

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

not yet closed. It is only three years since St. Theodosius of Tchernigov was added in consequence of the wonders worked by his relics. I am not certain on what principles men are elected to a place amongst the saints; it would seem to be in part connected with the state in which their remains are found on examination at some long interval after their decease, and it will be three or four hundred years before Father John is thus, if ever, honoured. Still, one cannot help feeling that the Russian people have at the present time the opportunity of observing at first hand one of their future saints. But whether this be so or no, they at least have furnished to them in Father John a most effective exemplar of Him who went about doing good.

J. Y. SIMPSON.

ST. PAUL'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH CORINTH.

A REJOINER.

MR. WHITE'S able and interesting article in the February (1898) number of the *EXPOSITOR* was a valuable contribution to the discussion of the theory which I had ventured in the preceding year to lay before the readers of the September and October Numbers. A theory, if true, has nothing to dread, but has everything to hope, from the result of honest and able criticism; the most dangerous foes of a new truth are inattention and neglect.

I think it will be well to preface my rejoinder to this criticism of Mr. White by stating as clearly as I can the points at issue between us.

Some of these points bear on the question of the date of 1 Corinthians, and it is possible that some critics may assent to these who are unwilling to accept my other conclusions. I will therefore take these first. On this question I hold that 1 Corinthians was not written (as is

generally supposed) in the spring of the same year in which St. Paul left Ephesus, but considerably earlier (probably in the spring of the year before); and that consequently it cannot be the Epistle about whose reception by the Corinthians Titus brought the first news to St. Paul after he had left Ephesus and gone into Macedonia.

One of the lines of proof leading to this conclusion is connected with a journey of the Apostle to Corinth which is not mentioned in Acts, but which is, as I believe, referred to more than once in 2 Corinthians. Mr. White is quite correct in thinking that I believe this journey to be a most important element in the determination of the chronology of St. Paul's correspondence with Corinth. Its importance was at once perceived by Paley, though he looked on it as a purely disturbing element. Speaking of one of the passages which I am now about to examine, he writes: "I own that I felt myself confounded by this text. It appeared to contradict the opinion which I had been led by a great variety of circumstances to form concerning the date and occasion of the epistle." And a little earlier he says that if 2 Corinthians xiii. 1 imports that the writer had been at Corinth twice before, it overthrows every congruity which he has been endeavouring to establish.

Those who maintain the traditional date of 1 Corinthians must necessarily adopt one or other of two courses with respect to this question. They must either deny that any such journey took place at all, or they must endeavour to place it before the date of 1 Corinthians.

I have already, in the *EXPOSITOR* for October, given some proofs which appear to me to render the latter of these two solutions an impossible one. Mr. White agrees with me in this, but adopts the more radical mode of solution by denying the journey altogether.

The validity of this mode of solution has to be de-

terminated by the interpretation of three passages, *i.e.* 2 Corinthians xii. 14, 2 Corinthians xiii. 1, 2, 3, and 2 Corinthians ii. 1.

In his examination of the first of these passages Mr. White calls special attention to the expression *ἑτοιμῶς ἔχω*, I am *ready* to come to you, which he considers to be so strongly in favour of his contention that the Apostle is not referring to three actual visits but only to three occasions on which he has been ready to visit Corinth, that it can be made use of to determine in a like sense the rendering of the second passage 2 Corinthians xiii. 1, which if taken by itself would, as he admits, appear to be against him.

In this contention he has most of the leading commentators against him. They hold, and I believe rightly hold, that the words *ἑτοιμῶς ἔχω* do not of themselves determine the matter at all; for it is quite as admissible to connect the *τρίτον τοῦτο* with the *ἔλθειν* as with them; so that we may either translate the passage, "Behold this is the third time that I am in readiness to come to you" or "Behold I am ready to come to you this third time."

The sentences which follow immediately after may, I think, help us to see which of these renderings gives us the true meaning of the writer; for in them he informs his readers that during this coming visit he intends to live at his own charges, and to make no demand upon their hospitality. In this connection a reference to previous visits in which he had adopted the same independent course would be pertinent and appropriate; but visits which had not been paid in the body but only in intention could not possibly have made demands on the hospitality of the Corinthians, so that it would be difficult to discover what possible connection the mention of them could have with the Apostle's argument in this passage.

I think, therefore, that even this text, which Mr. White

regards as specially favourable to his supposition, favours rather the supposition of visits actually paid, when it is taken in connection with its context. The most decisive utterance, however, is that which is found in 2 Corinthians xiii. 1, 2. This is a passage whose importance and interest demands and repays a careful exegesis.

For the second of these verses two rival translations are proposed; and, if it is possible to determine which of these is right, it is possible also to determine whether the disputed visit was really paid or no. The first translation which is adopted by Mr. White, and by other critics to whose authority he appeals, renders *ὡς* by "as if," making it introduce a fictitious supposition. Mr. White does not say how he translates *καί*; but most of the commentators to whom he here appeals render it by "though." This latter rendering appears indeed to be almost a necessary consequence of the meaning given by them to *ὡς*; for if *καί* were the simple copulative here, it would be necessary either to regard both the suppositions which it connects (the presence and the absence) as fictitious, or to regard them both as real.

The alternative translation renders *ὡς* by "as," and supposes *οὕτως* to be omitted before *καί*. This is the rendering adopted in the text of the Revised Version. "As when I was present the second time, so now, being absent." The other rendering is given by the Revisers in the margin.

We have an instance of a similar omission of *οὕτως* before *καί* in Galatians i. 9—a passage which furnishes a most striking and suggestive parallel to this—*ὡς προειρήκαμεν καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω*.

If we confined our attention to the words *ὡς* and *καί*, either translation would be admissible. It is the context which must decide between them.

And first I would note the writer's introduction of the

word *νῦν*. He evidently meant something by it; and it appears from its position in the sentence to be intended to mark a contrast in time between the *παρών* and the *ἀπών*. The probability that there is such a time contrast intended becomes stronger when we extend our view to the previous clause "*προείρηκα καὶ προλέγω*"; for in this clause we have an analogous difference in time between two verbs, which makes them appear to correspond respectively to the participles—*προείρηκα* to *παρών*, and *προλέγω* to *ἀπών νῦν*. Nor can it be objected that if this were the true connection of the passage, each participle should have been placed immediately after its verb; for the sentence gains in rhetorical force by the present arrangement, which places the two warnings in juxtaposition. "I have warned, and I warn, as when I was present, so also when I am absent now."

The following clause—"τοῖς προημαρτηκόσι καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν"—still further continues the parallelism, the *πρό* of the *προημαρτηκόσι* marking the same difference of time between the pair contained in this clause as has been shown to exist between each of the pairs in the previous clauses, and in the same order. We have thus three pairs in perfect correspondence. It may be noted in passing that those who are spoken of as *τοῖς προημαρτηκόσι* are evidently the same as those whom the writer has referred to in xii. 21 as *τῶν προημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων*.

It will hardly be denied that the *προείρηκα* of xiii. 2 refers to a real occurrence; so that once the connection between the clauses of the paragraph is perceived, it becomes impossible any longer to regard the corresponding participle *παρών* as fictitious. But the question has further to be asked, On what occasion did the Apostle previously make the announcement, "If I come again, I will not spare"? The supposition that this previous warn-

ing was given in a letter or through a messenger seems to be forbidden by the connection of the verb with *ὡς παρών*. In short the connection between these two clauses excludes two suppositions, either of which would otherwise have been admissible. If the *προείρηκα* had stood alone, it might have referred to an announcement made by letter. If the *ὡς παρών* stood alone, it might be interpreted of a fictitious presence. But the conjunction of the two must refer to an announcement delivered during a visit which was really paid by the Apostle to the Corinthian Church.

There are other considerations which strongly confirm this view. The introduction of the supposition of a fictitious presence with the argument would not only have been objectless, but would have destroyed the force of the warning which the Apostle is uttering with such emphasis; for it would have made him say that if he were already present on his coming visit, he would utter by word of mouth the identical warning which he is sending to them now by letter; whereas he is expressly telling them that when he visits them next he will not do what he is doing now, but something altogether different—that he will then no longer threaten but perform.

Furthermore, if the journey is denied, the *δεύτερον* and the *τρίτον* refer to the same future visit, the *δεύτερον* being got by counting only real visits, the *τρίτον* by adding an intended visit. The latter mode of enumerating would be somewhat peculiar. Number one is a visit, number two an intention which was never carried out, and this is number three. Such a mode of enumerating would have suggested the too obvious question, "Will then number three be like number one, or like number two? Will it be an intention which will be carried out or an intention which will not be carried out?"

But once the reality of the disputed visit is acknowledged, the mode of enumerating becomes consistent and

lain in the proofs which they could bring to show the impossibility of doing this. But the disinclination to admit its reality which has thus been caused has, I think, been strengthened by the notion that if it had really taken place, it would have been mentioned in the Acts. How little justification there is for this notion may be seen from a passage in one of the very epistles with which we are dealing. In the eleventh chapter of 2 Corinthians St. Paul tells us, "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one."

Not one of these occasions is mentioned in the Acts. "Thrice was I beaten with rods." One only of these scourgings is recorded—that which took place at Philippi. And—most important of all in its bearing on our subject—we also read, "Thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep."

Not one of these shipwrecks is mentioned in the Acts; for, of course, the shipwreck recorded in the twenty-seventh chapter of Acts occurred long after the date of this epistle.

If such thrilling events as shipwrecks have been passed over without the slightest notice, we have no right to feel any difficulty because the narrative omits to mention a voyage of about ten days or a fortnight on a frequented route between two of the greatest seaports of the ancient world, where large and swift vessels were constantly passing to and fro. St. Luke was not with St. Paul during the latter's stay at Ephesus, so that very little is told us of the events of those three years till we come to the riot which took place at their close. Not one of those plots of the Jews which St. Paul speaks of in his address to the elders of Ephesus is so much as mentioned in the direct narrative.

If then there is no reason for denying the occurrence of the visit except the difficulty of placing it before 1 Corinthians, the question arises, May it not have taken place between the dates of these two epistles. The only objection to this solution is the notion that the composition of 1

Corinthians must be placed between the events recorded in Acts xix. 22 and 23, and that it is the letter referred to in 2 Corinthians. These and these alone were the premises which led Alford to the conclusion (referred to by Mr. White) that there was no room for a visit between the sending of 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians. It is the assumption of the truth of these premises which has necessitated the attempts of some commentators to explain away the journey by strained interpretations of the passages which speak of it, and the not less forced attempts of others to place the visit before 1 Corinthians. The proper course in such a condition of things is to raise the question, Are we certain that the premises, which necessitate these strained interpretations, are true?

This course would suggest itself even if we had no other evidence for the earlier date of 1 Corinthians than that which is connected with the question of the visit. But we have other quite independent evidence of the strongest kind in favour of this earlier date. I have already in the *EXPOSITOR* for October endeavoured to call attention to the fact that, while St. Paul in 1 Corinthians xvi. gives directions about the establishment of a system of weekly collections in such terms as clearly show us that a beginning of these collections had yet to be made, in 2 Corinthians he says that he has been boasting of them that they were ready a year ago.

This system of weekly collections was admirably suited to the circumstances of a community such as the Christian Church at Corinth, where not many mighty, not many noble, had been called. Poor men, many of whom were probably weekly wage earners, and some of whom were slaves, could not give much at once, though out of their small means they might put by a little every week. This would take time, so that two or three months at the least must elapse before they could be said to be ready. Even if we

suppose that they commenced the collections immediately on Titus' arrival, this would bring the date of their readiness very near midsummer, supposing him to have come about Easter. How then could the Apostle, writing in the autumn of the same year, say that he had been boasting of them that they were ready a year ago?

Mr. White's reply is that "*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 which had elapsed."

I should have thought that those would be the very circumstances under which we would have no right to do anything of the kind, and that if we did so, our hearers or readers would be disposed either to laugh at or to resent any serious attempt on our part to employ a purely arbitrary division of time such as New Year's Day in order to make the most of an interval.

This would be the case even now when all the nations of western and central Europe have the same New Year's Day. In St. Paul's time there would have been still less temptation to adopt this device; for different men had different New Year's Days according as they used the Jewish, or the Greek, or the Roman calendar. Mr. White and the commentators who agree with him evidently assume that St. Paul used the calendar of the Greeks; for that is the only calendar which places New Year's Day where their argument requires it to be. But, as Zahn has remarked, we cannot in this connection leave the Roman calendar out of our reckoning, as St. Paul was writing to a Roman colony, and very possibly from another Roman colony. The Roman calendar put New Year's Day on the 1st January, which would not suit the argument at all.

If the proofs here given establish the fact that 1 Cor-

inthians was written at least a year before the traditionally assigned date, that conclusion is of itself one of great interest. It is possible to admit this fact without admitting that part of my theory which has to do with 2 Corinthians. The only way, however, of avoiding the necessity for this further step is to adopt the hypothesis of a lost epistle; for if 1 Corinthians was written a year before St. Paul's departure from Ephesus, it cannot possibly be the epistle referred to in 2 Corinthians as having been written with anguish and tears, and of whose reception by the Corinthians tidings were first brought by Titus to the Apostle after he had left Ephesus.

In the September and October (1897) numbers of the *EXPOSITOR* I laid before its readers a number of proofs that that epistle is not altogether lost, for that we have in 2 Corinthians x.-xiv. the latter portion of it.

The proofs of this are cumulative; but those on which I laid most stress were derived from three passages in 2 Corinthians i.-ix., in which the Apostle was avowedly speaking of the missing letter and in which I contended that he plainly referred to three corresponding passages in 2 Corinthians x.-xiv.; and I called attention to the fact that in each of these pairs of passages the act or purpose or feeling which in 2 Corinthians x.-xiii. is present or future, in 2 Corinthians i.-ix. is spoken of as belonging to the past. To my argument from these pairs of parallel passages I have not yet seen any reply.

Mr. White devotes a considerable part of his reply to meeting one of the lines of proof which I had brought forward, and which was derived from the fact that whereas in the first nine chapters the Apostle almost exhausts the resources of language in describing the fulness of his joy at the reconciliation of the Corinthian Church to himself after a temporary estrangement in 2 Corinthians x.-xiv. he speaks of the estrangement as present and not past.

I had endeavoured to show the untenable nature of two modes of explanation of this difficulty which had hitherto been extensively adopted, viz. the assertion that the first nine chapters are addressed to a repentant majority and the four concluding chapters to an unrepentant minority; and the hypothesis that after St. Paul had written the first nine chapters fresh news arrived of a very different kind from the favourable report which Titus had brought.

Mr. White, with characteristic originality and independence, throws both these attempted explanations overboard and brings forward one of his own.

His explanation is that "the same persons are addressed, but 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."

Mr. White has not quoted any passages from these nine chapters in support of his theory; nor would it be fair to blame him for this, for among the passages which speak of the repentance of the Corinthians and of their reception of St. Paul's messenger with fear and trembling there is not one in which there is any express mention made of their previous immorality and profaneness; so that it would be impossible to quote what was not there. I think the theory must rest on the assumption that the offender mentioned in the second and seventh chapters of 2 Corinthians is to be identified with the incestuous person whose case is mentioned in 1 Corinthians. If this is so, it is rather unfortunate for the theory that in the seventh chapter St. Paul expressly says that his only reason for referring to the case of the now repentant offender (whoever he was) was the bearing of his case on the relation of the Corinthian Church to himself: "I wrote not for his cause that did the wrong, nor

for his cause that suffered the wrong, but that your earnest care for us might be made manifest unto you in the sight of God."

Some critics maintain with considerable probability that this declaration of St. Paul shows that the "offender" of 2 Corinthians is not the incestuous person at all, for that St. Paul, who felt most strongly the enormity of sins of that nature, would never have spoken thus about so terrible a moral offence. In any case both here and throughout these nine chapters the acknowledgment by the Corinthians of St. Paul's authority is the predominant thought. I am not surprised at this, for I fully agree with Mr. White that "the permanent discrediting of St. Paul and the triumph of his opponents would have been fatal to the very existence of the Catholic Church."

Mr. White makes much of the fact 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 eighteenth century. My answer is that neither is there a shred of evidence from any of these sources for an Epistle to the Corinthians prior to our 1 Corinthians, yet this apparently overwhelming negative evidence does not prevent the vast majority of commentators from believing that such an epistle once existed on the strength of a single allusion in 1 Corinthians v. 9; for it is felt that there is no conflict of testimony here. Evidence in favour of an occurrence cannot be disproved by the evidence of a thousand reliable witnesses who visited the spot without seeing anything, if their visit was considerably later than the date of the alleged occurrence. That is the precise relation of the evidence of the succeeding manuscripts and versions either to the total or partial loss of an epistle before the first copy had been made. The business of later scribes was simply to copy the manuscript as it was delivered to the Church at large by the local Church to

which it was originally addressed. If a mistake was made in the first copy and the original then destroyed, they had no means of getting behind the copy to correct the mistake. Many modern Biblical critics seem to have substituted for all other infallibilities this infallible canon, that external evidence is reliable, and is conservative in its tendency, while internal evidence is misleading and revolutionary. There is no such short cut to truth to save us the trouble of using the power of discrimination which God has given to man. There is good and bad internal evidence, and there is good and bad external evidence. In this case I believe that the result of the internal evidence will be revolutionary only in appearance, but in reality will be thoroughly conservative in its tendency; for it replaces discrepancies by harmonies, and it vindicates St. Paul from the imputation of inconsistencies which he never committed, but which are fathered on him by commentators in their attempt to save the traditional theory.

J. H. KENNEDY.

*A HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE
TO THE GALATIANS.*

LI. VOLUNTARY LIBERALITY TO TEACHERS (VI. 6-10).

THIS paragraph continues the subject of the last: Paul is still engaged with the dangers to which the Galatian Churches are exposed through their proneness to certain faults. He now urges them to treat with wise liberality their religious teachers, to persevere and not to lose heart in beneficence generally, to take advantage of every opportunity of doing good to all with whom they are brought into contact, but more especially to their Christian brethren, "the members of the household of the faith."

This is only a further exposition of what is involved in