

upon a profound sense of the mystery of things, but the mystery is evenly distributed. Whichever way the mind looks it is met by mystery, and the resultant attitude is like that of the Psalmist when he says, "I refrain my soul and keep it low."

But with Dr. Moberly's book the case is different. There the mystery recedes to an unexpected degree from a part, and yet only from a part, of God's ways. One section of them as it were is thrown into bright light, the effect of which however is but to increase the surrounding shade.

And in relation to the Scriptures the effect seems to be similar. It is one of the strong points of the book, and a point by which I am duly impressed, that it gives the fullest possible force to certain of the Apostolic and even of the Evangelic utterances. But then there are others of which this cannot be said. Rather, the theory by its negations seems to stand in the way of adequate justice being done to them.

These negations indeed are not peculiar, they are common to much of the more advanced thought of our time. We who cannot share them are yet very far from grudging the help that is given to those who can. We are only compelled reluctantly to keep to old paths as best we may.

W. SANDAY.

HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

XLV. THE APOSTOLATE.¹

NOWHERE does Paul state in clearer terms his views about the authority vested in an Apostle, and about the origin of that office, than in the chapter which we now approach. His own authority in Corinth was questioned, and he

¹ In the previous article, p. 234, read § XLIV. in place of XLII.

justifies it. Let us first try to understand exactly¹ what he says, and then determine what can be fairly inferred.

IX. 1. "Am I not an Apostle," *i.e.* an accredited envoy and representative of Christ, despatched into the world? Am I not independent of any control exercised by any human power? Have I not come into direct and immediate relations with Christ, by being permitted to see Him and thus enabled to bear witness to the world of His glorified state? Is not my right made evident to all by your existence as a Church in Corinth? 2. Even if I should not be recognized as an Apostle elsewhere, yet assuredly I am an Apostle so far as you are concerned; for you are the seal guaranteeing the genuineness of my Apostolic powers. 3. This is my answer to such as inquire into my rights and my position.² The authority which Paul claims in Corinth is based on his position as the Apostle or envoy sent to them. If a proof is sought that his Apostolate is genuine, it is found in his success: the Corinthian Church is his proof. Such always is the ultimate test, as he has previously stated.³ As an Apostle, he is free; *i.e.* he is independent of all human control: no person or persons have any right to order or limit his action; he does, or refrains from doing, according to his own judgment of what his Apostolate requires.

But whence does his commission as an Apostle originate? How has he been appointed? In reply to that question he appeals to the fact that he has seen Jesus. The importance of this seeing of Jesus leads Paul to insist on it at greater

¹ In doing so we follow chiefly Canon Evans's admirable edition, and often use his words.

² The Authorized Version places only a comma here, and makes *v.* 4 the continuation of the sentence. The Revised Version rightly puts a period. There is a distinct pause at this point after *vv.* 1-3, which form a closely connected whole. Alford and Evans seem right in this (so too Findlay, etc.). The punctuation in Westcott and Hort's text places the pause at the end of *v.* 2, and connects *v.* 3 with the following verses, though marking it off by a period. That view is susceptible of defence; but Canon Evans's view carries conviction.

³ See § XLIII. p. 231 f.

length elsewhere in writing to the Corinthians. That is one of the leading ideas in the Epistles: it was one that rose again and again in his mind as a fact of special importance for them. He insists on it in no other of his letters; but to the Corinthians he mentions it in ix. 1, xv. 8, 2 Cor. xii. 3 f.¹ The reason for this insistence lies in the necessity of bringing home to them his apostolic commission. His glory and his peculiar honour was that he had been admitted more than once to come into direct relations with Jesus, and so marked out as His envoy and Apostle. He was one of the witnesses that Jesus was living.

Thus the argument comes practically to the same issue as we have seen in *Galatians*:² the only parties to be considered are the converted, the messenger, and the Divine Author of the message. No human authority can for a moment claim to intrude between these three.

Considering how important, how absolutely fundamental for Paul it is that his commission originates directly from God, and that no human power intervenes so as to acquire any authority over him, we cannot understand the opinion expressed by some distinguished scholars, whom we would gladly follow to the utmost possible limit, that he (and so too Barnabas) was not actually constituted an Apostle until he was invested with that office by the Church in Antioch (*Acts* xiii. 2). There is something hid from us, or alien to us, in the process by which such an opinion is reached.³

XLVI. "AM I NOT FREE?" (IX. 1).

That the meaning of "free" here is as we have assumed in the preceding section seems clearly proved by ix. 19:

¹ The last passage refers to a different incident, which as an "ecstatic vision" is regarded by some (following Neander) as much less important. Paul himself recognizes no such distinction of dignity, but counts those visions as the greatest glory of his life.

² *Hist. Comm. Gal.*, § XII. p. 270.

³ *St. Paul the Trav.*, p. 67.

“ though I be free from all, yet have I made myself servant¹ unto all ” : I have allowed my acts to be guided and determined by men, accommodating myself to them, in order to gain more complete success. The antithesis is rather rhetorical; but all its force comes from the sense which we have given to the word “ free.”

It is characteristic of Paul's tone to the Corinthians that, while he claims freedom as a right, he says that in practice he has made himself a servant, a slave. In this Epistle he glorifies the duty of obedience and voluntary servitude. To the Galatians, on the contrary, he glorifies freedom. The difference in this respect between the two Epistles is very striking; and it shows how necessary it is always to interpret Paul's words by reference to the character and circumstances of his audience. The slavish Phrygians are called to freedom (v. 13): that is the Divine gift to them (v. 1): the Jerusalem which is now lies in bondage, but freedom belongs to the Jerusalem which is above (iv. 26): the Galatians are born free as the sons of the free woman and not of the slave mother (iv. 31).

On the other hand, the Corinthians, too self-confident, and too little disposed to obedience, are often reminded that freedom is not to be sought as an end always in itself desirable.² A mere numerical statement sufficiently indicates the difference of tone: the words “ free ” and “ freedom ” occur 10 times in the 6 chapters of *Galatians*, 7 times in the 16 chapters of 1 *Corinthians*, and once in the 13 chapters of 2 *Corinthians*.³ But when we look at the spirit of the passages in which “ freedom ” is mentioned to the Corinthians, the contrast to *Galatians* becomes still more marked. In ix. 1 Paul insists on his freedom, but he adds in ix. 19 that he has voluntarily made himself a slave. He points out

¹ More strictly “ slave,” under the dominion of another man or men.

² This is not wholly forgotten in *Galatians*; see v. 13.

³ See *Hist. Comm. Gal.*, § LIV. p. 442.

that in the Church the slave has equal advantages with the free man (xii. 13),¹ and should not set it before himself as an object to attain freedom (vii. 21).² Freedom of conscience may be a danger to others (x. 29).

It is quite wrong to think, as some do, that Paul found he had gone too far in *Galatians* in praising freedom; and in *Corinthians* corrected his teaching so as to praise obedience. The advice in each case is relative to the audience. In each case Paul sees and says that freedom is the highest condition, though there are dangers in seeking after it too hastily. But in the one case it is prudent to insist more on the dangers, in the other on the advantages of freedom.

While Paul sees that it is necessary to impress strongly on the Corinthians the duty of obedience, we observe in what a generous and lofty way he does this. There is nowhere any expression that might tend to break the spirit, or wound the just self-respect of the Corinthians. No better example could be quoted of true nobility of mind than the manner in which Paul counsels them to be content with less than absolute freedom, and to acquiesce in the control of wisdom and authority.

. XLVII. PRIVILEGES OF AN APOSTLE.

IX. 4. Have we not privilege to be maintained, while resident among you, at the cost of the Church? You know that we have. 5. Have we not privilege to take about with us a Christian woman for wife, as also the rest of the

¹ The same thought, of course, occurs in *Gal.* iii. 28.

² The second half of the verse is enigmatic. It has been understood by Alford, etc., as "if thou art even able to become free, remain in slavery rather"; but (although this is quite possible with the Greek) we feel bound to conclude with Evans, Findlay, etc., that Paul means, "but still, if thou canst also become free, rather make use of the opportunity (than not)." Though Alford's construction is in keeping with the general tone of the context, yet we scruple to take such an extreme meaning. Paul seems to be making a concession parenthetically in spite of the context.

Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?¹ 6. Or is it only I and Barnabas that have not privilege to abstain from working for our bread? 7. The soldier is maintained by the State. The tenant (*métayer*) who plants the vineyard (*though he is not the owner of the soil and the vines, but merely contributes the work, and divides with the owner the profits*), eats the fruit of it (*i.e.* not to consume it all, but he is free to use the fruit for his own personal needs). He who tends a flock for the owner uses the milk for his own needs.

Three illustrations are here taken from common life.² The soldier is fed by the State: the illustration is drawn rather from the standing army of the Romans than the citizen force of a Greek city: it is more Roman than Greek.³ The agricultural system of *métayers* working the soil and paying a proportion of the crops to the owner was widespread under various modifications in ancient times.

This paragraph, with the following, has no bearing on the argument, unless the Corinthians had been struck by a contrast between Paul and some other teacher or teachers who lived at the expense of the community. Nor would it be sufficient to suppose that the Corinthians had heard that teachers in other places were supported by the congregation. Something that had come home to them in Corinth is needed to make the situation and the words intelligible. Apollos had gone to Corinth after Paul; but his conduct alone would not explain the prominence given here to the action of the Apostles. Something further must have occurred, and the thought of this, and of the talk roused in Corinth by it, is in Paul's mind. This event can hardly

¹ On the emphatic position assigned to Cephas, as marking a climax, see next section.

² Hence *κατὰ ἀνθρώπων* in the following verse: so *Hist. Comm. Gal.* § XXXIII. p. 349.

³ The Greek armies of the later centuries B.C. were, indeed, largely mercenary; but the idea always remained as a theory in the Greek city that every citizen of suitable age is a soldier in case of need.

have been anything else than the appearance in Corinth of some important personage who took advantage of the privileges which Paul denied himself.

XLVIII. ST. PETER IN CORINTH.

One of the most striking facts in this first Corinthian Epistle is the prominent position which St. Peter occupies in it.

1. A group or class of Christians in Corinth hold by him : "I am (a partisan) of Cephas" was their motto. It is implied in i. 12 and iii. 22 that the Corinthians discussed the merits and style of Paul and Apollos and Cephas as teachers, and some preferred the one, some another, while others again were not contented with the exposition of Christ as given by any of them.¹

2. In the passage before us Peter is singled out, separated from "the rest of the Apostles," and used to mark a climax rising from them, through "the brethren of the Lord" to "Cephas." This peculiar prominence is assigned to him in respect of a personal fact, viz. that he travelled accompanied by his wife and taking certain allowances.

There seem to be only two possible explanations of the importance thus attached to him. Either he was already recognized in Corinth as the supreme Apostle, whose example far outweighed that of all others, or he was personally known in Corinth, so that his example was peculiarly impressive to them.

It seems impossible to hesitate for a moment between these alternatives. Not a scrap of evidence is known to support the first. The second alone can stand. People in Corinth discussed Peter's teaching and his style and his conduct—with all the free criticism that Greeks used—because they had seen him and listened to him. For the

See § V. in EXPOSITOR, Jan., 1900, p. 28 f.

same reason they knew that he travelled in a different way from Paul.

3. He is quoted first and separately from the other Apostles as a witness that Christ was still living (see xv. 5). This might be sufficiently justified on chronological grounds: Luke xxiv. 34 mentions that Christ was seen by Peter alone before He was seen by the Twelve. But his evidence would be all the weightier to the Corinthians if they had heard him tell the story himself.

Elsewhere¹ we have studied the variation in the way in which Paul mentions individuals, according as they are, or are not, personally known to his correspondents. When the effect of the reference to an individual depends mainly on facts not stated in the context, but presupposed as familiar to the readers, that individual is probably known personally to them. On that principle we infer that Chloe and Sosthenes and Apollos were personally known in Corinth, and so also Cephas.

Nor is there anything improbable or strange in this conclusion. The Corinthian tradition was that the same two Apostles who preached in Rome had preached in their city—Paul and Peter. Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, mentions that fact in a letter written about 170–175 A. D. A tradition so early on such a matter has strong claim to be considered authoritative; and Lightfoot draws the proper inference² from a comparison between Dionysius's statement and 1 *Corinthians* i. 12, iii. 22. It must, then, be regarded as a fact, and a very important fact, that St. Peter had preached in Corinth before this First Epistle was written.

Now there is every probability—at least for those to whom the evidence seems conclusive as to St. Peter having preached in Rome—that he visited Corinth on his way to Rome. Corinth was the half-way resting-place between

¹ *Hist. Comm. Gal.*, §§ III., IV. p. 246 ff.

² See his note on Clement, vol. ii. p. 26.

Syria and Rome; and it seems improbable that Peter would stop short at Corinth when we consider what is likely to have been his business on this journey.

We shall probably not be wrong in supposing that Peter's visits to Rome, to Syrian Antioch (*Gal.* ii. 11), and to Samaria (*Acts* viii. 14), are to be all classed together as made on behalf of the supreme Church authorities. He was commissioned from Jerusalem to inspect these new Churches, and to report upon them after forming an opinion as to their character. Whether he was similarly commissioned to a purely Pauline foundation like the Corinthian Church is perhaps more doubtful; but we think it highly probable that he was so commissioned, for we see no reason to think that either Paul or the leading Apostles in Jerusalem wished to make any distinction between his churches and the rest.

In Rome, at any rate, the young Church must have been an object of much interest in Jerusalem; and those who think it unlikely that Peter would intrude on the Pauline Church at Corinth as a commissioner with authority from the central body in Jerusalem, must feel all the more strongly that he would be there only because it was on the way to some place beyond; and the only place beyond that has a moment's claim to consideration is Rome.

Even we who think that Peter was an authoritative commissioner in Corinth must feel that the interest attaching to the Church in Rome was likely to attract him thither, and that a commission to inspect the new Churches was most unlikely to stop short at Corinth.

Further, we must probably regard this visit of St. Peter as having formed part of a regular tour of inspection. "As Peter went through all parts he came also to the saints which dwelt at" Derbe and Lystra and Iconium and the cities of Asia and Corinth (*Acts* ix. 32). We must assume that he took the land route so as to visit the new Churches.

Moreover, if he was on his way to Rome (as we think highly probable), it would follow that he must have chosen the land route, for the sea route would not bring him to Corinth, but to Puteoli.¹ If he came to Corinth by the land route over Asia Minor, it is beyond doubt or question that he must have passed through Ephesus on the way. The regular voyage over the Ægean was between Ephesus and Corinth.

The character of this tour may perhaps explain why a staunch Paulinist like Luke did not mention it. He did not regard an inspection authorized by the Church in Jerusalem as an event of importance in the development of the Pauline Churches; and his rule is to mention only the great critical steps in the growth of the Church.

It is an interesting point that Peter is here implied to have been accompanied by his wife when he visited Corinth. Tradition records also that she was with him in Rome and that he saw her led to martyrdom there.

XLIX. THE DATE OF ST. PETER'S VISIT TO ROME.

It would furnish a fixed point of the highest value in an obscure subject if the precise date of St. Peter's visit to Corinth could be fixed. Apparently it had occurred some considerable time before this Epistle was written, for the effects on the congregation in Corinth after his departure are alluded to in i. 11, iii. 22. Moreover, we might have looked for some more explicit allusion to the visit, if it had occurred only shortly before the Epistle was written (winter-spring, 55-56): probably it was known to and mentioned by Paul in that previous letter (which is alluded to in v. 9).

The latest date for Peter's visit to Corinth, therefore, is the late spring of 55 A. D.

¹ Lucan, *Navig.*, describes an Alexandrian corn ship on its way to Rome as lying in the harbour of Piræus, not far from Corinth; but it is evident that the visit was an unusual and unnatural episode of such a voyage, introduced for the sake of this dialogue, and explained as due to bad winds.

On the other hand it is evident from i. 12, iii. 4, 6, 22, that Apollos visited Corinth before Peter. Apollos was the first important teacher who had come there after Paul to carry on Paul's work: "I planted, Apollos watered." Now Paul passed through Ephesus in March A.D. 53; and some time afterwards Apollos arrived, was brought over to the Pauline views by Priscilla and Aquila, and sent across to work in Corinth. He had preached a little in Ephesus before he departed; and we can hardly date his arrival in Corinth earlier than the end of summer 53. He was in Corinth preaching when Paul reached Ephesus about mid-winter 53; and it is very unlikely that any ordinary person would cross later than October.¹ Hence we may fairly date the arrival of Apollos in Corinth about September 53, and suppose that he spent the winter of 53-54 at least, and perhaps the whole of 54, in Corinth.

These considerations show that Peter went to Corinth between spring 54 and spring 55.

But we can advance still further, and establish a fair probability that the spring of 55 was the date of the visit. The visit was doubtless a short one. Its purpose was probably, as we have seen, simply inspection, and Peter was on his way to Rome.

Now the date of Peter's visit to Rome is assigned to A.D. 55 by Lactantius (?) *de mortibus persecutorum*, a work written in A.D. 313-315 and of good historical value. He says that the Apostles spent twenty-five years, down to the beginning of Nero's reign,² in laying the foundations of the Church; and that Peter came to Rome when Nero was already on the throne.³ The writer is indubitably count-

¹ Peter also would not cross the sea in winter, and could therefore not reach Corinth earlier than late spring A.D. 54.

² *Usque ad principium Neroniani imperii*, c. 2.

³ *Cumque iam Nero imperaret Petrus Romam advenit*: the *iam* implies *principium Neroniani imperii*.

ing from A.D. 30 as the date of the Crucifixion, to 55 as the arrival in Rome.

Dr. Erbes¹ would explain this date as due to a confusion with the false date 55 assigned by Eusebius for the arrival of Paul in Rome. He is convinced (just as we² are) that Eusebius made a blunder of five years in interpreting that Pauline date; but his theory that Lactantius (writing earlier than Eusebius) erred in the same way about the Pauline date and then transferred it to Peter is a very thin-spun hypothesis, such as some writers take for chronological reasoning.

We hold that Lactantius (?) goes back to a good Roman tradition, fixing the arrival of St. Peter in the summer of 55; and the late *Liber Pontificalis* (as Dr. Erbes says) gives the same year, "Peter entered Rome in the first consulship of Nero Cæsar."³ That the whole history of Peter in Rome has been confused and distorted by the false idea that the two Apostles were martyred on the same day is quite true; but the date 55 has the look of a real fragment of history, preserved in the Roman tradition.

L. NOTE ON THE DATE OF SECOND JOHN.

A query in reference to Prof. Rendel Harris's interesting note on the address of Second John in the *EXPOSITOR* for March may not be out of place here, since the forms and methods of epistolary communication are of the utmost importance in studying the Pauline letters. Prof. Harris has done so much real service in this line of work that he can well afford to make allowance, if we hesitate to go with him completely. That Second John is a real letter to a lady, we entirely agree with him; and we accept his inferences as to her family and position as highly probable and

¹ *Todestage Pauli und Petri*, p. 13f.

² See *EXPOSITOR*, Aug., 1900, p. 92 f.

³ *Petrus ingressus in urbe Roma Nerone Cesare I.*, i.e. A.D. 55.

almost certain. But we cannot think that he has made out his case as to the meaning of the address—"that *κυρία* is a term of endearment, and should be so translated: at the least it should be 'dear lady.'" He quotes *κυρία μου Σερηνία* from an Egyptian letter, where Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt render "my dear Serenia." But the endearment there lies in *μου* rather than in *κυρία*. Those who have been used to colloquial Greek in modern times will feel at once the difference between *κυρία* and *κυρία μου*.

The use of *κύριος* and *κυρία* in polite communication at that period seems to be exactly similar to the use of *dominus* in Latin. Prof. Harris quotes another Egyptian letter, where a man addresses his own brother as *κύριέ μου* and concludes that "the expression must be affectionate rather than official." We remember that Seneca speaks about his brother (towards whom he had a very warm feeling) as *dominus meus Gallio* (if my memory serves me right); and we find the two cases quite parallel. But Seneca would also speak of the reigning emperor as *dominus meus* or *dominus noster*. The truth is, perhaps, that *κύριος*, *κυρία*, and *dominus* in the language of polite society at that time were almost colourless terms, mere forms of courtesy, and just because they were colourless in themselves they were susceptible of taking the colour of the surrounding circumstances. They might be very respectful; and they might be used of one's nearest relations. But there seems to be in them no note of love or affection: that is given only through the addition of a personal pronoun. In another Egyptian letter a father writes to his son as *κυρίῳ μου*, but he also says *δέσποτά μου*, and speaks of his wife as *τὴν δεσποίνην μοι*. As Prof. Harris himself allows, the father was "a stickler for proprieties"; and we must see elaborately polite forms in his letter.

In regard to this one detail we would ask if Prof.

Harris's argument might not be strengthened. But, apart from this little point, he has brought out very instructively and convincingly the early character of the Epistle. In the same number we have tried to prove a similarly early date for the Third Epistle, and, as he says, it "was written at the very same time as the Second."

LI. HAD PAUL SEEN JESUS? (IX. 1).

It is remarkable that Paul, here and in xv. 8, lays such stress on his having actually seen Jesus—evidently referring to the appearance of Jesus to him near Damascus—whereas two of the three accounts of that event in *Acts* contain no direct statement that he saw the person who spoke to him, and even suggest that he did not see.

In *Acts* ix. 4-8, there shone a light: Paul fell on the ground: he heard a voice: he arose from the earth: he found that he was blind. In xxii. 7, also, there shone a light: Paul fell to the ground: he heard a voice: he could not see, but had to be led. Taken alone, these two accounts would certainly suggest that Paul had only heard, but had not seen, the form. Yet in 1 *Corinthians* he twice claims to have seen and to be a witness to the risen Jesus.

Moreover, those two accounts represent the voice as saying to Paul, "Rise and go into the city"; and they certainly would suggest that his rising from the ground took place at the end of the vision, and was the first action resulting from it.

In *Acts* xxvi. 13-20, the account varies in some important details: there shone a light: all fell to the ground: Paul heard a voice: he was ordered to rise and stand on his feet: a longer address was then made to him, declaring the intentions of Jesus in appearing to his eyes,¹ and laying stress on

¹ ὤφθην σοι, in *Acts* xxvi. and 1 *Cor.* xv. 8, is not quite adequately rendered in the Revised Version by "appeared to thee." The Authorized Version has "was seen" in 1 *Cor.* and "appeared to thee" in *Acts*. For perfect accuracy we need "appeared to thy sight," an awkward phrase.

the fact that his work would be to bear witness of what he had seen ¹ and of the circumstances in which Jesus should in future be seen by him.

We see, then, that the author of *Acts* was quite aware that Paul claimed to have seen Jesus; and when we look more closely at the other accounts, we observe that in ix. 7 the men who were with him "stood speechless, hearing the voice but beholding no man." There is no point in saying that they saw nobody, unless Paul saw some one. Might we not infer from that incidental touch that Paul had seen? Yet how indirectly and briefly is the information given!

Similarly, in xxii. 14, Ananias reminds Paul of the vision that appeared to him, when he was chosen "to see the Righteous One, and to hear a voice from His mouth," and to be a witness of what he had seen and heard. Here again the information is given by the author, in this indirect way, through the mouth of Ananias. He knows it; but he omits in the primary narrative what is sufficiently given in the immediate sequel. He also reports in the briefest way the words addressed to Paul, omitting what seems to us to be of the greatest importance, but giving the words much more fully in another part of his book. Surely we may infer that the extreme brevity of the account in chap. ix. was compensated in the writer's plan by the fuller information which was to come in the report of Paul's speeches in xxii. and xxvi., *i.e.* in writing ix. he had before his mind xxii. and xxvi.

We see from this case how to interpret the much abbreviated narrative of the New Testament; we should never

¹ ὦν τε εἶδες in the immense majority of MSS., including N A (but not B C), is defended by xxii. 15, μάρτυς . . . ὦν ἐώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας, and is rightly preferred by almost all modern editors (Tisch., Blass, Knowling, Meyer-Wendt, Baljon, etc.). WH. and Rendall follow B C*, ὦν τε εἶδες με, but the construction then is worse than rude, it is intolerable in a speaker like Paul. We can understand him being led on in a desire for balance and symmetry to add ὦν τε ὀφθῆσομαι σοι after μάρτυρα ὦν τε εἶδες, but not his saying μάρτυρα ὦν τε εἶδες με. The corruption arose through the straining after a supposed correspondence εἶδες με with ὀφθῆσομαι σοι.

too hastily infer that, because only certain words are recorded in the account of any incident, therefore nothing else of importance was known to the writer. A detail which on some occasions St. Paul regards as of primary importance is altogether omitted both by him on one occasion, and by his friend and admirer Luke, from the account of the incident; and the omission is so made that the narrative seems to leave no gap and no room for that detail, until we find elsewhere the more complete account; and when we have that, the whole action becomes clear.

It is necessary to insist on this important principle. Most of the difficulties in early Christian history arise from failure to catch the method of the narrative.

The New Testament books have none of the character of formal treatises composed at a later time by persons who look dispassionately over past history. They bear the stamp of the stress and emotion of actual conflict. The speaker or writer remembers so vividly the details which are at the moment necessary for his immediate purpose, that he leaves out or slurs quickly over other details, also important, yet not at the moment pressing on his attention.

We must also recognize the close relation between 1 *Corinthians* xv. 1-8 and the command in *Acts* xxii. 15, xxvi. 16, "be a witness of what thou hast seen." Paul quotes to the Corinthians all the testimony which proved that Jesus was not dead: he himself is the last witness: in giving his testimony he is acting in obedience to the instruction mentioned in those two passages of *Acts*.

Another variation in the accounts may be noticed here. In xxvi. 16-18 the order to preach to the Gentiles is given Paul in the vision. In xxii. 21 it is not given¹ till long afterwards in Jerusalem. In ix. 17 f. it is presumably reported by Ananias to Paul. This last account is specially remarkable. Ananias hears about Paul in a vision, receives

¹ Except in the general order, "to all men," xxii. 15.

a message to deliver to him, and is informed that Paul is chosen to preach to Gentiles and to Jews. He goes to Paul and gives him quite a different message, omitting the prophecy as to Paul's future preaching, but mentioning his vision by the way and his receiving of the Holy Spirit (neither of which is reported in Ananias's vision). It seems quite clear that the author intends us to combine what Ananias tells Paul with the account given of Ananias's vision, and to understand that all the combined details occurred in the vision, and then were all reported in full by Ananias to Paul.¹ But nothing is mentioned twice: there is no room in so abbreviated a work as the *Acts* for needless repetition.

But one thing comes out clear from the minute examination of the various accounts. While the commission to go to the Gentiles was given to Paul at the very beginning, it was not given in the same explicit, precise, unmistakable fashion as on a later occasion in Jerusalem (*Acts* xxii. 17 ff.), shortly before the beginning of his first missionary journey.² At first it was united with a commission to the Jews: ix. 15, xxvi. 20² (briefly, "to all men," xxii. 15). Paul did not gather from the first vision a clear conception of the nature of his mission as being specially to the Gentiles. He was for a long time firmly persuaded that his experiences and his known vehemence as an enemy to the Christians qualified him specially to persuade the Jews: when at last the commission to the Gentiles was given to him in clear, brief words, he even ventured to object, on the ground

¹ Beyond doubt Luke thought it unnecessary to relate that Ananias delivered the message. He tells of the message given to Ananias, and then of the meeting between Ananias and Saul. The rest is left to be inferred by the reader.

² xxvi. 17 and 20 furnish a good example of the general principle we are trying to illustrate. In v. 17 Paul is commissioned to the Gentiles; but in 20 he goes, in obedience to the heavenly vision, to the people of Damascus, Jerusalem, and Judæa, "and also to the Gentiles": showing conclusively that the vision gave him a general commission to all men, Jews and Gentiles.

that the Jews knew him as the persecutor, the murderer of Stephen (and therefore would believe his assurance that he had seen the living Christ).

After that definite commission Paul, in looking back to the first vision, perceived that the commission to the Gentiles was given even then, though he had not at the time recognized it.

Further, this shows probably that, in comparison to later visions, Paul's appreciation and memory of the first was more confused and blurred. That is only what must be regarded as natural. If some rare and exceptional men are so sensitive to that Divine nature which surrounds us and embraces us and breathes through us as to be occasionally able, in moments of special exaltation and heightened sensibility, to commune with it, that quality in them will be strengthened during their life, and they will become more able to stand before and to comprehend the Power which manifests itself to them.

W. M. RAMSAY.

SCIENTIFIC LIGHTS ON RELIGIOUS PROBLEMS.

IV.

OPTIMISM AND PESSIMISM.

THERE have been two extreme estimates of the present world—that of the Chinaman and that of the Indian. The Chinese view is rose-coloured. It regards Man as already among the celestials—in the enjoyment of social laws which are so perfect as to admit of neither repeal nor modification. The Indian view, on the other hand, is sombre, nay, it is dark. It looks upon this world as an absolute delusion—a series of dream-pictures or false appearances which lure the soul into temptation and debar it from its native rest.

These nations represent two sections of humanity—the