; Judg. v. 23)].

2. The minister of Christ is a spiritual warrior, in arms against every thing which is in the way of the progress of Christ's kingdom, of the truth and of the knowledge of God; or which tends to impede or impair their exclusive and complete authority. He is often compelled to experience that his natural powers are weak and sinful, but his sinful infirmities and afflictions are never allowed to control his method of warfare. The Spirit of that God, in whose cause he maintains the conflict, supplies him with weapons of Almighty power, which pierce every covering, overcome all opposition, and overthrow the strongest holds. This sword of the Spirit, the enlightening and quickening word, cuts through the most ingeniously contrived knots which the mind of man, however aided by Satanic art has been able to form, and batters down and destroys the most powerful defences which the reason of man has been able to construct against God. This is the light which penetrates the darkness of the human understanding, awakens in men a consciousness of their weakness and their errors in Divine things, convinces them of the infallible and exclusive certainty of the revelation God has made of Himself in Christ and so completely subjects their mental powers to Christ that that revelation becomes their only authority in matters of faith. In opposition to an enemy whose equipment is "great power and much craft," the spiritual combatant or commander has not only a Divine energy but a wisdom which is superior to all human craftiness. But before punishing the refractory, he distinguishes accurately between the seducers and the seduced, and he is careful kindly and thoroughly to win the latter and to draw them away from their dangerous associates. In such a work his love will be quite as prominent as his wisdom, for he will remember that his official power was intrusted to him by God not to destroy but to save and benefit his fellowmen.

2. The true minister of Christ can easily be distinguished from all arrogant intruders into the sacred office, in the first place, by his abstaining from all self-laudation, and by his leaving it entirely to God to justify him and to authenticate him as a servant of the Lord; so that if he ever boasts it will be a glorying in the Lord by whose grace he is qualified for his work, and without which he is and can do nothing: and in the second place, by his confining himself strictly to the sphere to which his Lord has called him, in which he makes all he does subservient to the Divine glory, and beyond which he never attempts to pass into new fields until he has performed all that had been previously required of him and is led and strengthened by the Divine hand.

[3. The conflict of truth with error, of sin and holiness, can never cease until all sin and error are exterminated from the earth. While true benevolence will allow of no such intolerance as resorts to carnal weapons against the life, reputation or outward prosperity of ungodly men, it can never be wanting in inclination, wisdom or power to pursue its conquests while any degree of sin or error remains in the world. *This* conflict is therefore truly "*irrepressible*" until the kingdom of darkness shall be utterly destroyed].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—VER. 1. Christ's faithful ministers will endeavor to deal with souls as Jesus Himself dealt with them (Matth. xii. 17–20).—It is right

to meet all evil reports, but let it be always with becoming modesty.—Ver. 2. HEDINGER: Gentleness may and ought sometimes to be followed by sharpness and severity. In a world which is filled with wrong and outrage, who would be perpetually administering consolation (1 Tim. v. 20)?—Ver. 3. God's people and servants are spiritual soldiers who must war a good warfare (1 Tim. i. 18), and for this God alone can provide adequate weapons.—Ver. 4. IBID: A fortress is what makes resistance and is not easily taken. In the unsanctified heart it is: wilfulness, a proud spirit, inveterate wickedness, habitual sins, the old Adam with all his defences, subterfuges and pretended rights; or it is: everything which Satan and the world sets up in opposition to the kingdom of Christ, such as power, great names, craft, fraud, calumny, wealth, great numbers, philosophy and eloquence.—CHRYSOSTOM: Carnal weapons are wealth, fame, worldly power, fluency of speech, severity, circumventive arts, flatteries and hypocrisies.—Ver. 5. IBID: That which is lofty is also proud, established. Here it stands for all opposition to the word of God, to Christ, to repentance and to faith; inasmuch as men are ashamed of the humble requirements and the cross of Christ, ridicule the duties of self-denial, and resist the progress of Christ's kingdom with all their subtility and power.—Reason is one of the noblest of God's gifts, but when it is abused, when it sets itself against God's word, and claims to be the supreme judge and arbiter in matters of faith, *etc.*, it must be rejected.—Ver. 6. The revenge which springs from a carnal and embittered spirit should always be repressed, but that which comes from a spiritual desire to rebuke and faithfully punish wickedness is commendable and desirable.—A faithful minister should endeavor to unite, edify and strengthen his people before he attempts to scatter and punish those who are opposed to him.—Ver. 7. Teachers and preachers should not be directed by the mere outward semblance of things, but act honestly, faithfully and suitably to their calling.—Ver. 8. A good Christian will always be grateful to those who faithfully tell him the truth and never flatter him.—Spiritual power should be exercised with no other desire than to edify and benefit God's people (chap. xii. 19).—Ver. 9. An upright servant of God will be especially careful to avoid every appearance of that which has been laid to his charge (1 Pet. ii. 12).—Ver. 11. We should strive never to make an improper use of the gentle dealings of pious people, lest we compel them to exchange gentleness for severity.—It is a great thing for a preacher never to contradict his words by his works, and to be always the same, present or absent, *etc.*—Ver. 12. No man can judge himself correctly, if he looks only at himself. He must compare himself with those who possess more excellent gifts, that he may learn to think moderately of himself.—Ver. 13. God has measured out to every faithful preacher, the precise limits of his official duty, and he should strive to occupy these with all fidelity, and to leave nothing undone within his measure!—Ver. 14. A grandiloquent style of speaking however common and favored by worldly people, is peculiarly offensive to the servants and the children of God.—Ver. 15. Blessed is that congregation which, for a long time, has a faithful pastor, and has grown and strengthened under his ministrations.—But the minister who has been successful in saving and building up the people of his charge, may be convinced on right principles, that God has called him to go further, and enlarge his field.—The great business of Christianity is to have faith. This is the true bond by which our souls are spiritually united with God, and through which we become and continue branches of Christ, derive spiritual nourishment from Him, and so are able to advance in goodness.—Ver. 17. Everything without Christ is nothing; and nothing with Christ is everything.—Ver. 18. SPENER: To praise one's self is to derogate just so much from God's glory, and is an insolence which God will assuredly resist. Great indeed is the commendation which God bestows; by showing to an assembled universe, that He is pleased with our works, by the testimony of a good conscience in our own hearts, and by the successful result of what we have done.

BERLENB. BIBLE:—VER. 3. Christians live in the flesh among their fellowmen, not to obey, but to overcome their fleshly inclinations.—Ver. 4. Before anything can be built up in the kingdom of God, whatever is opposed to it, as pride and false prejudices must be discovered and removed.—Ver. 5. Carnal wisdom, vain thoughts, and the conclusions of unassisted reason, are the principal obstacles with which the gospel has to contend. They can never be subdued by external force, nor by counter opinions of men, but by the sword of the Spirit. Our great work is to learn to wield this sword with faithfulness and skill.—The right knowledge of God will always lead to a subjugation of ourselves to Him, for it will show what are our true relations to Him. Whoever follows not the Lord Jesus as a little child, but proudly adheres to the conceited maxims of human wisdom, will certainly fall into darkness. It must be our constant care to humble every high thing and bring it into subjection to the simplicity of Christ. It will be easy to do this if we allow the Holy Spirit to work freely in our hearts.—Ver. 7. Whoever sees only what the outward eye naturally rests upon, will never observe the Spirit, and the footsteps of Christ.—Ver. 8. If the appointed overseers in the Church would use their power in the wisest manner, they should insist upon nothing but what will promote the growth of real piety, and they should exclude from visible fellowship none whom Christ has thought worthy of an invisible fellowship with Himself and His people.—If each one would give his attention to the measure which God hath measured to him, and be faithful in that without disturbing others in their proper spheres, the peace and unity of the Christian world would never be broken.—Ver. 15. Our first business is to learn what is the peculiar work to which God calls us.—Ver. 17. As long as you imagine you have something to boast of, you know neither God nor yourself, and you are making a god of yourself.—Ver. 18. We have here a little text of great importance. Great and small, strong and feeble, come within its range, that the one may not be discouraged, and that the other may not be presumptuous.

RIEGER:—VERS. 1, 2. Nothing is more difficult than for a man to speak much of himself. If, however, circumstances demand it, let him show that a good conscience is not necessarily a feeble or timid one.—Our Lord always endeavored to make the way of repentance and amendment as easy as possible, and He never threw needless impediments in the path of those who were seeking for truth.—Ver. 5. We should never hesitate to break in pieces all carnal weapons, but we should strive to bring those who once used them, to accept of the easy yoke of Christ, and to learn of Him that they may find that rest which their souls never knew while contending against God.—Ver. 7ff. We are very liable falsely to suspect others, when our judgments are guided by wrong principles, and are formed according to appearances. How cruel have been the imputations under which the most excellent of the earth have sometimes been obliged to live! Wicked men have not been afraid to trample under foot those whom God has prepared to sit with His Son on the throne of His glory. Teach us, O God, so to use Thy grace, that we may meekly submit to ignominy, and yet hope for glory!—Ver. 12ff. Where God helps, there only can the believer find a path to walk.—Ver. 17f. Something we must have to support us while all around us are judging and despising us. But if thou wilt glory, glory only in the Lord who has accepted of thee, and counted thee worthy of His high calling, with whose pounds thou art trading, and for whom thou art to live and die.—Even in the judgment of common sense it is a contemptible thing for a man to praise himself. But there are many arts by which it is consistent with good manners and intelligence to draw upon ourselves the observation of those around us.—The Lord can praise us, sometimes by opening doors which no art or power of man could previously open, and sometimes by quieting those who before had thought unfavorably of us (Rev. iii. 9). But in general our cause must be reserved for that great day when the Lord will judge every secret thing.

HEUBNER:—VER. 1. The good qualities of those who act as spiritual shepherds are sure to be misrepresented. Their gentleness will be called weakness, and their earnestness, arrogance and rashness. Even those who commonly appear retiring and diffident, when necessity calls for it, sometimes put forth great energy.—Ver. 3. The Christian must always be at war with the world, but his weapons must be spiritual and very different from those of worldly prudence.—Ver. 4. Only the pure in heart have courage to attack sins which are rooted deeply in the spirit of the world, and sustained by public laws and usages (wicked maxims, established customs and erroneous opinions).—Ver. 5. Man's pride rebels against the Gospel, but those who are enlightened and strengthened by the Spirit of God can get the victory over it.—That reason which exults itself against Christianity and will learn nothing from Christ, is false (Luther: Satan's harlot).—Ver. 6. All who are in favor of right and order in the Church must ordinarily rally around their ministers.—Ver. 7. There are other and perhaps better Christians than yourself (against exclusiveness).—Ver. 8. There is a salutary power which belongs to the pastoral office, which is not for condemnation, but for edification, and which ought always to be cheerfully acknowledged by the people. Ministers should never attempt to drive their people by slavish fears.—Ver. 10. Extraordinary talents or merits are not always connected with an imposing presence or a remarkable eloquence.—Ver. 11. The truest respect of our fellowmen is acquired by showing them that we have been called of God and are led by His Spirit; not by exhibitions and a consciousness of our own powers, which too often engender pride.—Ver. 12. Great as thou mayest be, there are probably some much greater! Nothing can be more idle than for a man to make himself his standard and then measure himself by it.—Ver. 13. God gives to every man the sphere of action in which his talents may be best employed; this he should strive to occupy, and never break into that of his neighbor and arrogate to himself something which is not his.—Ver. 15. Those who occupy well a small sphere will be very sure to be Divinely called to a larger (Luke xix. 17).—Ver. 17. No garment is so beautiful and no honor so illustrious as humility.—Ver. 18. What if you are commended by yourself and by all men? One word from your final Judge may turn it all to shame. How different will be His estimate of all human merit!

W. F. BESSER:—VER. 3. The Spirit of Christ enables us not only to mortify the deeds of the body (Rom. viii. 13), but to subject the flesh in which we live and walk (Gal. ii. 20) so completely under the seal of the Spirit, that our tongue, eyes, ears and all our members, our reason, and all our minds and hearts, shall be consecrated to the service of God (Rom. vi. 13). But whoever serves God in this life must be a warrior. If this is true of all Christians (Eph. vi. 10), it is in a double sense true of ministers. But he wars a good warfare if, while walking in the flesh, he wars not after the flesh, with passion, vindictiveness, pusillanimity, unworthy artifices and vain ambition.—Ver. 4. In the eye of the world, carnal weapons are mighty, and the spiritual weapons of the Church (the word of God, preaching, faith, confessions, patience and spiritual gifts) are of no consequence; but in God's sight, carnal weapons are powerless and vain, and those which come from the holy armory, where David obtained his equipments (Ps. xviii. 35, 36), are mighty. What bulwarks has the god of this world erected to keep men in their wicked ways! The idolatrous systems of heathen nations, the self-righteous prejudices of the Jew, the philosophic arrogance of the Greek, the civil grandeur of the Roman, the haughty power of the world, the whole manner of life sanctioned by ancestral usages and deeply rooted popular prejudices, strongly fortified errors of heretics,—these are the strongholds which the Church has had to storm, with no other weapons than the trumpet of the Gospel and the sword of the Spirit.—Ver. 5. As a beleaguered enemy builds up one wall behind another, and erects many towers in his defence, so rises up from the carnal institutions assailed by the Gospel, one high thing after another to maintain their life, their purposes, their honor, and their

loves and pleasures against the word of God, which demands an unconditional surrender. What was it that subdued me and made me renounce myself, die to myself, and thus become my own enemy; made me depend entirely upon Jesus, lose myself in Him, and find my all in Him? Nothing but the word of God, whose power is so wonderful. This it was which destroyed every high thing which my imagination erected, and behind which I had intrenched myself. As long as reason, with its power of thought and will, remained in the service of the flesh (Eph. ii. 3), she was God's enemy and "Satan's harlot" (Luther); but no sooner was she taken captive to the obedience of Christ, than she became a submissive handmaid, performing precisely the opposite service for, not against, the knowledge of God. For faith is in its essential nature obedience to Christ (Rom. i. 5; xvi. 26).—Ver. 8. This text appeals to all ministers: For edification and not for destruction! This admonishes us that we should make such a use of the power which the Lord has committed to us that we may be commended as faithful stewards.

[The Christian Church is engaged in a conflict, and every Christian is a warrior. I. For what? 1. For the knowledge of God; and 2. for the obedience of Christ (ver. 5). This conflict can never cease while a hurtful error, or a disobedient person, remains on earth. Strongholds must be demolished (ver. 4); rational powers taken captive (ver. 5); and incorrigible ones cast out (ver. 6). II. Some principles according to which it must be conducted. 1. Christ must be over all, all must be His, and exclusive Christ-parties among such as belong to Him are schismatic (ver. 7); 2. Christ's Spirit must animate all; (*a*) his meekness and gentleness (ver. 1), or (*b*) his severity (ver. 2) according to the occasion; 3. Spiritual weapons alone must be used: every man's freedom and external position must be respected, but whatever truth and love can do must be done (ver. 4); 4. Nothing but the good of individual men and of society must be sought (ver. 8, 9); 5. Men must be valued not by their own or other's estimate of them, but by the standard of Divine truth (vv. 12, 17, 18); 6. Each one must be confined to the sphere to which Providence assigns him, and yet this should be continually enlarging (vv. 15), 16].

XIV.—HIS OWN BOASTING IN CONTRAST WITH THAT OF HIS OPPONENTS. REASONABLE DEMANDS UPON THEIR FORBEARANCE. SEVERE DESCRIPTION OF HIS OPPONENTS. PREËMINENCE OF THE APOSTLE.

Chapter XI. 1–33.

Would to God [Would that] ye could bear[1] with me a little in *my* folly [a little
2 folly in me]:[2] and indeed [ye do] bear with me. For [me; for] I am jealous over
you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present
3 *you as* a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so[3] your minds should be corrupted from the simpli-
4 city[4] that is in Christ. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached [a Jesus whom we preached not], or *if* ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received [received not, λαμβάνετε], or another gospel, which ye
5 have not accepted [accepted not, ἐλάβετε], ye might well bear with *him*.[5] For[6] I suppose I was not a whit [in any respect] behind the very chiefest [these super-eminent,
6 ὑπερλίαν] apostles. But though *I be* rude in speech, yet not in knowledge; but we have
7 been thoroughly [in every respect] made manifest[7] among you in all things. Have [among all with respect to you. Or have, ἢ] I committed an offence in abasing myself
8 that ye might be exalted, because I have preached to you the gospel of God freely? I
9 robbed other churches, taking wages *of them*, to do you service. And when I was present with you, and wanted, I was chargeable to no man: for that which was lacking to me the brethren which came from Macedonia supplied: and in all *things* I have
10 kept myself from being burdensome unto you, and *so* will I keep *myself*. As the truth of Christ is in me, no man shall stop me of this boasing [this boasting shall not
11 be closed against me, ἡ καύχησις αὕτη οὐ φραγήσεται] in the regions of Achaia. Where-
12 fore? because I love you not? God knoweth. But what I do, that will I [also] do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion; that wherein they glory,

13 they may be found even as we. For such *are* false apostles, deceitful workers, trans-
14 forming themselves into the [*om.* the] apostles of Christ. And no marvel;[8] for Satan
himself is transformed [transforms himself, *μετασχηματίζεται*] into an angel of light.
15 Therefore *it is* no great thing if his ministers also be transformed [and become] as the
16 ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works. I say again,
Let no man think me a fool [foolish, *ἄφρονα*]; if otherwise [but if it cannot be so, *εἰ*
17 *δὲ μή γε*], yet as a fool receive me, that I [too, *κἀγὼ*] may boast myself a little.[9] That
which I speak, I speak *it* not after [the manner of, *κατὰ*] the Lord, but as it were
18 foolishly, in this confidence of boasting. Seeing that many glory after the flesh, I
19 will glory also. For ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye *yourselves* are wise.
20 For ye suffer [it patiently], if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour *you*, if
a man take *of you* [insnares you, *λαμβάνει*], if a man exalt himself, if a man smite
21 you on the face. I speak as concerning reproach [By way of disparagement, I speak]
as though we had been [were] weak.[10] Howbeit [but], whereinsoever any is bold, (I
22 speak foolishly,) I am bold also. Are they Hebrews? so *am* I. Are they Israelites?
23 so *am* I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so *am* I. Are they ministers of Christ?
(I speak as a fool [as though beside myself, *παραφρονῶν*],) I *am* more; in [by, *ἐν*] la-
bours more abundant, in [by] stripes above measure, in [by] prisons more frequent,[11]
24 in [by] deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty *stripes* save one.
25 Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night
26 and a day have I been in the deep; *In* [by] journeyings often, *in* [by] perils of
waters [rivers], *in* [by] perils of robbers, *in* [by] perils by [from] *mine own* country-
men, *in* [by] perils by [from] the heathen, *in* [by] perils in the city, *in* [by] perils in
27 the wilderness, *in* [by] perils in the sea, *in* [by] perils among false brethren; In [by]
weariness[12] and painfulness; in [by] watchings often, in [by] hunger and thirst, in [by]
28 fastings often, in [by] cold and nakedness. Beside those things that are without [Be-
side other things which take place, *χωρὶς τῶν παρεκτὸς*], that which cometh[13] upon me[14]
29 daily [day by day], the care of all the churches. Who is weak, and I am not weak?
30 who is offended, and I burn not? If I must needs glory, I will glory of the things which
31 concern mine infirmities. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which [God,
the Father of the Lord Jesus,[15] who] is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not.
32 In Damascus the governor under Aretas the king, kept [guarded, *ἐφρούρει*] the city
of the Damascenes with a garrison [*om.* with a garrison, desirous[16]] to apprehend me:
33 And through a window [a small opening, *διὰ θυρίδος*] in a basket was I let down by
[through, *διὰ*] the wall, and escaped his hands.

[1] Ver. 1.—The best attested reading is *τι ἀφροσύνης*. Several MSS. have *τι τῆς ἀφροσύνης* [and this was the reading which our A. V. adopted], to which some [Ital. Vulg., and Lat. Fathers] add *μου*. The var. *τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ* [which Stephens adopted from some less important MSS., and Chrys. Theodt.], and *ἀφροσύνην* are probably corrections with the view of restoring the regular construction.

[2] Ver. 1.—The Rec. *ἠνείχεσθε* is but feebly sustained [only a few cursives of no great authority, one MS. of Theophyl.]. The var. *ἀνεχέσθε* [which is a little better sustained, *i. e.*, by B. (Birch) K., a number of cursives, Theodt., and one MS. of Chrys.] originated in the same word near the close of the verse. [Cod. Sin. gives *ἀνασχέσθε* instead of *ἀνεχ.*, as a var. lect.].

[3] Ver. 3.—*Οὕτως* before *φθαρῇ* is probably not genuine; it is wanting in the best authorities. [B. D. (1st hand), F. G. Sin. Copt. Arm. and some Greek Fathers, Tisch. Bloomf. and Words. with the Rec. retain it, but Griesb. Lachm. Alf. Stanley and Moyer omit it].

[4] Ver. 3.—*καὶ τῆς ἁγνότητος* is a gloss which is to be accounted for by *ἁγνήν* in ver. 2; it was placed either before or after *τῆς ἁπλότ.* [It is inserted by B. F. G. Sin. (3d hand brackets it) and several versions. Alford suggests that it would naturally arise from its ending being so similar to that of *ἁπλότ.*, while Tisch. and Bloomf. reject it as a gloss to explain *ἁπλότ.* Epiphan, p. 275 adds: *καὶ ἁγνείας Χριστοῦ καὶ δικαιοσύνης*, which, perhaps, confirms the conjecture of a gloss].

[5] Ver. 4.—Lachm. has *ἀνέχεσθε*, but on inferior authority. It appears to be a correction [on account of the apparent necessity of the present tense in the apodosis to correspond with the pres. of the potasis; but comp. ver. 1. and Exeg. obss.].

[6] Ver. 5.—Lachm. has *δέ* instead of *γάρ*, but on the sole authority of a reading in B., which appears to have originated in an attempt to lighten the severity of the expression.

[7] Ver. 6.—Lachm. and Tisch. have *φανερωσαντες*; it probably originated in the attempt to explain *φανερωθέντες* by *φανερώσαντες ἑαυτούς*, which words some copies actually have, [and they were regarded as especially appropriate to *τὴν γνῶσιν*, of which, however, the reading involves a very harsh ellipse]. The var. *φανερωθείς*, found in some copies, is also in favor of the Receptus. [Lachmann's reading, however, is sustained by B. F. G. and the later Sin., though the 3d hand has *φανερωθέντες*. Alford thinks it much more likely that the harsh *φανερώσαντες* should have been changed into the easy *φανερωθέντες*, than that the contrary should have occurred, especially as the latter word could so naturally be suggested by chap. v. 11. It probably became *φαν. εαυτους* and then *φανερωθέντες*].

[8] Ver. 14.—Rec. has *θαυμαστόν*, but it has less authority than *θαῦμα*, and it is probably a gloss.

[9] Ver. 16.—Rec. has *μικρόν τι κἀγὼ*; but *κἀγὼ μικρόν τι* is much better sustained.

[10] Ver. 21.—Lachm. has *ἠσθενήκαμεν*, but it has the authority of only B. and 80. [also more recently of Sinait. and a Vat. MS. of a recent date].

[11] Ver. 23.—Lachm. has *ἐν φυλ. περ.* before *ἐν πληγ. ὑπερβ.* on the authority of B. D. (1st hand) E., the Vulg. Goth. and Ethiop. Versions, and many Latin Fathers. Sinait. has *ἐν πληγ. περισσοτέρως, ἐν φυλακαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως*; the 3d hand, however, agrees with the Receptus].

[12] Ver. 27.—Rec. has *ἐν* before *κόπῳ*, but in opposition to the [best authorities, and conformed apparently to the following.

[13] Ver. 28.—Rec. has ἐπισύστασις; Lachm. and Meyer, with some excellent authorities [with B. D. F. Sin., *et al.*, and 4 cursives], have ἐπίστασις. The former was probably derived from Acts xxiv. 12, [and yet the same variation of reading is found there. The two words are often used in the same sense, but ἐπισύστ. can be taken only in a hostile sense, which the connection certainly seems to require, [so Chrysost.: οἱ θόρυβοι, αἱ ταραχαί, αἱ πολιορκίαι τῶν δήμων καὶ τῶν πόλεων ἔφοδοι: the tumults, the disturbances, the assaults of mobs, the onsets of cities. So also the Greek expositors generally. This word, too, as Tisch. suggests, seems much less likely to have been changed for ἐπιστ. than the contrary].

[14] Ver. 23.—Instead of μοι some MSS. have μου (Rec.); but it was probably an emendation.

[15] Ver. 31.—The ἡμῶν after κυριου, and χριστοῦ after Ἰησοῦ are probably both additions to the original. [B. F. Sin. omit both; and others omit one of them].

[16] Ver. 32.—After πιάσαι με, some MSS. add θέλων. It is probably an exeget. addition [and yet Sin., *et al.*, and some Greek Fathers have it, while B. the Vulg. Syr. and Arm. versions, and a few of the Lat. writers omit it, and some MSS. and versions place it before πιάσ με].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1–4. Would that ye could bear a little folly from me. Nay, indeed, ye do bear with me; for I am jealous of you with a godly jealousy.—The Apostle now felt compelled, in order to recover the respect he had once enjoyed in Corinth, and to destroy those influences which were utterly inconsistent with it, to maintain that his position in the Church was not only equal but far superior to that of those who disparaged him. This commendation of himself, to which he stooped in condescension to them and as a matter of duty to himself and the cause of truth he ironically calls a "folly," because it seemed to give undue importance to that which was insignificant and connected only with outward appearances. He therefore entreats them to bear with him, although he might seem for a while to contradict the principle he had just laid down.—Ὄφελον 1 Cor. iv. 8. [The word is a shortened form of the Imperfect for ὤφελον (which some MSS. have instead), and in the later Greek it was used as an interjection like εἴθε, to express a wish. Its tense implies an incomplete action still in its course and not yet come to its perfection (Webster, p. 88, Winer, § 42, n. 2). It is connected with verbs in the Indicative here with the Imperfect]. Ἀνείχεσθε is the Hellenistic, and ἠνείχεσθε the classical form.—The imperfect (not equivalent to the pluperfect) is an ironical intimation of the boldness of the desire expressed, and implies that he could hardly expect its realization.—If we read (with de Wette, Fritzsche) τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ, μου would have to be governed by ἀνείχεσθε, a construction common in the New Testament, though unusual in the classic writers. Μικρόν has the sense of: a little, and the dative τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ signifies: in respect to foolishness. But according to the best supported reading μου is not dependent upon ἀνείχεσθε but upon μικρόν τι ἀφροσύνης, before which it is placed that it may become emphatic [*my* small degree of folly]. Such an emphasis makes the insertion of an "also" unnecessary. In μου μικρόν τι there is probably a slight reference to the *great* folly of those boastful opponents which they had already endured. [Ἄφρων is one who does not rightly use his powers. Hence Bengel says that it is a milder word than μωρία which implies a folly of a perverse or wicked kind. The fault of the ἄφρων (ἀφροσύνη) is imprudence or rashness (Mark vii. 22)].—The doubt which after all is apparent in ἀνείχεσθε (that ye could or would bear) supplies an occasion for the expression of confidence when he adds, "but indeed ye do bear with me." The object of ἀλλὰ is to correct the impression, which the wish he had just expressed might have produced, as if there were any doubt on the point: I need have no such desire, for you are already doing this very thing. Καί has an intensive force: even, in fact. Ἀνέχεσθε is not in the Imperative [but in the Indicative: but you are in fact bearing, *etc.*,] for as a request it would be feeble, and as a command unsuitable to the spirit of the context.—In ver. 2 a reason is given for the expectation he had just expressed in ver. 1. They had good reasons for the ἀνέχεσθε, inasmuch as the folly alluded to, had its origin not in a regard for his own interest or in pride, but in a Divine zeal for their welfare and for Christ's honor. (Bengel: [*amantes videntur amentes*, lovers usually seem out of their wits]; comp. chap. v. 13). The word ζηλοῦν refers here to the jealousy of love, the object of which is in the accusative (γυναῖκα, Numb. v. 14: Eccles. ix. 1). He was jealous of the Church in behalf of Christ (to whom he, as the one who had made the match, had espoused it), lest it should prove unfaithful, and be drawn off by seducing teachers from the simple dependence on Christ which his gospel had awakened in their hearts. He calls this feeling a zeal of God (θεοῦ ζήλῳ), which signifies here, not as in Rom. x. 2, a zeal in behalf of God (gen. obj.), for the feeling was properly in behalf of Christ; not merely one which came from or was produced by God; and still less qualitatively, a very great or holy zeal; but such a zeal as God has (gen. subj.). This zeal was felt by God, inasmuch as He was exceedingly desirous that the bride, whom He had provided for the Son, who acts in His name, should remain constant in her attachment; and it was of course felt also by those ministers through whose instrumentality this Divine work had been accomplished. With respect to this zeal of God (among men, jealousy) as the Husband of His people, comp. Isa. liv. 5; lxii. 5; Jer. iii. 1, *etc.*; Ezek. xvi. 8, *etc.*; xxiii. 1, *etc.*; Hos. ii. 19.—The reason for his use of this expression he now proceeds to give when he adds (ver. 2)—**For I have espoused you to one Husband, that I might present you as a chaste virgin to Christ.**—The word ἁρμόζειν when applied to the conjugal relation signifies, to betroth, to marry. —The middle voice in other places signifies, to betroth one's self; but among the more recent writers it has the same meaning as the active, and especially denotes the act of him who was instrumental in forming the engagement and who among the Jews always continued the medium of intercourse between the contracting parties. Comp. John iii. 29 [and "Chrysostom's epithet on the Apostle: νυμφαγωγὸς τῆς οἰκουμένης (Stanley)], (not the guardian who had the charge of the education of the maiden, as if ἁρμόζειν were equivalent to *præparare, ornare;* nor the father who made the contract for her);—The words *to one husband*, are emphatic, in contrast with their dependence upon their party leaders. The design which the espousal was intended to accomplish was *to present to Christ a chaste virgin*,

He here gives the name of the one husband. The idea of virginal purity is especially prominent in the epithet *chaste*, on which the emphasis must be placed. The presentation refers to the period of the second advent (parousia), when the union of the Church with Christ will be completely realized (the marriage Supper of the Lamb). It is one part of this exclusive devotion of the Bride to her Lord, that she should remain chaste (ἁγνότης). [The ancient Fathers had much to say of the virgin purity of the Church, and of the duty of each Christian as a part of Christ's betrothed Church to maintain "*virginitas mentis*," which Augustine defines to be "*integra fides, solida spes, sincera charitas.*" Such views were striking in distinction from the spiritual polygamy and pollutions of heathenism and ancient heresy. Comp. Wordsworth]. In contrast with this endeavor on the part of the Apostle, he now mentions the danger which had awakened his fears:—**but I fear lest, peradventure, as the serpent completely beguiled Eve by his many arts, so your minds might be led away from the simplicity which is in Christ** (ver. 3). Νοήματα occurred also in chap. iii. 14; x. 5, and here signifies the mind itself, especially those faculties by which we think and will; for in the present case the reference is evidently to an impurity both in the intellect and in the will—a departure from the pure Gospel and a disturbance of their entire surrender of themselves to Christ. Beck (*Seelenl.* 52 f.) makes it the corruption of all the spiritual powers of the soul, inasmuch as the thoughts and purposes are drawn away from the simplicity of truth by deluding the understanding with sophistries and the heart with vain hopes. The words φθαρῇ ἀπό are a *constructio prægnans*, and signify, to be led astray, *i. e.*, to be brought off from any thing. The verb φθείρεσθαι is significant, for it was not unfrequently appropriated to the destruction of virginal chastity (*vitiare*). In the present instance this spiritual chastity is called a simplicity in respect to Christ (εἰς χριστόν) because it implied a simple dependence upon Christ. He illustrates this by a comparison with the temptation of Eve by the Serpent; in which the points of comparison are: 1, the feminine character of the Church (παρθένος), and 2, the influence of Satan in both instances. He presumes that his readers were well acquainted with, and believed in, the seductive influence of Satan through the Serpent upon the woman, Gen. iii.; comp. John viii. 44; Rev. xii. 9, 14–17; xx. 2; 1 John iii. 8. [Wordsworth finds in ver. 3 "a clear assertion of the reality of the appearance of Satan in the form of a Serpent to Eve in Paradise," and we may add that we have the Apostle's sanction to the historical nature and accuracy of the history in Gen. iii. 1ff. In ἐξαπατάω, which the Apostle uses both here and in 1 Tim. ii. 14, the ἐκ strengthens the idea of the deception. He thus expresses the *thorough* deception which passed upon the woman, and which he feared might take place among the Corinthians. Comp. Ellicott on 1 Tim. ii. 14]. But those who had seduced the Corinthian Church are expressly called the ministers of Satan in ver. 15. Πανουργία suggests the various arts of deception and the false shows made use of by the Judaistic teachers, when they substituted their doctrine of the law for the pure Gospel Paul had preached. (Whether a Gnostic element was mingled with their instructions, and whether rhetorical and dialectic arts were employed in enforcing them, may be left undecided.—**For if indeed he who is coming were preaching another Jesus whom we preached not, or ye were receiving another Spirit which ye accepted not, ye might well bear with him** (ver. 4). This verse presents more than common difficulties, especially with reference to its connection with what precedes and what follows it. Some contend that the Apostle is here ironically giving the reasons for the solicitude he had expressed in ver. 3. "For if my opponents teach and work among you things which are entirely new, you might well be pleased with them." The idea expressed in plain terms would then be: "ye would, in fact, have reason to be much displeased with such novelties." By his ironical reproach he would thus show what reason he had for anxiety on acount of their complaisance toward those false Apostles. His reason for reproving them for such a complaisance he presents in ver. 5. Thus Meyer. In like manner, Osiander, though he explains καλῶς to mean: "you endure them finely; you find much delight in them, imagining perhaps that you will acquire some honor from them;" and he makes the Apostle give in ver. 5 the reason for the ironical reproach in ver. 4, by directly denying there the hypothesis on which they had claimed superiority over him, *viz.*, because they had first preached the true Jesus and brought among the Corinthians the true Spirit and the true Gospel: "If, therefore, my opponents could claim superiority over me on this account, you might well be pleased with them. But such a claim is an empty assumption; for," *etc.* On this interpretation, καλῶς has a more appropriate meaning, and the connection with the preceding context is more obvious, but the idea of denying what had been supposed in ver. 4, has something artificial in it. If no such irony is allowed in ver. 4, its connection with ver. 5, is still more difficult: "if he who presents himself preaches another, *i. e.*, a better Jesus, *etc.*, you may very properly be pleased with him; but this is not so." In this case the connection with ver. 3 is not plain, unless we add yet further: "such an endurance is not well and I have good reason for my solicitude." The reason for his implied assertion that this was not so, would then be given more fully in ver. 5.—In καλῶς ἀνείχεσθε we have an apparent reference to the ἀνέχεσθε of ver. 1. In the first place he tells them what reason they had for bearing with him: (ver. 2, ζηλῶ γὰρ—his reason for this he then gives further: ἡρμοσάμην—φοβοῦμαι δὲ.)—Now he says that after seeing how they had acted toward others, he surely had reason to expect such a forbearance from them. If the man who had come to them (among them) was preaching another Jesus, altogether different from the one he had preached, *etc.*, they might well find the greatest delight in him, *i. e.*, they might find the utmost conceivable pleasure in his adversaries. But if this were so, he surely had reason to expect that they would tolerate him and a little folly on his part; since he was

in no respect inferior to these super-eminent Apostles (ver. 5). In this case we only need to retain a constant recollection of what had been said in the leading sentence (ver. 1), to gain a consistent connection for the whole passage. No actual occurrence would be introduced by *εἰ*, but only a supposable though extreme case: an alteration of the fundamental principles of Christianity. In the apodosis or conclusion, he introduces a sentence of a different construction (*ἀνείχεσθε*), but one which not unfrequently is found in classic writers. In such an apodosis the *ἄν* falls away, if the object is to imply that there was something surer and necessary, unless some circumstances to prevent it should take place, or if nothing is spoken of except what must have taken place according to the supposition (Passow, *ἄν*, D. 1.). [Winer, § 43. 2.] Had he said in the protasis: *ἐκήρυσσεν, etc.*, he would have implied that the whole supposition was an impossibility, and this is an assertion which he does not wish to make. The idea is: in the case supposed, you would indeed have been well pleased. He thus intimates that such a case was not an actual reality.—The present tense in the protasis does not compel us to take *ἀνείχεσθε* as a simple præterite: "you made yourselves well pleased," thus expressing a real displeasure or only a compulsory satisfaction; nor as a question ("have you reason to be pleased with him?") [The leading verbs in the conditional clauses (*κηρύσσει, λαμβάνετε*) were each in the present, and we should naturally have expected that in the conclusion (apodosis) the verb would have been in the present also: (*ἀνέχεσθε*, ye bear with him). But instead of this the Apostle designedly softens the expression by saying (*ἀνείχεσθε*): "ye *might* well bear with him." In this way he avoids saying directly that they had *actually* borne with the assumptions of their false teachers.] Ὁ *ἐρχόμενος* in this connection does not signify that he who comes first must of course be the best, but simply that he who comes makes his appearance; the presence of his opponents is conceived of as the coming forward of a single person (Meyer). [Wordsworth: "ὁ ἐρχ. is, he who *cometh, i. e.*, he who is not sent with a regular ordination and *mission*. This is the true character of an unauthorized teacher. This one *sends himself*, in contrast with the *Apostle* who is *sent* by another, *viz.* by Christ."] Ἄλλον as applied to Jesus, is a mere denial of identity and the meaning therefore is: if he so preaches that the Jesus preached does not seem the same as the one before preached. (Not: *χριστόν*, for then he would imply that some other one than Jesus was the true Messiah.)—Ἕτερον on the other hand, as applied to the gospel, signifies something different in nature or kind, comp. Acts iv. 12, Gal. i. 6, 7.—Ἐδέξασθε has not the same meaning with *ἐλάβετε* (to receive), but it signifies to accept, and refers to the time when they were converted. [Bengel says that this change of verbs was because "man is passive in receiving the Spirit but active in accepting the gospel."]—As in the relative sentence the emphasis lies upon the negation, there is no *ἡμεῖς* or *ὑμεῖς*.—In the words *ἄλλον*, and *ἕτερον* it is implied that the subjects compared are entirely different from one another, and not that the thing spoken of was more excellent in the estimation of the Apostle's opponents. By *ἕτερον πνεῦμα* we are also not to understand the spirit produced in the heart by the preaching of the law, *viz.*, the spirit of fear (Rom. viii. 15), or the spirit of the world (1 Cor. ii 12), or more definitely, the earthly spirit of a party; and by *ἕτερον εὐαγγ.* (scil. *λαμβάνετε*), those institutions or instructions which came wholly from men, *etc.*—[He had given two reasons for bearing with him, *viz.*, the jealousy which he, as the friend of Christ (the paranymph) might reasonably be expected to feel for them, and their easy toleration of those who were preaching something like another gospel; and] he now proceeds in ver. 5 to show that if they could take such extreme pleasure in his opponents, they had some good reason for enduring him (comp. above), since he was in no respect inferior to them. He now specifies some particulars.

Vers. 5, 6. **For I think that in no respect have I been behind these very superior apostles** —The word *λογίζομαι* denotes the result of careful reflection and probably has in this place still a delicate ironical tinge (Osiander).—In the negative *μηδὲν ὑστερηκέναι* (the perfect reaching forward into the present) there is a modest reserve, inasmuch as he really had reason to boast of a positive superiority. But the *μηδὲν* forbids a limitation of the expression to anything of a partial nature. The words *ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι*, however, both in this place and in chap. xii. 11, must apply to his opponents, previously designated by *ἐρχόμενος* and afterwards more particularly characterized in vers. 13–15. According to Neander the Apostle intended by this compound word (*ὑπερλίαν*) to designate the extravagant importance which was attributed to or assumed by these false teachers, comp. ver. 13. The whole connection is inconsistent with the interpretation prevalent in the ancient church, which applied the phrase to the principal Apostles, Peter, James and John (Gal. ii. 9), and which the Protestants very generally accepted in their controversy with the Romanists on the subject of Peter's primacy. Even if the expression contained nothing but praise rather than a bitter reproach, it would be entirely out of place in the argument.—**But though I be perhaps rude in speech, I am not so in knowledge; but in every respect in regard to you we have been thoroughly made manifest among all men** (ver. 6).—The Apostle here introduces a detailed explanation of what he had said in ver. 5, with a concession that in one respect there might be an exception to what he had just said, inasmuch as his opponents might pride themselves on a kind of eloquence gained in the schools. This concession, however, he would not extend beyond the manner of discourse subordinate to that which ought to be the main point with an Apostle, *viz.*, the *γνῶσις*, the knowledge or perception of Divine truth (chap. x. 5; ii. 14). The word *ἰδιώτης*, 1 Cor. xiv. 16, signifies a beginner, a bungler, an uneducated one who has no skill for the work in hand. [It does not deny any amount of education or skill on other or general matters. It signifies rather a man not professionally acquainted with that which he undertakes (Alford). Such a one might possibly perform the part as-

signed him even better than those who were trained to it, but he would do it in ways not taught in the regular schools. Paul was in reality a powerful speaker (Acts xix. 12; xxii. 1; xxiv. 10; xxvi. 2; xvii. 22), but he did not speak in the methods usually practised by professional orators. WEBSTER'S *Synn.* p. 215, and TRENCH, *Synn.* 2d Part, p. 152]. The occasion for such a reproach may be seen (comp. chap. x. 10) in 1 Cor. i. 17; ii. 1, 4. The Apostle was an impressive but not an artificial orator. When he says, *we have been thoroughly made manifest, etc.*, he passes as he often does in this epistle and in his other writings (*e. g.* chap, v. 11; x. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 4, 5) from the use of the singular to that of the plural (*φανερωθέντες*); from the individual to the collective or collegial form of expression. If *φανερώσαντες* be adopted as the true reading *αὐτήν* (*γνῶσιν*) must be understood. [The recent addition of the authority of the Sinaiticus to that which before was so strong in favor of this reading almost compels us to adopt it. Alford accepts of it and renders the clause thus: *But in every matter we made things manifest, i. e.*, he made *the things* of the Gospel (not as our author suggests, his knowledge itself) known among all men].—The connection with ver. 7 will not permit us to refer *φανερωθέντες* to *γνῶσιν* for what is there presupposed as well as what is implied in *ἐν παντί* (in the sense of: in every respect, not: at all times) requires a more general assertion. We see no need of supplying: "as an Apostle and an upright man," or anything of a similar kind to define more particularly what he meant by *φανερωθέντες*; for the specification of what he intended was very obvious. In every respect, so far as you are concerned, we have been quite manifest among (with) all men; *i. e.* what we are to you, and what advantage you have derived from us is well known to every one (Meyer). [The phrase *εἰς ὑμῖν* cannot mean *among you*, as in the A. V., for that would have required *ἐν ὑμῖν* (Hodge)].—The second *ἀλλ'* introduces not a second conclusion or apodosis, but something contrasted with *οὐ τῇ γνώσει*, and it is called for by the transition to a more general assertion which includes the possession of the *γνῶσις*.—Mistaking this, some have connected it with ver. 5, in such a way as to include *εἰ—γνώσει* in a parenthesis. This is not only unnecessary, but it deprives what is asserted in the parenthesis of all appropriate signification. After *φανερωθέντες*, we may supply *ἐσμέν* from the context, so that the general meaning will be: "not however with respect to knowledge, for in every respect are we manifest; or, we are plainly known," *etc.*—*Ἐν πᾶσιν* after *ἐν παντί* is in the masculine and not in the neuter: [*i. e.* in all *things* among all *men*].—From the *ἐν παντί* he now proceeds to select and give special prominence and vividness to one point, *viz.*, the unselfishness of his whole life while he was at Corinth, ver. 7ff. [It would have been natural for him now to have gone on to speak of his knowledge, by means of Divine revelations, *etc.*, but the use of *φανερωθέντες* had suggested to him one of the charges made against him at Corinth, and he now proceeds immediately to answer this, leaving his "boast" of knowledge in spiritual things to be pursued afterwards (chap. xii.). This charge was that he had taken no money from the Corinthians but had supported himself by his own labors; and from this his enemies had insinuated: 1, that if he had been a real Apostle he would have claimed a support as his right; 2, that it indicated a want of confidence in his brethren there; and 3, that he was now making his former disinterestedness a cover for large collections under Titus, ostensibly for the poor, but really for himself. The first two of these objections, as they bore on his affection and open dealing with the Corinthians, he answers immediately, but the third he does not notice till further on, chap. xii. 16–18. See Stanley].

VERS. 7–12. **Or have I committed an offence in abasing myself that ye might be exalted, because I preached unto you the gospel of God without charge?**—[The particle *ἤ* is not rendered in our Eng. versions, and yet it is expressive as marking a transition to a new objection by his opponents (Hodge)]. The Corinthians would necessarily understand the Apostle, when he asserted that he had been made manifest among them, as in every respect maintaining that he had behaved himself honorably among them. This induces him to raise the question given in ver. 7. As the object of this question is to ward off from himself a very foul reproach, it implies a very painful and bitter reproof. His opponents probably represented his gratuitous labors and his earning of his own support by his daily toil, as a letting down of his apostolic dignity, not merely a defect and a violation of decency, but as an *ἁμαρτία* [a transgression of established law], as a refusal of the dignity and position which God had assigned him, and perhaps also as a contempt for the Corinthians themselves by scorning to receive any thing from them. The relation of the following sentences to the principal proposition and to one another has been variously explained. The two sentences, *ταπεινῶν ἐμαυτόν, etc.*, and *ὅτι—ὑμῖν*, may be coördinated [so as to be two forms of expressing the same thought] and may be thus regarded as a misrepresentation: 1, of the Apostle's humility; and 2, of his disinterestedness. On the other hand, the first sentence may be taken as the essential part of his offence, and the second as an epexegesis of the first. Or, finally, *ὅτι—ὑμῖν* may be regarded as the proper substance of the objection, and *ταπεινῶν, etc.*, as describing, in a parenthesis, or in a transposed or hyperbatic sentence, the character of the act of preaching the Gospel without support (as if he had said: because humbling myself, I preached the Gospel without charge). The correct way undoubtedly is to make the one sentence subordinate to and not coördinate with the other; and then the best, and probably the easiest, way is to take the participial sentence as a parenthesis [: Have I committed an offence in abasing myself, because I preached, *etc.*]. It is, however, not to be resolved into: while I was abasing myself (Meyer). By the words *abasing myself that ye might be exalted*, which he brings forward to the earlier part of the sentence, he shows how he thought his gratuitous preaching might be and ought to be regarded. His opponents looked upon it as an act of self-degradation, whereas it deserved to be esteemed an act of affectionate self-renunciation, an abstaining from the asser-

tion of an acknowledged right (1 Cor. ix. 4), and a supporting himself by the work of his own hands (Acts xviii. 3), to which he submitted for their good (*ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψωθῆτε*). The exaltation at which he aimed was not merely that of general prosperity, but a spiritual elevation from the depths of a sinful corruption to the heights of a Christian salvation. In the words, preaching the Gospel without charge, we have a refined contrast between what is gratuitous and what is of the utmost possible cost and value (*τοῦ θεοῦ* is here the *gen. auctoris*). [MEYER: "observe the collocation of the words *δωρ. τ. τ. θεοῦ εὐαγγ.*: the Divine or most precious Gospel for nothing."]—**I spoiled other churches, receiving wages from them, that I might minister to you** (ver. 8). The idea contained in *δωρεὰν* he here more fully carries out; and he places in contrast with the Corinthian Church some churches (the Macedonian, comp. ver. 9), on whom he had made demands, in order that he might serve them (officially, *εὐαγγελιζόμενος*). *Ἐσύλησα* is a strong expression and calculated to awaken shame in the hearts of those to whom he wrote, inasmuch as it implies that others in straitened circumstances had been reduced to want in order to do them a favor (comp. viii. 2). The word is more particularly explained when he comes to say *ὀψώνιον λαβών* (1 Cor. ix. 7), which signifies wages for service performed for a livelihood. This he received while he was doing service for the Corinthians; it was contributed, not for the poor, like that mentioned in chap. viii. 4; ix. 1, but for the promotion of their spiritual welfare. [CHRYSOSTOM: "he did not say *took*, but *robbed*, *i. e.*, I stripped them bare and made them poor. And, what is surely greater, it was not for superfluities, but for the supply of his necessities; for when he says wages he means necessary subsistence. And, what is more grievous yet, to do you service"]. He first speaks of what was needful during his journey to Corinth, and while establishing himself there. Immediately afterwards he speaks of his condition while residing there.—**And when I was present with you and was in want, I was chargeable to no man** (ver. 9 *a*). When I also suffered want (*καὶ ὑστερηθείς*), when I became destitute (*ὑστερεῖσθαι* in Luke xv. 14, *καὶ* concessive), when, particularly, what I had brought with me was exhausted, and what I could earn was not sufficient. *Καταναρκῶν τινος* (*I was chargeable to no one*) occurs also in chap. xii. 13, 14). [WORDSWORTH: "The metaphor is from the fish, *νάρκη*, or *torpedo*, which attaches itself to other creatures and produces torpor in that to which it attaches itself, and then endeavors to derive nourishment from it. 'I was not,' says Paul, 'like a torpedo to any among you'"]. According to Hesychius, the word has the sense of *βαρύνειν*, properly to grow torpid, and so to press down upon any one. Jerome speaks of it as a Cilician expression, meaning *gravare*; in this place to be a burden to any one by relying upon him for support. Others regard it as meaning here: to be inactive in my duties. *Οὐδενός* in the sense of: to no one's disadvantage [*i. e.*, not enough to injure any one], would not be appropriate in this passage (comp. ver. 9), nor in chap. xii. 13, 14.—**For that which was lacking to me the brethren which came from Macedonia supplied.** (ver. 9 *b*.)—This was the way in which he avoided being burdensome. The words need not be regarded as a parenthesis [as in Alford and Stanley]. *Προσαναπληροῦν ὑστέρημά* occurs also in chap. ix. 12. As in all this connection no allusion is made to the Apostle's supporting himself by his own earnings, we may reasonably doubt whether the *πρὸς* in this compound verb contains any hint of the kind, as if it implied an addition to what he earned. We rather understand by it an addition to the small amount which he perhaps yet possessed, or that which was necessary to complete what he lacked. The brethren here mentioned were possibly Silas and Timotheus, who we know actually came to him from Macedonia (Acts xviii. 5), and may have brought with them additional means for his support. The Corinthians knew very well whom he meant. Phil. iv. 15 has no reference to this transaction. It is very likely that he had some reference to such means of support when he goes on—**in every thing I have kept myself from being burdensome to you, and so will I keep myself.** (ver. 9 *c*.)—That is, he had always kept from being burdensome to them in any way, and he now announces that this would be his principle of action for the future (*καὶ τερήσω*). This was said that they might not think he was reminding them of these things in order to induce them afterwards to contribute to his support, or to establish some claim upon them for another time. This assurance he further confirms by a solemn affirmation—**As the truth of Christ is in me, this boasting shall not be closed against me in the regions of Achaia** (ver. 10). A similar expression is found in chapter i. 18 and Rom. ix. 1. He pledges the truth of Christ which dwelt within him and which was pure truthfulness, in opposition to all hypocrisy or falsehood, as the security or warrant for what he was asserting, *viz.* that this boast (about keeping himself free in future, *καὶ τηρήσω*, should never be suppressed; *i. e.*, that he would always so conduct himself that no one would be able to contradict him when he confidently maintained that his life had been and should be unselfish. [Alford (with whom Dr. Hodge agrees) maintains that there is no oath or even solemn affirmation here, but that the expression is exactly analogous to that in Rom. ix. 1, and signifies: "the truth of Christ is in me, that, *etc.*; *i. e.*, I speak according to that truth of which Christ Himself was our example, when I say that," *etc.*]. The metaphor in *φραγήσεται* is essentially neither that of a road hedged in, nor of a stream dammed up, but a *φράσσειν στόμα*, *i. e.*, a stopping of the mouth, inasmuch as *καύχησις* is talking in a loud tone (comp. Rom. iii. 19; Heb. xi. 33; Ps. cvii. 42; Job. v. 16; 2 Macc. xiv. 36). The *καύχησις* is personified. Its mouth shall not be stopped, it shall never be put to silence. *Εἰς ἐμέ* is here simply, in respect to me, not adversatively, as if he had meant, for my injury or in spite of me. In *ἐμέ* also may be perceived a silent contrast to those with whom it would be very different. "*The truth of Christ is in me*," contains nearly the same idea with that which asserted that the life of Christ was in him, and other expressions of a like nature Gal. ii. 20; 1

Cor. ii. 16; Rom. viii. 9–12) Olshausen's interpretation: "as truly as I am a Christian," is not in accordance with the spirit of the words. Rückert's explanation, on the other hand: "This assertion, that my boasting shall never be taken from me, is the truth of Christ in me, *i. e.*, is as surely true as if Christ Himself asserted it," is rather forced. Instead of saying *ἐν ὑμῖν*, he more solemnly and beautifully says, in the regions of Achaia (*ἐν τοῖς κλίμασιν τῆς Ἀχαΐας*. MEYER). Κλίματα means a district or a region of country, and it occurs also in Rom. xv. 23; Gal. i. 21. It was very possible for Paul's readers to explain this assertion so as to make it an indication of his aversion to them and estrangement from them, inasmuch as love usually receives with readiness what is offered by a beloved one, and even what is done from a different motive. He guards against such a construction when he subjoins—**Wherefore? Because I love you not? God knoweth** (ver. 11).—He calls God to witness that his resolution to receive nothing from them, sprung not from any defect of love toward them. He then proceeds (in ver. 12*a*). to explain positively the object he had in view, and the reasons which moved him in this whole affair.—**But what I thus am doing, I will also continue to do, that I may cut off the occasion from those who desire an occasion.**—He refers once more to this matter in *ὃ δὲ ποιῶ, καὶ ποιήσω*, which is not a single proposition, corresponding to *ἐτήρησα* and *τηρήσω* in ver. 9, for in that case *διὰ τοῦτο ποιῶ* or *ποιῶ καὶ ποιήσω* would have to be understood. The assurance refers to his future course, and this makes it necessary that *καὶ ποιήσω* should be the concluding proposition of the sentence (MEYER). A *τοῦτο* before it can very well be dispensed with. He thus testifies that he had had his eye upon his opponents in this affair, and that his object had been that no one should be able to allege that he thus showed that he had no affection for the Church. This he expresses in a final sentence: *that I may cut off the occasion, etc.* By *ἀφορμήν* he designates the particular matter with respect to which his adversaries wished to assail him; the occasion for making an attack upon him. According to the context this must refer to his disinterestedness. When he took nothing from the Corinthian Church, his object had been to deprive his opponents of all power to disparage him for his want of this disinterestedness. In *τὴν ἀφορμήν* the article implies, this precise occasion. The last *ἀφορμήν*, without the article, signifies, any occasion in general.—**that wherein they glory, they may be found even as we** (ver. 12 *b*).—Some connect this second final sentence with the first, and regard *ἐν ᾧ καυχῶνται* as a parenthesis, referring to *εὑρεθῶσι καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς*. [This goes on the supposition that they themselves took money of the Corinthians, and desired that the Apostles should do so "in order that (in this matter on which they boasted) we might be found even as they"]. In opposition to this it must be recollected, that they pretended to be superior to Paul. It may, however, be said that his opponents regarded the reception of money as an apostolic prerogative, and hence that this was the object of their *καυχᾶσθαι* (1 Cor. ix. 7 ff.) [:"from those who desire occasion that in this apostolic right of which they boast, they might be found even as we," *i. e.*, they desired that we should receive money as an apostolic right, that thus they and we might stand before the people on the same level of apostolical authority in the matter of receiving a maintenance (STANLEY). But in whatever way this second final clause is made dependent upon the first, and thus expressive of the desires of Paul's antagonists], the whole passage assumes an ironical tinge, and implies that, although they would willingly allow him to participate in their boast, it was only that they might thus conceal their own shame, and deprive him of his just fame (OLSHAUSEN). But such a view of the passage is justified neither by what is said in 1 Cor. ix. 7ff. (where no allusion is made to any such assertions of his opponents), nor by our context. In such a case also the words ought to have been *εὑρεθῶμεν—αὐτοί*. The correct construction would seem to be to coördinate the second final sentence with the first [*i. e.*, regard both as expressive of the Apostle's design in keeping himself as he was], and yet this seems to imply that these opponents actually received nothing from the people, and prided themselves upon that fact, and endeavored to make it a ground for triumphing over the Apostle. Paul, in this case, says that he had given such a direction to his conduct that in this respect they should be found like himself, *i. e.*, that they should have no reason for preference to himself. Such an explanation, however, is opposed to what is contained in ver. 20, 1 Cor. ix. 12, and to our context (ver. 13), even if we pass over the necessity of giving to *καθὼς* the strange meaning of, no better than. Besides, how could he urge upon their consideration his own gratuitous services among them, if his opponents were in the same position. [Alford proposes another interpretation. He finds the clue to it in ver. 18ff., where he thinks this *καυχῶνται* is again taken up and described as being *κατὰ σάρκα*, and the *καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς* is taken up by *Ἑβραῖοί εἰσιν; κἀγώ, etc.* From this he thinks it manifest that the meaning of the present clause is: that in the matters of which they boast they may be found even as we, *i. e.*, that we may be on a fair and equal footing. This, he thinks, affords a natural connection with the next verse, since the Apostle implies by the *γαρ* there that this would end in their discomfiture; *for* realities they had none, no weapons but misrepresentation, they being false apostles, *etc.* The objection to this is, that before and after this verse the Apostle is not speaking of general apostolic claims, but only of the specific point —that he had received no support from the Corinthians, and that he had declined to receive it that he might cut off occasion, *etc.*]. The correct presumption is, that they boasted of their own disinterestedness without reason, and that Paul was determined by a course of actual disinterestedness, not only to cut off all occasion for imputing to him mercenary motives, but to compel them to assume a position in actual practice like his own (MEYER). The sordid spirit which is ascribed to them in ver. 13 shows that they had no good ground for boasting of their disinterestedness, and we need not, therefore, with de Wette, assume that the point on which they

made their boast was their performances as apostles, for such a claim would have been too vague (comp. Meyer). He now shows (in vv. 13-15) by his representation of their true character, that he had had good reasons for such precautions with respect to them.

Vers. 13–15. **For such persons are false apostles, deceitful workers transforming themselves into Apostles of Christ.**—In a very arbitrary manner some who interpret *ἵνα—καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς* in ver. 12 to mean "no better than we," interpolate in this place the thought: "but rather worse, for" *etc.* (Rückert.). The same must be said of the interpolation of the sentence: I doubt not that they employ such artifices (as pretending that they receive no remuneration), for" *etc.* (Billroth). Probably also the connection with *ἵνα εὑρεθῶσι* which Meyer proposes: "not without reason do I make it my object that they may be found even as we in those things on which they make their boast: for the part these persons are acting is that of falsehood and deceit," is rather too intimate.—The words *οἱ τοιοῦτοι* (such persons) form the subject, and *ψευδαπόστολοι* (false apostles) the predicate of the sentence. It is only in this way that they receive their proper force as a discovery of the true character of these teachers, and they thus form a harmonious whole with the remaining predicates. If *ψευδαπ.* be taken as the subject of the sentence, the object of *οἱ τοιοῦτοι* would be, what the course of the argument does not call for, to distinguish them from other false apostles, and the subject would be brought into too close contact with the predicates (Osiander). By *such persons* the Apostle intended the same as those who in ver. 12, are said to desire occasion and to boast. The false apostles were such as wished to be regarded as apostles, as men who had been commissioned perhaps as Paul was, by Christ Himself, and who therefore assumed the name and claimed to be called apostles. Whether they claimed to have seen Christ, or only to have been the true founders of the church at Corinth, is uncertain. In either case their claim was without foundation and contrary to actual facts, since they were obviously contending for their own interests and not for Christ's cause (comp. Osiander).—The second designation, *deceitful workers*, (not *workers of deceit*, or such as busied themselves with deceit), has reference to their influence upon the people, leading them astray by deceptive arts, having no care for the *welfare* of their hearers but pursuing their own selfish ends, and organizing parties in opposition to the Apostle, and to the true interests of the congregation (perhaps also corrupting the doctrines of the gospel, comp. chap. ii. 17, iv. 2). *Ἐργάται κακοί* occurs in Phil. iii. 2, and the opposite *ἐργάτην ἀνεπαίσχυντον* in 2 Tim. ii. 15.—[The middle part. *μετασχηματιζόμενοι*, signifies, changing for themselves their form into (as far as to) Apostles of Christ. Rev. ii. 2.] In saying that these pretended apostles did this, he intimates that their proper form was a very different one, and rather that of messengers of Satan, comp. vers. 14–15, (Osiander says: emissaries of men and of human factions—in opposition to the context), and of course that their representation of themselves as the messengers of Christ was a mere pretence assumed for the occasion.—W. F. Besser says: They disguised themselves *a.* in respect to doctrine, inasmuch as they retained many words and names which belonged to Christianity, but which were only like empty husks wrapped around some seeds which belonged not there; *b.* in respect to conduct, inasmuch as they outwardly imitated the works which Christ's Apostles wrought, but they were destitute of that benevolence which constituted the perfection of a Christian's doings (chap. v. 12).—**And no marvel; for Satan himself transforms himself into an angel of light.** (ver. 14*a*).—The Apostle finds it altogether natural (*οὐ θαῦμα*) that they should thus disguise themselves, inasmuch as it was a matter of notoriety that their Master was wont to assume a garb altogether opposed to his proper character. [Milton has made use of the hint here given in *Par. Lost.* B. III. vv. 634–44.] The relative *αὐτος* is in contrast with *οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ* of ver. 15.—Good angels are called angels of light, because their purity is a participation in God's light (1 John i. 5). This light has sometimes become perceptible to men, when such angels have made their appearance on earth (Matt. xxviii. 3, Acts xii. 7, *et. al.*). Satan, on the other hand is a dark power (comp. Eph. vi. 12, Acts xxvi. 18). We have no reason to maintain that the Apostle had his eye at this time upon any particular event like the temptation of the first man or of Christ; much less that he was thinking (like the later Rabbins and others) of magical appearances of angels in radiant forms. The only explanation which is probable is that which refers it to certain moral and spiritual influences of a seductive character, under some splendid semblance of truth and goodness.—**It is no great thing therefore if his ministers also should transform themselves, so as to seem to be ministers of righteousness** (ver. 15).—In this way, he draws a conclusion from the greater to the less: if such is the conduct of the prince of darkness, it is no great matter (*μέγα* 1 Cor. ix. 11), and therefore, nothing remarkable or extraordinary (therefore *οὐ θαῦμα* ver. 14), if his ministers undertake to do a similar thing. *His ministers* are those who prove to be his agents by their efforts to corrupt the work of God, and to disturb the churches.—*Μετασχηματίζονται ὡς* is equivalent to: *εἰς τὸ εἶναι ὡς*. Righteousness represents in this passage a power in opposition to Satan, and his dark and unholy influence (comp. chap. vi. 7, 14).—**Whose end shall be according to their works** (ver. 15 *b*).—He thus finally, refers solemnly to the doom which such sinners must ultimately meet, inasmuch as the end of such servants of Satan must be according to their works, comp. Phil. iii. 19, Rom. vi. 21, 1 Pet. iv. 17. The saintly form they have here assumed will hereafter be removed and they will suffer the doom of those hypocrites who, under a fair exterior, are opposed to every good cause and are in harmony only with Satan's designs.

Vers. 16–20. **I say again let no man think me foolish, but if it cannot be so, yet as a foolish man receive me that I may boast myself a little** (ver 16).—The Apostle here commences a more extended comparison with his opponents. In the first

place he demands that they would not regard what he was saying upon this subject as foolish (*ἄφρονα*); but in case they could not grant this request he entreats them to extend to his foolish boasting that indulgence which they had learned so willingly to yield to the more extravagant demands his opponents had made upon it. The *πάλιν* (again) in connection with what immediately follows, awakens some surprise, and hence some have been disposed to refer it entirely to his request to be received as a fool (*ὡς ἄφρονα ὀέξασθέ*), comp. ver. 1. But there is no necessity for passing over such an interval, inasmuch as the word has reference to both these expressions. It must have been evident from the whole tenor of his discourse that he had spoken in ver. 1 quite ironically of his *ἀφροσύνη*, and of course that he really did not regard his boasting as a folly.—[Εἰ *μη* signifies by an ellipse of *εστι*: *if it be not;* and thence by the addition of *δε* it takes a force adversative to the preceding context: *'but if otherwise'* (Jelf § 860, 5. c.). The *μή* indicates that the whole is in the mind, *μή τις* implying a wish, and a will, and *εἰ μή* an opposition in the mind alone]. Εἰ *δὲ μήγε* (Matth. vi. 1) even in the classic writers sometimes follows a negative proposition, where it is intended that a positive wish is not to be gratified. The idea here is: I desire that no one should think me a fool, but if this wish is not complied with, then, *etc.* The *γε* makes the negation more striking and is equivalent to, *even if not, truly if not.* Κἂν (also in Mark vi. 56; Acts v. 15) is an elliptical mode of expression, equivalent to, receive me, *even though* you receive me as a fool; provided you extend to me the forbearance usually allowed to a fool. In *δέξασθέ* he refers back to *ἀνέχεσθαι* in ver. 1, as if he would say, receive me, give me a hearing; and his object is to obtain from them what is needful for that which he immediately afterwards declares that he intended to do, *viz.*, that I also may boast myself a little. The phrase *I also* (*κἀγὼ*) has reference to the boasting of his opponents, comp. ver. 12 and 18.—But under a clear conviction of what became an Apostle of Christ, he wished them to understand that this boasting in which he put himself on a level with his opponents, was not a style of address to which he had been led by the Lord (Christ) or by the Divine Spirit. It was not a way conformed to our Lord's pattern, in His spirit (Matth. xi. 39; Luke xvii. 10), or as His servant might be expected to do, but it was an expression of Paul's own feelings as a man.—**What I am speaking, I am speaking not after the Lord, but as if in foolishness** (ver. 17).—In *ὃ λαλῶ* he has in mind; in this confidence of boasting; what he had already arranged in thought, and what he had already begun to express in some introductory words. [Stanley draws attention to Paul's use of *ὁ λάλῶ*, 'my language,' 'my general strain,' in distinction from *ὸ φημί* or *λέγω* 'my words.' In classical usage *λαλῶ* appears to have had the sense of a continuous flow of talk, comp. Lat., *lallo.*, Germ., *lallen*, and Eng. *lull.* Eupol. Dem. 8: *λαλεῖν ἁριστος ἀδυνατώτατος λέγειν.* Plut. 2. 909 A.: *λαλοῦσι μὲν οὗτοι, φράζονσι δὲ οὐ.* The word is in the future present because the Apostle was already thrown forward into the discussion (Osiander)]. With respect to *κατὰ κύριον* comp. *κατὰ* in chap. vii. 9; Rom. xv. 5, and analogous expressions in 1 Cor. vii. 10, 25, 40; comp. Bengel, Meyer, Osiander.*—Ὡ*ς ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ*, as if in folly, as one who is in a foolish state of mind.—The concluding words; **in this confidence of boasting.** (*ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ὑποστάσει τῆς καυχήσεως*),—must be joined with the *λαλῶ* which must be supplied to *ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ, but I speak as if in folly*, in the confidence of boasting. Meyer connects them with *οὐ κατὰ—ἀφροσύνῃ*, I speak this not according to the Lord but as a fool with this confidence, *etc.* Such a construction seems rather constrained and harsh. *Ὑπόστασις*, has here the same meaning as in chap. ix. 4, *i. e. confidence*, not *matter, object* (in this matter, *etc.*,) still less *circumstance* (since we have come to boasting). [Stanley: "The whole phrase" refers to the boasting not of himself but of his opponents, or at least of himself and his opponents conjointly: and it is intended to limit the justification of his boasting to this particular occasion].—**Inasmuch as many boast after the flesh I will boast also** (ver. 18).—He here more fully develops what he meant by the *κἀγὼ* of ver. 16, and puts himself in direct contrast with his opponents, whose boasting according to the flesh he implies had led him to these self-laudations. *According to the flesh*, is in contrast with *according to the Lord* (*κατὰ κύριον*) in ver. 17, and corresponds with *as if in foolishness* (*ὡς ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ*). It designates here either (1) the object of these self-commendations (external advantages) such as are in other places (esp. Phil. iii. 3, *etc.*,) declared to be *ἐν σαρκί*; or (2) the objective rule according to which one judges; or finally (3) the subjective turn or determination of the mind under the influence of such sensual and selfish motives as pride, vanity, *etc.* Our explanation of the phrase will depend upon the answer to the question whether in the succeeding clause the Apostle carried forward the same idea, as seems to be intimated by the *κἀγὼ* and by the connection with vers. 17 and 19.

[* As the phrase *κατὰ κύριον* in our passage has been generally brought into discussions respecting the Apostle's inspiration, we should carefully notice its meaning. Literally it signifies, "according to the Lord." Of course, here as every where else in Paul's own writing, the Lord means the Lord Jesus. But was it, (1) according to the *example* of the Lord who was lowly and never boasted; or (2) according to the Lord's command or *direction* (on sometimes: as in 1 Cor. vii. 6, 10, 12, Paul refused to lay a Divine command on his brethren and only gave them human advice which they were at liberty to follow or decline); or (3) according to the Lord's *inspiring Spirit?* Evidently it was not the last, for Paul claimed always to be under the Spirit's influence, and the preposition would not have been *κατά* with an accus., but *ἐν*, *ἐκ* or *ἀπό* (Winer § 51. 5. k. 3). The analogy of I Cor. vii. 6ff., would favor the second method. In this case it would be no denial of his general *θεοπνευστία*, but rather an assertion of it; for his present exception would prove the general rule. Indeed we are under no necessity of supposing an exception in this particular instance, for even the inspiring Spirit might direct Paul to leave men unfettered by authority in matters of social expediency as in marrying or boasting. But the contrast implied by *ἀλλὰ* between the matter here spoken of in *ἀφροσύνη* and *κατὰ τὴν σάρκα*, shows almost conclusively that the Apostle was here speaking of something *κατὰ κύριον* which was not according to a boastful manner. So Chrysostom; who thinks that Paul here condemns boasting in form and in general as not after the Lord, and yet goes on to boast because the good intention which led him to do so made it right in the present case. We are led therefore by the preposition here used and the connection to adopt the first method of interpretation mentioned above. Comp. Hodge, Stanley, and especially Lee on Inspiration, Lec. VI. pp. 207–8.

The third method, however, seems unsuitable, if we are obliged to conclude that the Apostle was determined by sinful and selfish motives. The best way is probably to unite the third and the first in such a way that the self-commendation intended was one which sprung from his higher spiritual nature, and yet took the direction of the flesh, because it was concerned with such external advantages, as genealogical descent (ver. 22), and individual position (ver. 23). Paul had done and experienced many things which might incline him to speak of such things (vers. 24, *etc.*). Such carnal boastings are here represented, though perhaps in an ironical manner, and confessed to be, on the part of the Apostle, foolishness (*ἀφροσύνη*). [As *κατὰ τ. σάρκα* (the article much strengthens the expression and makes it mean according, to *their* flesh) cannot be made to signify, *in* carnal things, and as it can be made to mean nothing but, *according to unsanctified human nature* (as opposed to *κατὰ κύριον* of the preceding verse), we see not how we can adopt any interpretation which makes Paul declare his determination, *καυχᾶσθαι κ. τ. σάρκα*. It would not be possible to make it consistent with Paul's character or a Christian spirit. Nor does the language strictly require it. HODGE: "There is no necessity of supplying *κατὰ σάρκα* after the last clause. What Paul says is, 'As many boast from unworthy motives, I also will boast.' If they did it from bad motives (*κατὰ σάρκα*), he might well do it from good ones"]. **—For ye who are wise suffer fools with pleasure** (ver. 20). He here tells them what it was that strengthened or at least encouraged him in this purpose. It was their toleration of such persons, and, in fact, their pleasure in fools. [People usually tolerate the chatter of fools, as they do the petulance of children]. The reason for this he assigns in a sudden turn of his discourse, ironically reminding them that they must be wise men (comp. 1 Cor. iv. 10). Ὄντες is not here by way of concession, in order that the force of the reproach might be increased and their guilt aggravated; but its object is to suggest the reason for their indulgence, though in a way to inflict a severe reproof in connection with the irony. As intelligent people can have no pleasure in the vaunting talk of fools, they should not by their indulgence encourage others in their folly.—**For ye suffer it, if one brings you into bondage, if one devours you, if one enslaves you, if one exalts himself, if one smites you in the face** (ver. 20). He here illustrates further what he had said by reminding them of the extraordinary degree to which they had carried their indulgence, when they had taken pleasure in even the most unworthy treatment, yea, abuse of themselves (how much more, therefore, might he expect them to endure his *ἀφροσύνη*?). In the first place, he recalls to their recollection the complete subversion of their freedom under the arrogant exercise of power which these false Apostles had put forth among them (*εἴ τις καταδουλοῖ*). In this we must understand not so much the imposition of the yoke of the law and the loss of evangelical freedom, as a tyrannical assertion of authority, a sacerdotal guardianship of their consciences, and a requirement of a blind obedience. In the next place, he reminds them of the selfish, avaricious practices to which they had submitted: *εἴ τις κατεσθίει*, if a man consumes you, and wrests from you all you have, comp. Ps. liii. 5; Matth. xxiii. 13. The word has the sense of *devorare* (not, *to destroy by grief*, nor, *to disturb the Church* by breaking it up into parties). There is no necessity of introducing here the idea of an inordinate fondness for luxurious food and good living, in order to distinguish *κατεσθίει* from *λαμβάνει*, for this latter word means not simply to take (as when one receives a present or reward, or secretly conveys something away; for this would require something like *ὑμῖν* after it, and as a feebler expression would not be needed after the preceding verb), but to catch, as in chap. xii. 16, by craft, by sly contrivances to get one in his power (as in hunting), by such means as would readily be supplied by ambition or avarice. [HODGE: "Our version, by supplying: *of you*, alters the sense and makes this clause express less than the preceding; devouring is a stronger expression for rapacity than *taking of you*. As after *κατεσθίει* in the preceding clause, *ὑμᾶς* must be supplied after *λαμβάνει*: '*if any take you*,' *i. e.*, capture you or ensnare you"]. He closes this account by mentioning some insolent (*ἐπαίρεται*) and disgraceful treatment they had received. Whether by *ἐπαίρεται* (sc. *ὑμῖν*) we are to understand the assertion of some advantage which these Jews pretended to have over the Gentile Christians (Osiander), must be considered uncertain. Εἰς *πρόσωπον δέρειν* indicates that their rule over the Church was characterized by violence, intimidation, and even insolence. [The ancient interpreters agree that this expression refers not to a literal blow with the fist, but only to those abusive reproaches which one heaps upon another to his face (Jerome: "*Si quis etiam præsentes objurgat*"). The immediately following words were supposed to call for this modification of meaning (Theodoret). The highest possible insolence is implied; for in Oriental countries such a blow was intended for the utmost contempt (1 Kings xxii. 24; Matth. v. 39; Acts xxiii. 2). Stanley suggests that ecclesiastical rulers must sometimes have resorted even to corporeal buffetting, since even the Apostle found it needful to forbid such a thing (1 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. i. 7), and the Council of Braga (A. D. 675) orders "that no bishop at his will and pleasure shall *strike* his clergy." WORDSWORTH: perhaps fanatically, with a pretence of Divine enthusiasm and prophetic zeal, comp. 1 Kings xxii. 24; Neh. xiii. 25; Isa. lviii. 4]. EWALD: "*e. g.*, by the reproach, as among the Galatians, that those who had been converted and instructed by Paul were not, in fact, Christians."

VERS. 21–27. **I say it with shame, that we have been weak.** (ver. 21 *a*)—The Apostle here passes on to his commendation of himself; and he here compares his own preëminent endowments and sufferings with the pretentions of the boastful false apostles. He first draws attention to the fact that when he was in Corinth he had been weak in comparison with these powerful men (comp. 1 Cor. ii. 2). This is said in words of forcible irony (*κατὰ ἀτιμίαν λέγω*): I confess it with shame, for if it were true, it must be

a deep dishonor, and much disgraces me (*κατὰ* with an abstract noun, I say it with shame, *i. e.*, as though it were a circumlocution for an adverb). [WINER, *Gram.* § 58, WEBSTER, p. 169]. In strong contrast with this ironical concession respecting his earlier weakness, we have immediately after it an assertion of his right to be as bold as any one in his claims. By means of the *ὡς* before *ὅτι* he implies that what he had just conceded as a shameful thing, was a circumstance conceived of only in the mind as in 2 Thess. ii. 2 (Meyer). In the sentence *λέγω—ἡμεῖς* we have the same change of persons as in ver. 6. Osiander: he puts himself and his companions in direct contrast with their whole company. In this way we obtain a good and consistent meaning in accordance with the signification of the words and the connection. This, however, would not be the case if we regarded *κατὰ ατιμίαν λέγω* as referring to the preceding verse: I say this to your shame (because ye are pleased with such things); or I say this with reference to the disgraceful manner in which you have been treated, for both of these remarks would be entirely foreign to his discourse. We may add that on this construction not only would the ironical character of the whole passage be interrupted, but the words ought to have been: *κατὰ τὴν ἀτιμίαν ὑμῶν*. Without some such more particular definition, it would be most naturally referred to the subject of *λέγω* and of *ἠσθενήσαμεν*, especially as the latter verb includes within itself the notion of an *ἀτιμία*. Moreover there would be a harshness in taking *ὡς ὅτι* in the sense of *ὡσανεί, as if we had been weak*. The indefiniteness of the phrase *κατὰ ἀτιμίαν* is opposed to an explanation of the words, which should make them signify: To your shame I say that we were not as strong as they were, and that we never attained as much respect among you; and also to that advocated by Rückert: on this point, indeed, I must concede to your disgrace, that I was weak.—**But in whatsoever respect any one is bold (I speak it foolishly) I am bold also** (ver. 21 *b*).—He here begins his boasting in the proper sense. The idea is: I confess it with shame, that I have been weak in comparison with them, but now when the occasion calls for boldness (boasting), I put myself on a level with any of them in every respect. *Τολμᾷν* occurs in chap. x. 2, and *πεποιθέναι* in Phil. iii. 3.—*Ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ λέγω* is an ironical concession (Meyer) to what he knew would be the judgment of his opponents respecting these claims (comp. *μή τις, etc.*, in ver. 16), or (Osiander) an expression of his feeling of humiliation on account of this self-commendation, with an implied reproach of his opponents for compelling him thus to speak. The first point on which he would match his opponents in this self-commendation, is brought forward in ver. 22, and had reference to genealogical descent.—**Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so am I.**—This was a matter of especial boast with those Judaizing teachers, in whose eyes Christianity was nothing but a continued Judaism, which should give to the Jewish people a decided preference above all nations, comp. Phil. iii. 5. The three following sentences should probably be read, in accordance with the ardent feelings of the Apostle at this time, interrogatively, and we may notice in them an ascending climax. The first honorable appellation, *Ἑβραῖοι*, may be looked upon as the designation by which foreign nations usually distinguished the ancient and venerable nationality which derived its name either from Eber, Abraham's ancestor (Gen. xi. 16), or from its migration from the other side of the Euphrates.* Some, however, have contended that this name designated a Palestinian in distinction from a Hellenistic Jew; and they explain the *κἀγώ* by attempting to show that Paul was born at Giscala in Galilee (according to Jerome, but in opposition to Acts xxii. 3) or by supposing that his parents resided there before his birth, or that they removed to Jerusalem at an early period, and gave him there a purely Hebrew education. The first explanation is certainly to be preferred, since even if the facts on which the opinion is based were completely proved, the Apostle would hardly say of himself, without any further explanation, that he was no Hellenist, but a Hebrew, and hence a Jew of the purest stamp. The second appellation, *Ἰσραηλῖται*, designates a higher position, inasmuch as it indicates a participation in the honor of the sacred and important name of Israel, or a membership of the theocratic nation. Finally, *σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ* designates the highest external distinction, inasmuch as it signifies a participation in the exalted promises given to that ancestor.—**Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as one beside himself) I am more** (ver. 23 *a*).—The second point on which his opponents prided themselves, was, that they were ministers of Christ. To the question whether they were such ministers, he does not return a directly negative answer, but he declares that on this important matter he was superior to them, and he proceeds to produce a catalogue of sufferings and conflicts, in the endurance of which he was far in advance of them. The words *παραφρονῶν λαλῶ* (I speak as one quite beside himself), which are placed before *ὑπὲρ ἐγώ*, are much stronger than those he had used in ver. 21, and yet they are of a similar import. They may be supposed to express an opinion which he anticipated his opponents would form respecting what he was saying (Meyer), or [more probably, Alford] as the protest which his own humble consciousness of unworthiness urged him to make against these high self-commendations (Osiander). In the latter case the reference is, not to what he had just said, as if it were a sign of madness to call such people by the name of Christ's ministers (Rückert), but to the words, I am more (*ὑπὲρ ἐγώ*), and the

[* Robinson's Heb. Lex., Kitto's Encyc., and Smith's Dict. of the Bible, Art. *Hebrew*. The name עִבְרִי is now generally regarded not as a Patronymic, but as an appellative noun from עֵבֶר, one from the other side (Gen. xiv. 13 Sept., *περάτης*=transitor). It seems to have been originally a Cis-Euphratian word applied to Trans-Euphratian immigrants, but afterwards used by the Israelites themselves as the name best known to foreigners. There is no evidence that the Israelites attached any special value to their descent from Eber, which, indeed, they shared with a number of Oriental nations (Gen. x. 21, probably means simply: "the Father of the nations beyond the river.")]

further development of the idea which he was about to make, and in which he felt that there was a more than common boasting. The *ὑπὲρ* may refer to the idea contained in *διάκονοι Χριστοῦ*, as if he would have said, 'I am more than that; if they are such servants, I am more.' This would be a withdrawal of the appareat concession that they were such servants, and would be inconsistent with what he had said in vv. 13-15 (Meyer). The words may also be referred to his opponents, and be made equivalent to *ὑπὲρ αὐτοὺς*: I am such a minister in a higher degree than they are. The latter seems the simpler construction, and more correspondent with the particulars afterwards mentioned and the spirit (not ironical) which pervades the passage. We must also remember that he had not intended to decide whether they were in fact servants of Christ, and the sense would therefore seem to be: granted that they are such servants, I am more, *etc.* (*ὑπέρ* is used as an adverb only here). And yet he proceeds to mention (in ver. 23 *b*) as the reason for his preëminence, no illustrious achievements or wonderful results he had accomplished, but difficulties, troubles, conflicts, perils.—**By labors more abundant, by stripes above measure, by imprisonments more abundant, by deaths frequently.**—The word *ἐν* introduces us to the state in which he actually was, and in consequence of which he should be reckoned a servant of Christ in a much more eminent sense than they. The adverbs, *περισσοτέρως, etc.*, should be construed as adjectives belonging to the nouns with which they are connected, though they are placed after those nouns (comp. Phil. i. 26; Gal. i. 13). In opposition to the construction which explains them as adverbs [qualifying *ὑπὲρ ἐγὼ εἰμι*, which is to be understood before each member of the sentence], we have *πολλάκις*, before which we could not continue to understand the phrase. I am more than they a servant of Christ. Even if we might supply there some such phrase as: "I have been, or I have experienced the fortune of, a servant of Christ;" or I have been found by actual experience to be one, the relation of the several expressions to *ὑπὲρ ἐγώ* would be destroyed, and yet would be required again in ver. 26. Κόποι are the labors he had performed as an Apostle, while preaching the Gospel, saving souls and contending for the truth (comp. Acts xx. 19–20, 31). In such labors he well knew that he had far surpassed his opponents, even though he might concede that they were not deficient in an active zeal from impure motives. It was not perhaps easy to say anything of the stripes and imprisonments they had suffered, unless possibly their fanatical proceedings had involved them at some time in such sufferings. Ὑπερβαλλόντως, more exceeding, an interruption of the use of the comparative, as in the next clause by *πολλάκις*. Φυλακαῖς, Clemens Rom. in his first Ep. ad. Cor. chap. v. says that Paul suffered bonds seven times. By *θανάτοις* is signified every kind of peril of death. Comp. chap. iv. 11, and 1 Cor. xv. 31. To show in what way he had experienced these stripes and deadly perils, he here introduces a parenthetical passage (vv. 24–25).—**Of the Jews five times I received forty stripes, save one.**—In the first place he mentions the abuse he had endured from his own countrymen, the Jews. Πεντάκις—ἔλαβον. These five times were the repetitions of this kind of punishment at different times. This must have been the scourging which was inflicted for minor offences in the synagogues, and which was never to exceed forty stripes (Deut. xx. 3). [The manner in which this punishment was inflicted is thus described in the *Mishna:* The hands of the criminal are bound to a post, his clothes are then removed till at least his breast and shoulders are bare. With a scourge made of leather in four strands he is then scourged in a stooping posture, one-third of the stripes on his breast, another third on the right shoulder, and another third on the left shoulder (Clarke). Paul doubtless remembered, under these inflictions, how he had subjected Christians to the same treatment when he was himself a persecutor. Acts xxii. 19]. The probability is (though others explain the reason otherwise) that the number of these blows was limited to thirty-nine, lest by any wrong numbering the precept should be violated. Παρά designates an approximation toward an extreme point; until to, until upon (Passow, παρά iii. 1. c.) This whipping was so terrible that many died under its infliction, and it is therefore numbered among the *θανάτοις*.—**Thrice was I beaten with rods.**—Ἐῤῥαβδίσθην signifies, a Roman kind of punishment by scourging with rods (slender staves), Acts xvi. 22. But although in the previous case he had designated the authors of his punishment by the phrase *ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων* and had placed this designation by way of emphasis at the commencement of the sentence as if it were especially grievous to him (perhaps also as peculiarly disgraceful to his Judaizing countrymen), he here says nothing expressly of the persons by whom the punishment was inflicted. Indeed no specification was necessary.—**Once was I stoned; thrice I suffered shipwreck; a night and a day have I spent in the deep.** (ver. 25).—On ἐλιθάσθην consult Acts xiv. 19.—With respect to the three shipwrecks nothing is said in the Acts (that mentioned in Acts xxvii, was at a later period). —The *νυχθήμερον* (24 hours) *ἐν τῷ βυθῷ πεποίηκα* must have been the consequence of some shipwreck. Not that he had been preserved that length of time in some wonderful manner under the water, but that he had been driven about upon some board or piece of timber or wreck in the midst of the sea, and probably been overwhelmed by the waves. Βυθός here signifies, not a pit or a deep prison, but the depth of the sea, as in Ps. cvii. 24, *et. al.*—Ποιεῖν here signifies to pass away time, as in Acts xv. 33 *et. al.* The perfect indicates a lively representation of the past in the mind of the writer [Winer, § 41, 4. p. 214].—In vv. 26, 27 he resumes his proof that he was a servant of Christ in a higher sense than his opponents, and mentions first his frequent journeys and the manifold dangers through which they led him, and then the hardships and privations of all kinds he had been obliged to encounter.—**By journeyings often, by perils of rivers, by perils of robbers,** (ver. 26). —Ἐν is not to be supplied in these several clauses, for the dat. instrum. is here made use of. [Hodge: "Our translators have throughout this

passage supplied the preposition *in*. But as ἐν in the preceding verse is used instrumentally, so here we have the instrumental dative, *by* journeyings, *by* perils, *etc.* It was by voluntarily exposing himself to these dangers, and by the endurance of these sufferings that the Apostle proved his superior claim to be regarded as a devoted minister of Christ."] After the parenthesis of vv. 24, 25, there is a return to the former construction (ver. 23). Rivers (ποταμῶν) perils which proceeded from streams of various kinds (according to the classical usage of language). He had in his mind those inundations and difficult fordings, *etc.*, [common, especially on the road frequently travelled by Paul, between Jerusalem and Antioch, comp. Alford].—Robbers (λῃστῶν) were very common in those regions which were the scene of most of his journeys.—**By perils from my own countrymen by perils from the heathen.** (ver. 26 *b*).—The words ἐκ γένους, from the Jews who not only themselves laid snares for him, but at Corinth and in other places stirred up the Gentiles (ἐξ ἐθνῶν) against him; γένους μου occurs otherwise in Gal. i. 14.—He now proceeds to mention the scenes in which these perils had been encountered.—**By perils in the city, by perils in the wilderness, by perils in the sea, by perils among false brethren.** (ver. 26 *c*).—The words ἐν πόλει are contrasted with ἐν ερήμῳ, as we sometimes say: city and country. He had before his eye such cities as Jerusalem, Damascus (vv. 32, 33) Thessalonica, Philippi and Ephesus.—In desert, uninhabited countries (ἐρήμῳ) he was in danger from robbers, from wild beasts, from losing his way, *etc.*—The words ἐν θαλάσσῃ are closely connected with ἐν ερήμῳ, for the perils of the sea were not merely those extreme cases mentioned in ver. 25.—He finally notices that which was the most painful of all, *among false brethren*, (ἐν ψευδαδέλφοις, comp. Gal. ii. 4). He has reference to those hostile Judaizers, whose fanatical hatred impelled them so far as to threaten the life of the Apostle to the Gentiles, and thus made it evident that the name of brethren had no proper application to them. (Others think that these were not really Christians, but only such as pretended to be, that they might more easily lay their hands upon him and remove him out of the way!).—After this enumeration of various kinds of peril, he now proceeds to mention first his hardships:—**By labor and weariness, by frequent watchings, by hunger and thirst, by frequent fastings, by cold and nakedness.** (ver. 27).—The word μόχθῳ is an advance in signification upon κόπῳ. Very probably he had in mind here the manual labor he went through when he was at Corinth, and which not unlikely consumed some of his nights (1 Thess. ii. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 8), and so gave occasion for watchings (ἀγρυπνίαι) in immediate connection with his official duties.—The word νηστείαις in distinction from λιμῷ καὶ δίψει must signify voluntary fastings, comp. chap. vi. 5, 1 Cor. ix. 27. On hunger, thirst, nakedness, consult 1 Cor. iv. 11.—We thus have before us on the one hand such voluntary self-denials as were required for his official duties that he might have time to devote himself more unreservedly to prayer and intercession; and on the other the want of those absolute necessities of life which could not always be obtained during the hasty journeys which his work and his safety sometimes required. The thirst (δίψος) also could not always be avoided in seasons of extreme heat in desert lands.

Vers. 28–30. **Besides the things not enumerated, the business which comes upon me day by day the anxiety for all the churches.**—The Apostle now turns from a particular recital of the various perils, pains, *etc.*, which he had been obliged to endure, to those more general burdens and cares which came upon him every day in his official duty. Τὰ παρεκτός signifies the things besides, *i. e.*, those which take place beside (not, what are to be met with from without, outside of the church, or, what occurs out of the regular order; for both these expressions would be inconsistent with the usages of demonstrative discourse). He had reference to further details, in addition to those he had just given, but which he was about to leave unmentioned. Χωρίς therefore has the sense of: without, irrespective of.—It would seem an unnecessary harshness to regard the following nominatives as in irregular apposition with τῶν παρεκτός so that the sense would be: all that I have thus mentioned come upon me only in the regular course of things, in addition to, or irrespective of, that which is beyond that course, *viz.*, the daily matters of attention, *etc.* The same may be said of the attempt to connect χωρὶς τῶν παρεκτός with that which precedes, according to which ἡ ἐπίστασις would be a very abrupt commencement of a new sentence. Nothing need be understood but ἐστὶν in the sense of: takes place. If the reading, ἡ ἐπισύστασίς μου, which has considerable authority in its favor, be adopted, the meaning of the words must be either: an insurrection, a collecting together in troops against me (comp. Acts xxiv 12); in which case the fact mentioned would belong rather to the κινδύνοις and certainly could not be a daily occurrence; or the burden which came upon him in consequence of the perverted doctrines and disorderly practices of those around him (Bengel). The idea of a concourse, a great crowd of people or even of importunities every day, is not altogether sustained by the meaning of the word (even in Numb. xxvi. 9, ἐπισυστάντες has the hostile sense of rising in opposition to one).—Ἐπίστασις which is sustained by better authority gives us a signification which is appropriate to the context, for we may take it either in the sense of delay (hinderance), that which causes me delay every day; or in the sense of attention, having the care of something, an intense straining of the thoughts to determine what is to be done or how a thing is to be arranged. The latter sense seems most consistent with what follows. If we adopt the reading μοι, sustained by B. F. G. [and Sin.] instead of μου, it will not be difficult to bring it into agreement with the ἐστιν which we have supplied, in the sense of, *takes place for me.* With this also may be closely connected the immediately following sentence, *the care of all the churches;* though in that case we must not make that the subject of ἡ ἐπίστασις μου (μοι) *etc.* [my daily care is anxiety *etc.*] (Meyer). By *all the churches* are probably to be understood those which had been founded by the Apostle and his school or which had come

under his influence, *i. e.* those beyond the limits of Palestine. The care he exercised over them, was for the preservation of Christian usages and order, in doctrine and practice.—The trouble which this involved, he describes (ver. 29), with reference to the particular department of his pastoral work (comp. Acts xx. 18, 19, 31):—**Who is weak and I am not weak? Who is offended and I do not burn?**—Ἀσθενεῖ refers here not to physical infirmities but to moral imperfections, defects of judgment and of faith, intellectual and moral weakness.—A climax is reached in σκανδαλίζεσθαι (1 Cor. viii. 13), which signifies, to be perplexed or led astray. Οὐκ ἀσθενῶ does not imply that he condescended to enter into all the infirmities and prejudices of his brethren (like 1 Cor. ix. 22), but that he so sincerely sympathized with others, that he made their weakness his own, and to a great extent became one with those who were feeble. [Chrysostom: "He says not, 'And I share not in his sorrow,' but 'I am thrown into the tumult and agitation which I should have if I were under the same trouble or infirmity.'"] This is the reason that no ἐγώ is expressed before ἀσθενῶ, although it is subsequently used, because he feels himself not so intimately connected with those who were offended (σκανδαλιζόμενος). [He so identified himself with those who were weak, that he spoke as one with them, as though he were himself *the church* throughout the world; but when he came to speak of those who had been stumbled or led astray he separates himself from them in their wanderings, but is fired with indignation for their sake and speaks *for* them]. Thus Osiander; but otherwise Meyer, who observes that the negation in the former case had reference to the verb itself, '*who is feeble without occasioning a weakness also in me?*' whereas in the latter the negation had reference rather to the person: "*who is stumbled, and I do not burn?*" [He sympathized with the weak, he glowed with the strong]. Πυροῦσθαι has a different meaning here from that which it had in 1 Cor. vii. 9, for the idea here is either that he was violently displeased with the one who had misled his brother, or (more probably) that he was deeply and acutely pained for the brother who had been offended and misled. Of course it would have been inappropriate for him to have written σκανδαλίζομαι, and we should altogether miss the Apostle's thought if we took πυροῦσθαι in the sense it bears in 1 Cor. vii. 9 (in relation to incontinence). But very feeble and quite aside from the sense of the passage would it be to explain the verse so as to make it signify: who suffers if I do not suffer? *i. e.* I suffer more than any other one (this would call for an ἐγώ also before ἀσθενῶ).—**If I must boast, I will boast of the things which concern my infirmities** (ver. 30).—He here finally draws a conclusion from what he had been saying, with respect to the nature of the boasting to which his opponents had driven him (δεῖ); and he reminds his readers how unlike it was to that of his opponents, inasmuch as it referred entirely to matters connected with his infirmity, and it made him appear rather like a feeble man subject to ordinary passions (sufferings and afflictions of every kind).—He was about to mention some additional particulars of a similar kind, as matters of which he might boast (καυχήσομαι).—In ἀσθενείας he has no allusion to ἀσθενῶ in ver. 29, since the word there indicated merely a feeling which identified him with others, and καυχήσομαι shows that he had reference here to that which was to follow, [not *exclusively*, however, for he had already been boasting of such things, and was now only continuing the recital. Such futures in a narrative or in an argument often signify the purposed continuance of an action].

Vers. 31–33. — **God, the Father of the Lord Jesus, who is blessed forevermore, knoweth that I lie not.** — The affirmation here given is rendered peculiarly solemn by the unusually full and Christian designation it gives to God (comp. chap. i. 3) and the ascription of praise it contains (ὢν—αἰῶνας). It must not be connected with the enumeration commenced in ver. 23, for ver. 30 stands between the two sections. We should rather refer it to the purpose which he had announced in ver. 30, inasmuch as it might seem incredible to many that he would boast of his suffering condition rather than of his achievements, his manifestations of power, and the results of his actions. The main fact mentioned in the two next verses appears of too small importance to call for such an asseveration. It seems only a poor evasion of the difficulty to suggest that the fact was not generally known and that it could not then be proved without great difficulty; or that it seemed hardly credible that the Jews would be guilty of such an atrocity; or finally that his escape must have seemed very wonderful, and hence that the Apostle might feel called upon to make the assertion especially solemn. We must either conclude that he here commenced a historical account of his personal sufferings, which was immediately interrupted and never completed (Meyer), or we must connect it with chap. xii. 7, 8, where he begins again to speak of his ἀσθένεια (Osiander, who is inclined to make it refer to both the preceding and the following verses). What he mentions in vers. 32, 33, took place when he first commenced his work, and it had therefore made a deep impression upon his mind as his first deliverance from imminent danger. It does not seem likely that this circumstance is mentioned merely to authenticate what he had said in vers. 23, *etc.*, because it came first in the order of his deliverances, nor as a supplementary account of a persecution which had come upon him out of the ordinary course of what he had been recounting, and separated, far back in the very commencement of his course. According to Osiander, this incident was mentioned with so much prominence because in time and character it was closely connected with chap. xii. 2. Ewald suggests that there can be no doubt that Paul throughout this whole picture had his eye especially upon those calamities and afflictions which had their origin in the hatred of those Jews and Jewish Christians from among whom his Corinthian opponents had arisen, and that this will explain why he could not refrain from heightening the colors of that picture by this account of a special danger into which that deadly hatred had brought him soon after his conversion.—**In Damascus, the governor under Aretas the king guarded**

the city of the Damascenes that he might apprehend me (ver. 32). We have here either a pleonasm or an anacoluthon. Perhaps he had intended at first to write ἐφρούρει τὰς πύλας (comp. Acts ix. 24), and afterwards did not notice that he had already written ἐν Δαμασκῷ. [BARNES: "Our translation implies that there was a body of men *stationed* (a garrison), in order to guard the city. The true idea is that there were men (perhaps a guard of hostile Jews gathered for this purpose only) to keep watch of the gates, lest he should escape them." The word ἐφρούρει signifies *to sentinel, to keep guard over.* Wordsworth thinks that the phrase "the city of the Damascenes" implies that the city was not altogether subject to Aretas, but had some independent jurisdiction left at the same time that Aretas had an Ethnarch there. It may have been nominally free, but under the protection of a superior power." As the Jews in some cities had a special ruler under the title of Ethnarch, it has been suggested by some that this governor was in a special sense over them]. The *Ethnarch* (ἐθνάρχης) was the same as a prefect or governor, though this precise title was used but little, and only in the Septuagint and among the Byzantines. Aretas was a king of Arabia Petræa, and the father-in-law of Herod Antipas. After the death of Tiberias, he must have taken advantage of the circumstances of the moment for gaining power in the city of Damascus. The incident here related took place during the period of this brief ascendancy there. What is here ascribed to the governor is in Acts ix. 24 ascribed to the Jews; but this apparent discrepancy is explained by the supposition that the governor acted under the instigation and possibly through the instrumentality of the numerous and influential Jews who are known to have resided there. Comp. Meyer, Osiander, Winer, Zeller (Aretas). On ver. 33 comp. Acts ix. 25.— **And through a window I was let down in a basket through the wall, and escaped his hands.** (ver. 33).—The word θυρίς [is a diminutive form of θύρα], and signifies, probably, a small opening overhead in the wall of the city, perhaps in the house of some Christian. [Hesychius tells us that σαργάνη was defined by some to be a rope twisted of rushes; by others, any thing woven together of rushes; but Suidas makes it the same thing as σπυρίς in Acts ix. 25, *i. e.*, a basket. From this incident Paul was ridiculed by infidels of a later period, as ὁ ἀπόστολος σαργανοφόρητος. He was, however, so far from being ashamed of it, that he gloried in it. In Acts and in our passage the phrase is διὰ τοῦ τείχους, which our English A. V. translates "by the wall," but which should probably be, "through the wall," as more consistent with the radical meaning of the preposition. As the aperture, however, was probably from some such building as is even now seen overhanging the walls of Damascus (see a representation of such a house in Conybeare and Howson, Vol. 1, p. 100), either expression may be consistent with the actual fact. Smith's *Diet.* Art. *Window*; also Stanley. Comp. Josh. ii. 15, and 1 Sam. xix. 12. On the chronological relations of this incident see Alford on Acts ix. 25].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

A minister of Christ should meet the spirit of sect and of faction with all the resistance of which he is capable. For by that spirit Satan often succeeds in drawing the Church away from her Bridegroom, and in causing her to prove unfaithful. Gradually he brings her under the tyranny of men, who assume to be ministers of Christ while they are in truth the servants of Satan, arrogate to themselves every kind of power, and by every art and outrage enslave the souls of men. Their object is by such means to make God's people dependent entirely upon them, and to get complete possession of all persons and property in the Church, under the pretence that "it is needful for the good cause and for the salvation of souls." A hierarchy which has usurped the name of the Catholic Church, or any other name which promised to serve its corrupt purpose, whether of prophets, messengers of Christ, men of the Spirit or restorers of the true Church, has been practising such arts in every age, but always openly or covertly depreciating the system of faith and order which the true Prophets and Apostles once established, and now, as the great apostasy draws near, threatening to become more insolent. Every true servant of Christ is sacredly bound, for his Master's sake, to contend against such practices by every means within his reach, that the purity of the Church may be secured or maintained, that her dependence upon her only Head may be sincere, and that her devotion to Christ may be unreserved and pure. While he freely rebukes wickedness and calls it by its true names, he must denounce with severity, and, if advisable, with gentle or keen irony, the weaknesses and follies of those who have allowed themselves to be led astray. In extreme cases he must cheerfully endure for the cause of his Lord all those sacrifices, self-denials, sufferings and conflicts which that Lord Himself endured. Though he thus humbles himself in the presence of a meek and lowly Master, and feels that he can never do too much, he should not hesitate to make use of what he has done and suffered to confound those who assume the credit of what others have done, or by fancied or pretended merits seek to obtain influence at the expense of more deserving persons. In such circumstances he must bring to notice things which he would rather have concealed, and make his own virtues the means of saving those who have been wickedly seduced from the way of truth. In this way the esteem in which Christ's ministers are held may be used to preserve these weaker brethren from becoming the slaves of Satan's ministers.

[2. Our Lord's relation to the Church is not only most endearing, but most permanent and secure. Whatever his relations to angels and other beings may be, his connection with his church is like that of a monarch with his queen. Until her number and her graces are completed, she remains only espoused and in a state of preparation. God's ministers are now, as it were, filling His place, as His ambassadors, proxies, or paranymphs (Isa. lxii. 4. 5), but it is only to

bring her into a true conjugal relation to him (comp. a sermon of Pres. Edwards on "*The Church's Marriage;*" Works, vol. vi. p. 192). But when this preparation is completed, "Christ will invite His Spouse to enter with Him into the palace of His glory, prepared for her from the foundation of the world, and will lead her in with Him; and this glorious Bridegroom and Bride shall ascend together, with all their shining ornaments, into the heaven of heavens, the whole multitude of angels waiting upon them: and this Son and daughter of God shall, in their united glory and joy, present themselves together before the Father; and they both shall, in that relation and union together, receive the Father's blessing: and shall thenceforward rejoice together in consummate, uninterrupted, immutable and everlasting glory, in the love and embraces of each other, and joint enjoyment of the love of the Father." EDWARDS: vol. VI: p. 205.

3. "Our religion has cost much suffering. We have here a detail of extraordinary trials and sorrows in establishing it. It has always advanced, amidst sufferings, persecutions and martyrdoms. How many such men as Brainard and Martyn have sacrificed their lives to extend it round the world. All that *we* enjoy is the fruit of such toils and sacrifices, and we have not one Christian privilege which has not cost the life of many a martyr."

4. "We may infer the sincerity of such men and the truth of the cause in which they are engaged. They had nothing to gain by such sufferings, if they did not believe the facts on which their religion was founded. And as they could not be mistaken with respect to such palpable facts, their religion must be true." BARNES, abridged].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—VER. 1 HEDINGER:—The commendation of ourselves solely for the honor of God, to confound blasphemers or to defend truth and innocence, is in fact wisdom, although envious and uninformed persons may not so regard it or so represent it. When we see one boast of his person and of his merits from a spirit of pride, covetousness, or selfishness, and another only of his office, of the grace which has been shown to an unworthy sinner, or of what he has done entirely through grace, we cannot but see that the latter is a very different act from the former; for Satan has obtained no small advantage when he has deprived a Christian of his credit.—HEDINGER:—Never be grieved, if your doings and your zeal are evil spoken of. Know you not that most men carry a pope within themselves, *i. e.*, wilfulness, prejudice, passions? What hope can there be before such judges? Pray earnestly that God would rule in your heart, and keep you from all corrupt affections and views, and then go forward (1 Thess. ii. 4).—Ver. 2. As the high-priest under the Old Testament was forbidden to marry any one but a chaste virgin (Levit. xxi. 13), so Jesus will have only those who are pure and who will not play the harlot with the world (chap. vii. 1; 1 Pet. i. 22; Eph. v. 26–27). True ministers are Christ's paranymphs, to bring men to Christ, and to confirm them in spiritual wedlock.—Ver. 3. When we see men turn away from God's Word, wrest it from its true meaning, or disbelieve its promises or its threatenings, we may be sure that Satan is at work among them, and corrupting them (Luke viii. 12).—Ver. 4. Wo to such as teach their fellowmen to come to God by any other way than that of faith in Christ, for they are preaching a new and a false gospel.—Ver. 5. HEDINGER:—When God's honor and the welfare of your neighbor is suffering, do not hesitate to check the vile devil, and defy him, however lofty his pretentions.—Ver. 17. Better be poor and unknown than to harm the church and its work. The more humble, the more likely to be sincere! —Ver. 8. Churches should assist one another, as members of the same great body.—Ver. 9. Preachers should be ashamed to beg, but not to be poor.—Ver. 11. One of the best marks of a spiritual shepherd, is a fatherly love to his people. "God knoweth," is a real oath, and we need not be afraid to use it in attestation of the truth, but only when the cause is important, and nearly connected with God's honor. — Ver. 12. How many sins would never be committed, if we were more careful to remove all occasions for sin.— Vv. 13–15. HEDINGER:—Satan can put on the face of an angel, and hypocrites can prate smoothly of righteousness. To speak, to teach, and to preach fluently are no great things; but to work faithfully and zealously, and to have a right spirit, are of the utmost importance. Try the spirits! (1 Jno. iv. 1). Trust nothing to mere appearances, though angelic. Be satisfied with nothing but God's own Word, for that contains all you need for salvation. The damnation of heretics and of factions never slumbers (2 Pet. ii. 3).—Ver. 16. Preachers have the best of reasons for defending the honor of their office and their personal character against all who vilify them, for in this way good men are much aided, and bad men are effectually thwarted.— Ver. 19. HEDINGER:—We often bear more from those who deceive and seduce us, than from those who are faithful to us, and it is in this way that God punishes us for our sins (Amos v. 13).— Ver. 20. People are often obliged to yield to the devil a thousand fold, what they have withheld from Christ and His faithful ministers (Hos. ii. 8).—Ver. 21. If those who preach the Gospel, faithfully perform their duties, they will often be obliged to speak unwelcome truth, and expose errors, that those who oppose themselves may be put to shame.—Ver. 22. It is a great mercy, for which we cannot be too thankful, to belong to a good family.—Ver. 23. The highest glory of a minister and of every Christian, is to suffer and to be afflicted much for righteousness' sake (Rom. v. 3).—Ver. 25. Let us never cast away our confidence in God!—Ver. 26. You can never get away from perils; therefore, fear God and pray! God's best servants must not unfrequently experience severe trials from their own countrymen, and even from those of kindred faith.—Ver. 27. The more neglected a congregation has been, the severer the labor it will need for its spiritual cultivation. But let the servant of God be faithful, and the Lord will be his portion and his reward. The cares of a faithful minister will doubtless give him many a sleepless night; but

groaning and weeping before the Lord will at last restore him to rest and sleep —Ver. 28. God's true servants have frequently not an hour which is not occupied with preaching, instructing, counselling, visiting, comforting, praying, studying, *etc.*—Ver. 29. Those who have themselves acquired strength, skill, and experience, should sympathize with and strengthen those who are still weak in faith and practice. An earnest minister will have his righteous indignation and holy zeal enkindled when his people are made to stumble before his eyes.—Ver. 30. HEDINGER:—We should never boast of our sins, but if we have endured afflictions, and experienced Divine consolations, let these be our glory. —Ver. 31. A solemn affirmation or an oath, is in truth a prayer. If, therefore, it is right to pray, it is right to take an oath, if the honor of God, the good of our neighbor, and the cause of truth and righteousness demand it.—Vers. 32, 33. Even in extreme perils, and when every way and opening seems closed against us, God knows how to deliver us. But we should never rely upon extraordinary methods, as long as a way of escape, however singular, is possible to our own efforts.

BERLENB. BIBLE.—VER. 1. God has such a zeal for souls, that He will have them entirely to Himself. Christ has purchased them with His own blood and now He sends His servants to bring them to Him.—Ver. 3. There is no better preservative of our virginal simplicity and innocence, than a perpetual consciousness of our great perils. The devil, having crept like a serpent, into the inmost soul and poisoned it with corrupt imaginations, throws out from that central point, over every object some deceitful excitement to evil. He always has free access to our minds as long as our wills and inclinations are not in subjection to Christ. He can corrupt us only by turning us from our *simplicity with respect to Christ; i. e.*, from looking with a steady eye upon Him alone, as to our true and only Husband. This is that genuine chastity of the soul which depends upon Him alone, and allows nothing in the world to rival Him.—Ver. 12. It is no small part of our religion to guard against the assaults of the devil.—Ver. 13. Honesty and simplicity are characteristics of a genuine laborer. Those who fear no danger never try the spirits, for they have never proved their own selves.—Ver. 14. Had not Satan succeeded in concealing his own wickedness under forms of a self-imposed devotion and a worship adorned with every thing to flatter the human heart, he would never have kept the people for so long a time in fancied security and false peace. The light of God he has often withheld from the people under the pretence of some good intention or of communicating some higher knowledge.—Ver. 15. When godless men preach, and are heard and tolerated perhaps with delight, the devil has none to hinder him, and he comes as an angel of light and in the name of Christ, to destroy souls by the thousand.—No man can be a minister of Christ who is not himself a righteous man and who does not utter with his life what he speaks with his lips.—Ver. 19. Cunning men love most those who are like themselves.—Men are so blind that they would rather have bondage and a galling yoke of their fellowmen, than the sweet liberty of Christ. Those who enslave them to some human system, acquire more importance, authority and power than those who commend the easy yoke of Jesus.—Ver. 23. God brings out how much His saints endure, that men may see the difference between such sufferings, and those of which many boast, no small part of which were brought upon themselves by their own fault, and others were only imaginary.—Ver. 25. In Jesus Christ shame has been made honorable, pain awakens joy, and toils refresh us.—Ver. 26. The more an instrument is used in God's hands, the more polished it becomes, and when it needs repair He sharpens it by sufferings.—(Spiritual hints:) Ver. 26. Perils of murderers: the world, the flesh, and the devil, who endeavor to rob us of grace; in the city: from intercourse with every kind of men; in the wilderness: temptations of solitude.—Ver. 27. Troubles, for the sake of wisdom; hunger and thirst after God and his righteousness; fastings (Mark ii. 20), want of comfort; cold, the warmth of the Divine presence gone; nakedness, (within).—Ver. 28: It is a vain excuse when any allege that they cannot give themselves to prayer because they have so much to do.—Ver. 29. It should grieve me to hear of another's distress, and in his afflictions I should be afflicted.—When God is dishonored by prevailing wickedness and sins, it should be a fire in our hearts to consume us.—Ver. 30. The world is so much given to lying, that even an Apostle feared he would not be believed, unless he called God for a witness.

RIEGER:—VER. 3. We may see in the fall of our first parents, as in a glass, how much our souls are in danger of being seduced by lies. Without a direct intention to do wrong, one may be so utterly crazed that in the first place his understanding and then his heart is taken as it were by storm, his entire dependence upon Christ, and the supply of his fruitful energy from Christ is interrupted, and he imagines that he can make more rapid progress in some other way than by a simple dependence upon Christ. —Ver. 4. We always make a very different thing from the gospel when we attempt to improve what Christ has given us.—Ver. 7ff. The gospel of the heavenly kingdom can never be preached without a heavenly mind and a low estimate of earthly things.—Vv. 10, 11. The heart can be judged only by Him who searches the heart.—Ver. 12ff. The world never gives a good name to those who zealously oppose prevailing errors. The only virtue it sees in a minister is a moderation which is generally nothing but lukewarmness which is loathsome to our ascended Lord! But even if no one acknowledges the propriety of his course, he will consider it an honor that he cannot endure them that are evil, and that he is allowed to expose deceitful workers and to show that they are liars.—ver. 16ff. It is very difficult for a Christian to understand how he is bound by the spirit of Christ to esteem others better than himself, when he finds that he is abused by deceitful and arrogant persons, for this very lowliness of spirit, and is obliged to separate himself from them.

NEANDER:—VER. 30. The mental elevation of a Christian has its origin not like that of the Stoics in self-confidence but in the consciousness of human infirmity.—EWALD: A Christian

more inclined to glory in his infirmities than in his strength.—W. Hofacker: Vv. 23–30. The picture here given of the Apostle's life, is full of instruction, for the direction of our own hearts and lives: 1. In our own calm and peaceful times for the church of Christ, we should thankfully remember, the hard struggles, the bloody conflicts and the faithful constancy which others had to maintain, to secure for us this costly possession. 2. What an amount of painful privation and distressing experience was brought within the narrow limits and the feeble capacity of a single life. In such a light how pitiable and contemptible do we appear in our effeminate horror at suffering and our perpetual recoil from every cross. 3. The disciple of Christ can accomplish great and glorious things, if he will only make good use of his day of grace, and be thoroughly what he professes to be;—very appropriately our motto might be: No rest for the flesh! 4. In the outer man the Apostle was feeble and frail, and yet through this very weakness Christ's power was wonderfully glorified; on the same principle Christ now dispenses His Spirit and His gifts.

Heubner:—Ver. 1. It is indeed foolish to boast. No wise and humble man will condescend to it, but from necessity, for the cause of God and for the welfare of others.—Ver. 2. The holy zeal a pastor feels for his people, has its source in a pure love to God and not in personal vanity, *etc.* —None but the pure, deserve the bridal honor, and the figure of a "virgin," beautifully expresses the idea of a soul which loves none but Christ.—Ver. 3. Men listen with far greater pleasure to those corrupters who befool them and flatter their selfish passions, than to those who honestly tell them the truth. The simplicity which is in Christ, is that disposition which desires and believes in nothing but what Christ teaches and which gives no heed to any professed improvements upon this.—Ver. 4. Let no one wrest from thee a pure Christianity, for what better system can you have in its place?—Ver. 6. Fine words are not wisdom and are never enough to make a preacher. We must have something deeper for that.—Ver. 7. There is no surer way to mortify the pride of some persons than to make sacrifices in their behalf.—Ver. 13. Christianity has suffered more from unworthy professors, erroneous teachers, and hypocrites, than from open enemies. But by the side of every teacher of the truth, we shall always find some teacher of falsehood under the semblance of truth.—Ver. 14. If the evil spirit presented himself to men in his true form, they would be struck with horror. He therefore assumes some brilliant form that he may be received as an angel of light. His vilest ministers put on the face of saints, base pleasures assume the mask of love, eclipses of faith take the name of enlightenment, and an antipathy to the atonement puts on the semblance of a regard for strict morality. God permits the evil spirit in this manner to conceal his real form that his children may be trained to watchfulness and conflict.—Those who propagate error are Satan's real though often unconscious ministers.—Ver. 15. Satan's servants make use of the same tricks as their master; and as in the end their mask must be torn from them and they must be judged by God Himself, we may be sure that their punishment will be terrible.—Ver. 19. An honest and profound love feels its keenest torture when it sees its objects unconscious of their own corruption.—Ver. 20. False preachers leave to others the hard part of their work and then claim the credit and the benefit of its performance. They flatter and amuse men with the pretence of a better Christianity, and then wish to rule over and make a gain of God's people. But their object is the fleece and not the flock. And yet many are greatly pleased with just such preachers, because their selfish passions are gratified, and they are displeased with those who are in earnest and present the truth with earnestness. Accordingly those who mislead and deceive men find ready listeners while genuine preachers lose their power and influence, and true friends are easily mistaken and sacrificed for false.—Ver. 22. Those who esteem all things but loss for Christ, may yet when circumstances call for it, without inconsistency make use of every advantage of birth or fortune.—Ver. 23. In the performance of our duties there are various degrees with respect to the amount of service, the abundance of the labors, and the completeness of the performance. Some are satisfied when they do what is customary, indispensably necessary, or essential to their office; while others do that which is extraordinary. There are both phlegmatic and sanguine temperaments; and yet there can be in the sight of God no works of supererogation (Luke xvii. 10). It is one of the best marks of a faithful minister to be always in earnest and attentive to his duties.

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 2. The church consists of not many brides, but she is herself the only bride of Christ. The churches to which the Spirit spoke (Rev. ii. 7), were the Bride which, immediately after the Spirit, said, Come (Rev. xxii. 17)! Individual Christians and individual churches are allowed to remain together in the bridal chamber where Christ graciously dwells by the dispensation of his word and sacraments; and there they are all organized as distinct members into one great body, to be nourished and cherished by him as a wife by her husband and head (Eph. v. 29). Every division, whether among Christians of the same congregation, or among different congregations, is a division in this great body (1 Cor. xii. 25) and impairs the bridal purity of the virgin to be presented to Christ.—Ver. 13. Those who wickedly resolve to see nothing in the world but black, shall have their reward in seeking nothing but black. The slanderous disposition of the enemies of truth, is a sure sign that their damnation slumbers not.—Ver. 14. Tertullian called Satan "God's ape." All the mysterious names which the god of this world (Eph. ii. 2) has written upon his forehead, such as enlightenment, progress, freedom, equality, education, *etc.*, are only new forms of the old serpent's words.—Ver. 15. The only security against wandering into unrighteousness and a godless life, is a faithful adherence to the righteousness which is by faith in Christ Jesus.—The voice of the Spirit, through our Epistle, speaks not to the Corinthian Church alone but to every church and to every age of Christendom. It is a perpetual call upon the Bride to be ever on her guard against the plausible insinuations of the

old serpent, lest her mind should be corrupted from the simplicity into which Christ has called us by His Gospel. Oh happy he who yields himself unreservedly to Christ and follows Him with all the heart!—Ver. 20. In every instance where men have been led away from the church and from Christ its head, God has visited upon the apostate people the evils which are mentioned in this passage. In every age, just as in Corinth, false teachers endeavor to alienate the people from God's true ministers, by accusing these of crimes which are calculated to destroy their influence. But no sooner do they succeed in making their dupes completely dependent upon them, than they are themselves guilty of the very crimes which they had falsely charged upon others.—Vv. 23–27. Drones are seldom seen where the working bees are collecting honey.

[Paul's personal vindication of himself. Introduction: apology for pursuing the subject, vv. 1–4. 1. His love for them, and his jealousy—he had brought them to Christ, ver. 2, and he had grounds for apprehension, ver. 3. 2. He had no reason to expect they would gain by the change, ver. 4. I. *His claim*, vv. 5, 6. 1. Equality with the best, ver. 5. 2. Especially in knowledge of Divine things, ver. 6 *a*. 3. In those practical proofs which demonstrated his Apostleship, ver. 6 *b*. II. *His proofs*, vv. 7–33 Not in great dignities and shining qualities, ver 7, but in, 1. His disinterested love to the Church, vv. 7–21, (1) he had given up his rights to a support, (and to supply their defect, had (*a*) exhausted himself, Acts xviii. 3, and (*b*) robbed others, ver. 8; (2) he had been actuated by a sincere love to them, not by indifference nor pride, vv. 11, 12, and (3) his course was in favorable contrast with that of his opponents, vv. 13–22 (for notwithstanding their outward show, they were no better (much less) than he, ver. 12, and they were as bad as they accused him of being, vv. 20, 21). 2. His relations to the covenant people of God, ver. 22. 3. His conduct as a minister of Christ, vv. 23–33; here he was superior to them, not in things of which men usually boast, but in labors, ver. 23, in sufferings, vv. 23–27, in cares, ver. 28, in zeal for those in peril, ver. 29, and in the humble use of means for his deliverance, vv. 31–33].

XV.—HIS REVELATIONS AS A GROUND FOR BOASTING (1ff.). HOW HE HAD BEEN KEPT FROM SELF-EXALTATION, AND BEEN LED TO GLORY IN HIS INFIRMITIES (7ff.). HOW HE OUGHT TO HAVE BEEN SAVED THE NECESSITY OF SUCH SELF-COMMENDATION BY THE CORINTHIANS THEMSELVES (11ff.).

Chapter XII. 1–18.

It is not expedient for me doubtless to glory, [I must needs[1] boast: it is not expe-
2 dient for me, for[2]] I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew
[know, *οἶδα*] a man in Christ above [*om.* above] fourteen years ago, (whether in the
body, I cannot tell [know not, *οἶδα*], or whether out of the body, I cannot tell [know
not]; God knoweth): such an one caught up to [even unto, *ἕως*] the third heaven.
3 And I knew [know] such a man, (whether in the body, or out of [apart from, *χωρὶς*][3]
4 the body, I cannot tell [know not[4]]; God knoweth: How [*om.* how] that he was
caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a
5 [*om.* a, *ἀνθρώπῳ*] man to utter. Of such a one will I glory: yet of myself I will not
6 glory, but in mine[5] infirmities. For though I would [should] desire to glory, I shall
not be a fool; for I will say the truth: but *now* [*om.* now] I forbear, lest any man
should think of me above that which he seeth me *to be*, or[6] *that* he heareth of [from,
7 *ἐξ*] me. And lest[7] I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the
revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger [an angel,
8 *ἄγγελος*] of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure.[8] For [concerning, *ὑπὲρ*] this thing [angel] I besought the Lord thrice, that it [he] might de-
9 part from me. And He [hath, *εἴρηκέν*] said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee:
for my [*om.* my[9]] strength is made perfect[10] in weakness. Most gladly therefore will
I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest [abide] upon me
10 Therefore I take pleasure [am well contented, *εὐδοκῶ*] in infirmities, in reproaches, in
necessities, in persecutions, in[11] distresses for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then
11 am I strong. I am become a fool in glorying [*om.* in glorying[12]]; ye have compelled
me: for I ought to have been commended of you: for in nothing am [was, *ὑστέρησα*] I

behind the very chiefest [these overmuch, *ὑπερλίαν*] apostles, though I be nothing.
12 Truly the signs of an Apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in [by[13]] signs
13 and wonders and mighty deeds. For what is it wherein ye were inferior[14] to other churches, except *it be* that I myself was not burdensome to you? forgive me this
14 wrong. Behold, the[15] third time I am ready to come to you; and I will not be burdensome to you [*om.* to you[16]]: for I seek not yours, but you: for the children ought
15 not to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children. And I will very gladly spend and be spent for you [your souls, *τῶν ψυχῶν*]; though [if, *εἰ*[17]] the more
16 abundantly I love you, the less I be loved. But be it so, I did not burden you:
17 nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with guile. Did I make a gain of you by any
18 of them whom I sent unto you? I desired [besought, *παρεκάλεσα*] Titus [to go to you] and with *him* I sent a [the] brother. Did Titus make a gain of you? walked we not in the same spirit? *walked we* not in the same steps?

[1] Ver. 1.—Rec. and Tisch. have δὴ, others δὲ. The best authorities are in favor of δεῖ. The apparent want of connection gave occasion for changing it into δὴ, δὲ, εἰ—δεῖ (δεῖ was not transferred from chap. xi. 30). [Authorities *now* seem evenly balanced between the *three*. Δὴ has in its favor K. M., most of the cursives, the Arm. vers., and (on such a point) the powerful testimony of *all* the Greek Fathers; δὲ has D. (1st hand) Sin. 114, Copt. Slav. and Latin versions, and Theophyl.; and δεῖ has B. D. (3d hand) E. F. G. L. Sin. (3d hand), many cursives, the Syr. Arm. Vulg. Ital. verss., and Ambrosiast. But as Tisch. suggests, B. is evidently corrupted here by (εἰ—καὶ), and δὲ and δεῖ were most likely to be derived from δὴ, and as the most difficult reading, and the one most consistent with the ironical style of this section, the latter has much the best internal evidence. It is adopted by Bloomf., de Wette, Reiche, Alford, Wordsworth, Conybeare, and Hodge, while Lachmann, Meyer, Osiander, and Stanley adopt δεῖ].

[2] Ver. 1.—Lachmann has οὐ *συμφέρον μὲν, ἐλεύσομαι δὲ* (B. δὲ καὶ), on authorities by no means the highest. [B. F. G. Sin. some curss. and verss. (the Copt. Latin Fathers, Damasc. and Vulg., add καὶ with B.)]. The Rec. οὐ *συμφέρει μοι· ἐλεύσ.* γὰρ is the more difficult reading on account of γὰρ, and *μὲν—δὲ* are evidently corrections to make the sense clearer. [The reading *συμφέρον* can only be retained with *μὲν—δὲ*. The variations are very considerable here, but the Rec. is sustained by most of the uncials and cursives, and especially by the verss. (except the Lat. and Vulg.) and the Greek Fathers; and if original it most easily accounts for the variations].

[3] Ver. 3.—Rec. has ἐκτός, but it was probably taken from ver. 2; for *χωρίς* is well sustained. [Sin. D. (2d and 3d hand) E. (2d hand) F. G. K. L. M. have ἐκτός; but B. D. (1st hand), E. (1st hand) and Method. have *χωρίς*].

[4] Ver. 3.—Lachmann leaves out οὐκ οἶδα, but without sufficient authority [only that of the Vatican and Methodius].

[5] Ver. 5.—Lachm. throws out *μου*, but on insufficient evidence. [The only important MSS. for the omission are B. D. (1st hand), with the Copt. Syr. (both) and Arm. versions; while D. (3d hand) E. F. G. K. L. M. Sin. Vulg. and the Fathers insert it].

[6] Ver. 6.—Τι is wanting in many, and even in some of the better MSS. [B. D. (3d hand) E. (2d hand) F. G. Sin. Vulg.]; but it probably was omitted because it disturbed the sense of the passage, or at least seemed superfluous.

[7] Ver. 7.—Before the first ἵνα Lachmann inserts διὸ after A. B. F. G. [and Sin.], *et al.* But "it was probably an interpolation, to disconnect this sentence with the preceding." [The words καὶ *τῇ ὑπερβ. τῶν ἀποκ.* were united in sense with εἰ *μὴ ἐν ταῖς ἀσθεν.* (ver. 5), making ἐὰν—γὰρ ἐξ ἐμου a parenthesis, and then Διὸ ἵνα *μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι.* (ver. 7) began a new sentence. It must be conceded that the documentary evidence for this word is now very strong, and Stanley has adopted it. If it is accepted, the punctuation which is mentioned above must also be adopted, *viz.*: "I will not glory except in my infirmities, and in the abundance of my revelations. Wherefore, also, lest I should be exalted above measure, there was given." *etc.*].

[8] Ver. 7. Some important MSS. [A. D. E. F. G. Sin. 17, and many versions and fathers] leave out ἵνα *μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι*, from not recognizing the emphasis which the Apostle meant to give by the repetition of these words (Meyer).

[9] Ver. 9.—Rec. after *δύναμις* inserts *μου*, which deserves to be retained, though left out by important MSS., on account of its necessity to the sense. It might easily have been overlooked after—*ρις*—*μις*. [And yet B. D. F. G. Sin. and many verss. and fathers (Tisch., Bengel, Lachm., Stanley) omit it].

[10] Ver. 9.—Τελεῖται is well authenticated [with A. B. D. F. Sin.]. Rec. τελειοῦται was doubtless a gloss [with D. (3d hand) K. L. Sin. (3d hand) Orig. and Athan.].

[11] Ver. 10.—Both B. and Sin. leave out ἐν before *στενοχωρίαις*].

[12] Ver. 11.—Rec. has *καυχώμενος* after ἄφρων; an exegetical addition, and feebly sustained [with only L., many cursives, the Goth. and Syr. (both) versions, and some Greek Fathers].

[13] Ver. 12.—Rec. has ἐν before *σημείοις*, but according to the preponderance of evidence [A. B. D. F. Sin., *et al.*] it should be erased; it was a repetition from the preceding clause.

[14] Ver. 13.—Instead of ἠττήθητε Lachm. has ἠσσώθητε; but the latter was evidently an error of the transcribers. [B. D. Sin. 17 (Alford) have ἠσσωθ. Tisch. with A. D. (2d and 3d hand) K. L. and the Greek Fathers have ἠττήθ.].

[15] Ver. 14.—We are not certain about τοῦτο. [Rec. omits it, but it is given in A. B. F. G. Sin. Ital. Vulg. Goth. Syr. Arm. Æth. and most of the fathers]. It has different positions, being sometimes before, and sometimes after *τρίτον*. Perhaps taken from chap. xiii. 1.

[16] Ver. 14.—Rec. after *καταναρκ.* has ὑμῶν. Some MSS. have ὑμᾶς. Neither were original [A. B. Sin., *et al.* omit both].

[17] Ver. 15.—εἰ καὶ. A. B. F. G. [Sin.] have only εἰ, and a number of MSS. leave both words entirely out. Exeget. explanations.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 1–6.—It is necessary to boast; it is not for my advantage, for I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. —Although we should not regard the Apostle as precisely breaking off from a special history commenced in the last two verses (Meyer), he certainly passes now to a new subject of boasting (*καύχησις*). In a preface composed of short sentences grammatically unconnected (asyndeton) but logically arranged, he declares that under the circumstances he could not avoid self-commendation, but that in a moral respect it was not expedient, inasmuch as it exposed him to the temptation to exalt himself (comp. vers. 7ff.). Λεῖ must be taken in an absolute sense, equivalent to, *it must be so*. It is not necessary to connect *μοι* with it. The γάρ introduces the reason why he once more speaks in self-commendation. It is that he was about to relate something which might incline him to an unprofitable self-exaltation (comp. ver. 7). With less simplicity, Meyer thinks that because boasting was unprofitable, Paul was anxious to pass on to something in which there was no self-commendation (ver. 5), and he thinks that *οὐ συμφέρει μοι* is thus accounted for and justified, although he himself notices what the Apostle says in ver. 7 of self-exaltation on account of the abundance of the revelations. If we adopt the reading of the Receptus, the idea of

the Apostle would be: Truly it is not expedient for me to glory (comp. chap. xi. 1, 17, 30). The reason for this he would assign by pointing to the elevating character of his subsequent glorying, for it is implied that the danger would be more imminent, the more exalted the boast and its object was. Thus Osiander, who adheres to the Receptus, explains it, but essentially concedes that the original clause with δεῖ would have seemed so very abrupt, and the asyndeton so unusually harsh, that a plausible reason was presented for a change. It will not do to lay the emphasis upon μοι, as if Paul had meant that it was not for his own, but for their good that he boasted himself (*i. e.*, to correct their judgment respecting himself, Reiche), for this would have required οὐκ ἐμοί, or ἐμαυτῷ, or at least ἐμοί, instead of μοι.* The things of which he now begins to speak are visions and revelations of the Lord (ὀπτασίαι καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις κυρίου). Κυρίου is the genitive, not of the object, but of the subject [*i. e.*, not *respecting*, but *from*, the Lord]. Nothing is said in the context which implies that the transaction here spoken of was a vision of Christ, in which the Lord was revealed to him (the way of speaking is different in 1 Cor. ix. 1; Gal. i. 16). Christ had given him disclosures and revelations of himself (1 Cor. xiv. 6). The visions (ὀπτασίαι), however, describe the form in which he had received them. No further nor profounder disclosures are intended by the revelations (ἀποκάλυψεις) than by the visions (ὀπτασίαι). Osiander thinks that the words describe two ways in which supersensual objects are presented: one by a figurative apparition for the eye, and the other by means of sound for the ear. The *Berlenb. Bible* makes *visions* refer to those representations of heavenly forms which the Holy Ghost makes to the inward spirit of man, in a Divine light and in a spiritual manner; and *revelations* (the higher manifestation) to that thorough enlightenment of the mind and heart by the Holy Ghost in which we learn the true mind of the Spirit. W. F. Besser: From the very commencement of his Christian experience, the Lord had allowed Paul to see in visions and to hear in revelations those mysteries which belonged to a world invisible and imperceptible to the external sense. By Christ's own appearance to him at first (Acts xxii. 15; xxvi. 16), his want of outward evidence through the eye and ear had been made up to him in an extraordinary manner, and his authority had been made equal to that of the twelve Apostles. The visions (ὀπτασίαι) may designate the general form in which the revelation was made, but in addition to them an explanation of the visible objects was given by words addressed to the ear (as in the prophetical visions). We feel obliged, with Meyer, to maintain that we have no evidence that Paul had in view here some pretensions of his opponents with respect to which he wishes to show that he had the advantage of them, for nothing in the context seems to imply that his object was to show that an external acquaintance with Christ was unnecessary to the Apostolical character (Baur), nor to show that he was quite equal to the Christ-party who boasted largely of visions. **I know a man in Christ, fourteen years ago (whether in the body I know not, or whether out of the body I know not, God knows), such a one was rapt as far as the third heaven** (ver. 2). The Apostle here affords a specimen of what he had just given only an intimation. It is certainly inconsistent with the context and with the general aim of the writer to maintain that he was here giving an account of some other person than himself.* It was perfectly accordant with the nature of the occurrence

[* Wordsworth still thinks that μοι is emphatic in contrast with ὀπτασίας κ. ἀποκαλύψεις, and with κυρίου (hence each of these words are contrasted in position at the end of their respective sentences): to glory is not proper or expedient for one like me; I will now, therefore, proceed to such things as have been vouchsafed to me by the Lord. Alford thinks that Paul did actually desist from all boasting here, and that he now proceeds to give a vision and revelation which was intended to show the folly of it (γάρ); Stanley, that Paul intended here to cease all boasting of himself, but that the necessities of his position repeatedly overcame his reluctance, and betrayed him into boasting again, though more and more of things which really humbled him. Dr. Hodge also thinks that Paul did actually desist at this point, and came to such things as involved no real boasting, but rather a personal humiliation and a recital of God's goodness. Indeed, most of the interpretations, though resting upon different readings and explanations of the words and connection, come finally to the same thought in only different shades. There are contrasted, what was necessary to his position with what was proper and useful to his person: what related to him as a carnal man with what related to his infirmities as a spiritual man; and what was done by him with what was done by the Lord. He therefore says: I know that boasting of myself is not calculated to benefit me in the higher sense as an individual, but I am compelled by the circumstances in which you Corinthians are, to do something which would ordinarily be so called,—and yet what I have to say will only be humiliating to me as a man, while it tells what wonderful things God has done for me, and proves conclusively my claims as one of the highest Apostles. W. F. Besser: "The '*high Apostles*' at Corinth could lay no claim to such things as had been mentioned in the preceding chapter, but they spoke much of their numerous visions and revelations. What had the Apostle to set off against these? He would have told the truth if he had spoken of many of his glorious revelations, but he would allude only to one, of which he had hitherto been silent, at least among the Corinthians; and of this he would speak only in a way to show the evident difference between a modest discourse and a carnal prating of personal distinctions. He had experienced a holy joy when his faith in the invisible realities of the Christian hope had been strengthened by a holy trance, but he was not inclined to describe in a wordy style what he had then seen and heard. He was rather disposed to bring forward an humbling incident connected with it, in which he became painfully conscious of his sinful infirmity,—a thorn in the flesh, an angel of Satan, and an earnest prayer,—when he had been favored with a promise of inexpressible consolation, and was led to boast that when he was weak in himself, he was strong in the Lord." He thus shows that a spiritual grace obtained even by a painful experience was of far greater value than the most exalted outward privilege].

[* And yet *J. E. C. Schmidt*, of Giessen, in his Clavis on the N. T., has maintained this opinion with no little degree of plausibility. His main points are, the repeated declaration of the Apostle that he was not boasting of himself, his use of the third person, the strong contrast between τοῦ τοιούτου and ἐμαυτοῦ in ver. 5, and his assertion that he would spare his readers (φείδομαι) this very thing. According to him, the course of thought is: 'It is *not* expedient for me to boast: I will come to those visions and revelations of which my opponents make so much. I am reminded of a man whom I knew long since (and who perhaps was claimed by Paul's opponents to be of their party). Of such a thing (neuter), or of such a man (masculine), I am prepared to boast, as of an incident or person in which is shown the extent of the grace I preach. I also might personally boast of such things without vanity, for I should say the truth,—but of myself *I will not*, except of my infirmities, lest any one should think of me above what he sees me to be. And lest I should be exalted above measure for these revelations (from the detail of which I forbear), there was given to me a thorn,' *etc.* This view would avoid the appearance of inconsistency in the Apostle *i. e.*, of refusing to boast, and yet appearing continually to do so, but it seems altogether too constrained, especially in its explanation of ὑπὲρ τ. τοιούτου κανχ. in ver. 5].

for him to speak of such an occurrence in the third person, inasmuch as the individual spoken of was in a passive state, and might seem in his normal state of activity as another person (Meyer). Osiander suggests that his own proper person had become estranged to him in his ecstatic state, and was here conceived of as still remaining with the Lord. [Οἶδα should be translated, not: *I knew*, but: *I know*]. It may be doubted whether the word has any special emphasis, as if the Apostle intended to give prominence to his complete certainty about a fact which might be questioned by many on account of its extraordinary character (Osiander). *A man in Christ* signifies a Christian, and not a minister of Christ. He is not, indeed, expressly speaking of himself. NEANDER: "It is an expression in which Paul distinguishes between that which he had become by the grace of God and that which was merely human in himself." There is, however, no very obvious contrast between the humble '*man*' and the exalted character of the revelation. *In Christ* indicates that the man was in the great general fellowship of the common faith. The words imply nothing connected with the ecstasy, and still less do they have a special bearing against the suspicion of a demoniac ecstasy. The precise statement of the time belongs to ἁρπαγέντα (from which it is separated only by a parenthesis: εἴτε—οἶδεν), and not to ἀνθρ. ἐν χριστῷ, as if he had intended to say, a man who has been serving Christ fourteen years. The reason he so accurately specifies it was, that the occurrence was particularly important to him, and peculiarly appropriate to his representation of what pertained to a third person. There can be no reference here to events attending his conversion, which must have taken place from seventeen to eighteen or even twenty years before the composition of this Epistle. Even if chronology were not against supposing that he here referred to the appearance in the Temple mentioned in Acts xxii. 17–21, the facts related in the two visions are essentially so different that we cannot suppose them the same. The only way to meet this is (with Osiander) to suppose that there were different elements in this ecstasy, and that what is here mentioned was only the culminating point. With this view it would be chronologically connected with chap. xi. 32–33. [ALFORD: "The date probably refers back to the time when he was at Tarsus waiting for God to point out his work, between Acts ix. 30 and xi. 25." WORDSWORTH says: "Fourteen years, reckoned inclusively, carry us back to the time of St. Paul's ordination to the Apostleship of the Gentiles, which must not be confounded with the time of his conversion to Christianity." "Probably this vision and revelation were vouchsafed to him *then*, because he was going forth for the first time to incur shame and suffering," and they were not communicated *to the world* until fourteen years afterwards, and even then only as facts and not in detail, because they were designed only for *him*, and for such a purpose. On this use of πρὸ, Webster says: "The primary idea of πρό is, *in sight*, and it is applied to what is *before one*, in some place opposite, *in view*. From this meaning it passes on to denote priority in time, and so with a trajection in its use it signifies here, *before*, in time." *Syntax and Synn.* p. 160]. We have no other account of what is here related. With respect to the manner in which it took place, the Apostle was entirely uncertain. He was not sure that the soul retained any connection with the body. The latter may have been raised by the Spirit's power along with Paul's spirit into heavenly regions, or this connection may have been for the time dissolved, and his spirit rapt away from its earthly tenement. In a word, the whole person, composed of his soul and his body together, or his soul alone, separate from his body (or at least without any of its external functions) was lifted up into a celestial world. Ἁρπαγέντα signifies much more than the different varieties of subjective mental vision, whether accompanied by bodily mental perceptions or not. The uncertainty here expressed does not refer to the question, whether this was a mere vision (ἐν), or an actual trance of the spirit (ἐκτός). Any doubt on such a point would have seriously impaired the importance of the occurrence itself (comp. Meyer, Osiander). We have no means of determining to which of these suppositions, the ἐν or the ἐκτός) the Apostle was most inclined. But the whole representation which he gives makes it probable that the ascent was real and in actual space, and not merely ideal.* Εἴτε, εἴτε have here the sense of: whether, or whether. Ἁρπαγῆναι, is spoken of sudden, involuntary removals from one place to another (comp. Acts viii. 39; Rev. xii. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 17), [and it here implies great celerity and the power of some external force].—**And I know such a man (whether in the body or out of the body I know not, God knows); that he was caught up into Paradise** (vv. 3, 4 *a.*).—In the words, *such a man* (τὸν τοιοῦτον) the Apostle recurs to the subject of the ecstasy, the one he had before described as the man in Christ. Osiander, thinks that the phrase, *such a man*, contains an allusion to the fact, that he is now endowed with qualities which fitted him for such an exaltation. The point reached in the course of his ecstasy under the influence of the higher power (the Spirit of God) which had taken possession of him, he calls the third heaven (τρίτος οὐρανός). This is not to be interpreted spiritually of the utmost degree of Divine knowledge, *etc.* (the number three being taken simply as a symbol of perfection), for the Apostle had un-

[* "We may conceive the soul to receive a supernatural vision, either while it remaineth still in the body, or by its departing from the body for a season. The latter may not be called a death, because either the sensitive, or at least the vegetative, soul or faculty continues meanwhile in the body, either naturally or miraculously vivificating it. Again, we may conceive a man's spirit remaining in the body, to receive such visions, two several ways: either by a real rapture of both body and spirit into that place, whereof the soul or spirit hath such a vision; or else by a representation of such things really absent to the spirit, neither the body nor it changing at all their place; yet, as in dreams, the spirit apprehending a change of place, and a presence of the whole person to those persons and things, which it spiritually and supernaturally, and by the power of God, not by any operation of nature or fancy, beholds. This last, if not only, most commonly happeneth: and thus St. Paul's rapture will be most agreeable with other Scripture-rapts. Rev. i. 10; xvii. 3; xxi. 10; Acts xii. 11; Ezek. viii. 3."—Old Paraphrase and Annott. on Paul's Epistles, published by the Oxford Angl. Society. "The infusion of spiritual influences suspends at the same time the usual succession of ideas and the ordinary current of thought; the power of imagination alone remaining active, and the sense of spiritual vision being excited to the highest degree of intensity."—LEE *on Inspiration.*]

questionably in his mind a higher sphere of the heavenly world. A plurality of heavens is not inconsistent with Scriptural doctrine, for something of the kind is implied even in the plural (heavens, *οὐρανοί*) here used, and in the description (Heb. iv. 14) of Christ's ascension, in which He is said to have passed into the heavens *διεληλυθέναι τοὺς οὐρανούς*), the termination of which is described (Heb. ix. 24) as an entrance into heaven itself (*εἰσελθεῖν εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐράνόν*), *i. e.*, into the dwelling place of the Divine Majesty, to which the heavens he had passed through were related, just as the sanctuary in the tabernacle was related to the holy of holies. Jewish tradition generally speaks of seven heavens (Rabbi Judah alone speaks of two). To such common views and forms of speech the Apostle doubtless had some reference, but the original idea must be distinguished from the arbitrary and monstrous details of the Rabbinical writers. As neither here nor elsewhere (except in some later ecclesiastical writers, who probably derived their views from the passage before us) is it necessarily implied that there were no more than three heavens, this third need not, of course, be regarded as the highest heaven. Neither here nor in Heb. iv. 14 must we suppose the allusion to be to some region of the visible heavens (the clouds, *etc.*), but to some supersensous space between the stellar and the highest heaven, the true holy of holies (comp. RIEM, *d. Lehrbegr. des Hebr. Br. p.* 512). And yet we must unquestionably make a distinction between this higher region called the third heaven, and the place called Paradise although it does not follow that the former must of course be a lower region than the latter). It does not seem probable that what is said in vv. 3 and 4, should be a mere repetition of what had been said in ver. 2.* On the other hand the Apostle probably speaks in vv. 3 and 4 of a higher degree of ecstasy than that which he had mentioned in the other. And yet the Paradise was not exactly some interior department of the third heaven, but some higher region, that which is called in Rev. ii. 7 the Paradise of God (the lower department in Sheol, Luke xxiii. 43, comp. Luke xvi. 23). OSIANDER: "The abode in which the highest peace and joy are enjoyed, where fellowship with God and the God-man is most intimate, and where the world of spirits has its most delightful and most perfect development." NEANDER: "Paul here describes a higher degree of life in God, a foretaste of that which the soul will reach at a later period, no illusion of the imagination or product of Jewish superstition, but a certain and actual exaltation of the soul. And yet we may here distinguish between the supernatural and the divine on the one hand and the human on the other, and we may concede that the representation here given to the Apostle was in that form which was most familiar to him in his actual state of mind at the time."—**And heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for man to utter** (ver. 4 *b*).—It is evident from the use of the word *ἤκουσεν* that *ῥῆμα* cannot here be equivalent to *things*, but that it must mean *a word*. But *ἄρρητον* signifies, not what cannot be expressed, for then the words could not have been perceived, but as the relative sentence immediately following shows, words of such mysterious import as ought not to be uttered or to be generally known. In this sense the word is used in Herod. and other writers. Ἐξόν is equivalent not to *δυνατόν* but to *fas est*. —The substance of the communication was so exalted that it would have been a profanation to give it in human language. W. F. BESSER: "It is likely that the substance of the heavenly words was taken up by the Apostle as he heard them, but he felt that no man after receiving such a communication in successive details, could find language adequately and worthily to express what he had heard in that sacred presence. And even if God had given him power to express on earth what he had heard in heaven, there were no earthly ears which could intelligently receive the communication." We cannot accept of Ewald's explanation, that the reason Paul determined to keep these revelations to himself (revelations, as he thinks likely, of the final victory of Christ over Rome and heathenism, and also over Jerusalem and the Jews), was because he saw that other men might easily be led to pervert them in many ways and then to obtain credit on his authority. [These words were "unspeakable," (not only to *him* but to *man*) perhaps on account of their nature, but as Paul tells us that it was not "lawful to utter" them, we must suppose that he was restrained from *uttering* them principally by a moral reason. The whole vision appears to have been intended for the Apostle alone, to prepare him personally for his work, and for this reason *alone* he had no occasion to speak of it for fourteen years, and never to speak of its contents. The apocryphal literature of subsequent times, shows what follies the minds of men are inclined to, on such mysteries. (See the *ἀναβάτικον Παύλου* used by the sect of Caïani, mentioned by Epiphanius, Haeres: 18,

[*The reasons for this opinion are not given by our author, and seem to us not quite sufficient. The apparent repetition in the text is partially accounted for by the intervention of the parenthesis, and partially by the peculiarly abrupt and animated style which the recollection of the event occasioned. If the transaction mentioned in vv. 3, 4 was different from that mentioned in ver. 2, then Paradise must be a different place from the third heaven, as is contended for by Grotius and many Lutheran and English divines. The question then must arise, why was the visit to Paradise mentioned last, as if this were a higher sphere than that of the third heaven? If Paradise is (as all agree, and as Luke xxiii. 43 and Rev. ii. 7, compel us to believe), the abode of departed saints immediately after death, and if the third heaven is a different locality (as usually held by those who make this distinction, the abode of saints after the resurrection), we naturally inquire why was the visit to the lower sphere made after that to the higher? If we answer with Bp. Taylor (Fun. *Serm.* on Sir. G. Dalston Vol. II. p. 135), Bp. Bull (Works, Vol. I. Ser. III. p. 89), and Wordsworth, that "the vision of the heavenly glory would not have satisfied Paul since it was to be attained only at the distant period of the resurrection, and hence that he was shown something to be entered upon immediately after death;" not to insist on the fact that the prospect of the Parousia was not so very distant to the mind of Paul, we may suggest that this only shows that he needed to see Paradise at some time, but not necessarily to see it *last*. The view of Augustine, Thomas, Estius and Calvin seems to us more strictly conformed to our passage, *viz.*, that the third heaven included the whole world of the blessed, (the Father's house with its many mansions) in some part (not necessarily some more *interior* part) of which was Paradise where the ascended Jesus abides with His saints. (Bengel: some inner recess in the third heaven, rather than the third heaven itself; an opinion very generally held by the ancients. See Greg. Obs. c. 18.) Whether the latter is different from the home which the saints are to possess after the resurrection is not determined by ver. 4, in which we recognize simply a more specific designation of the place than in ver. 2.]

38). But nothing in this passage implies that the Apostle possessed any arcana or mysteries on the general subject of salvation, which are to be withheld as dangerous matters, from common inspection, and yet capable of investigation to more philosophical and learned persons.] Ἀνθρώπῳ is not the object of λαλεῖν but is governed by ἐξόν. There are no means of determining whether Paul was brought to this conclusion by an express command with regard to it, or whether he saw its propriety without such a command. The speaker, however, must have been the Lord, comp. ver. 1, ἀποκ. κυρίου. What was said must have been very significant and eminently strengthening to the Apostle's mind (comp. Osiander).—Instead of proceeding to say now: ἐν τούτῳ (of such a thing) καυχήσομαι, as must have been in his mind, he says, in accordance with the mode of representation commenced in ver. 2. **Of such a one will I glory** (ver. 5).—Τοῦ τοιούτου is not neuter but masculine. This is proved not only by ὑπέρ which has relation to a person in whose behalf the boasting must take place (chap. vii. 14, v. 12, viii. 24), but by the contrasted ἐμαυτοῦ, and the unmistakable reference to τὸν τοιοῦτον in vers. 2 and 3.—The principle which lies at the basis of the whole passage is, that he was not to boast of such revelations, as though they argued anything in his own favor, but only as an incident connected with a man in Christ, who had been at this period completely lifted out of his own individuality and had been thought worthy of such grace merely on account of his being in Christ. His only object in condescending to this boasting of such a one, was that he might bear witness that such glorious things had been granted to such a one.—**But of myself I will not boast, save in my infirmities** (ver. 5 *b*).—In behalf of himself, (regarded simply as himself), he would boast only with reference to his infirmities (comp. chap. xi. 30). He alluded here to those many manifestations of human weakness, which had occasioned so much humiliation to him, which had completely extirpated all vanity from his bosom, and which had finally compelled him to boast only of that divine power which evinced its greatness through his infirmities, (comp. vv. 9, 10.).—**For if I shall desire to boast, I shall not be foolish, for I will speak the truth** (ver. 6 *a*).—There is some difficulty here in determining the connection which the γάρ implies with ver. 5. To make it refer back to the first half of that verse, and thus to make the Apostle begin to reveal his identity with the man in Christ (Osiander) does not seem after all very probable. And yet to supply something to οὐ καυχησομαι (ver. 5) by which it shall mean: I will not boast of these great revelations, and to make εἰ μή signify *but only*, and then in this ver. 6 to make *if I should desire to boast* refer to the same things with the additional thought: although I could thus boast (De Wette), seems very harsh. We would prefer, without any such completion of the sense, to understand before the words οὐ καυχ. εἰ μή, *etc.*, in ver. 5, simply: I could thus boast concerning myself if I wished to do so (*i. e.*, of my worth and merits), and to suppose that when he continues, *if I should desire, etc.*, he is giving the reason for this thought which had sprung from what is obviously implied in the sentence itself (Meyer). But, perhaps after all it would be simpler to make the γάρ refer to the whole of ver. 6, so that the writer would have already in view the subsequent φείδομαι, and the sentence connected with it: I will not boast of myself except of my infirmities; for although I should not be a fool even if I were to boast myself, inasmuch as I should tell the truth, yet I forbear, lest, *etc.* Or: not because I should be a fool, if I were inclined to boast myself, *etc.*, but because I would guard against, *etc.* In this case there would be no need of adding anything to the thought expressed.—The boasting (καυχήσασθαι) has reference to something the reverse of weakness, and hence to deeds (comp. 1. Cor. xv. 10) in which power was exhibited. In ἄφρων (*senseless, without reason*) he alludes probably to the empty boasting of his opponents, in which there was no basis of truth like that in his self-commendations—**but I forbear, lest any one should reckon of me above what he sees me to be or hears from me** (ver. 6 b).—There is no need here of supplying ὑμῶν to φείδομαι; along with μή (or in the infinitive) this verb has the sense of: to shrink back or to act with reserve, *i. e.* to deal sparingly with his self-commendation. In μή we have certainly the idea of mental care (Meyer: of guarding against something). This anxiety, however, was well founded, so far as it referred to the inclination to boast in men then so strong among the Corinthians, and the Apostle did not wish to encourage in any way a disposition against which he had so earnestly contended. Τις has reference to no particular individual, for we have no reason to suppose that he is here aiming at some Pauline party at Corinth. The over-valuation of his person which he here deprecates, he expresses in the words *beyond what he sees me, or hears something from me* (ὑπὲρ ὃ βλέπει με ἢ ἀκούει τι ἐξ ἐμοῦ) *i. e.*, beyond the immediate impression which my personal presence would make. There is no necessity of supplying either εἶναι or ποιεῖν, after ὃ βλέπει με, which has reference to his whole appearance, his bearing and behavior. Ἀκούει refers to his performances in oral discourse. Ἐξ ἐμοῦ (*ex me*) from myself, in contrast with that which might be heard of him through others. Τι is a brachyological or concise form of expression equivalent to εἴ τι ἀκούει. Notwithstanding the unfriendly opinions which had been expressed of him (chap. x. 1. 10), he desired to have no other standard laid down for judging of him than a strict conformity to what all might perceive in him.

Vers. 7–10. **And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations** (ver. 7*a*).—[Stanley, adopting Lachmann's reading of διὸ before ἵνα, is obliged also with him, to connect καὶ τῇ ὑπερβ. τῶν ἀποκ. with ἀσθενείαις in ver. 5, and to make the whole of ver. 6 a parenthesis. Even Alford concedes that if διὸ forms a part of the text, it must be the commencement of a sentence, and that we must adopt Lachmann's punctuation. But he thinks that "a very strange sense would thus be given," for then the Apostle would refuse to glory in himself, *except* in his infirmities *and* in the exceeding abundance of his revelations; thus making

his glorying in his revelations a part of his glorying in himself. But rejecting *διὸ*, for which we have hardly sufficient authority, the sentence reads smoothly. Osiander remarks that everything in *κ. τῇ ὑπερβ. τῶν ἀποκ.* is remarkable: the expression itself, the way in which the words are joined together, and the position of the words in the sentence. For emphasis the words are placed first (comp. chap. ii. 4), the revelations are represented as multifarious, and for additional force a substantive is used with an adjectival signification.] Having said (vv. 5, 6) that he now abstained from further boasting, not because he lacked in good grounds for it, but from a regard to them, that they might not overvalue his person, he now returns to the revelations he had spoken of in ver. 1, *etc.*, and shows how he had been kept from a possible self-exaltation on account of these revelations, by means of a peculiarly severe affliction. *Καί* here signifies not: *even*, but: *and*, merely connecting with the former sentence.—*Ὑπερβολή* occurs also in chap. iv. 7. It is difficult to decide whether the dative is that of the instrument (: by means of), or of the cause (: on account of) like *ἐπαίρεσθαι τινι*. The meaning is much the same in either case. We have *ὑπεραίρεσθαι* in 2 Thess. ii. 4, in the sense of *to exalt himself*.—**There was given to me a thorn in the flesh, an angel of Satan to buffet me**—There can be no doubt that a Divine intention or design is implied [by *ἵνα*], whether God or Satan is looked upon as the giver in *ἐδόθη*. It is possible to interpret it of either, but it seems rather more appropriate to refer it to God, inasmuch as the object to be accomplished by it was under the Divine direction. We must not, however, conclude from thence that *ἐδόθη* implies merely a Divine permission, for it includes the idea of disposing, and ordaining. God gives even what is afflictive for the attainment of some higher and benevolent end; *i. e.* as the means of trial and humiliation. *Σκόλοψ* is a sharpened piece of wood, a stake, or a thorn (as in Numb. xxxiii. 55). The first of these meanings is not altogether inappropriate. [Stanley adheres to this, and contends that *σκόλοψ* is not a thorn (from which he finds it sometimes distinguished, esp. Hos. ii. 6; Sept. Artemid. iii. 33) but generally a pointed stake or palisade (Numb. xxx. 55; Ezek. xxviii. 24). It must be conceded that this is the usual meaning. Hence Luther and many understand by it a stake, for the execution of criminals. Stanley finds *ἀνασκολοπίζω* in the Sept. of Est. vii. 10 explained by Phavorinus and Hesychius as equivalent to *ἀνασταυρίζω*, and he thence infers that *σκόλοψ* was equivalent to *σταυρός*, the cross, or the stake. In Lucian, too (De morte Per. 11), *ἀνασκολοπίζω* is used for the crucifixion of Christ. As in describing his state of constant torture the Apostle draws his image from crucifixion, so here he draws it from impalement. The angel of Satan like Death in 1 Cor. xv. 55, is armed with the impaling stake; or the Apostle was himself already impaled or crucified. The phrase *τῇ σαρκὶ* is certainly unsuitable to this interpretation]. *In the flesh* (*τῇ σαρκὶ*) is not in apposition with *to me* (*μοι*) and dependent upon *was given* (*ἐδόθη*), but it is to be connected with *σκόλοψ* (*a thorn*) as a dative of appropriation. But *σάρξ* is not human nature in general, unregenerate and sinful, but man's corporeal nature with the sinful disposition connected with it. In this place it has reference especially to the sensitive horror which that nature feels at pain, or its recoil from the suffering which God had decreed for it. *Σκόλοψ* is undoubtedly the subject of *ἐδόθη*, and *ἄγγελος σατᾶν* is in apposition to *σκόλοψ*, though the converse of this may not be true (as if *σκόλοψ* were an *ἄγγελος*.). These words in apposition, however, are the subject of *ἵνα—κολαφίζῃ*, which involves a metaphor no longer quite suitable to *σκόλοψ*. But such an apparent irregularity of construction may be found in other places. And yet there is no inversion of the words, as if he would say: *that the angel of Satan might buffet me.* *Κολαφίζῃ* expresses continued action and it is therefore in the subj. præs. not in the aorist. *Ἄγγελος σατᾶν* does not signify merely a hostile angel, for *σατᾶν* never is to be found precisely as an adjective, and in the New Testament it never has the sense of *adversarius* (an angel, an adversary). Nor can it mean Satan himself [the angel Satan] who is never designated an *ἄγγελος*; but an angel of Satan like *ἄγγελοι τοῦ διαβόλου* in Matt. xxv. 41. *Σατᾶν* thereforo is in the genitive (the var. *σατανᾶ* has less authority for it, is a correction of the indeclinable noun, which is a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*). An exceedingly painful suffering is indicated by *σκόλοψ*, and is described by the phrase an angel of Satan. It is not merely a suffering sent upon the Apostle by Satan, (for Satan's angel in the estimation of the Apostle was a real malignant power) by means of which God had ordained for him a humiliating torment (comp. 1 Cor. v. 5, Job ii. 6), with the exalted purpose which he afterwards brings forward in an emphatic manner when he says:—**lest I should be exalted above measure** (ver. 7*b*). —The idea conveyed thereforo is, that in accordance with the divine decree the Apostle was abased in a humiliating manner by an angel of Satan, and that in consequence of this tormenting influence sent on him from the kingdom of darkness, he was kept from unduly exalting himself on account of the glorious revelations vouchsafed him from the kingdom of light. But of what nature were these sufferings? Of course we are not to think of literal and real blows or buffetings. The idea of an internal assault of Satan by means of blasphemous thoughts, or by remorse of conscience on account of his earlier persecution of the followers of Christ, or by means of temptations to lust, must be regarded (irrespective of the last mentioned suggestion, which was an improbable product of the ascetic exegesis of the monks, comp. Osiander p. 473 and chap. iv. 7), as directly in opposition to *τῇ σαρκί* (according to Meyer also in opposition to *σκόλοψ* and *κολαφίζῃ* in which are described an acute and continuous pain). Still more improbable is the idea of external assaults on the part of hostile opponents, called here ministers of Satan (chap. xi. 15), and designated collectively an angel of Satan, inasmuch as one of them (sing.) may have distinguished himself above the rest; or the idea of a great pressure of apostolic duties in general. The context leads us to think of a definite and special form of suffering (Meyer) in contrast with the abundance of the

revelations, and of something for whose cessation he could properly and earnestly pray (ver. 8), as he could hardly do with respect to his official duties.—The most probable supposition is that he had in view some very severe and painful bodily suffering, which however did not prevent his undergoing exhausting labors and his persisting in numerous hardships. But it is utterly out of our power to determine precisely what this suffering consisted in (hemorrhoids, hypochondria and melancholy, epilepsy, stone, violent head-ache, *etc.*). Ewald: "When this disease came upon him, it was like a terrific blow upon the head (*κολαφίζῃ*) without a previous warning." It was something personal, not affecting him simply as a minister of Christ, and an *ἀσθένεια* (ver. 9), although of a peculiar kind, reminding him of his human frailty and hence having a tendency to keep him from undue self-exaltation on account of his remarkable experiences of divine favor. We are very naturally reminded of Luther's disease of the stone which in like manner was ascribed to the devil.—Osiander unites together the ideas of bodily and spiritual assaults, and his explanation is favored by the fact that there is usually a reciprocal action between the two, but the general impression of our passage is rather in favor of a long-continued evil rather than of a temporary darkening and disturbance of mind.—In vv. 8, 9, he tells us how he prayed that this evil and its consequences might be removed from him.—**Concerning this, I besought the Lord thrice, that he might depart from me** (ver. 8).—Ὑπέρ, since Demosthenes, has frequently had the sense of *περί*: in consideration of, in respect to. Τούτου is not neuter but masculine, as is shown by *ἀποστῇ* (might depart). He had in his mind the angel of Satan. Τρίς is not equivalent to *πολλάκις*, nor is it a number for perfection. There may have been long intervals of time between each prayer, and perhaps he only prayed when under extreme paroxysms of suffering. That he was under this affliction when he wrote however, is not necessarily implied. He received no answer from the Lord until the third petition, when, of course, he ceased. The Lord (*κύριος*) is Christ who has obtained the victory over every kind of Satanic power. Παρακαλεῖν is a word which in the New Testament is never used with reference to God and only with reference to Christ. It has the sense of, *to call for help*, and in the classic writers is used to designate a call on the gods. Ἀποστῆναι (*to depart*) as in Luke iv. 13 is used with regard to Satan, but in Acts v. 38, and xxii. 29, it is applied to human assailants.—**And he has said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee, for power is made perfect in weakness** (ver. 9).—In this place *εἰρηκε* express a continued action [the perfect of a continued past action], but we have no means of determining how it was said, whether in a vision, or merely by some internal encouragement. (Osiander: "probably a testimony of the Holy Spirit in the exercise of the highest spiritual functions, by means of which the Apostle's heart was thoroughly tranquilized, assured of his gracious state and enlightened with respect to this special case. It was thus a distinct revelation of the mind of Christ, by special inspiration, and confirmed, perhaps, by the application of some passage of Scripture." The answer was an apparent refusal, with such a promise as was a virtual granting of his request. The *ἀρκεῖ*, which stands for emphasis at the head of the sentence, is not equivalent to: *will protect* (a poetical usage), or *will assist* (Xenophon and others), but it means simply, *will be sufficient for, will satisfy;* it will be enough that I am gracious to thee, and that I love thee, and will take pleasure in thee. There is no reference to miraculous gifts. To show that he would need nothing else, the Lord adds: *for my strength, etc.* The *μου* has only a few authorities in its favor, but they are of the highest importance; and even if it is not supplied in the text, it must be understood. The fact that *ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ* has no *σου* after it may have had some influence in inducing transcribers to leave it out. The meaning is: with one who is in this weak state, my power comes into more perfect activity (comp. chap. iv. 7; 1 Cor. ii. 3, 4). But this power of the Lord dwells only in those who share also in His grace; *i. e.*, it is put forth in its full strength and activity only where there is nothing but helplessness and painful weakness; for where a consciousness of power is, it is rather impeded in its action. (Τελεῖται has not the sense of: proves itself to be perfect).—**Most gladly, therefore, will I rather glory in my infirmities, that Christ's power may abide upon me**—(ver. 9).—The Apostle here describes the effect of this promise. He gave up all expectation of being freed from his trouble, and he was satisfied with the prospect of enjoying the grace whose work was to be completed in his weakness. Grammatical usage will not permit us to refer *μᾶλλον* to *ἥδιστα*. Nor should we supply after it: than before, when I prayed thus (ver. 8), or: than any thing, or: than in my own power, or: than in the revelations which I had. It belongs rather, as its position necessarily shows, to *καυχήσομαι*. Instead of complaining and praying that the suffering might cease, I will rather glory in my infirmities. This, however, would lead to the accomplishment and experience of the promise given him when the Lord visited him, *i. e.*, that Christ's power might dwell (permanently abide) upon him. The word *ἐπισκηνοῖν* signifies to enter, to turn into, a tent or dwelling. Ἐπ' ἐμέ, in other places, has reference to the direction generally; and here, where the Apostle is speaking of the power of Christ, who was then in heaven, it means, to come down upon me and to abide with me (the figure is that of a permanent connection). Whether any thing of unusual solemnity attaches to the expression, as if it had reference to the Shekinah, as if the power of Christ were as a pavilion extended over him for his protection, or as if he himself were the space in which it was to be manifested, is uncertain.—**Wherefore I am well contented in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake** (ver. 10). From what he had just described as the object of all this proceeding, and of course from the promise of Christ which had been accomplished by his glorying in his infirmities (ver. 9), the Apostle now makes a practical inference, *viz.:* inasmuch as this glorying in my infirmities has brought

Christ's power to take possession of me, I take pleasure in infirmities, *etc.* Εὐδοκεῖν ἐν signifies here a voluntary endurance, a patient satisfaction with these sufferings. [Our English A. V.: *take pleasure in*, is too strong; the Greek is: *I am well contented in* (Fausset)]. The ἀσθένειαι, the suffering condition in which these infirmities become perceptible, are particularized in ὕβρεσιν, insulting abuses, ἀνάγκαις, *etc.*, comp. chap. vi. 4 (external afflictions proceeding from those around him). Ὑπὲρ χριστοῦ, which belongs to and qualifies all these preceding nouns, signifies here: for the sake (or, in behalf) of Christ.—**For when I am weak, then am I strong** (ver. 10 *b*.). The reason for his good courage while enduring these sufferings for Christ's sake, was that he had felt strengthened under all his infirmities by the power of Christ dwelling continually in him (comp. Phil. iv. 13). In these words we have the fulfilment of the promise in ver. 9. Τότε is emphatic, and shows how triumphant were the Apostle's feelings, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 54; Col. iii. 4.

[Stanley: "The long burst of passionate self-vindication, has now, at last expended itself, and the Apostle returns to the point from whence he diverged at chap. x. 7, where he was asserting his intention to repress the disobedience of those who still resisted his authority at Corinth. Before, however, he enters again upon this, he looks back over the long digression, and resumes here and there a thought which needed explanation or expansion. Hence, although this concluding section stands apart from the interruption of chap. x. 10—xii. 10, and is truly the winding up of the main argument begun in chap. x. 1–7, it is filled with traces of the torrent which has passed through his mind in the interval. His 'folly,' chap. xi. 1-10; the 'commendatory epistles' (chap. iii. 1; v. 12); the 'apostolical' pretensions of his opponents (chap. xi. 12, 13) are resumed in ver. 11; his miracles and sufferings (chap. xi. 23-28), in ver. 12; the question of self-support (chap. xi. 12) in vv. 13-18; the strength and weakness united in Christ (chap. xii. 19), in chap. xiii. 3, 4, 9"].

Vers. 11-15.—**I am become a fool; ye have compelled me: for I ought to have been commended by you; for in nothing was I behind these overmuch apostles, although I am nothing** (ver. 11).—He here makes an ironical concession (for the words should not be regarded as a question) with reference to the many things he had said in commendation of himself in the course of the last two chapters: *I am become a fool.* [The verb γέγονα indicates that he had *become* what he was not originally]. And yet he follows this immediately with a justification of himself; for he throws upon them the responsibility of all: ye have forced me thus foolishly to boast myself, for I ought to have been commended by you, instead of being obliged to commend myself. [The ironical nature of the passage explains the concession without taking this verse interrogatively, as Wordsworth, after some Greek scholiasts, suggests]. In emphatic correspondence with one another are arranged the words: ὑμεῖς, ἐγώ, ὑφ' ὑμῶν. By ἐγω he does not put himself in special contrast with those opponents who were so highly commended by the Corinthians. He merely censures here the want of attention which these Corinthians had shown to his claims. Their positive injustice toward him he exposes when he comes to say, that he had been in no respect behind those much-lauded apostles (comp. xi. 5). Ὑστέρησα limits the time of the comparison to the period of his residence at Corinth. With humility, however, he adds (comp. 1 Cor. xv, 8, *etc.*), that he was after all nothing, *i. e.*, I am absolutely powerless in myself (1 Cor. i. 28). This is a sincere assertion, though it contains a severe allusion to the pride of his opponents (Osiander). He shows that he was in no respect behind these supereminent apostles, by referring to those proofs of his Apostleship which he had given among them. —**Truly the signs of an Apostle were wrought among you in all patience by signs and wonders and miracles** (ver. 12). The signs of an Apostle here signify those things by means of which the Apostles showed that they were Apostles, and were recognized as such among their fellow men. The article makes the idea of an Apostle especially prominent (Bengel: *ejus, qui sit apostolus*); the reality and not merely the ideal of one. The first σημεία is here to be taken in the more comprehensive sense [of general evidences], whereas the second should be explained in the narrower signification [of special tokens of a Divine power]. Neander: "Our faith in the reality of the Apostle's performance of miracles need not therefore be founded solely upon tradition, for Paul here asserts that he wrought them, and he thus comes in direct opposition to all mythical views of the narratives of New Testament miracles." The passive κατηργάσθη (were wrought) or κατειργάσθη is a modest form of expression for: I wrought. Even if we are not influenced by the inappropriateness of such an idea ἐν πάσῃ ὑπομονῇ cannot be taken as the first in the series of σημείοις, *etc.*, for the ἐν is not really a part of the original text. The phrase designates the ethical element in which these signs were wrought in Corinth (ἐν ὑμῖν), and which had a tendency to confirm believers there. It shows his perseverance, with all steadfastness in the midst of the opposition and sufferings he had to meet as an Apostle (comp. chap. vi. 4). Ὑπομονή has reference here not to an outward objective tolerance of all kinds of evils (for it has no genitive of the object in connection with it, as in chap. i. 6), but it refers to the feelings with which he persevered under his trials. Πάσῃ implies the degree, the completeness of his patience, for if we refer it to the extent to which it was carried in respect to the variety of its exercises, it would more properly apply to the objective interpretation. These proofs of his Apostleship (κατεργ. is said of that which is a *res ardua*) he calls σημεία, τεράτα, δυναμεῖς. The words designate the same thing under various aspects; we have: 1, their significance, with reference to the Divine legation; 2, their impression, on account of their extraordinary and wonderful appearance; 3, their causality, as expressions of Divine power. [Σημεῖα are "*signs*," and have an ethical purpose beyond themselves as credentials of a Divine mission; τέρατα are "*wonders*," regarded simply as supernatural prodigies to excite surprise, and are never spoken

of except in connection with some of the other names; and *δυναμεῖς* are "*mighty works*," looked upon simply as putting forth of Divine power. See Trench, part 2, p. 198ff.; Webster, 233f. It is much to be regretted that each of these words in the original is not rendered in our English version uniformly by the same word]. The same words are used in 2 Thess. ii. 9 (of Satanic miracles), but in Heb. ii. 4 and in Rom. xv. 19, they are referred to for the same purpose as in our passage, *i. e.*, to legitimate Apostolical authority. The accumulation of such words brings into more distinct prominence the magnitude and variety of the miracles. Some have attempted, rather arbitrarily, to refer the first to the cure of diseases which were curable by ordinary means; the second, to the cure of diseases beyond the reach of human art; and the third, to exercises of Apostolical power in punishing crimes, or to spiritual powers. The force of the passage is entirely lost by those who explain it of the extraordinary effects produced by his preaching and character. The *μέν* gives a hint of a contrast, on which the Apostle is otherwise silent, *i. e.*, the want of acknowledgment which these signs had suffered. Meyer: the proofs were indeed (truly) wrought, but they have failed to produce the corresponding conviction among you. There is no *γάρ* in the sentence, and the omission is in accordance with the abrupt and lively style of the general passage. It is, however, supplied in ver. 13, where he corroborates by a touching question what he had said in ver. 12.—**For what is there in which ye were inferior to the rest of the churches?** (ver. 13*a*).—The proofs of an Apostleship had been wrought among them, for in nothing were they inferior to the other churches where he had labored. Ὑπέρ signifies generally *over, beyond;* but here on account of *ἡττᾶσθαι, downwards, below.* In other places we have *ἡττᾶσθαι τινός τινι* (but with the accus. of the "*wherein*"). Rückert, very incorrectly and contrary to the connection with ver. 12, gives the meaning: ye have suffered no more injury than, *etc.* It seems also an arbitrary limitation of the thought, to make it refer exclusively to the gifts of the Spirit.—The Apostle, however, allows that there was one respect in which they might be considered inferior:—**except that I myself was not burdensome to you** (ver. 13*b*); *i. e.* had labored among them without compensation. This was a delicate though painful irony, which amounted to bitterness when he added the prayer which follows. Εἰ *μὴ ὅτι*: *i. e.* except perhaps; or: except this, that, *etc.* The great distance of ver. 16, *etc.*, renders it improper to explain *αὐτὸς ἐγώ* by a reference to it. [Αὐτὸς is very emphatic especially before *ἐγὼ*]. He places his own person in contrast with those Apostolic works to which his question had just alluded. Οὐ *κατενάρκησα* is explained on chap. xi. 7, 8.—This fact that he had received no personal maintenance from them as he had done from other churches, made them inferior to those churches and was an injustice to them, for which he craved their pardon:—**forgive me this wrong** (ver. 13*c*).—Such a request was a severe censure, as if they had been so ungrateful and had so completely failed to appreciate his conduct, that they had become grossly prejudiced against him through the influence of his contemptuous and suspicious opponents.—Chrysostom and some others contend that the Apostle was not here speaking ironically, but that he was endeavoring to mitigate the wounded feeling he had produced by his allusion to his self-denying course among them (as if it were a sign of a defect in his regard for them). But the irony of the preceding question compels us to regard the prayer as a continuation of the same strain.—Not until he comes to ver. 14, does he come back to his ordinary tone:—**Behold, I am ready to come unto you the third time, and I will not be burdensome to you.**—In this verse *τρίτον* does not belong to *ἑτοίμως ἔχω* but to *ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, for it is not with reference to his readiness, but to his actual coming among them that he could say he was resolved not to be burdensome to them. He intended to say that on two occasions when he had been among them [see on chap. xiii. 1], he had not been a burden to them and he was equally resolved not to be a burden to them on this third visit for which he was now prepared. On *ἰδού* comp. chap. vi. 2, 9; vii. 11.—His reason for this purpose he says was to be found in his disinterested love for them (comp. Phil. iv. 17); they were of importance to him, not because of what they possessed, and hence not for any advantage they would be to him, but for their own sakes; since if they were won to Christ and advanced in the work of salvation, he would gain by them as much as he desired (Rückert reverses this: the Apostle would gain them for himself, and in this way for Christ; but such a view is not as much according to the spirit of the passage, comp. Osiander).—This idea he traces back to the natural relation between parents and children; by virtue of which children were not bound to make provision for the parents, but the parents for the children:—**For the children are not bound to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children** (ver. 14*b*).—This applied to him as their spiritual father (1 Cor. iv. 15), and it was therefore his part not to seek for their possessions, but to care for them and to collect spiritual treasures for them (as the duty of providing for children by the investment of property is not abolished but brought within the proper limits of a confidence in God and a heavenly mind by what is said in Matth. vi. 19, so here the duty of children to support their parents is not excluded, Osiander). After *οἱ γονεῖς* understand *ὀφείλουσι θησαυρίζειν*.—He applies this rule to himself in ver. 15, but he implies that his love was strong enough to go far beyond the limits usually reached by parental duty:—**And I will most gladly spend and be spent for you.**—The gradual rise in the discourse or the climax indicated by *δέ* is clearly brought out even in *ἥδιστα*, which goes far beyond *ὀφείλει*, but it is carried far beyond both in *ἐκδαπανηθήσομαι*. Instead of collecting something for himself at their expense, he was determined not merely to expend with hearty good will, all that he had acquired or possessed, for their benefit, but so to use all his powers as to wear them out in the interest of their souls, *i. e.*, to sacrifice his life and his whole self, if he could thereby promote their supreme good. The compound verb *ἐκδαπανᾶς-*

θαι is much stronger than the original simple verb, and signifies to be utterly consumed (comp. Osiander's admirable remarks). The Apostle adds:—**although the more abundantly I love you, the less I am loved.** (ver. 15*b*) —If we accept εἰ καί according to the Receptus, the sense would be: although I shall be loved the less, the more I love you. Rückert and Osiander preserve this idea, even if καί is rejected (making εἰ concessive), but such an interpretation is very doubtful. Meyer takes εἰ in the sense of: if, equivalent to ἐπεί, as if the Apostle hesitated to make the direct and confident assertion, but declared that he was willing to go to the utmost in overcoming their hostile spirit toward him. This willingness he would still express if the condition were set forth as an actual and known fact: though I, as is now evident, shall be loved the less, *etc.* If this is presented by the Apostle as the motive of his conduct the language certainly is very severe, but on any other view the idea comes out in a very awkward and feeble manner. It is better probably to take it in a concessive sense, but then it becomes necessary with Tischendorf to retain the καί, which has many and good authorities in its favor.—Περισσοτερως—ἧττον is an abbreviated expression for ὑσῳ—τοιούτῳ.—Nothing needs to be understood in addition to the comparative (as: *more than other churches*, or: *less than my opponents*).

VERS. 16–18. He here meets the attempt to throw on him the suspicion that under the pretence of personal disinterestedness he had sent deputies, and through them had imposed burdens upon the Corinthians. He comes upon his readers boldly and confidently with the question whether these deputies had not exhibited a disinterestedness similar to his own.—**But be it so, I was not burdensome to you; nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with guile** (ver. 16). In ἐστω, *etc.*, he puts himself in the position of an objector. Such a one must concede that the Corinthians had not been burdened with any selfish claims on his part, but it might be insinuated that this had been only to play a deeper game of craft to get them into his power, and to overreach them by means of his emissaries. Ἐστω is found with a similar use in Plato, as in the Latin: *esto! sit ita sane!* Ἐγώ is here emphatic in contrast with those intermediate agents mentioned in vers. 17–18. With ἀλλά he introduces the precise objection (in contrast with ἐστω—ὑμᾶς): he had caught them by a crafty method gaining them over by an appearance of disinterestedness (ἐλαβον is found in chap. xi. 20). Πανοῦργος signifies adroit, sly, subtle (chap. iv. 2; xi. 3). Paul's real prudence and skill was here represented in an unfavorable light (comp. Osiander). Ὑπάρχων is used in a similar manner in 1 Cor. xi. 7.—**Did I make a gain of you by any of them whom I sent unto you** (ver. 17). This verse is an anacoluthon; where τινὰ is in an emphatic position at the commencement of the sentence, and as an accusative absolute. He was probably about to write: ἀπέσταλκα εἰς τὸ πλεονεκτῆσαι ὑμᾶς, but with an impressive abbreviation, he leaves this second ἀπέσταλκα out, and, losing sight of the accus.: τινὰ, writes: δι' ἀυτοῦ ἐπλεονεκτησα. The ὧν is here an instance of attraction for τούτων οὕς.—**I besought Titus to go on this mission, and with Him I sent the brother** (ver. 18 a). He here names these deputies, and especially Titus, whom he had sent last, and the brother [not *a* brother, as in our English A. V.] accompanying Titus, unnamed, but well known to his readers. It is impossible for us to determine who this brother was. We conclude from the word συναπέστειλα, and from the fact that only Titus is afterwards named, that he was subordinate to Titus. The sending is the one mentioned in chap. vii. [soon after the writing of the first Epistle of our canon] and not that spoken of in chap. viii. On παρεκάλεσα comp. chap. viii. 6, 17. [Osiander draws attention to the fact that in each of the three passages (chap. vii. 13; viii. 6) in which Paul's agency in inducing Titus to enter upon this mission, the same word (παρακαλέω) is used. The word appears to convey an idea intermediate between that of a command and that of a prayer, *i. e.*, a friendly requirement, a reminding of what *ought* to be done].—**Did Titus make a gain of you? Walked we not in the same spirit and in the same steps?** (ver. 18). Τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι is the dative of the mode and manner (Rom. xiii. 13), or of the rule or law. The meaning is: did not the same Holy Spirit control us all in our conduct, and keep us from all selfish conduct, from every thing like making a gain of any one? The dative οὐ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἴχνεσιν is probably the local dative, as in Acts xiv. 16, and the words here signify an agreement in external conduct, as the preceding clause refers to an agreement in internal purpose and feeling. The Apostle is not here speaking directly of Christ's footsteps (1 Pet. ii. 21), but we must conclude that they walked in the same steps, because Titus followed those of Paul (Meyer).

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. When a Christian is distinguished for remarkable degrees of Divine grace, he is very apt to become elevated in his own estimation. A faithful God not unfrequently prevents this by bringing him into circumstances of deep humiliation, that by such painful methods he may become conscious of his own inability, and that he may not claim those glorious distinctions which are given him for Christ's sake, as if they were his own and were intended for his personal honor. In all such afflictions, whether bodily or spiritual, or both combined, there is an influence of Satan designed to torment and worry him, but God will use them to drive him to the throne of grace. And though his ardent request to be freed from the distress may not be granted, he will surely receive that Divine grace which will enable him to bear the heaviest burden. Divine power will find its best sphere of activity in his weakness, and the result will be that he will be strong in his weakness. Instead, therefore, of complaining and fretting about his various infirmities and those sufferings which make him conscious of them, he will experience and exhibit to the world no small degree of satisfaction in them.

2. A faithful member of Christ will be inclined

to keep his own person in the background, wherever he is. He seeks no honor for himself, and least of all will he boast himself when he gains esteem and influence in consequence of some special impartations of grace from on high. Every attempt to give him an undue importance on account of such things will be offensive to him, because it will seem like giving him an honor which belongs only to God. He desires to be esteemed only for what he has actually done and spoken. The important thing with him is not the fleece, but the sheep, that those souls which Christ has purchased may be brought to Him and be saved. For such an object he is willing to make any sacrifice, to bring to the altar all that he is and has, even his life. What if men do not appreciate his love and fidelity, make him no suitable return, and even show themselves ungrateful? His love will only become more ardent, and his devotion to their welfare more intense.

3. W. F. Besser:—Ever since God stationed before Eden the cherub with his naked, flaming sword, man must look for no Paradise on earth. There is, however, one beyond this sinful world in the third heaven. Its treasures and its jewels were enjoyed by the Apostle when in holy ecstasy he was allowed to have direct communion with God in Christ, that true tree of life which was lost in Adam but regained in Christ. Our Lord promised it to the thief on the cross (Luke xxiii. 43), and now offers it to all sinners. When the tabernacle of God shall be pitched upon the new earth, then shall the New Jerusalem be revealed in Paradisaic glory (Rev. xxi. 2, 3).

[3. "Paul evidently supposed that his soul *might* be taken to heaven without the body, and that it might have a separate consciousness and a separate existence. He was not therefore a materialist, and he did not believe that the existence and consciousness of the soul was dependent on the body." (Barnes). Doddridge says that he has "yet to learn what the presence of an *immaterial* soul in a body can be (for this also seems supposed by the Apostle to be a possibility), distinct from the capacity of perceiving by it, and acting upon it." And yet the Apostle makes both suppositions and evidently regarded them as credible.

4. All prayer is answered in heaven—though sometimes not until it becomes importunate, and the petitioner has come by continued prayerful fellowship with God to a consciousness of his real want. Paul (like his Master) prayed and held communion with his Lord, until he came to know what was possible and best for him. The subject matter of his prayer, as it existed in the heart, was for *relief*, rather than for that specific mode of relief which the outward words asked for. *That* prayer in the heart was answered when his thorn ceased to be a thorn to him.

5. It is lawful to address Christ in prayer. Though the verb παρακαλέω is never used in classic Greek, nor in any other passage of the N. T., as equivalent to δέομαι, and in an address to God, the reason for its preference here was probably simply because of the familiar and personal relation in which Paul supposes himself to his Lord. The distinction between *invocatio* and *advocatio* seems here inappropriate, since Christ is evidently not addressed as an advocate with the Father, as if He were subordinate, but as a supreme and ultimate Disposer of affairs.

6. We have here (ver. 12) one of the few allusions which the Apostles make in their Epistles to the evidence of miracles. Only in seven out of all their Epistles is any thing said of this kind of evidence, and the reason is that most of those Epistles are hortatory and not apologetical. Here, however, the importance, if not the indispensable necessity of miracles, as σημεῖα τ. ἀποστόλου is clearly asserted. And yet here, as every where else, they are spoken of in an unobtrusive manner as of universally acknowledged facts. They had been performed, as Christ wrought them, not *merely* as credentials of a Divine mission, but from benevolence also, and from a fulness of power to relieve human woe. And yet in another aspect they were, and might properly be, appealed to as the seals of the Apostleship. Comp. Fausset, *Port. Com.*].

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Chrysostom:—Ver. 10. Where there is suffering there is consolation, and where there is consolation there is grace. And yet before the reward which God bestows, we derive much benefit from the very exercises of affliction itself; for our arrogance is repressed, our littleness is taken away, the use we can make of many human instruments is discovered, and we are, as it were, anointed for the conflicts before us.—Basil:—Ver. 18. The left hand is not more indispensable to the right, than unanimity and concord to the ministers of the church.

Starke:—Ver. 1. Never boast of yourself; it is always useless and vain. But if you so conduct yourself that others praise you, it is honorable and useful to you (Prov. xxvii. 2)—Ver. 2ff. Spener:—While under such Divine influences, ecstasies and revelations, the external man cannot pay attention to itself, and frequently it has no conception of what is passing within itself; all power and intelligence is taken up with what is taking place within the soul itself. While the eternal God is at work within him, the man knows nothing of time, and while God's power occupies his thoughts, he has no remembrance of such a thing as himself or the world. Hedinger:—During the present life, heavenly things are much too high and difficult, and it is enough if we can be gradually prepared for them by a few fortastes of them.—Ver. 5. Our highest boast now is, to know what weak, poor and miserable creatures we are. Whatever good we are and have, is entirely the result of God's grace and mercy.—Ver. 6. Hedinger:—A faithful pastor will be careful that his people think of him no more highly than they ought to think. Ver. 7. Where much is given, much also shall we be tempted; but great also shall be our consolation and sure our final victory.—Let no one pride himself on anything he has received from God, for as sure as he does so, all enjoyment of it will be taken away from his flesh by some keen thorn, which Satan knows how to sharpen so ingeniously that he will be compelled to feel it whether he is willing or unwilling.—Ver. 8.

Affliction drives us to God, and teaches us to call on him day and night, Isa. xxvi. 16. But very probably God will make us wait, Ps. cxxx. 6. Christians gain their victories by patience and prayer. Prayer makes the heart light and merry. If you cannot pray, then groan, and if you cannot groan and even this distresses you, that very distress is a prayer, Rom. viii. 26.—Ver. 9. LUTHER:—Christ cannot make known His full strength in us, until we are weak and suffering. God knows best what is for our good; and no one is more ignorant on this point than those who are enduring the anguish of the cross. Our prayers, therefore, should always be conditional. Think not that it is a sign of God's displeasure, when you are not heard according to your desire, even though you have prayed aright, for it is rather a token of grace. Happy the man who is so satisfied with Divine grace, that it is easy for him to depend wholly upon God; for he who is thus satisfied with grace actually enjoys it. Our weakness need never trouble us. The weaker we are in ourselves, the stronger in Christ, Ps. xviii. 36. It is the weak tendril which unites the branch with the vine. Christ is our vine. We who are truly in Christ shall never fall, whatever storms may beat upon us. If we have much grace, we must have much suffering; if great suffering, great power; and if great power, great victory. All these hang together in one undivided chain.—Ver. 10. HEDINGER:—The more humbled by afflictions, the more exalted by grace. Faith increases under conflicts.—Ver. 11. Pious Christians should never remain silent when men venture by falsehoods to cast suspicion upon their spiritual teachers. Such is the duty of every Christian in behalf of his fellow men, how much more of spiritual children in behalf of their parents. Humility forbids us not to allow others to commend us, but only to love the praise of men. The more thou humblest thyself, the more exalted thou art, and the more God will be gracious to thee, Eccles. iii. 20.—Ver. 12. The signs of a true servant of Christ are seen not merely in his passive suffering, but in his active doings.—Ver. 13. SPENER:—Without keeping back what they owe to God and their fellow men, parents should economize what God has kindly bestowed upon them, that their children may have something after their death; but let them be careful to lay up no treasures from mere covetousness, from a distrust of Providence, to the prejudice of the claims of justice, and to the withholding of what is due to the honor of God, their neighbor's necessity, or the proper education of their children. By not attending to these latter considerations, many live to experience much anguish of heart, and drown themselves and their children in everlasting destruction (comp. Matth. vi. 19; 1 Tim. vi. 9). Happy the church in which many are serving the Lord, and all are faithful!—Ver. 18. It is a great blessing, where God's servants are ruled and animated by the Spirit of Christ alone, and where they all walk in the same steps.

BERLENB BIBLE:—VER. 1. What is there higher for a poor creature, than for him to come into direct communion with God and heavenly beings? And yet even this would be an injury if it became a ground of self-glorification.—Ver. 2. Who could keep to himself a matter like this for fourteen years? Those who have great gifts must be most watchful over themselves.—Ver. 3. In circumstances like these it is God's way to have men say: "I cannot tell;" for they are thus kept from being puffed with pride. Many lessons God reserves to the higher school of heaven.—Ver. 4. Not unfrequently God gives His people some foretaste of their future blessedness; but such things are not indispensable to our happiness. Our highest excellencies are best shown in the modesty with which they are enjoyed. Those who have seen most of God's majesty, know not how to humble themselves enough, Isa. vi. 5.—Ver. 5. Ineffable grace it is when the Lord graciously vouchsafes to turn the heart of his servant to his native home, and to let him know what no mortal eye, ear or sense could perceive. Even if we have done all things, what have we to boast of? Luke xvii. 10. Only of our infirmities, and yet these should afford us no excuse for indolence and wickedness.—Ver. 6. Anti-Christianity has sometimes had its origin in an excessive veneration for the eminent gifts which God has sometimes bestowed upon His people.—Ver. 7. Those who have carefully observed the mysterious ways of Divine wisdom, have remarked that without giving any explanation of his dealings God has deeply humbled His own people as well as other men. To say nothing of external afflictions, this is particularly the case with inward trials. God will gradually consume and exhaust even the most secret influences which might injure or destroy the highest gifts of His grace. It is His secret counsel that many a Christian who seems a favorite of heaven, should be encumbered with some sore trouble, and taste, perhaps, even the powers of hell, until the ends of grace are accomplished, and he is in no danger of self-exaltation.—Ver. 8. Why thrice? was not once enough? How long has the Lord been obliged to wait upon thee! Besides, if He lets thee struggle awhile in thy distress, it may wake thee up to more faith, hope and patience at last. A Christian may have wonderful revelations of God, and yet not know much of the secret ways of God with Himself. God often seems severe, when He is really aiming at our highest good. His help consists not so much in ridding us of the evil, as in preserving us under it. Here is the error which makes many prayers seem unanswered. But is it not help when God keeps us from being consumed in the flames?—Ver. 9. Let us not be afraid of temptations, but see to it that we lose not our hold upon grace by turning aside to evil. We need never fear to meet trials if we only maintain a vigorous resolution in harmony with the inward action of grace, and thus proceed from one degree of attainment to another. To keep us humble we must never lose sight of our miserable condition; and yet we may go so far in this direction, that we may make shipwreck of hope and despair of God's love and mercy. The best state we can attain in this world is, a happy assurance by God's Spirit, that we always have in heaven a gracious God and Father. Our whole safety depends upon this, for then our hearts rest upon God Himself. "Lord, give me Thy-

self, and it is enough!" Ps. lxxiii. 25, 26. God's power seems mightiest when we are conscious of our own wretchedness, and in the midst of such travail of soul it comes to its perfection. The Saviour is obliged frequently to let His people know that they can do nothing of themselves, that thus they may be driven to a reliance upon grace alone. If they truly boast of their infirmities, they will take pleasure not in their sins, but in being humble. Not so with those who make an excuse of their infirmities. They have no desire, and hence they have no ability to do anything. Let them resolve in a proper manner, and they will soon accomplish something by Divine grace; for they will soon cast away all confidence in their own powers, and make such a use of God's, that they will triumph over all evil, and begin and complete every good work. —Ver. 10. The Spirit's power increases as that of the flesh decreases. As I lose my own power I am clothed with Christ's. God makes the creature see its own nothingness, that it may become something in Christ to the praise of His glory. God was robbed of His glory when man fell, and it can be restored to Him only when man is shown in his weakness and nothingness, that God may become all in all. Whoever strives in his self-sufficiency to live according to his own pleasure, acknowledges no subjection to God, and will derive no power from him.—Ver. 11. It is quite possible to be at the same time something and nothing. All are striving hard to be something, but none like to learn that they are nothing. If thou art something, esteem thyself as nothing, and then thou wilt remain something, and become something more.

Rieger:—Ver. 1, *etc.* Men think at the present day they can gain much attention by some wonderful accounts of the invisible world. But whoever has not given himself up thoroughly to obey the word of the Cross, will find that the word from the third heaven and from Paradise will be only a manacle of unbelief, and a temptation to forsake the faith.—Ver. 4. In Divine things it is better to have more in store than is given out.—Ver. 6. How much honor a man may gain before God, by not seeking and not accepting of the honor which comes from his fellow men. Indeed, God's love goes beyond this, and provides against the self-exaltation of His children when they have received what is of real value and pleasure to them.—Ver. 7. Mighty grace! which can provide that neither height nor depth can do us an injury!—Vv. 9, 10. Let nothing overwhelm thee; even in utter weakness be strong, and assured that Christ's power will accomplish some gracious purpose thereby. In sorrow's night, when troubles distress thee, His power will defend thee until the sure morning comes.—Ver. 14, *etc.* In preaching the Gospel of the kingdom, we cannot be too careful to avoid not only the reality, but even the slightest appearance of a worldly spirit To aid a soul in escaping from death and in the work of salvation, will be a greater joy to your own soul in the day of the Lord Jesus than to have won a world. Love generally goes downward (*i. e.*, from parents to children), in greater strength than it returns; and what must be said of the great love of that God who is nothing but love and from whom all good comes, as compared with our feeble love!

Heudner:—Ver. 1. Boasting, to please ourselves, always lowers us in the esteem of others, and is usually punished by some great humiliation.—Vers. 2, *etc.* Extraordinary revelations have been sometimes given to those who are distinguished for piety to strengthen them for their duties, by a foretaste of future blessedness. No one, however, should long for such revelations, and much less make a parade of them when they are vouchsafed; for they are not needful to a believing and godly life, and in seeking them we run great peril of self-deception, of gross errors, and above all, of spiritual pride. For every spark of pride which accompanies them, our fall will have to be so much the deeper.—Ver. 5. When we glory in our infirmities and confess that we can do nothing of ourselves, we give glory to God.—Ver. 6. The pious man makes it his aim not to appear better than he is, but to be better than he appears.—Ver. 7. The example of Paul is most instructive to all who are called to endure severe but unavoidable evils. God does not always appear for their help; for though He is able, He knows it unwise to do so. He knows what is best for us, and He intends to try our faith, to purify our hearts, and to suppress that pride which is the greatest foe to eminence.—Ver. 9. The only consolation which can satisfy us in affliction is that which springs from an assurance of the Divine favor, and an unreproving conscience. If we long for nothing else, we can triumph over all things.—Ver. 10. The more we let go all confidence in ourselves and leave ourselves entirely and unreservedly in the Lord's hands, the more strength we shall receive from Him. Such is the true weakness of a Christian. That which is only spurious makes excuses for sin, shrinks from conflicts, and has no desires for growth in grace.—Ver. 14. Genuine love says: "I seek not yours, but you;" that which is false seeks for external and adventitious advantages, such as power, honor, rank, *etc.* A rare thing it is to find those who love us solely for what we are! —Ver. 15. The highest degrees of love are seldom fully reciprocated. The Christian must not expect it.

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 9. In the weakness of the instrument, the power of him who uses it has an opportunity to show how completely it can triumph over difficulties (chap. iv. 7). "It is God's way," says Luther, "to manifest His power and majesty by means of nothingness and feebleness." Give up praying away thy thorn, O Christian, and take to heart the promise of all-sufficient grace; then shalt thou begin with Paul to boast of thy weakness and shelter thyself in Christ's own power! Thou mighty God and merciful Saviour, in covenant with the falling leaves and withered grass of human weakness, dost permit us to witness miracles of Almighty power precisely where our power completely fails us! Teach us to understand an arrangement in which Thy glory is in harmony with our joy, and we become satisfied for Thy sake with every cross and with manifold infirmities; since like a magnet they bring down Thy power to us.—Ver. 14. If it is indeed reasonable and just that children should support those parents who need their care;

surely it is the duty of churches to sustain their spiritual fathers by a return not only of intercessions in their behalf, at the throne of grace, but of such honor as is required in 1 Cor. ix. 11.

GERLACH:—Ver. 9. The greatest peril to a sinful man is pride and self-exaltation. When his powers and his gifts seem greatest, and all that he attempts succeeds and thrives, great will be his temptation to be proud and self-sufficient; and it will be hard to feel continually that all he has is of grace. Though our own hearts and outward appearances may suggest the contrary, never are we better prepared to have God's power work within us and around us, than when we are enduring outward and inward afflictions.

CHAP. XI. 19–XII. 9. Gospel for Sexag. Sunday. HEUBNER:—*The Apostles as the most eminent of the followers of Jesus.* How they—1, preached and were faithful in all their duties, from mere love to the Church, and notwithstanding the envy and opposition of false teachers; 2, suffered the greatest hardships in their work without wavering from their steadfastness; 3, were vouchsafed more exalted revelations; 4, were nevertheless more deeply humbled.—*How Christian love suffers*—1, First, it can bring us into deep afflictions; 2, God will thus purify us, and assimilate us to Jesus; 3, His grace is an abundant consolation. The Christian's commendation of himself: 1) Its proper occasion: urgent reasons (vers. 19–26); 2) Its object: excellences which have a spiritual value, labors, sufferings, *etc.* (vv. 23–33), gracious tokens which God vouchsafes to us; 3) Its limitations (to boast of these things only as gifts of God, and to induce others to trust in him).—Comp. Oetinger, *Epistelpredigten*, S. 151ff., Kap. xii. 1–9; Albertini, *Predigten*, S. 49ff., Kap. xii. 1–10; L. Hofacker, S. 199ff., 757ff.; *Zeugnisse Evang. Wahrheit*, I. S. 399ff., Kap. xii. 9; Hossbach, 2 Samml. S. 45ff.; Schmidt, *Vorhalle des Predigtsegens*, 1864, S. 384.

[VERS. 1–5. The wonderful incident here related, and Paul's appreciation of it. I. *The fact itself.* 1. The manner in which he speaks of himself as the subject of this experience (with reluctance and embarrassment vv. 2, 3). 2. The time in which it took place (at the commencement of his religious life, ver. 2). 3. The place in which it occurred (in a local heaven, vv. 2, 4). 4. The state in which the Apostle was (so taken up with heavenly things as to be unconscious of his sentient life, vv. 2, 3). 5. The things he saw and heard (were not thought useful to our knowledge, and so were withheld ver. 4. II. *The Apostle's estimate of it.* 1. He clearly distinguished between an exalted privilege and a gracious attainment. 2. Regarded it as very liable to become a snare. 3. Esteemed his infirmities and afflictions as more useful to him. 4. And yet he evidently highly appreciated what he had here seen and heard.—Vers. 7–10. I. *Prayer.*—1. Its appropriate objects; 2. Its encouragements; 3. The importunity allowed; 4. The limitation finally given. II. *Its Answer*—1. At the best time, however delayed; 2. With transcendent wisdom, and 3. With a view to spiritual results alone.]

XVI.—REPROOF OF SOME MORAL IMPERFECTIONS NOT YET REMOVED, AND ADMONITION TO SPARE HIM THE NECESSITY OF APOSTOLIC DISCIPLINE. CONCLUDING ENCOURAGEMENTS AND BENEDICTION.

CHAPTER XII. 19–21. XIII. 1–14.

19 Again, think ye that we excuse ourselves unto you? [For a long time[1] ye are thinking that it is to you that we are excusing ourselves πάλαι δοκεῖτε; ὅτι ὑμῖν ἀπολογούμεθα]; we speak before[2] God in Christ: but *we do* all things, dearly beloved, [but
20 all, beloved,] for your edifying. For I fear, lest, [haply μήπως] when I come, I shall not find you such as I would, and *that* I shall be found unto you such as ye would not: lest [haply] *there be* debates [discord][3], envyings [emulation, ζῆλος], wraths,
21 strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults: *And* lest, when I come[5] again, my God will humble[6] me among [with respect to, πρὸς] you, and *that* I shall bewail many which have sinned already, [before, προημαρτηκότων], and have not repented of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they have committed.

XIII. This *is* the third *time*[7] I am coming to you. In the mouth of two or three
2 witnesses shall every word be established. I told you before, and foretell you, as if I were present, the second time; and being absent now I write [I have said before, and now say beforehand. as I did when I was present the second time, so now also in my absence, *om.* I write][8] to them which heretofore have sinned, and to all others,
3 that, if I come again, I will not spare: Since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in
4 me, which [who] to you-ward is not weak, but is mighty in you. For though[9] he

[For He also, καὶ γὰρ] was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God. For we also [*om.* also][10] are weak in him,[11] but we shall live[12] with him[11] by
5 the power of God toward you.[13] Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know [Or, know] ye not your own selves, how that Jesus
6 Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates? [to some extent unapproved, τι ἀδόκιμοί?] But
7 I trust that ye shall know that we are not reprobates [unapproved]. Now I pray to [yet we pray, εὐχόμεθα δὲ][14] God that ye do no evil; not that we should appear approved, but that ye should do that which is honest, [excellent], though we be as re-
8 probates [as if unapproved]. For we can do nothing against the truth, but [we can
9 do something] for the truth. For we are glad, [rejoice, χαίρομεν], when we are weak, and ye are strong: and this also[15] we wish, [pray for, εὐχόμεθα] *even* your perfection
10 [perfect restoration, κατάρτισιν]. Therefore I write these things being absent, lest being present I should use sharpness, according to the power which the Lord hath
11 given me to [for, εἰς] edification, and not to [for] destruction. Finally, brethren, farewell, [rejoice, χαίρετε]. Be perfect [be restored to order, καταρτίζεσθε], be of good com-
12 fort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you. Greet
13 one another with a holy kiss. All the saints salute you. The grace of our Lord
14 Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, *be* with you all. Amen. [*om.* Amen].[16]

[1] Ver. 19.—Rec. has πάλιν [with D. E. K. L. Sin. (3d hand), many cursives, versions, and Greek Fathers], but the preponderating evidence is in favor of πάλαι [with A. B. F. G. Sin. the Vulg. and several ancient Lat. versions. The latter word standing at the beginning of a sentence is without an example in the N. T., and is in itself so difficult a reading as to seem improbable; inasmuch as it makes the whole sentence refer to past instead of present time (Heb. i. 1); but this only makes it more likely to have been altered. Bloomfield and Wordsworth and Conybeare still adhere decidedly to πάλιν, but Tisch., Lachm., Alford, Stanley, and most recent editors are equally decided in behalf of πάλαι, and are disposed to regard πάλιν either as the mistake of transcribers, or as a conjectural emendation and reminiscence of the parallel chap. iii. 1.]

[2] Ver. 19.—Rec. has κατενώπιον for κατέναντι, as it had also in chap. ii. 17.

[3] Ver. 20.—Lachmann has ἔριες for ἔρεις, but it has no sufficient authority. [That of Sin. has since been added to that of A. a number of cursives, Syr. Arm. verss., and Chrys. and Theophyl. in favor of Lachmann's reading. B. D. E. F. G. K. L. *et al.*, the Ital. Syr. (later) Copt. Goth. versions, Theodt. Damasc. Tert. Ambrosiast. have ἔρεις.]

[4] Ver. 20.—Rec. has ζῆλοι, but ζῆλος has better evidence in its favor. [The plural never occurs in classical nor Septuagint Greek. This, as well as the preceding ἔρεις may have been a correction to conform to the other plurals in the verse and to usage. Bloomf. thinks they were a provincialism, and probably genuine. Tisch. has ζῆλος with ἔρεις, while Sin. has ζῆλοι with ἔριες].

[5] Ver. 21.—Rec. has ἐλθόντα με.; but it is the *lectio facilior*, and it has the least authority. [Ἐλθόντος μου has A. B. F. G. Sin. and many Fathers in its favor. Most MSS. which have the accus. omit also the subsequent με before ὁ θεός. This suggests that both must have been attempted corrections.]

[6] Ver. 21.—Rec. has ταπεινώσῃ, but ταπεινώσει is better authenticated. The former was an attempt to make the word conform to the preceding subjunctive; [and yet it has A. K. Sin. and many Fathers. It may have been as Alford suggests, an itacism. The latter word has been adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.]

[7] Chap. XIII. 1.—Cod. A. reads Ἰδοὺ τρίτ. τοῦτ. ἑτοίμως ἔχω ἐλθεῖν. Ἰδοὺ has in its behalf also Sin. (3d hand), many cursives (some omit τουτο), the Vulg. and Ethiop. verss., and Damasc. Theophyl. and Aug.; but it was doubtless borrowed from ch. xii. 14. The ἑτοίμ. ἔχω ἐλθ. has also for it the Syr. and Copt. verss., but it was probably taken from the same passage. Sin. also has ἵνα before ἐπὶ with some less important authorities, and ἤ instead of καὶ, with the Vulg. and Arm. versions. Such authority, however, is hardly sufficient for either.]

[8] Ver. 2.—Rec. has γράφω after νῦν. It appears to have been an addition to conform to ver. 10. The best MSS. [A. B. D. F. Sin.] are against it.

[9] Ver. 4.—After the first καὶ γὰρ the Rec. has εἰ, but it is not found in the best MSS. [B. D. F. G. K. Sin. (3d hand inserts εἰ, as do also the Syr. Vulg. Goth. and several Greek Fathers). It appears to have been a correction on account of the doctrinal offence which the text without it gave]. See Exeget notes.

[10] Ver. 4.—The second καὶ of the Rec. [after καὶ γὰρ and before ἠμεισ], has only feeble authority.

[11] Ver. 4.—For ἐν before αὐτῷ A. F. Sin. have σὺν, and for σὺν before the last αὐτῷ some less important MSS. have ἐν, by an obvious interchange].

[12] Ver. 4.—Much better authority [A. B. D. F. Sin. Damasc.] is found for ζήσομεν than for ζησόμεθα of the Rec. [D. (3d hand) E. K. L. Chrys. Theodt].

[13] Ver. 4.—Lachmann puts εἰς ὑμᾶς in brackets, but it has ample authority in its favor. [The only important authorities for its omission are B. and Chrysostom].

[14] Ver. 7.—Rec. has εὔχομαι so as to conform to ἐλπίζω. Εὐχόμεθα has decidedly better evidence.

[15] Ver. 9.—Rec. has δὲ καὶ. The best MSS. leave out the δὲ.

[16] Ver. 14.—The ἀμήν is not critically well established. It is wanting in the best MSS. [A. B. F. L. Sin. *et al.*].

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Vers. 19-21.—For a long time ye are thinking that we are excusing ourselves unto you (ver. 1).—Paul here guards against the erroneous impression which he anticipated some might receive from his self-defence, that he was standing in judgment before them; he assures them that his only object was to do them good. Nothing was then of more importance to him than their amendment, unless he was willing to have their whole conduct come before him in his judicial capacity. The interrogative form of the sentence would become necessary if we adopt the word πάλιν of the Receptus (a reading perhaps occasioned by chap. iii. 1.); but it would be quite unsuitable if πάλαι be adopted. With this latter reading Paul must be understood to refer to what would take place, when his Epistle should be read or heard at Corinth, especially that part which was of an apologetical character. Ὑμῖν stands at the commencement of the sentence for the sake of emphasis. It is the dative of direction or tendency (with, or before you) as in Acts xix. 33. He was about to set before them the positive bearing of his self-defence upon them, *i. e.*, to show them that its true object

was to promote their spiritual life (*οἰκοδομή*). This required that all obstructions to his Apostolical influence, and all prejudices and wrong thoughts against him and his conduct among them, should be removed, and that all dependence upon their false teachers should be broken off. But before he presented this it was of consequence to assure them that he was standing with his apology at the bar of God, to whom alone he was responsible.—**we speak before God in Christ, but all things, beloved, for your edification** (ver. 19 *b*).—In these words (comp. chap. ii. 7) his object was not to affirm the sincerity of his purpose, but to let them know that it was to God that he was accountable, and from God that he expected an acquittal. The words *in Christ* (*ἐν Χριστῷ*) point out the sphere in which he was speaking, one far above every human tribunal, as a Christian and an Apostle, conscious of his fellowship with Christ. In connection with the last clause (*τὰ δὲ πάντα*) we must supply *λαλοῦμεν* (we speak) from the preceding sentence. Some would join the sentence with the preceding [and unite *τὰ* and *δὲ* together] so as to read: *λαλοῦμεν ταδε πάντα, etc.*; but *τάδε* usually refers to that which follows it, and never is made use of by Paul in any other passage. [It refers here to something definite, and not to all things in general, for it is confined to those matters of which he had been speaking, and especially his apology for himself]. In this last clause also, he makes, by way of conciliation, a direct appeal to them as his beloved ones (*ἀγαπητοί*), before entering upon a more severe remonstrance. The reason for this is apparent in vv. 20-21.—**For I fear that haply when I come, I shall not find you such as I would, and that I shall be found unto you such as ye would not** (ver. 20 *a*).—He here notices the unhappy condition he had reason to fear they were in, and which called for these efforts on his part for their benefit. His first reference to this condition is very tender. He merely mentions the impression which such a state of things would necessarily make upon him when he should come among them, and he alludes to the proceedings which such a state would necessarily call forth from him. Even when he says, *I fear lest, etc.*, he expresses the solicitude of a father, and his earnest desire that his intercourse with them might be free from annoyance; but in *μήπως* we have something likewise of a conciliatory nature. [The word is used in two successive clauses (anaphora), but in the third (ver. 21) it is exchanged for *μή*, inasmuch as the hesitation to express his thought in decisive terms wears away as he proceeds. The expressions: "such as ye would not," and "such as I would," are euphemistic, to avoid a more disagreeable phrase. The use of the verb *θέλω* for *βούλομαι* was not uncommon, and yet we may recognize something of the specific meaning of *θέλω* here, inasmuch as the Apostle meant perhaps to express some determination of the will in the case]. In *κἀγώ—οἷον οὐ θέλετε* he shows that he was painfully conscious of an Apostolic power of discipline which he would be obliged to exert; and he now reappears in that triumphant attitude of authority which he had formerly assumed (comp. Meyer).

Ὑμῖν has not the sense of: *by you*, but *to you*, or *for you*, as in Rom. vii. 10. The position of the second *οὐ* before the *θέλετε* is especially emphatic.* What he meant by *such as he would not*, he shows in greater detail in the second part of ver. 20 and in ver. 21.—**lest I shall find, perchance, among you debate, emulation, passions, contentions, slanderings, whisperings, insolences, tumults** (ver. 20).—The unpleasant things which he found are arranged under two different relations, according to the two different kinds of moral defect he knew to be in the Church. [Bengel: "That which was *not such as he would*, is treated of to the end of the chapter, then what was *such as they would not*, is treated of from chap. xiii. 1 and onwards." Such vices indicate how great were the difficulties to be met with in churches just emerged from heathenism, but we are not to suppose them prevalent among that portion which Paul had described in chap. vii. as penitent and obedient]. Not, however, until the commencement of the next chapter does he come to speak of the exercise of his Apostolic power to punish offenders (for in the next verse he brings before us another kind of offences). To *μήπως ἔρις, etc.*, must be supplied *εὑρεθῶσιν* (or *ὦσιν*) *ἐν ὑμῖν*. We have *ἔρις* and *ζῆλος* in 1 Cor. iii. 3, and *ἔρις* in 1 Cor. i. 11; on *ἐριθεῖες* comp. Winer, § 9 [p. 59, Philad. ed.]. *Θυμοί* occurs also in Gal. v. 20, and signifies vehement passion, boiling emotion. *Θυμός* signifies the heart as the seat of passionate emotion, and then this emotion itself—passion, wrath, rage; the plural is found also in the classic writers. *Ἐριθεια* signifies hired work, mercenariness, love of intrigue, a disposition to foment parties. See Rom. ii. 8; Gal. v. 20; Phil. i. 17; ii. 3; James iii. 14, 16 (not of *ἔρις*.) Com. Meyer and Fritzsche on Rom. ii. 8. *Καταλαλιαί* signifies, evil reports in general; *ψιθυρίσμοί*, secret slanderings. The original verb of *φυσιώσεις* is used with reference to the insolence of faction, an arrogant conceit of knowledge, and arrogance with respect to gifts in general, in 1 Cor. iv. 6; viii. 1; xiii. 4. *Ἀκαταστασίαι* occurs in chap. vi. 5; 1 Cor. xiv. 33. In addition to these moral defects, which had

[* The whole comment of Chrysostom on this verse is so characteristic a specimen of his discrimination and acuteness, that I cannot resist the inclination to transcribe it:—"It was not here out of arrogance, nor the authority of a teacher, but out of a father's tender concern, when he is more fearful and trembling than the sinners are themselves at that which is likely to reform them. And not even so does he run them down (*κατατρέχει*), nor make an absolute assertion, but says doubtingly (*ἐνδοιάζων*): '*lest perchance when I come*,' *etc.* Nor does he call them not virtuous or wicked (*ἐναρέτους*), but: '*I shall not find you such as I would*;' everywhere employing terms of affection. And the words: '*I shall find*,' are those of one who would express what is out of natural expectation (*τὸ παρὰ προσδοκίαν δηλοῦντός ἐστιν*), as are also those: '*I shall be found by you*.' For the thing is not of deliberate choice, but of a necessity originating with you. Wherefore he says: 'I shall be found such as ye would not.' He said not here: *such as I would not*, but with more severity: '*such as ye wish not*,' for it would in that case become his own will, not indeed what he would first have willed, but his will nevertheless. For he might indeed have said again, 'such as I would not,' and so have shown his love; but he wishes not to relax (*ἐκλῦσαι*) his hearer. Yea, rather, his words would in that case have been even harsher (*τραχύτερος*), but now he has at once dealt them a smarter blow, and showed himself more gentle. For this is the characteristic of his wisdom (*τὸ βαθύτερον τέμνοντα, ἡμερώτερον πλήττειν*), cutting more deeply, to strike more gently"].

their origin in the factious spirit prevailing at Corinth, and hence called for decisive measures, the Apostle now proceeds (ver. 21) to mention some manifestations of that sensuality for which their city was noted.—**Lest again when I come, my God shall humble me with respect to you** (ver. 21 *a*).—There is no need of commencing a new period here, and so of giving this whole verse an interrogative form. The reading *ταπεινώσει* does not require this, for this word, like the *μή* (previously *μήπως*), indicates simply an increased anxiety that such a sad calamity should not come upon him. We may also notice that a question calling for a negative answer (comp. vers. 17, 18) would not be appropriate in this connection (ver. 20). The *πάλιν* qualifies the whole phrase: *ἐλθόντος μου ταπεινώσει με* (comp. chap. ii. 1), and not merely either *ἐλθόντος μου* or *ταπεινώσει*. He does not intend to say that he had experienced a similar mortification during some former visit [and yet comp. chap. ii. 1. We see not how *πάλιν* can have its force without supposing some reference to a former visit, even if it should be made to qualify *ἐλθόντος* alone. And yet this could not have been his *first* visit when he had great success and general joy in spite of his persecutions, but certainly no such humiliations. We are obliged to think of a second unrecorded visit between his first and second Epistle. See on ver. 1 of the next chapter]. The genitive absolute here is remarkable, and hence the reading in the Receptus. The *ταπεινοῦν* has reference not to the exercise of discipline among them, as if this would produce a feeling of humiliation on account of his love to the Church and to the Lord, and would be traceable to God because it would take place according to the Divine will, but rather to the mortification the Apostle would experience if he were compelled to see the fruit of his labors among them utterly destroyed, and thus to find all his boasting either much abated or completely wrested from him. Should such a humiliation come upon him, he would trace it to the hand of God, and receive it as a wholesome discipline. He would therefore humbly submit himself to it, and find consolation in the reflection that the God who did it was *his* God (Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 4), the God whom he served, and with whom he was in such intimate fellowship that the interests of one were the interests of both. If we give the word the sense of: to trouble, or to grieve, it will have precisely the same signification with *πενθήσω*. Πρὸς *ὑμᾶς* has here the sense, not of: *with* or *among you*, for with such a meaning it would be superfluous, but of: in respect to you. —**And I shall bewail many of those who have sinned before and have not repented of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they have committed** (ver. 21 *b*). The word *πενθεῖν* signifies, *to mourn, to lament, lugere*, especially for the dead, *etc.* It expresses the genuine feeling of a spiritual pastor (comp. Calvin), and perhaps it alludes to the idea of a spiritual death. It expresses either the sorrow he would feel on account of their impenitence (Meyer), or the grief he would feel in denouncing punishment or in excommunicating them (De Wette, *et al.*). [In ancient times sentence of condemnation in the Church was pronounced with outward signs of sorrow and mourning; see 1 Cor. v. 2; 2 Cor. vii. 7, 9 (Old Paraphrase). Perhaps the customs attending excommunication were derived from an extreme interpretation of such passages]. The objects of this sorrow are mentioned when he says: *πολλοὺς τῶν προημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων, etc.* This is not an inexact form for designating a general class, instead of saying *τοὺς μὴ μετανοήσαντας*; many, *i. e.*, who have not repented. But the Apostle had not in mind all unconverted sinners, in every congregation, among whom he gave especial prominence to those in Corinth by using the word *πολλοὺς* (Lücke), for nothing in the context warrants us in giving such an extension to the idea. He unquestionably had his eye upon sinners in Corinth alone, when he used the phrase *προημαρτηκότες, etc.* But our further explanation must depend upon the answer to the question, whether *ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ, etc.*, should be connected with *μετανοησάντων* or with *πενθήσω*. The first method would be without analogy, so far as the New Testament is concerned, for in every instance there, *μεταν.* is construed with *ἀπό* or *ἐκ* (with *ἐπί* only in the Old Testament, in Joel ii. 13, and Amos vii. 3, where the *μετανοεῖν* in both cases is the act of God). And yet it is probably admissible, even if the idea of a mere change of mind without that of sorrow for sin, be connected with the word. It would then signify, a change of mind in respect to, or on account of, *etc.* [Osiander draws attention to the contrast of *προ*: and *μετα*:] The connection of the words with *πενθήσω* seems rather unusual and strange, inasmuch as in other places we meet with *πενθεῖν ἐπί τινι* in the sense of: to lament over something, but not with *πενθεῖν τινα ἐπί τινι*. It is, however, not altogether unallowable on this account. If we adopt the first mode of connecting the words, we must understand by *πολλούς* the worst among the class of persons mentioned (De Wette, Osiander), *i. e.*, those whom he would be obliged to punish by excluding them from the Church (*πενθεῖν* would then be: to mourn for them as dead persons; and it is used with respect to such an act in 1 Cor. v. 2). If we adopt the other mode, *προημαρτηκότες, etc.*, would signify those who had in any manner sinned, *etc.*, and we should make the Apostle say that he feared he should have to mourn over many of these on account of the sins of the flesh, of which they were guilty; and he designs to mention here the other class of sins which were most prevalent at Corinth (*i. e.*, besides those mentioned in ver. 20). We prefer the second of the methods, because the reference to the excommunication of the worst contains something unnatural, and 1 Cor. v. 2 by no means justifies us in referring *πενθήσω* to such a transaction. Against this second method no objection should be urged on account of the position of *πενθήσω*, nor of the thought itself, to *mourn for one on account of such things.* Πενθήσω stands at the commencement of the clause for the sake of emphasis, and *ἐπί* stands not at a very extraordinary distance from it. The Apostle might very reasonably be understood to mourn over such impenitent persons on account of their sins, even though he does not in this place, as in other places (comp. 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10), bring pro-

minently before us the consequences of those sins. The προ, however, refers not to the period before their conversion, but to the time preceding his second visit, when misunderstandings had begun to prevail, and when he had admonished them to repent (comp. chap. xiii. 2), though with so little success that he found the peculiar faults mentioned in vers. 20 and 21 were still prevalent among them. Ἀκαθαρσία signifies sins of a sensual nature generally, such as defiled both soul and body, Rom. i. 24; Gal. v. 19; Eph. iv. 19. Πορνεία (1 Cor. v. 1), and ἀσέλγεια (wantonness, shamelessness, voluptuousness, Rom. xiii. 13; Gal. v. 19, *et al.*), are particular exhibitions of ἀκαθαρσία. Πράσσειν signifies, to bring about, achieve (comp. Passow). We do not (with Meyer and Osiander) make μὴ μετανοησάντων refer to those who should be impenitent at the anticipated coming of the Apostle at Corinth: "and shall not have repented," but to the fruitlessness of his admonitions when he was among them the second time. [The perfect in προημ. has here a special force and significance, implying that the sins were continued, and were not overcome by a true repentance. The aorist of μὴ μεταν. is in contrast with this, and we see no reason why it may not be taken in the sense of a futur. exact, *i. e.*, those who will not have repented when I shall be with you].

Chap. xiii. 1–4. **This is the third time I am coming to you** (ver 1*a*) —Now follows the Apostle's announcement of his determination to proceed with an unsparing judicial severity, in accordance with what he had said in chap. xii. 20: κἀγὼ εἰρηθῶ ὑμῖν, οἷον οὐ θέλετε. Τρίτον τοῦτο signifies here: this is the third time, as in John xxi. 14, *et al.* Ἔρχομαι speaks of his actual coming, and presupposes that he had been at Corinth twice before this (it cannot refer to a mere purpose or plan of such a journey, nor to a coming by letters).

[*General note on Paul's visits to Corinth.* It seems to us impossible to interpret 2 Cor. xiii. 1, on any other view than that Paul had previously been twice at Corinth. It cannot be made to mean simply, *this is the second time I have been ready*, and if it could it would have been a most unfortunate reference, in which he would rather remind his readers of his failure actually to come. The usual appeal to chap. xii. 14, is unsatisfactory, not only because our passage should not be a repetition of that, but because the proper idea of that is, *I am ready to come the third time.* The word διέρχομαι in 1 Cor. xvi. 5, is not quite to the point (Wordsworth), since it would only show how the will was taken for the fact, but would not account for his expected coming, being the third of a series of the same kind. Certainly no one, reading 2 Cor. xiii 1, without a previous bias, would ever think of anything but a third actual visit. In 2 Cor. ii. 1, Paul also implies that he had once visited them "in heaviness," evidently on account of the misconduct of Christians there; in 2 Cor. xii. 21 he intimates that God had then humbled him; and in 2 Cor. xiii. 2 (rightly rendered) he implies that he had then given them warning that if he came again he would not spare them. Now when could that visit have been paid? The whole idea is unsuitable to the *first* visit when the church was formed. Nor could it have been after that which we now call the First Epistle, when he announced his intention to remain at Corinth until Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8), and after "the Epistle" in which he had written to them "not to keep company with fornicators" (1 Cor. v. 9), and answered the inquiries the Corinthians had made of him (1 Cor. vii. 1). See Introd § 6. But we know that Paul resided at Ephesus during the whole time between his first visit to Corinth and his journey through Macedonia, during which he wrote our present Second Epistle. There must, however, have been time enough after his departure from Corinth for the springing up of the disorders which were censured in that unrecorded visit, and the subsequent lost Epistle, and for the sending of a letter and perhaps a deputation from the Corinthian Church to Paul (1 Cor. vii. 1; i. 11; xvi. 17). On the supposition that Paul came to Ephesus late in the year 54, Alford ventures to place the unrecorded journey in the Spring of 55, and the lost Epistle in the Spring of 57, or at least early in the same year in which he left Ephesus for Macedonia (1 Cor. xvi. 8). As Ephesus and Corinth were the usual points of transit between Asia and Europe, Paul might easily have made a brief visit of the kind supposed, but as it was attended with no special results, it was not mentioned in the Acts. The shipwrecks and disasters at sea mentioned in 2 Cor. xi. 23–28, indicate that Paul must have made several voyages during his missionary life, which are not recorded. Comp. Alford, Introd. to Cor. § 5., and Essay on *How to use the Epistles in Sun. Mag. for* 1867. J. L. Davies, *Art. Paul in Smith's Dict. of the Bible*].

In the mouth of two witnesses and of three shall every word be established (ver. 1*b*).—By a citation from the very letter of the Law in Deut. xix. 15, the Apostle lets them see how rigid and precise were to be his disciplinary proceedings when he should come to them this third time. He would so arrange the proceedings that the witnesses should be heard in the presence of the congregation (comp. 1 Cor. v. 12, 13, 3, *etc.*), for in the trial of notorious offences, it would be necessary to adhere strictly to all legal forms, that he might avoid any appearance of partiality. Ῥῆμα [*the word*, after the Hebrew manner] stands here for the matter, cause, conduct or charge in dispute. Σταθήσεται, signifies: *shall be established, determined or brought to a decision.* Ἐπὶ στόματος, *i. e.*, on account of what is spoken. The καί instead of ἤ before τριῶν was designed to imply, *and by three*, if there are so many; or, *also by three*, as if he had said, *from two to three.* The free application which some have made of this citation from the law, (either to his repeated warnings and their certainty and validity; or to those repeated announcements of his coming with the accompanying warnings and threatenings which were equally sure to prove true; or to the various occasions on which he had been or was about to be present among them, as if these were distinct personal witnesses to establish the truth of the matter) seems to us by no means ingenious or plausible, even if we accept the more delicate and profound explanation which Osiander proposes; *viz.*, that his apostolic visits among them were, in consequence of their repetition, not

merely means by which he directly saw them, but distinct practical attestations of his faithful testimony among them, deposing against those who should continue impenitent (comp. Matth. viii. 4; x. 18).*—Whether any relation was intended between *τρίτον* and *τριῶν* is very uncertain. Inasmuch as he was about to announce in ver. 2, that he was now determined to proceed in an unsparing manner against them, it is difficult to perceive in what way he can imply that he was especially patient in delaying and in repeatedly warning them.—What is said in 1 Tim. v. 19 shows that the law in such matters was not looked upon as abrogated. [Its validity, however, depended upon its general reasonableness and upon Christ's recognition and re-institution (Matth. xviii. 15) and not upon the perpetual obligation of the Mosaic precept].—**I have said already and now say beforehand, as when I was present the second time so now also in my absence, to them which heretofore have sinned and to all the rest** (ver. 2*a*).—The verb *προείρηκα* (I have said before) has reference to previous announcements which still remained in force (perfect tense), and *προλέγω* (I foretell) to what he was then writing [in which he probably used precisely the same words, *viz.*: "If I come again," *etc.*] With respect to the former, he says: that he had said when present the second time, *i. e.*, as I did when I was present the second time; and with respect to the latter he says, I say beforehand, now when I am absent (*καὶ ἀπὼν νῦν*, comp. ver. 10). There is a correspondence between the two clauses *προείρηκα* and *προλέγω* on the one hand, and *τὸ δεύτερον* and *νῦν* on the other, and hence the *τὸ δεύτερον* should not be separated from *παρών* and connected with *προλέγω*. It is evident from ver. 1 (*τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι*) and other passages, that the Apostle had already been twice at Corinth, and hence there is no need of the interpretation here: "as if I were present the second time, although I am now absent." The *προημαρτηκότες* were those in general who had previously sinned (and even then [open perfect] continued to do so), whether before his second visit (*ὡς παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον*), or until his present writing (*ἀπὼν νῦν*). The *λοιποί* were not those who had become impure after those just mentioned, as if *προημαρτ.* were related to *προείρηκα* and *οἱ λοιποί* to *προλέγω*, for such an expression would be not only forced but indistinct. It means rather the remaining members of the congregation, either such as witnessed his threatenings, or (better) such as should be brought by his warnings and their own reflection to a reformation, and hence such as would not fall under discipline. The substance of what he had thus told them, and now foretold them, was:—**that if I come again I will not spare** (ver. 2*b*).—In the words *εἰς τὸ πάλιν*, the *πάλιν* which had been used as a noun, is converted by the *εἰς* back again into an adverb. Why it was that he had been so lenient on his second visit is not told us; it may have been because he had hoped that they would themselves come to a better mind by reflection, or because he had feared that he would only make matters worse, *etc.* With *οὐ φείσομαι* is intimately connected what is said in ver. 3.—**Since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me, who toward you is not weak, but is strong among you** (ver. 3).—The reason he would not spare them, is introduced by *ἐπεί*: "I will not spare, since now ye seek, and indeed challenge by your conduct a proof," *etc.* Others make *ἐπεὶ ζητεῖτε* the protasis or conditional proposition to ver. 5, and regard the words, "Who is not weak toward you—by the power of God toward you," or at least the whole of ver. 4, as a parenthesis. Such a construction, however, seems unnecessary and awkward. *Δοκιμήν*, which stands for emphasis at the commencement of the sentence, signifies: proof, trial, verification by experiment [see on 2 Cor. ii. 9]. The genitive, however, may be either of the object: the proof of the fact, *etc.*, *i. e.*, the proof that Christ is speaking in me; or of the subject: that Christ may give proof that He is in me. That which follows, *who is not weak toward you, etc.*, is rather in favor of the latter interpretation. In the words, *Christ speaking in me*, he had reference not merely to Christ's speaking through him (*ἐν*=*διά*), but to Christ's being and acting in him. By their impenitent conduct they were putting Him to the proof whether he could carry out what He had threatened against them, and so they challenged Him to make a demonstration of His power to punish them. What is said in the relative sentence, was intended to make them consider how dangerous such a challenge was: "who is not weak with respect to you [*εἰς*], but is mighty among [*ἐν*] you." In this he refers not to earlier manifestations of this power among them by means of spiritual gifts and miracles, *etc.*, but to such an exercise of it among them as would become indispensable to punish them if they continued impenitent. The word *δυνατεῖ* occurs nowhere else except here and in Rom. xiv. 4, though it is analogous to *ἀδυνατεῖ*, and was perhaps occasioned by the use of *ἀσθενεῖ*. The reason for the assertion that Christ was not weak but mighty, he now proceeds to give in ver. 4:—**For he also was**

[* Stanley (with whom Wordsworth agrees) thinks it unlikely that Paul would express himself so formally and yet so imperfectly if he merely intended to speak of the usual legal process. He therefore contends that "the journeys of the Apostle, accomplished or intended, occupy throughout the Epistle a prominent place in his mind; and now they seem to him to assume almost a distinct personal existence, as though each constituted a separate attestation to his assertion. He, as it were, appears to himself, a different person, and, therefore, a different witness in each journey accomplished or proposed. The first witness was that which he had delivered during his first visit, or in his first Epistle (iv. 20); to which he refers in the words: 'I have said before' (*προείρηκα*). The second witness was that which he now bore on his present journey and through his present Epistle, which was intended to supply the place of the journey once intended (chap. i. 15; 1 Cor. xvi. 7) but now abandoned by him. To this he refers in the word *προλέγω* 'I speak beforehand,' *i. e.*, before my next visit; and he strengthens this witness by representing himself as in a manner present on that second visit which had really been postponed (*ὡς παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον*). It is by thus reckoning his second Epistle as being virtually a second visit, or at least a second witness, that he was enabled in the first verse, to call the visit which was now about to be actually accomplished, his third visit. And this third visit would be reckoned as the third witness, if it were necessary that the words quoted from Deut. were to be literally complied with." We have thought it fair that this view (which had so general a support in ancient, and until recent times), should be thus fairly presented, but we agree with Barnes when he says, that "with all respect due to such great names, it seems to us that this is trifling and childish in the extreme." Hodge: "Three visits are *not* the testimony of three witnesses."]

crucified on account of weakness, but he lives on account of the power of God (ver. 4 *a*). The Apostle here reminds them that Christ was once reduced to an extremity of weakness, but that he now lived by the power of God. That extremity was when He endured crucifixion in consequence of the human infirmity which He had experienced in the season of His (voluntary) humiliation and privation (Phil. ii. 7–11). Ἐκ here designates the cause or origin. The ζῇν refers to the life of absolute power (energy) which began with Christ's resurrection, was derived from God, and was afterwards proved by influences among men (comp. Rom. vi. 4; Acts ii. 33; Eph. i. 20–23; Phil. ii. 9). If we accept the reading: καὶ γὰρ εἰ (which Osiander with Tischendorf adopts as the *lect. diffic.*), εἰ must be taken as concessive, and by itself it seems not inconsistent with the ἀλλά which follows. But καὶ γὰρ does not correspond with ἀλλά very well, inasmuch as it signifies not merely: *for*, but: *for even*. Καὶ γὰρ εἰ would then signify: for even (although) if. But καὶ εἰ indicates that the condition must be looked upon as an extreme one, and not to be expected. On the other hand εἰ καί would have implied that this condition was probable or certain, but that for the argument in hand it was a matter of indifference. We are obliged in this case to suppose that there has been an exchanging of καὶ εἰ for εἰ καί, which must be ascribed to some transcriber having interpolated the εἰ, rather than to Paul. A concessive protasis appears appropriate on account of the ἀλλά. The solution of the difficulty which Osiander proposes, *viz.*, that the καί implies that the case of Christ was similar to that of his ministers, does not seem clear to us, and indeed appears unintelligible. The best way would seem to be, to leave out the εἰ, as it may easily have been inserted. It is evident that the Apostle looked upon this as the actual condition in which Christ was, for he now proceeds to show that he himself was in the same condition of weakness and life through the power of God: **—for we also are weak in him, but we shall live together with him through the power of God toward you** (ver. 4 *b*).—It is evident, therefore, that he leaves us to infer what must be the condition of Christ from that of one who stood in fellowship with Christ (ἐν—σὺν αὐτῷ); inasmuch as the condition of the former was reflected or was repeated in that of his followers, or was the consequence of it. Ἀσθενοῦμεν refers not to the Apostle's sufferings, but to his appearing to lack power when he spared the Corinthians It must be regarded, therefore, as something which was like Christ's own weakness, voluntarily assumed. He describes it also by the words ἐν αὐτῷ as something which was the consequence of his fellowship with Christ [Winer's *Idioms*, § 52, p. 311 note], and therefore like Christ's own weakness transient and temporary, inasmuch as the Divine power which made Christ alive would necessarily and in that very act make alive all who were connected with him (σὺν αὐτῷ). And indeed, εἰς ὑμᾶς indicates that his being alive would be manifested in the energy by which they would be directed. There is no reference in the word ζῆν, as here used, to the future resurrection, but it means simply to be vigorous, to be full of life. Neander: "In the discharge of our Apostolic authority among you will be manifested the Divine power of a risen and glorified Christ." [The Apostle, in this passage, surely claims that Christ spoke and acted in him, and we reasonably infer that his Apostolic words, Epistles and acts were those of an infallible Christ within him. It has been said that he never advanced such a claim. Not only in the ἀλλὰ, which occurs in both clauses of ver. 4, but in the use of the present (ζῇ ἀσθενοῦμεν) and the future (ζήσομεν) in opposition to (ἐσταυρώθη), we have a strong contrast with the resurrection and all its endless and perpetual influences through Christ and His people].

Vers. 5–10.—**Examine your own selves whether ye are in the faith, prove your own selves** (ver. 5 *a*).—In opposition to the thought represented in ver. 3, according to which they desired a proof of Christ in him, the Apostle presents the demand that they should direct their examination to their own selves. For the sake of emphasis ἑαυτούς is put first. Πειράζειν signifies, to make proof or trial of one, to tempt (1 Cor. x. 9, ἐκπειράζειν Χριστόν, which is here the same as δοκιμὴν ζητεῖν, *etc.*). [On the ordinary distinction to be observed between these expressions, see Trench, *Synn.* 2d Part, p. 119ff]. He then more particularly defines the point to which that self-examination should be directed, *i. e.*, whether they were in the faith; thus probably intimating that their δοκιμὴν ζητεῖν betrayed a serious defect in that respect, inasmuch as they would hardly have needed any proof of Christ in him if they had been in the faith. *To be in the faith*, or, to esteem themselves standing in the faith, were phrases which designated a living Christianity, the original principle of which is a faith laying hold of Christ, surrendering the whole heart to Him, and in this way bringing us into fellowship with Him (not: *fides qua creditur*, in contrast with erroneous doctrines; and also not the faith of miracles). The δοκιμάζειν also is not in this passage equivalent to δόκιμον ποιεῖν, but as in 1 Cor. xi. 28, it signifies, to try, to inquire into the worthiness of a thing, with the view of accurately distinguishing between what is and what is not genuine. The word here properly refers back to their seeking a proof of Christ (δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε). The essential nature of the faith is further pointed out in the succeeding clause.—**Or know ye not your own selves, that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye are to some extent unapproved** (ver. 5 *b*)?—(Comp. Eph. iii. 17; Gal. ii. 20). The use of the entire name Ἰησοῦς Χριστός indicates more than usual solemnity, and implies that the presence of Christ's spirit, by faith, in the Church and in the hearts of its members, produces a practical fellowship with the whole person of Christ (comp. vi. 16; 1 Cor. iii. 16; Eph. ii. 21–22). In ἑαυτοὺς, ὅτι—ἐν ὑμῖν we have an attraction of a peculiar kind (where the attracted word is not the subject of the succeeding sentence). [Winer's *Idioms*, § 63, 3. a. p. 896]. *Yourselves* (ἑαυτούς) in this connection is emphatic, since it is contrasted with *Christ speaking in you*, in ver. 3. [Our English version entirely overlooks the ἤ at the head of the clause.] There

are two ways by which *ἢ οὐκ ἐπιγιν. etc.*, may be connected in sense with that which precedes it; according to the first, the spiritual relation which Christ sustained toward them, and of course into their faith, in order to ascertain whether it was not wavering (Osiander). According to the second, he appeals to their sense of honor, and implies that for this reason they should not shrink from self-examination; *i. e.*, they surely ought not to be so entirely destitute of a Christian spirit as not to know their own selves (Meyer, deWette). In either case there was a motive for self-examination; but the *ἢ οὐκ* argues in favor of the latter method. In *εἰ μήτι ἀδόκιμοί ἐστε*, he intended to say, that they would find this to be the case with themselves, unless they should prove to be unworthy, spurious Christians (OSIANDER: He throws out a doubt of that gracious state to which they laid claim, in the same proportion in which they were ignorant of their relation to Christ and did not examine themselves). Ἐι *μήτι* is used in 1 Cor. vii. 5; and the *τι* has the effect rather to soften the force of the expression [unless ye are "*somewhat reprobates*," or "*to some extent abide not the proof*"]. *Ἀδόκιμοι* has reference to *δοκιμάζετε* and *δοκιμήν*, which he had previously used.—**But I trust ye shall know that we are not unapproved** (ver. 6).—This verse is intimately connected with the latter part of ver. 5. *Ἀδόκιμοι*, in this verse, has reference to Paul's power as an Apostle to punish offenders, and he expresses the hope that (in case he should be compelled to exercise it) they would find him [if they ventured to put him to the proof] (in this respect) not unapproved, *i. e.*, as one who throws out empty threatenings, but is too feeble to execute them; but rather one who would make those who perseveringly resisted him feel his power (comp. vv. 7 and 9). This was the *δοκιμή* which they sought (ver. 3). His hope, however, was not fixed exclusively upon the punishment in itself, but upon the proper authentication of his office, the maintenance of his Apostolic authority by such means. The interpretation which maintains that *γνώσεσθε* (ye shall know) is to be understood, not of an experimental knowledge, but of a knowledge gained by their reformation in consequence of his warning, or by an observation of his life and works as an Apostle [*i. e.*, if you put our Apostolical power to the test by appealing to our clemency], is not quite consistent with the general scope of the passage. The same may be said of the view which aims to mediate between the different explanations, and maintains that the knowledge was to be obtained partly by an examination of themselves and partly by their experience of ecclesiastical discipline.—But in ver. 7 he shows that he would gladly be spared such an authentication of his power:—**But we pray God that ye do no evil** (ver. 7*a*);—His desire is expressed in the form of a prayer. The explanation which makes *ὑμᾶς* the object and the Apostle himself the subject of *ποιῆσαι* [that I may do you no evil], is unsatisfactory: 1, because he could not apply such a designation to the punishment he inflicted; 2, because *κακὸν ποιεῖν μηδέν* has an evident reference to *τὸ καλὸν ποιεῖν* [the one being what is morally bad or worse, and the other what is morally honorable, beautiful and right].—**not that we should appear approved, but that ye should do what is good, though we be as unapproved** (ver. 7*b*).—He here expresses what was more particularly the purport of his prayer. (We should observe the change which here takes place in the construction: the infinitive and *ἵνα*, comp. *προσεύχεσθαι ἵνα* Col. i. 9; 2 Thess. i. 11). The prayer was not (I pray or I desire), that he might appear approved (in consequence of the infliction of punishment, or the accomplishment of his threatenings) but that the Corinthians might do well (that which is right), though he should be unapproved (inasmuch as his threatenings would remain unfulfilled, or seem needless and uncalled for). [In this case he would use the word *ἀδόκιμος* in two different senses: in the one sense he would not be unapproved, since the reformation of the Corinthians would be the best proof of his Apostolic power, but in another sense he *would* be unapproved, because he would fail in the fulfilment of his threatenings, on account of their reformation. He meant to say that he cared not for being unapproved in the latter sense, since they would be saved and edified. Comp. Stanley]. Another explanation is given by Meyer, who takes *ἵνα* in the sense of, *that, in order that*, and understands *δόκιμοι* of the approbation which would be awarded to him as their spiritual father, if they should conduct themselves well; but he makes *ἀδόκιμοι* refer to his failure in exercising and applying his power as an Apostle to inflict punishment. It must be conceded that the idea advanced in this first explanation lies not within the range of thought pursued by the context, and yet it would not be inconsistent with Paul's manner, to say that the good conduct of his readers might make him seem in one aspect *δόκιμος* and in another *ἀδόκ.-μος*. He certainly gives reason in ver. 8 for saying that if they did well he would have no occasion for exercising his power as an Apostle to punish them, and therefore would in that same degree appear unapproved, inasmuch as he had laid down the rule by which he would be governed in his course with them:—**For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth** (ver. 8).—The truth here may be explained either as equivalent to moral truth (comp. 1 Cor. v. 8) or righteousness (a sense which is not allowable unless it is made necessary by the context); or as signifying that he could do nothing which did not accord with the facts of the case, a meaning very appropriate to a judicial proceeding, but entirely unsuitable when we come to the phrase *for the truth*. Meyer makes the word mean the truth *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, *i. e.*, the gospel: "If their good conduct had not been his object (*ἀλλ' ἵνα*) he would have been working against the Gospel; since that was a system designed to promote morality on Christian principles." Osiander's explanation is preferable: "The Divine law was the truth from which we deduce all our rules of discipline; and in Paul's Apostolic work he could do nothing against this, but every thing he did would finally result in the

advancement of that Divine truth which was dispensed in the Gospel." Κατα against—ὑπέρ, for its interests. In the latter sentence δυνάμεθά τι should be supplied.—**For we rejoice when we are weak and ye are strong: this also we pray for, even your restoration to complete order** (ver. 9).—His object here was to confirm what he had said in ver. 8, by assuring them that he would rejoice, even if he were weak, *i. e.*, powerless, so far as relates to the exercise of discipline among them (from want of occasion); and they were strong, *i. e.*, should conduct themselves so wisely as to disarm him of all judicial authority against them. If this were so, how could he do anything in opposition to the truth, and to those rules of action which the truth prescribed? He furthermore assures them that it was the object of his constant prayer, that they might in this way be made strong. As in ver. 7 εὔχεσθαι signifies not merely to wish, for it is an advance beyond the thought expressed in χαίρομεν. Τὴν κατάρτισιν ὑμῶν is added after τοῦτο epexegetically, and signifies your restoration to complete order, *i. e.*, perfection. The verb is used in ver. 11 and in 1 Cor. i. 10, and καταρτισμός in Eph. iv. 12. It contains a reserved hint that their condition at that time was disorderly.—**For this cause being absent I write these things, lest being present I should use sharpness according to the power which the Lord gave me for edification and not for destruction** (ver. 10).—In this he adds an explanation of his design in writing this Epistle: "I have written because my joy and my great anxiety before God is, that ye may be strong and restored to your proper state." In this expression he had reference to the whole Epistle, but especially to the latter part of it.—He here uses the singular number, because he begins to treat of conduct and purposes which belonged only to himself. Ἀποτόμως (Tit. i. 13, the noun is in Rom. xi. 22) signifies roughly, rigorously, with strict severity (from a verb signifying to cut or tear off). Κρῆσθαι is here used absolutely, and signifies to proceed, to act; in other places it is used with the dative of the mode of proceeding or acting, but here, with an adverb, there is no need of supplying ὑμῖν. The reason for his wishing not to act thus, he gives when he says that his power was given him for edification and not for destruction (comp. chap. x. 8). [He had no power or authority for the injury of men: it was all for their edification. Except for the latter purpose therefore it was not only null and void as to authority, but it was actually powerless in result. By a beautiful figure he conceives himself as a builder intrusted with no right or means to do anything except for the welfare of his fellow-men, to advance the true interests of humanity. Such were the Apostle's views of the limits of ecclesiastical power with respect to οἰκοδομήν. Comp. on 2 Cor. v. 1 and x. 8. Also J. S. Howson, *on Paul's use of Metaphore in Sund. Mag.*, 1867].

Vers. 11–13. **Finally, brethren, rejoice. Be perfectly joined together, be comforted, be of one mind, be at peace** (ver. 11 *a*).—Having in the previous verses resumed his original mildness of manner, he now concludes with some friendly admonitions, though without relaxing anything in the earnestness of his purpose. [The word ἀδελφοί, which he so often uses in his other Epistles and especially in his First Epistle but so seldom (only four times) in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, indicates here the importance of what he was about to say, and his transition to a new section, in which his affectionate spirit breathes forth with especial power.] In ver. 11, λοιπόν does not signify: for the future, henceforth, but it is a concluding particle in the sense of, *as for the rest* (*ceterum*), as in the Eph. vi. 10 *etc.*; 2 Thess. iii. 1. Osiander: "His object was to say, that he had something of importance to them, still upon his heart." This was addressed not exclusively to those whose minds were best disposed toward him, but like the preceding verses, to the whole congregation. Χαίρετε is not here a parting salutation, for that is given afterwards in ver. 13; but an exhortation to rejoice in the Lord (Phil. iii. 1, iv. 4). very appropriately pressed upon them after all that he had said in this Epistle to grieve them. But this χαίρειν could take place only on condition of the καταρτίζεσθαι and the τέλειον γίνεσθαι, *i. e.*, on condition of their complete restoration to order and to their perfection. These are here urged upon them as acts which they must themselves perform [middle voice and reflexive] under the power of the χαίρειν, which again is conditioned by the καταρτίζεσθαι. W. F. Besser: "In the alarm cry: Be perfect, (prepare yourselves)! hear the call of your commander, to form into rank and file, and to get into order of battle" (Col. ii. 5). But both the χαίρειν and the καταρτίξεσθαι were the conditions on which the παρακαλεῖσθαι was dependent. This παρακαλεῖσθε is here not an admonition or an exhortation that they should make progress in spiritual things (give attention to it among you), but that they should be comforted (comp. i. 4–7; vii. 7–13) with respect to all those things which had grieved them. An exhortation to mutual comfort (to comfort one another) would have been differently expressed: παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτούς or ἀλλήλους (1 Thess. iv. 18; v. 11; Heb. iii. 13). Finally he calls upon them to be of one mind (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖτε), which may be regarded as implying an humble estimate of each one's own self, a love for one another, and a tender interest in each other's welfare, on the ground that they had a community of interests in the Christian life (Phil. iii. 15–16; iv. 2; Rom. xii. 16; xv. 5; *Beck Seelenl.* p. 61), and to live in peace, *i. e.*, to maintain unity of action in the outer life (Mark ix. 50; Rom. xii. 18; 1 Thess. v. 13). To these admonitions he attaches yet further a promise: —**And the God of love and peace shall be with you** (ver. 11 *b*)—*i. e.*, if ye do these things, the God who is the author of love (τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν) and of peace (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 33; Rom. xv. 33; xvi. 20; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. xiii. 20) will be with you, will be near you to bless you, and to grant you the enjoyment of His gracious communion. That God from whom love and peace proceeds, makes those who yield to His influences in these respects, and are faithful in such things, experience how rich is His grace, and how abundant are His blessings. —**Salute one another with a holy kiss** (ver. 12).—On this verse comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 20.

[With respect to the φίλημα ἀγ. see on 1 Thess. v. 26; Rom. xvi. 16, and 1 Cor. xvi. 20. Among the Greeks the kiss had only an erotic signification, but among the Jews and Oriental nations it was generally a token of affection among kindred and friends. The Jews refused it to all except the holy seed of Israel. Thence it passed into the Christian community; and Justin says, (*Apol.* II. p. 37), "After the prayers are ended (in the church), we greet one another with a kiss." Cyril (Hier.) says that before the '*sursum corda*,') a deacon proclaimed to the communicants in the words of this verse: "Salute" *etc.* In the Eastern churches it was given before, and in the Western after the consecration of the sacramental emblems, and before their distribution, as a sign of reconciliation and love. In the *Apost. Constt.* it is said: "Let the men salute one another, and the women also one another, with a holy kiss in the Lord." Paul anticipated that his Epistle would be read before the whole Church, and he, therefore, connected with it this ecclesiastical or hieratic usage, as a sign of the common covenant by which they were all members one of another and the body of Christ. BINGHAM, *Chr. Antt.* B. XII. Ch. IV. § 5. SMITH'S *Dict. of the Bible*, OSIANDER and WORDSWORTH, *on* 1 *Thess.* V. 26].—**All the saints salute you** (ver. 13).—The words οἱ ἅγιοι πάντες refer to those saints who lived in the region from which he was writing (Macedonia), but a more comprehensive sense of the words is not excluded (comp. Osiander, who very thoroughly discusses the meaning of this whole verse). In place of his own salutation, he gives us finally that precious Benediction which has acquired such a liturgical importance in every age and in every part of the Christian world:—**The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all** (ver. 14).—[It is the most formal and solemn of all Paul's forms of benediction, and accordingly has been universally selected as the one to be used by the Church in its worship. It ascribes to each Person of the Trinity a special but not an exclusive part in the work of redemption. Each of those Persons share in the work of grace and love and communion, but each of them is distinguished for a peculiar prominence in one of these departments. Each of them are mentioned with equal, but with a distinct honor and efficiency. They are presented, not according to their ontologic or metaphysical nature, but to their economic relation to sinful men in the work of salvation. That salvation comes to us "*from* (ἐκ) God the Father, *through* (διὰ) God the Son, and *by* God the Holy Ghost."] The Benediction itself is divided into three parts in accordance with the relations of the sacred Trinity. We have first, the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ (comp. chap. viii. 9; Rom. v. 15), that grace which is continually bestowed upon, intercedes for (Rom. viii. 34), and strengthens (chap. xii. 9) those whom he has redeemed, and by means of which they come into the possession and enjoyment of the love of God. The communion of the Holy Ghost, the participation in Him and in His gracious influences, is the product of that grace and this love, and is His continual direction and application of them to believers (comp. Rom. viii. 9–26, 27; vii. 6; viii. 11; Gal. iv. 6; vi. 8. Κοινωνία, as in Phil. ii. 1, and 1 Cor. i. 9, signifies not communication merely, for τοῦ πνευμ. is the gen. subj.). He thus desires that the whole Church [even that portion which he had been obliged in some respects to censure] may enjoy all the blessings of God's salvation, as they are shed forth by the Lord of the Church, including that Spirit which is the bond of its fellowship and the source of its organic life. NEANDER: "We have in this passage the practical doctrine of the Trinity, the Father revealing His love in Christ; Christ, in and through whom he reveals Himself, and by whom the work of redemption (grace) is accomplished; and the fellowship of Divine life, which proceeds from Christ."—EWALD: "We cannot but feel an intense interest in knowing what was the effect of a letter containing such an unusual amount of severity. Fortunately we have some reason to conclude from Rom. xv. 25–27, and Acts xx. 2, that the result was all that could be wished. Paul actually returned to Corinth soon after sending this Epistle, and remained there for some time in peace, as he certainly could not have done, if this letter had not smoothed the way for him there, and enabled him to return to his beloved Church in triumph.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

1. Where an impenitent spirit which disregards all warning and admonition becomes manifest in a congregation, there is no other way than to administer discipline with severity. And yet the minister of Christ should always be careful to produce the impression that he is by no means proud of his official authority, but that he rather feels humbled under the hand of God when he finds that he is compelled to administer discipline with severity. He must indeed never spare, when he is called to act in behalf of Christ's authority, if it is evident that his forbearance will be imputed to a want of power in that Lord whom he represents, and whose organ he is known to be. Every one should be made to see not only that a minister, in imitation of his Divine Master, may for awhile lay aside his power and even appear feeble as he bears and forbears with his brethren, but that through the same Divine power which raised his Lord from the weakness of the cross to the might of an absolute and all-sufficient life, he possesses a living power for the accomplishment of those objects which are essential to the office he has received, and to his triumph over all who oppose him in his lawful work. But the same love which, on suitable occasions, refrains from all assertions of authority, will also incline him to make every exertion to avoid any necessity for its exercise. He will admonish, entreat and implore God that every thing which insolently puts Christ in him to the proof whether His threatenings are seriously intended, and whether He will venture to execute them, may disappear; that all who have been refractory and disorderly may have their attention turned rather to themselves to see whether they are in the faith and whether Christ is in them, and that so they may be reëstablished in Christian fellowship, may do that which is

good, and may be saved from the necessity of discipline. It will be a pleasure to him when he is able to exchange severity for gentleness, even though he may thus have the appearance of weakness. His only care will be so to conduct himself that Divine truth may be vindicated, that complete order may be secured, and that practical religion may be promoted.

2. Where Jesus Christ causes His grace to abound, and abundantly forgives, blesses and saves men, the love of God is revealed, and God Himself is freely and powerfully communicated to our souls. When this is the case and our souls are sealed by His grace, this love will be shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost, we shall be of one mind, we shall seek for the things that make for peace, we shall rejoice in the Lord, we shall earnestly aspire after perfection, and never want consolation when we are in trouble. In this manner the Church will be built up; and it is a blessed work to co-operate in the production of such a result by praising this grace and love, by bringing men into the communion of the Holy Ghost and by confirming them in it. No one, however, can perform such a work unless he knows by experience what it is to rejoice in this grace, love and communion, and regards it as his highest privilege to continue to do so.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

STARKE:—CHAP. x. 19. That no impediments may be thrown in the way of our work, we must, though with humble diffidence, repel those assaults which may be made upon it; but we must be especially careful lest we use such means of defence as will only make matters worse. Those who truly serve God, speak as though they were conscious of being ever before God in Christ, as though they were in communion with Him, and were under His direction.—Ver. 20. Where love is wanting, hatred will be found, and will break forth into every kind of discord, though all its forms will show a family likeness to one another. —HEDINGER:—Ver. 21. How distressing to look upon such disorders! Those whose hearts are still bleeding from the wounds which former sins, especially those of lewdness and impurity, have left upon the conscience, should be careful that those wounds be properly healed, and that the old sore is not liable to break out afresh. Isa. xxxviii. 15.—SPENER:—Chap. xiii. 1f. Even when we conclude that spiritual discipline does not call for a public judicial process, it should not be entered upon without reflection. If sinners have no fear of punishment, they will flatter themselves with the hope of impunity in sin. —HEDINGER:—To bear long is not necessarily to bear always. Even Elisha finally called for the bears, Samuel grasped the sword, and Elijah invoked fire from heaven, when time and patience were exhausted. Scoff not at God, who will surely give testimony in behalf of His servants.—Ver. 3. Let us see to it, that we do not so conduct ourselves that Christ is obliged to put forth His hand to punish rather than to assist us. The threatenings of God's faithful ministers will not be found empty words.—HEDINGER:—Ver. 4. Rejoice, for the Lord is King, and reigns in the midst of His enemies! Let no one be intimidated when the powers of darkness seem to prevail! If we would be exalted, we must humble ourselves and cheerfully bear Christ's cross.—SPENER:—Ver. 5. Many know not their own selves; for while some think too well of their own goodness, others are faint-hearted. A faithful self-examination would rectify all such errors. Most of us by nature have the bad habit of trying our neighbors and seeking a proof of what is in them, but of neglecting the same thing with respect to ourselves, Matth. vii. 1–3.—HEDINGER: —"Thou sayest: I am a Christian, a child of glory!" But hast thou proved this? Art thou really sure of it? Is it not possible that thou hast taken up with a vain conceit and received base coin for gold? Let every one search his own heart diligently, and if he finds Christ and the graces of Christ's Spirit there, if Christian love and a fraternal spirit reigns there, all is well.—SPENER:—While we examine ourselves, we almost invariably are led to pray that the Lord also would search and make us know our hearts, Ps. cxxxix. 23, 24.—If we have a faith which works by love, we have good evidence of our gracious state and of our salvation. Such an examination of ourselves is of great importance: 1, because our hearts are naturally so corrupt and our self-love is so inordinate that we never discover evil in ourselves without great difficulty; 2, because in the midst of so many cares and so much intercourse with our fellowmen, we are in danger of neglecting to watch over our thoughts, words, *etc.;* 3, because of the injury which is sure to follow the omission of this duty, in our continuance under delusive fancies, or our relapse into them; 4, because of the benefits which a frequent self-examination must bring, in the increase of faith, in assurance of salvation, in our security against apostasy, in our growing union and intimacy with God, in our better acquaintance with our faults, and in our purification from them by Divine grace. But the object of this trial is, to ascertain: 1, whether we have been truly converted, believe in Christ, and are united to Him, and whether we have the comforts and put forth the fruits of faith, such as the love of God and of our neighbor, delight in spiritual things, an inclination to every form of obedience, earnestness in prayer, lively hope, patience, *etc.;* 2, how successful we have been in following Jesus. The result will be, that we shall recognize what is good in ourselves with humility and thankfulness to God, and what is wrong with contrition, and prayer for forgiveness; we shall lay hold upon Divine grace with greater eagerness; and we shall arouse ourselves to walk before God with increased earnestness. It should be a special object of such an examination to discover what sins most easily beset us, and to what extent we have succeeded in laying them aside.—Ver. 7. Preachers will find it better to use their staff of office with gentleness, than to put forth the power given them so as to give pain.—Ver. 10. Think it not for thy injury that thy spiritual guide has touched thee rather roughly, for proud flesh needs a corrosive plaster.—Ver. 11. We must not be surprised that believers should not unfrequently be depressed with internal as well as external afflic-

tions, notwithstanding the seeds of spiritual joy they always possess. The admonition therefore can never come amiss, that they should be of good cheer and be joyful in the Lord.—Many heads, many minds! Look therefore continually to Christ or thou canst never come to Him. God dwells in souls exercised to good works through faith in Christ.—Ver. 13. Every minister should reflect whether such a salutation could go forth from him to his hearers in the spirit of the Apostle, with an earnest desire for their salvation and with a sincere faith in God; but it equally becomes these hearers to consider carefully whether they are prepared to appropriate such a salutation to themselves, and to confirm it with an earnest prayer and a hearty amen before God.—There are many who are unreasonable enough to long for the grace of Jesus Christ and the love of the Father, but are unwilling to be directed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost.—Let every one who reads and desires a part in the blessings promised in God's word, unite in applying this benediction to all, and add his hearty amen!

BERLENB. BIBLE, CHAP. XII. 20:—Such are the disorders which follow a removal from the simplicity of the Gospel.—How much reason has a sincere child of God for sorrow and humiliation when he thinks of the abomination of desolation in the holy places of the Church at the present time, and when he finds that everything there is disordered, that self-conceit, false wisdom, and confusion so generally prevails, and that almost every man's hand is turned against his brother!—Chap. xiii. 2: We must never connive at wickedness. But if it is willing to come to the light it should be freely forgiven.—Ver. 4. It is God's way sometimes to seem very small in His servants, but if they are despised, He manifests Himself in His greatness.—Ver. 5. There is no point on which men are so liable to be deceived as with reference to their own faith. On no point therefore should they be more careful to examine themselves. Unconverted men and hypocrites never prove their own selves. And yet no one can enjoy communion with God without it, for such a communion requires us to give up self-love for God's love, and to pass an impartial judgment upon ourselves.—Those who pay no attention to their condition, and never reflect whether they are prepared for another world, will surely be unable to abide the fiery trial of God's justice and will be cast away and dashed in pieces as worthless vessels.—The human heart is a fathomless abyss; we only need closely and properly to observe it to find in it every day some new thing to humble us before God and to make us willing to be judged by God and man. We must not, however, be insensible of the good which God has wrought in our hearts, for we shall never have courage to fight against our sins, if we know not our interest in Christ.—Especially should we examine whether we have that peace with God through Jesus Christ, which excites us to pray, to strive against sin, to praise God, to walk before Him, and to hunger and thirst after righteousness; and whether all our hope is built upon a consciousness of faith in Christ and love to God. Nor should we be satisfied unless we find these evidences during the whole course of our lives.—No one will become free from sin unless he is willing truly to know himself.—Ver. 11. Where love and peace reign, the heart becomes a temple in which God is adored and praised in spirit and in truth.—Ver. 13. Such is the order in which God conveys His blessings to men. Christ and His grace must precede everything else, or our evil consciences will prevent us from trusting to the love of God. Both are united together in our hearts by the fellowship of the Holy Ghost. This three-fold band encircles all who are willing to be the Lord's, and makes them children of the Father, members of the Son, and temples of the Holy Ghost. Amen!

RIEGER:—CHAP. xii. 20f. We are sometimes too careful to conceal those sins which take place in our own hearts and in our Christian community, and the consequence is they are not thoroughly removed. Where we do not bring what has been done in former times with sufficient honesty into the light of Divine truth, and to the forgiving and sanctifying grace of God, great mischief will afterwards spring from them.—Chap. xiii. 1. In matters of conscience we should hold ourselves to the strictest method of proceeding. Even those remarks and judgments which Christians pass upon one another, should be so thoroughly considered that they will bear an examination like that which is given to the most suspected witness in a judicial process.—Ver. 4. From His advent into the world until the close of His earthly career, Christ made Himself so weak that sinners thought they could do with Him as they pleased. But He now possesses through Divine power a life, in which He not only has life in Himself, but He gives life to the world, and sends His Spirit to make even the word of His cross the power of God unto salvation. A life of faith in the Son of God is even now a life of Divine power. Those who are troubled about their infirmities, will find that in losing life they receive a life eternal.—Ver. 5. A faith which does not bring us into communion with God, nor bring Christ and His Spirit into the heart, will never abide the test.—Ver. 7. Our threatenings and punishments must have the unction of prayer, or they will accomplish no good results. We not unfrequently find that we can get no access to men until we have found access to God.—Ver. 11. Even where considerable faults are known to exist among brethren, we must come back to the common relation in which we all stand to one another, that by its means all may be awakened to joy without giving up their faith.—Ver. 13. Every good thing we have or hope for from God, must come to us through the *grace* of our Lord Jesus Christ. The *love* of God can be exercised only toward those who find pardon and access to him through Jesus Christ. And it is only through the *fellowship* of the Holy Ghost that God will have or maintain any union with those whom he loves (John xiv. 23).—May we all be justified by grace, as pardoned sinners be the objects of Divine love, and as temples of the triune God be restored and glorified by Spiritual communion. May every soul have a part in this faith and in this prayer. Amen.

HEUBNER:—CHAP. xii. 20f. Every Church should be always ready to let any of Christ's ministers examine carefully into its affairs.

—Chap. xiii. 1f. There are certain limits beyond which Christian meekness cannot go, whether in the use of gentle or severe measures. But whatever change circumstances may call for in our outward action, our hearts should always be animated by the same benevolent spirit. The Christian should always act with energy.—Ver. 3. God not unfrequently disciplines His people with severity, and they should not be unwilling to be severe with themselves. What is a single preacher against an army of soldiers? And yet he has mighty power with them. Christ will live forever and will hold His sceptre over the world. Few worldly men imagine how completely He is their Lord.—Ver. 5. To be displeased with Christ's word shows plainly that faith is dying or dead. Only those who examine themselves can truly know whether they have this faith, for no other one can determine this for them. Then the only evidence which can prove that we possess it is Christ living and working in our hearts, and our hearts burning with love at the thought of Him. How few tried Christians would be found, if this only true test were faithfully applied!—Ver. 7. A faithful minister thinks only of the interest of souls, and not of his own authority or reputation among men.—Ver. 9. A genuine teacher always rejoices to see his pupil become wiser than himself.—Ver. 10. The church which gives heed to gentle and kind suggestions is much more advanced than one which can be moved only by harsh measures. The object of all spiritual power is the salvation of the Church. —Ver. 11. God is never in a church except where the conditions required in this verse are fulfilled. Where these are complied with, God's Spirit reigns.—Ver. 13. Through the Son we become children of the Father and temples of the Holy Ghost.

W. F. Besser:—Ver. 4. We may derive much benefit and comfort from contemplating the form of weakness which Christ endured during His life and on the cross, since it is the form of One who has been invested with Divine power, having entered into His glory by the power of that Father who has raised him from the dead, and of that Son who was raised from the dead, and of that Holy Ghost who declared and demonstrated that this Son of God and this Son of Mary was the Prince of life (Rom. vi. 4; i. 4). The same Divine power which raised up Christ from the dead and set Him upon the throne of heaven, is the source of all faith in the hearts of believers (Eph. i. 19, 20), and is concerned in the whole work of the ministry for the consolation of the penitent and the punishment of the impenitent. —Ver. 5. We learn two things here: *a.* that we may imagine ourselves to be in the faith when we are not; and *b.* that whoever deceives himself in this matter, so essential to his everlasting salvation, is criminally guilty for it; for God has made it the privilege and the duty of every man by faithful self-examination to ascertain with confidence whether he is in the faith.—Ver. 7. A minister's fitness for his work will appear in two ways: *a.* from the good results of his labors (chap. iii. 3); *b.* from his seasonable punishment of evil conduct.—Ver. 11. This friendly admonition: Live in peace, throws the peaceful bond of brotherly love around the whole body of believers (Eph. iv. 3), and is like a lock which holds together the whole chain of exhortations running through both these Epistles. Oh, that the peace which breathes here these Apostolic words might be imparted to all men! To all sons of peace, who rest in peace as on a mother's bosom, belongs the promise: "The God of love and peace shall be with you!"—Ver. 13. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God will not be far off, but pervadingly nigh the assemblies of God's saints; for among them the Holy Spirit's communion has its especial habitation and sphere of action (1 Cor. iii. 16). As the Holy Spirit communicates Himself to them through the word and sacraments, He produces and maintains in them a holy fellowship with the Triune God and with each other. As often as we hear these words of Apostolic benediction, it is only as the spirit of that faith which has for centuries communicated so many blessings to those who have received it, awakes within us, that the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, is with us and with all saints!

Florey:—Ver. 13. How happy is our lot if our souls are united by a perpetual bond of living faith to the Triune God! This thought—*a.* keeps before us every day the great object that we should seek for ourselves, *viz.:* forgiveness through Christ, assurance of God's love, and strength by means of the Spirit's power; *b.* makes us see that in every event of life we should strive to confirm and strengthen our fellowship with God; *c.* gives us strong consolation in every affliction in the consciousness that Almighty aid is always at hand; and *d.* instructs us with respect to the true wisdom, the true reason, the spirit, the object, and the proper range of all our prayers.