

Thou knewest them, and for Thy merit they were forgiven, and peace and joy were poured into my fainting heart anew.

“ My very services have been weak and unworthy, my prayers wandering, my love of Thee most cold—I confess it all—but yet, wast Thou not with me when the poor prayer was answered, and the heart warmed? Wast Thou not a hand to strengthen and a voice to cheer me at the worst—always my Saviour, my Companion, and my Friend? Master, it is not THOU Who wilt ever reproach me with these again.”

G. A. DERRY.

ARE THERE TWO EPISTLES IN 2 CORINTHIANS?

A REPLY.

DR. KENNEDY'S articles in the EXPOSITOR for September and October afford an excellent example of an argument based solely on internal evidence. I hope to be able to show that the phenomena presented by 2 Corinthians do not really support his theory, that two epistles have in this case been clumsily joined together; but although his reasonings do not bring conviction, one learns as much from studying the methods of inquiry adopted by so acute a scholar as if the result were true.

Dr. Kennedy grants at the outset that there is not a shred of external testimony from either MSS., Versions, or Christian writers, that the integrity of 2 Corinthians was ever doubted until the days of Semler in the 18th century. This is the more noteworthy if we bear in mind that archetypal defects, and omissions due to varying authentic editions, have left their traces in extant MSS. Thus the loss from some MSS. and Versions of the last verses of St. Mark's Gospel is very probably due to the fact that the first copy which reached Alexandria had lost the last page. Dr. Salmon (*Some Criticism of the Text of the New Test.*, p.

145), points out how some such accident may explain the otherwise inexplicable religious position of the Alexandrian Apollos, who "taught carefully the things concerning Jesus," while yet "knowing only the baptism of John" (Acts xviii. 25). The omission of important matter, in some MSS., in the last chapters of St. Luke, the variations in the place of the doxology in Romans, and the omission of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in Ephesians i. 1, are other well-known examples.

Dr. Kennedy accordingly, in order to account for this silence of the early authorities, puts forward a theory that these two epistles were, on account of their painful nature, not copied at once, but laid by in the archives of the Church of Corinth, and not published for a considerable time. So that when the first fair copy was being made for general publication, the originals had already fallen to pieces from age, and perhaps rough handling, and the scribe made one epistle by piecing together the beginning of one letter and the end of another. Now if 1 Corinthians had been similarly suppressed, an epistle which, however edifying, yet brands the recipients of it with such shocking scandals as encouraging incest and profaning the Eucharist, we might then accept Dr. Kennedy's theory as a plausible explanation of the non-publication of the Epistle 2 Corinthians x.-xiii.; but surely one would expect that the Corinthians would have been only too anxious to publish the rehabilitation of their character which is contained in the other Epistle (2 Cor. i.-ix.).

We are not, however, altogether dependent on *a priori* arguments for the early publication, and consequently for the integrity, of 2 Corinthians. The short Epistle of Polycarp, which quotes from nine of St. Paul's Epistles, has three distinct references to 2 Corinthians, and there is a slight presumption that Clement of Rome, who quotes 1 Corinthians explicitly, had also 2 Corinthians as well as the other extant Pauline epistles bound up in the same volume. This

presumption is based on a fact—the significance of which has not hitherto been noticed—that in all Greek MSS. and Versions, with one exception, St. Paul's undoubted Epistles are invariably placed in the same order. That order is roughly according to length. But in the case of thirteen distinct letters, one of which at least, that to Philemon, can never have circulated separately, it is impossible to suppose that if this order had not been prescribed by an authorized first edition, other principles of arrangement would not have recommended themselves to the various churches and editors. D₂ places Colossians next to the cognate Epistle to the Ephesians. If the present order had not been of primordial antiquity, we should have had many such variations, and probably larger and smaller collections of the Epistles.

This consideration, then, affords a presumption that the extant Epistles of St. Paul were always in one volume from the time that the Church recognised them as of general and permanent interest and value.

I have thought it best to notice at the outset the antecedent improbability of Dr. Kennedy's theory as to the manner in which 2 Corinthians was first given to the world at large. But whatever opinion may be held as to the value of the considerations just urged for the early *publication* of the letter, my objection to his main theory as to the *integrity* of 2 Corinthians is in no way affected thereby. My contention is that all the subtle reasoning from internal evidence by which his theory is supported is vitiated by a false assumption as to the purpose of the Epistle.

Dr. Kennedy insists on the sharpness of the opposition between 2 Cor. i.-ix. and x.-xiii. He dwells on what seems to him the cheerful tone of the first part of the Epistle, with its keynote *παράκλησις*, and the "torrent of indignation and pathos" which meets us in the second half of the letter.

This contrast would indeed be an astonishing one if, as Dr. Kennedy assumes, the same persons were addressed from the same standpoints in both sections of the letter. But the truth is that the same persons are in these two parts addressed from totally different points of view, the motive of the first part of the letter being the repentance of the Corinthians for their immorality and profanity, the theme of the second being the increased encouragement which at the same time they were giving to the party who depreciated the apostolic character of St. Paul.

St. Paul was a man not only of intense feelings and vigorous powers of expression, but also of fair mind and consummate tact. When giving praise or blame he never confuses issues; he is always ready to give hearty praise for actions in the least degree commendable; he is not prevented from censuring for blameworthy conduct those whose actions in other respects he has just lauded. Like Brutus in the play, he discriminates: "As Cæsar loved me I weep for him, as he was fortunate I rejoice at it, as he was valiant I honour him, but as he was ambitious I slew him." This characteristic is especially noticeable in 1 Corinthians, where an outburst of thanks to God for the grace which was given the Corinthians is followed immediately by a severe reproof for their factiousness (i. 4-17). Again, the denunciation of their profanation of the Eucharist is ushered in by "Now I praise you that ye remember me in all things, and hold fast the traditions, even as I delivered them to you" (xi. 2). The contrast between the tone of 2 Corinthians i.-ix. and that of x.-xiii. is not one whit more startling than those I have cited from 1 Corinthians. The note of indignation is indeed more intense and sustained, but that will not seem surprising when we bear in mind the circumstances under which it was written.

It may be well to give an outline of these, leaving objections to be noticed afterwards.

Very shortly before the date of Acts xix. 20 St. Paul, while at Ephesus, received a letter from the Corinthian Church asking for guidance on certain practical questions (1 Cor. vii. 1, 25; viii. 1), and about the same time he learnt from other sources of the scandals that were defiling the Church (1 Cor. i. 11; v. 1; vi. 1; xi. 18). St. Paul then wrote 1 Corinthians, and sent it by Titus and an unnamed brother (2 Cor. xii. 18). That Titus was the bearer of 1 Corinthians seems conclusively proved by 2 Corinthians viii. 6, where he is said to have "made a beginning before" in the matter of the collection, which can only have been by exhorting the Corinthians by word of mouth to follow the directions regarding the weekly offering, which are given for the first time by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians xvi. 1 *sqq.* After the riot at Ephesus, which is plainly alluded to in 2 Corinthians i. 8, St. Paul left Ephesus for Macedonia, as intimated 1 Corinthians xvi. 5. He expected that Titus would join him at Troas with news of the effect of 1 Corinthians. In this he was disappointed, but they met somewhere in Macedonia, 2 Corinthians ii. 12, 13. The news that Titus brought was partly joyful and partly sad. It was not that there was "a repentant majority and a rebellious minority," but that while recognising the justice of St. Paul's remonstrance about their ill behaviour, at least so far as the case of incest was concerned (2 Cor. ii. 6-11; vii. 8-12), they were at the same time giving ear to those who opposed his apostolic character. The improvement in morals was almost counter-balanced by an alarming spread of disloyalty to the apostle himself. This condition of things explains 2 Corinthians i. 14, "Ye did acknowledge us in part"; x. 6, "when your obedience shall be fulfilled."

The Judaistic party, which falsely used the names of Peter and James, and which had been only one of many factions when 1 Corinthians was written (1 Cor. i. 12), had

by this time gained the upper hand in Corinth, and were loudly depreciating St. Paul's apostolic character on every ground, personal and official. For such a rapid development of an anti-Pauline party we have many parallels in the Acts. The Judaizers ever dogged the heels of the apostle, and too often succeeded in alienating from him his spiritual children (see Gal. i. 6 ; iv. 19). The situation revealed by the coming of Titus was felt, and rightly felt, by St. Paul to be a critical one. Looking back on that time, we can see that the permanent discrediting of Paul and the triumph of his opponents would have been fatal to the very existence of the Catholic Church; can we doubt that the inspired apostle knew this too? It was no mere question of the relative personal dignity and privilege of Paul and James or Peter; it was a matter of life and death to the Gospel itself. It was while thus profoundly agitated that St. Paul wrote the Epistle before us. Dr. Kennedy quotes Dr. Plummer's remarks on the style. "Both narrative and sentences are often involved and broken. There is throughout a want of ease and smoothness." Dr. Kennedy quotes this as specially suiting chapters x.-xiii., which he identifies with the Epistle "written with many tears, out of much affliction and anguish of heart" (2 Cor. ii. 4). But as a matter of fact, it is more descriptive of chapters i.-ix. It is in these chapters we find the most involved and broken sentences. "To be wroth with one we love, doth work like madness in the brain." Under what Dr. Kennedy calls the cheerful tone of the first nine chapters one can feel the throbbing of the apostle's heart, the tempest of conflicting emotions. In these chapters there is no allusion whatever to the attacks on his apostolate. St. Paul, as usual, eagerly seizes on the hopeful feature of the case, the repentance of the Corinthians for their more scandalous sins. Having shown at length the depth of his love for them, and even assuming by his renewed

directions about the collection that "their obedience would be fulfilled," he then puts forth all his strength in one final vindication of his apostolic character. Accordingly in these chapters x.-xiii. there is no allusion to anything else, except perhaps in xii. 21, where we have a quite natural outburst of warmth. After all their seeming repentance and his acceptance of it, it might well be that disloyalty and impurity went hand in hand. "I should mourn for many of them that have sinned heretofore, and repented not of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they committed."

To this sketch of the circumstances under which 2 Corinthians was written, there are objections which I shall now deal with in detail. I have stated that the anti-Paulinism indicated in 2 Corinthians x.-xiii. is of a much more advanced type than that indicated in 1 Corinthians. But it may be objected that St. Paul was aware of antagonism to him as an apostle when he wrote in 1 Corinthians ix. 1, "Am I not free? am I not an apostle?" etc. St. Paul, of course, knew that the Corinthians had heard of opposition to him on this ground, but the context proves that he yet felt sure of their loyalty to him: "If to others I am not an apostle, yet at least I am to you." Besides this, a perusal of the rest of the chapter shows that the insistence here on his apostolic claims to support is introduced as an additional reason why they should contribute to the collection for Jerusalem which he had in view; as though to hint that the money which he had a right to receive, but which he had not taken from them, should be given instead to the poor saints at Jerusalem. In support of this view it is worth noting that one of the arguments by which he urges the reasonableness of his claim to maintenance (1 Cor. ix. 11) is repeated in identical terms in Romans xv. 27, when he is pleading the claims of Jerusalem on the Gentiles.

The sketch I have given above implies a short interval

between the writing of the two Epistles to the Corinthians. A serious objection to this is based on the commonly received idea that there were two visits to Corinth before the sending of 2 Corinthians. Alford sees rightly that the narrative in Acts, when taken in its obvious meaning, leaves no room for a visit between the sending of 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians; not to add that such a visit would imply a prolonged encouragement of incest by the Corinthians, which is scarcely credible. Alford accordingly dates this second visit before 1 Corinthians. Dr. Kennedy, on the other hand, correctly points out that the language of 1 Corinthians precludes the idea of a second visit having been paid since St. Paul had first preached there, and he accordingly dates the second visit after the sending of the Epistle of which 2 Corinthians x.-xiii. is the end. This is a vital point with him, for it implies the considerable interval between 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians x.-xiii. which his theory demands. Let us examine the evidence alleged in favour of this second visit, and we shall see that there is really no necessity for supposing that it ever took place at all.

At the outset it may be noted that if the language of 1 Corinthians ii. 1; iii. 2; xi. 2, proves that no second visit preceded the writing of that Epistle, the same conclusion may fairly be drawn from the language of 2 Corinthians xi. 9.

To come, however, to the positive proofs for a second visit. The strongest text is 2 Corinthians xiii. 1, "This is the third time I am coming to you," *τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς*. This seems plain enough when taken by itself; but whatever it means, it must mean the same as chapter xii. 14, "This is the third time I am ready to come to you," *τρίτον τοῦτο ἐτοιμῶς ἔχω ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς*. Strange language to use if he had really been at Corinth twice before! The mystery, however, is cleared up if we turn

back to chapter i. 15, 16, where St. Paul explains that his original intention had been to pay the Corinthians two visits before returning to Jerusalem, *i.e.* he intended to sail from Ephesus direct to Corinth, to go up thence to Macedonia, down again to Corinth, and thence to Palestine. This original intention was altered in consequence of the scandalous reports he had heard, and the change of plan was in his mind when in 1 Corinthians xvi. 5 he markedly repeats "for I do pass through Macedonia."

St. Paul's *intended third visit* would have been paid from Macedonia, and he here identifies with that visit the visit that he was now on the point of paying them from Macedonia. But it may be demanded, why should he call in any sense a third visit that which really was a second? Well, in the first place, his meaning could not be misunderstood by the Corinthians, and he may have desired to emphasize the fact that it was the third visit as far as his wishes were concerned, especially as he had used the phrase "a second benefit" in chapter i. 15. And, again, this way of speaking would give a special appositeness to the text which he proceeds to quote, "At the mouth of two witnesses or three shall every word be established." It is true that the R.V. of 2 Corinthians xiii. 2, "As when I was present the second time," supports the other view; yet the A.V. (R.V. marg.) "As if I were present the second time" is the translation adopted by De Wette, Davidson, Stanley, and Wordsworth, names which cannot be lightly set aside.

If the above explanation be accepted, we shall not find much difficulty in 2 Corinthians ii. 1, "I determined that I would not come again to you with sorrow"; which, referring as it does to his original intention before 1 Corinthians was written, simply means, "I determined that my second visit should be with joy as was my first."

Dr. Kennedy emphasizes ἀπὸ πέρυσσι, rendered by R.V.

in 2 Corinthians viii. 10 "a year ago," and in ix. 2 "for a year past," as implying the long interval which his theory requires. But ἀπὸ πέρυσι may very well be rendered "last year," a term that we might use in February when speaking of something that had taken place in the previous November or December, especially when, as in these places, the writer's intention is to make the most of the interval that had elapsed.

Again, Dr. Kennedy lays stress on the fact that the plans indicated in Acts xix. 21 and Romans do not accord with the indefinite statements of 1 Corinthians xvi. 3, 4, 6. It is sufficient to say in reply that if 1 Corinthians was sent, as I believe it to have been, with much uncertainty in the writer's mind as to its probable effect, it is not to be expected that St. Paul would clearly disclose all the details of his future movements.

It remains to examine Dr. Kennedy's four marks of identification of 2 Corinthians x.-xiii. with the Epistle referred to in 2 Corinthians ii. 4. I have already pointed out that Dr. Kennedy's own quotation from Dr. Plummer shows that this suits 2 Corinthians i.-ix. equally well. But the truth is that Dr. Kennedy forgets that tears rose much more easily to the eyes of an Oriental of the first century than to ours. St. Paul twice tells the Ephesian elders that while with them he had "served the Lord with . . . tears." "I ceased not to admonish every one night and day with tears" (Acts xx. 19, 31). Again, in Philippians iii. 18: "Many walk, of whom I . . . now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ." Did these people do anything worse than winking at incest, profaning the Eucharist, denying the resurrection of the body?

His second mark of identification has been already answered by my contention that in 2 Corinthians the same persons are addressed all through, but on two distinct counts.

With regard to the third mark, while it is quite true that 2 Corinthians iii. 1, v. 12, would suit 2 Corinthians x.-xiii. better than 1 Corinthians if there were any other sufficient ground to believe that it ever was part of a distinct epistle, yet in 1 Corinthians ix. we have a passage of considerable length in which St. Paul dwells in detail on the personal sacrifice he had made. And as for Dr. Kennedy's fourth mark, which seems to him the strongest of all, it, as I have shown above, refers to the original design of the apostle, which design he had ceased to entertain before 1 Corinthians was written.

NEWPORT J. D. WHITE.

A CRITICISM OF THE NEW CHRONOLOGY OF PAUL.¹

ONE of the most surprising, and, if established, most important results of the historical criticism of this decade, is the chronology of the life of Paul brought forward in Germany by scholars no less eminent than O. Holtzmann (in his *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 1895, pp. 125 seq., 248), and F. Blass (*Acta Apost.*, 1895, p. 21 seq.), but now most prominently identified with the great name of Harnack, who defends it on partly independent grounds in his *Chronologie der Altchristlichen Literatur*, pp. 233-243. The slightly variant chronology of Ramsay (*Paul the Traveller*, 1896), more fully developed in the *EXPOSITOR* (Series v. vol. iii. pp. 336, and v. 5. pp. 201 seq.), and the suggestions of McGiffert in *The American Journal of Theology* (I. i. pp.

¹ I desire to express my obligation to Mr. E. W. Lyman, of Yale Divinity School, for his careful and scholarly work in the examination of all the early sources referred to in this discussion and comparison of their data. The chronology to which our enquiry in common has led up was first suggested as a possibility by him.