

for whom the outgoing movement is as essential as the 'returning and rest', and not the mere quietist whether Eastern or Western. So that the value of Miss Underhill's work in this sphere is rather to convey a general impression of the attractiveness of Mysticism than to drive home the real argument which may be based on a study of religious psychology. But this is as far as it goes a great gain, and her work should receive a wide welcome.

J. L. JOHNSTON.

CHRYSOSTOM ON I CORINTHIANS i 13.

IN view of the uncertainty as to St Paul's meaning, when he says to the Corinthians *Μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός*, evidenced by our texts, versions, and commentaries in England, it may be worth while to ask for a re-examination of the treatment of the passage by Chrysostom. Our own readiness to consider the alternative interpretation mentioned by him, and our estimate of the importance which he himself attached to it, will both be influenced by a careful noting of the interpretation which he first gives, and of the tone, whether of confidence or of hesitation, in which he gives it. We may also gain something by observing what interpretations he wholly ignores.

The passage of his Third Homily with which we have to do runs as follows :—

'But that they were doing wrong in assigning* themselves to this and that person is evident; and he had good right to address to them the rebuke, You do not well in saying "I belong to Paul, and I to Apollos, and I to Cephas": but what made him add, "and I to Christ"? For if those who assigned themselves to men were doing wrong, surely their wrongdoing was not shared by those who referred themselves to Christ. What he was finding fault with, however, was not their claiming Christ as their own Patron (*ὅτι τὸν Χριστὸν ἑαυτοῖς ἐπεφήμιζον*), but their not all claiming Him alone. And I think that the words "And I to Christ" are an addition of the Apostle's own making (to what the Corinthians actually said), due to his desire to make the charge against them weightier, and to shew that according to this way of thinking (*οὕτω*) Christ too had been given merely as one part (*εἰς μέρος δοθέντα ἔν*), although they were not doing this in such wise (*οὕτως*, i.e. in this glaring and palpable manner). For that *this* was what he meant he made evident by the following words, "Has Christ been made a *part* (*μεμέρισται*)?" What he means (by putting this question) is something of this sort, "You have cut Christ to pieces, and broken up His body". Do you see his strong feeling, the vehemence of his rebuke, the indignation with which his language is filled? For whenever, instead of framing

a charge, he simply puts a question, he does so to mark his sense that the absurdity of the thing admits of no doubt.

Some, however, say that he would convey quite a different thought by saying, *Μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός*; that by *μεμέρισται* he means "divided up and shared the Church with men, taking one part Himself and giving them another".

(Chrysostom proceeds to consider the next words *Μὴ Παῦλος ἐσταν-
ρώθη κτλ.*)

A careful perusal of this passage will shew that Chrysostom suggests two ways of taking the question *Μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός*; (He apparently has no doubt at all that it *is* a question.)

(a) According to the first interpretation *μεμέρισται* is equivalent to *εἰς μέρος δέδοται ἔν*, to adapt his own way of putting it—'Has Christ been given as one part?' By saying 'I belong to Paul, I to Apollos, I to Cephas', you have been rending us, who are His members, away from His body, and leaving Him as a *mere part* of it. This would seem to be the meaning of the words *εἰς μέρος δοθέντα ἔν*. The Corinthians had 'assigned themselves' to this or that Christian teacher, to this or that member of the Body, as though he were (to them) the head: they had 'cut it up' *εἰς μέρη*, leaving Christ Himself to be but one *μέρος*. To make it clear to them that this is what they were doing St Paul has put in *ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ*, though they had none of them put forward this claim. By the words *κατετέμετε τὸν Χριστόν, καὶ διείλατε αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα* he is not giving a second paraphrase of *μεμέρισται*. The *word* he has already explained by *εἰς μέρος δοθέντα ἔν*. He is telling them that they cannot claim to *belong to* (to 'be of') a member of Christ without virtually cutting off that member and making him into a *quasi*-head separate from the body. And by doing this they are regarding Christ Himself as having been given (by the Father) 'as one part' and not as the whole Salvation of all. They are denying that 'the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of the Glory . . . gave Him as Head over all things to the Church' (Eph. i 22). And the word *δοθέντα* shews that *μεμέρισται* is the (supposed) act of *God*. 'Do you mean to say that God has given His Son as *part* only of the world's salvation? that Paul and Apollos and Cephas are co-ordinate parts of the great gift?'

It is of importance, then, to observe that Chrysostom does not treat *μεμέρισται* as the act of the Corinthian Christians 'dividing' Christ; and that he does not take the second *ὁ Χριστός* as meaning the mystical Body of the Lord. Indeed, the rendering adopted by the A. V. and R. V. does not seem to have occurred to him, any more than the possibility of taking the words otherwise than interrogatively (with Westcott

and Hort's text and R. V. margin). Moreover, he evidently thinks that the question 'Does Christ constitute a part (of the Father's gift)?' would be pointless had there actually been a party at Corinth claiming to differ from the other parties in belonging to Christ. The existence of such a party, with the three others claiming other heads, would have been an open avowal that Christ was no more than a co-ordinate part of man's salvation.

The first interpretation of *μεμέρισται* put forward by Chrysostom is not materially different from that adopted from Evans in the latest utterance of an English scholar on the subject in the 'International Critical Commentary'. These scholars agree with Chrysostom, in avoiding the rendering of our Versions of 1611 and 1881.

Chrysostom, it will be noticed, says hardly anything in support of his own explanation of *μεμέρισται* and bases it upon a guess (*οἶμαι*) which will scarcely win general approval.

(*b*) Having thus briefly explained the question with *μεμέρισται* treated as a Passive, he proceeds to tell us that some maintained that the Apostle used the verb here not as a Passive but as a Middle. He at all events does not forbid us to ask what these scholars could urge in favour of their view.

1. Did the Greek language allow of it? The Middle Voice *μερίζομαι* is perfectly familiar in the sense of 'sharing with others' or 'receiving a share'. So, in 1 Sam. xxx 24, we read *κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ μεριοῦνται*, 'they shall share alike'; and in Proverbs xxix 24 *ὃς μερίζεται κλέπτῃ*, 'he who goes shares with a thief'.

2. Would such an idea be familiar to a Corinthian audience in the reign of Claudius? The Roman Empire was, indeed, fast making the world forget its past, but the career of Alexander must have bulked larger in the Greek world than that of Napoleon in Europe. And had Napoleon not been overthrown but left an Empire for his Marshals to share, the fact of being ruled by the descendants of these men would have burnt the idea into the different peoples. Men living in a world ruled so long by Antiochi, and Ptolemies and the rest, would be quick to catch a speaker's meaning when he asked 'Do you regard such an one as an Alexander or as a Ptolemy?' A Greek historian, who flourished in the time of Julius Caesar, writing of these Diadochi uses these words:—*τῶν μεμερισμένων τὰς σατραπείας Πτολεμαῖος μὲν ἀκινδύνως παρέλαβε τὴν Αἴγυπτον* (Diodorus xviii 14); and a little later: *ὁ Περδίκκας . . . παρέδωκε τὴν σατραπείαν Εὐμένει τῷ Καρδιανῷ, καθάπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἦν μεμερισμένος* (xviii 16). These examples shew, were it necessary, how little the Passive can lay claim to sole possession of *μεμέρισμαι*. Can we doubt that a Greek hearing the words *ἕκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει Ἐγὼ μὲν*

εἰμι Παύλου, Ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ, Ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ, Ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ. Μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός; might easily take the question to mean 'Is Christ One who has received *but a share* of an empire?' 'Are Paul and Apollos on a level with Him, as Ptolemy with Eumenes and Antigonus?'

3. The synonym used by Chrysostom for *μερίζομαι*, meaning 'I go shares with', suggests another division of empire familiar to Greeks. The famous Myth in the *Gorgias* begins *διενείμαντο τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁ Ζεὺς καὶ ὁ Ποσειδῶν καὶ ὁ Πλούτων, ἐπειδὴ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς παρέλαβον* (523 A). Among writers who have come down to us, Plutarch, Eusebius, and Theodoret quote this Myth in whole or in part (see Thompson's note). May not an Athenian or a Corinthian audience have been almost as much at home with this Myth as with the fact that Greek generals had shared the Empire of Alexander?

4. If *μεμέρισται* be Middle, we escape the necessity of supposing, as the Passive obliges us to do, that, instead of Christians being spoken of as belonging to Christ, Christ is spoken of as belonging to them—as apportioned to them, instead of they to Him. After 'I belong to Paul . . . and I to Christ', it is surely far more fitting to ask 'Has Christ *shared* you?' than 'Has Christ been *apportioned* to you?' This latter question presupposes the claims 'Paul belongs to me . . . Christ to me'. This is a difficulty about the Passive which commentators as a rule ignore.

5. Nor is it otherwise with regard to the questions which follow. If Christ shared men with Paul, so that they can say 'I belong to Paul', then Paul must have somewhat to shew equivalent to the Cross, by the Blood of which Christ purchased us. If they are 'not their own' but 'Paul's', Paul must be able to point to the price which he paid for them. And their Baptism must testify before God and man that 'the fair Name called on them' was that of Paul. When like Paul himself they 'arose and were baptized and got their sins washed away', they cannot, like him, have 'called upon them the Name of the Lord Jesus' but they must have ascribed themselves to Paul.

6. The burden of the earlier part of 1 Corinthians is a renunciation by St Paul on his own and on Apollos's behalf of any position but one of *subordination* to God and Christ. He tells them that he and Apollos are 'God's team' (of oxen); that they are *God's* tilth, *God's* building: that '*servants* through whom ye believed', '*agents* of Christ', '*stewards* of mysteries of God' are the loftiest titles apostles can claim.

7. With the pronouns crowding before and after the question, there is no difficulty in supplying *ὑμᾶς*. But the pronoun could not have been inserted without detracting from the force of the indignant question: 'Has Christ taken part in a "partitioning"?''

G. H. WHITAKER.