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CHAPTER II.

THE TWO EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

These two Epistles stand in chronological order between the Epistles to the Galatians on the one hand, and the Epistle to the Romans on the other, and they form the centre of the important sphere of action in which the Apostle moved as the founder of Gentile Christian churches. That which is presented in its simplest elements in the Epistle to the Galatians, and which in the Epistle to the Romans passes over to the abstract sphere of dogmatic antithesis, widens out in the Epistles to the Corinthians into the full reality of concrete life, with all the complicated relations which must have existed in a Christian church of the earliest period. The Corinthian Church was the peculiar creation of the Apostle, it had been, as he himself says (1 Cor. iv. 15), a child begotten by him and nourished in all love; but such a child also as needed his fatherly correction and instructing care in every way. With no other church did he stand in so close and confidential a relation, to none did he address so many and such important Epistles, in none had he undergone so many experiences of different kinds, above all in none had he such a difficult and important problem to solve. All this was in consequence of the Corinthian Church being the first Christian one which existed in the classic ground of ancient Greece. How could the Greek spirit disown its original nature, when it underwent its new birth into Christianity? There is nothing more natural than that Christianity should at first break out into phenomena of a peculiar kind, among a people like the Greeks, whose spiritual activity and versatility, whose political party spirit had a new theatre opened before them, in the newly acquired sphere of action, and this especially

in a city like Corinth, where Greek culture and Greek sensuality stood in such close connection. But hence also arose a fact which was of peculiar importance in the personal relation of the Apostle to the Corinthian Church, and which gave him such manifold opportunities of placing before us the underlying, purely human phase of his many-sided individuality, and this fact was that the same Judaising opponents, with whom we are already acquainted, introduced a new and deeply penetrating element into the life of this Greek Christian Church, yet in the first stage of its development. But it must have been evident to their opponents themselves, if they had any tact at all, that they must take quite a different attitude in this thoroughly Greek Church, than in the one in Asia Minor, and that it was incumbent on them to appear in a more polished, more refined, and less strictly Jewish form, especially as they must meanwhile have given up much in their religious consciousness to which they had at first jealously adhered. Their opposition to the Pauline Christianity no longer proceeded from the purely Jewish standpoint, which laid the greatest stress on circumcision alone, it now took peculiarly Christian ground, and above all other subjects concerned itself with the true Christian idea of the apostolic authority, but in proportion as it was intense and thorough, it was all the more personally dangerous to the Apostle himself.

In the first Epistle the Apostle treats of a series of circumstances which at that early period had a special interest for a church still in its infancy. The chief matter with which he concerned himself was the party spirit which existed in the Corinthian Church through the influence of the Judaising opponents. It had split into several parties, which were called by names denoting their several opinions, i. 12. The names Paul, Apollo, Cephas and Christ betoken as it seems so many different parties. Very naturally the party of Paul is first placed before us. The Corinthians had not deserted the Apostle, they had only divided themselves into parties, and
those members of the Church who had remained most faithful to the Apostle, as we see from the contents of both the Epistles, still continued to form an overwhelming majority. When different parties were formed in Corinth it cannot be wondered at that one of these should be called by the name of Apollos. Apollos was, according to the Apostle, undoubtedly his fellow-worker in the cause of the Gospel at Corinth, and if, as is related of him, Acts of the Apostles xviii. 24, he had attained such eminence through Alexandrine education and literary acquirements, it may easily be understood how there might be many persons in Corinth, who owing to the peculiarly Greek spirit of his discourses became so prepossessed in his favour that they gave him a certain precedence over the Apostle Paul. But why did not the favourable reception which other like-minded teachers met with from a portion of the Church, appear to the Apostle as indicating such a dangerous party spirit, and one so earnestly to be opposed? Some other circumstances must have occurred therefore before the expressed predilection for Apollos could have been considered by the Apostle as a token of a doubtful tendency in the Church. We must seek for the peculiar cause of division and schism in the names of the two other parties. With the name of Peter, an opposition to Paul is naturally connected. As far as we know, Peter himself was never at Corinth, but under the authority of his name a Jewish Christian element had, without doubt, been introduced into a Church consisting almost entirely of Gentile Christians. In this sense only can the Apostle mean to affix the name of Cephas or Peter to one of these parties. We should have expected that the Apostle would have taken as the subject of his objection, the principles propagated by the Judaizing opponents, but the contents of his Epistle do not carry out this expectation. The Jewish doctrines of the absolute value of the Mosaic law, and the necessity of its observance for salvation, are no where combated as they are in the Epistles to the Galatians and the Romans, and there is no mention made of the law, and all that depends upon it. It is vain throughout the whole of both the Epistles to the Corinthians, to look for any trace which may help to bring us into a closer knowledge of the real existence of these parties, only the last chapter of the second Epistle leaves us in no doubt whatever that this opposition had by no means ceased. At the conclusion of the Epistle (xi. 22), the Apostle so openly unveils the Judaism of his opponents, and describes them as false with such sharp words, with all the authority of a born Jew who had become a teacher of Christianity, that we are easily enabled to understand the reason of his polemic against them; but we are no nearer to the desired explanation of their principles. The Judaism of his opponents appears here in a new form, and we may ask whether by means of these party relations we cannot see deeper into the fourth of these parties described by the Apostle—the so-called party of Christ. Here we come also to a most difficult question, which we must endeavour as far as possible to answer if we wish to arrive at a clear understanding of the circumstances of the Corinthian Church, and the position of the Apostle in it.

Who were these ἀι τοῦ Χριστοῦ? Amongst the interpreters and critics who in modern times have directed their attention to this question, Storr and Eichhorn have advanced theories which exhibit a natural opposition to each other, inasmuch as whilst the one adheres too closely to something special, the other on the contrary loses himself in generalities, but both have a common ground of agreement in neither relying on a decided point of support in the contents of the Epistle, nor in even giving a clear idea of the subject. According to Storr†

† I first investigated these questions in a treatise in the Theologische Zeitschr. fur Theologie, 1831, pt. 4, p. 6: Die Christus-partei in der kirchlichen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums, der Apostol Petrus in Rom.

Life and Work of Paul

Oi τοῦ Χριστοῦ were those members of the Corinthian Church who had made the Apostle James the chief of their party as being the ἔδεικνύσαντες κυρίων, in order that through this material relationship of the head of their sect to Jesus, they might claim for it a precedence which would exalt it over the Petrine party. The Apostle indeed might have had good reasons for hinting at this carnal idea of relationship to Christ, 2 Cor. v. 13, in the expression Χριστοῦ κατὰ σάρκα γινόμενον; but if Storr cannot bring forward anything else in support of his theory than that the Apostle 1 Cor. ix. 5, speaks of the "brethren of the Lord," and xv. 7, speaks of James especially with Peter, of what value is such an hypothesis? According to Eichhorn, oi τοῦ Χριστοῦ may have been the neutrals who stood apart from the strife of parties; they did not depend on Paul, nor Apollo, nor Peter; but only on Christ. In order to give some sort of colouring to the idea of these neutrals, Pott endeavours to establish Eichhorn's theory, by a comparison of the passage I. Cor. iii. 22, where Paul, after enumerating the schisms in the Corinthian Church which he had before denounced, brings forward as the main point of his argument the words πάντα ὑμῶν ἵσταται, ἐν τῷ Παύλῳ, ἐν τῷ Ἀπολλὼ, ἐν τῷ Κηφᾶ, πάντα ὑμῶν ἵσταται, ὡς δὲ Χριστοῦ, and does this in such a manner that we must look upon the views and doctrines of the Χριστοῦ ὑπήκοος as those approved of by the Apostle himself. These same oi τοῦ Χριστοῦ are meant in i. 12, whilst in iii. 22 the Apostle asserts that the Corinthians themselves τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἔίναι, and he wishes to point out to the followers of the sect, the doctrines of the true Teacher, to which oi Χριστοῦ already had given their adherence. The sources from which they derived their Christian doctrine were equally the teachings of Paul, Apollo, and Peter; but in order to avoid any appearance of sectarianism they did not dis-


about in some way similar to that which had been the case with the other sects, and we cannot see if they claimed to have a more perfect doctrine than others and to know Christianity better than Paul, Apollos and Peter, how they could have made good their claim to this preeminence with any better success than any other of the sects. Therefore either of Χριστοῦ were no sect to be classed with the other sects mentioned with them, or they indeed formed a sect, but a sect of which we must at the same time perceive we have at this day no data by which to form a clear conception of its tendencies and peculiarities.

In order to arrive at a clearer understanding as to the probability of the last mentioned point, it seems to me that the theory which J. E. Chr. Schmidt has given, in a treatise on 1 Cor. i. 12, is not without importance; namely, that there were really but two parties, one that of Paul and Apollos, and the other, as Schmidt expresses it, that of Peter and of Christ. Taking into consideration the acknowledged relation in which Paul and Peter, one as the Apostle to the Gentiles, the other to the Jews, really stood towards each other, or at least the relation in which they were thought to stand towards each other by the chief parties of the oldest Christian Church, there can be no doubt that the chief difference lay between the two sects which called themselves after Paul and Cephas. It follows that the two other parties, that of Apollos and that of Christ, differed less from each other, than from the former, of Paul and Apollos, and the relation also of the parties of Paul and Apollos must be viewed in the same light. We see from many passages that Paul placed Apollos completely on his own side and considered him as an authorized fellow-worker with himself in the preaching of the Gospel, and we find nothing in the contents of either of these Epistles of the Apostle, which would lead us to suppose that there was any important difference between them. Still I will not deny, what is generally believed, that the Apostle, in the passage in which he speaks of the distinction between the σοφία κόσμου and the σοφία θεοῦ, had the party of

Apollos especially in view, but on the other hand it must be granted, that the mental tendency here pointed out must have been more or less the ruling one in the Corinthian Church as a whole. The Apostle represents it as still fettered in this σοφία κόσμου, and the yet deeper and more thorough sense of the real Christian life in the inward man, he represents as a feeling which in the present state of their spiritual life, the Corinthians had yet to attain. Although therefore the predominance of this mental tendency, especially in so far as it consisted in an over-estimate of the outward forms of teaching, as opposed to its quality and the nature of the doctrine itself, divided the party of Apollos from that of Paul, and although the adherents of these parties set the teachers who were at their head, in a relation to each other which the teachers themselves in no way recognized, the difference cannot have been so essentially and dogmatically fixed that the two parties of the adherents of Peter, could not be reckoned as one sect; and if we look at the matter from this side, we can very well imagine that the relation between the party of Cephas and that of Christ may have been a similar one. Even if both sects must be considered as one and the same in the chief point, this does not at all affect the relation which must have subsisted between the parties of Paul and Apollos. The Apostle, 1 Cor. i. 12, may also have intended to multiply the names, in order to depict the overbearing party-spirit in the Corinthian Church, which expressed itself in the multiplication of sectarian names, which indeed indicated different colours and shades of party opinion, although not exactly different parties.

Let us, therefore, first investigate the question wherein the chief opposition consisted between the parties of Peter and Paul.

In the above named treatise, Schmidt finds the chief cause of the difference between the two parties in the presumption, which led the Jewish Christians to consider themselves true Christians, and which would scarcely allow them to reckon the Gentile Christians as real Christians. Among the first Christians there was a party which arrogated Christ to
itself in a special manner—this was the Jewish Christian party. Christ, the Messiah, came in the first place for the sake of the Jews, to whom alone he had been promised; the Gentiles might thank the Jews that Christ had come into the world. Among such proud men as these Jewish Christians, would not the presumption arise that Christ, the Messiah, belonged to them alone? Exactly in this manner the presumption did arise, as we see from 2 Cor. x. 7. They called themselves τοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ—disciples of Christ—disciples of the Messiah,—or, changing slightly the name, χριστιανοὶ. If these Christians were Jewish Christians no doubt can arise that they formed one party with the sect of Peter. But if we agree with this, something else must have lain at the root of such a presumption on the part of the Jewish Christians, because it is quite incredible that they as Jewish Christians with such a presumption, which excluded the Gentile Christians from a participation in the Messianic salvation, should have gained an entrance into a Church consisting for the greater part of Gentile Christians. Therefore, however rightly Schmidt may see the ground of this opposition between the parties of Peter and of Paul, in the claim that the Petrine party made to be οὐ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, we may still enquire how this may be more exactly and certainly determined than has hitherto been done.

In order to answer this question, we shall certainly not be proceeding on an arbitrary assumption, in supposing that the chief accusation which the opposite party brought to bear against Paul, would have been recognised in some way in these Epistles of the Apostle. But the vindication of the apostolic authority constitutes a chief portion of the contents of these Epistles—this authority not being willingly yielded in its full sense to the Apostle Paul by his opponents. They would not recognize him as a real and genuine Apostle, on the ground of his not being: in the same sense as Peter and the rest of the Apostles, τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and not like these having been in the same direct connection with Jesus during his life on earth? Peter himself had no share in the party which went by his name in Corinth, as it must be concluded, from what we have already seen, that Peter was never in Corinth at all; but it may well be supposed that the false Apostles who went about calling themselves by the name of Peter, eventually extended their travels to Corinth.

In the second Epistle, in which especially Paul speaks openly against these opponents, and directly contends with them, he calls them plainly, xi. 13, ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδάδελφοι, ἐγκαίνηται ἐλάχιστον, ἐνακεχομενοὶ εἰς ἀποστολοὺς Χριστοῦ. They also wished to be the true ἀποστόλοι Χριστοῦ, or to be in the closest connection with them, and in this sense to be Χριστοῦ δητες. The special zeal of the Jewish Christians for the Mosaic law, may also in this last respect be essentially the actuating motive, but since in a Church of Gentile Christians, such as was the Corinthian, they could not expect a favourable reception, if they had immediately brought forward their principles, they fell back on the special ground of their Judaistic opposition, they attacked the apostolic authority of the Apostle, and endeavoured in this way to work against him. According to this supposition, the relation of the party of Peter to that of Christ seems very simple and natural. Just as those of Paul and of Apollos did not essentially differ; so these two were not different parties, but only one and the same party under two different names, so that each name only denoted the claim which that party made for itself. They called themselves τοῦ Κηφᾶ, because Peter held the primacy among the Jewish Apostles, but τοῦ Χριστοῦ, because they relied on the direct connection with Christ as the chief token of genuine apostolic authority; and on this very account would not recognize Paul, who had been called to be an Apostle in a perfectly unusual and peculiar manner, as a genuine Apostle, enjoying the same privileges as the others, and thought they ought to place him at least far down in the ranks of Apostles.

On this account also their designation, evidently intentionally
chosen, was τοῦ Χριστοῦ not τοῦ Ἰησοῦ or τοῦ Κυρίου. The idea of the Messiah must be brought forward as the complete actuating organ of the Messianic happiness and blessing of the higher life, whose principle is Christ, in order to indicate all that those who belonged to this name had received from the most direct tradition, from an outward and actually experienced connection with the person of Jesus as the Messiah.

We must now endeavour as much as possible to establish the view here brought forward, by extracts from some principal passages of the two Epistles. Perhaps indeed the first apologetic section, in which the Apostle gives a vindication of his apostolic authority and work, (chap. i. 4), contains some indications that he may have had in his mind those adherents of the party of Peter who claimed to be considered as τοὺς τοῦ Χριστοῦ. When the Apostle, ii. 26, maintains with all his energy, ἡμὶς δὲ νόον Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν (so far as the divine πνεῦμα is the principle of his Christian consciousness)—when, iv. 1, he desires his readers to remember that they have to look on him as ὑπηρέτης Χριστοῦ—when, iv. 10, he asserts that he as the least of the Apostles is willing to consider himself as a μωρὸς διὰ Χριστοῦ, in so far as on good grounds they hold themselves as φρόνιμοι ἐν Χριστῷ; when, verse 15, he reminds them that although they might have μυρίους παῖδαγωγοὺς ἔχων ἐν Χριστῷ, they could not have πολλὰς πατίρας; in all passages such as it is tolerably clear that he referred to the sects which he had just before mentioned; those parties who in the Apostle's opinion wished to make themselves known in an obnoxious manner, and in a perfectly peculiar sense as οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄντες, and these special references lie behind the general apologetic tendency of all this section of the Epistle. In any case, an important passage of this section is to be found ix. 1, &c. The Apostle with a sudden transition here speaks in his own person, while still very closely connecting the portion of his Epistle, beginning ix. 1, with the contents of the chapter immediately preceding, and he skilfully avails himself of the opportunity thus offered for an apologetic discourse. In the foregoing eighth chapter then, the Apostle had discussed the cause of the question which had been laid before him, about the use of meat offered to idols at the participation in the Gentile sacrificial feasts, and had given his opinion that cases might arise when it would be necessary to give up, out of consideration for others, what according to a man's own views he would be perfectly justified in maintaining. He puts this idea in such a manner as to give himself an opportunity of considering many things alleged to his disadvantage by his opponents in a light which with regard to his apostolic call can only appear as a voluntary renunciation. As an Apostle he had also certain rights of which he as well as the other Apostles might avail himself of; but that he had never done so because a higher consideration had hidden him make no use of them, Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἑλέθερος; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος; οὐχὶ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν ἔφρακα; am I not free? am I not an Apostle? and truly an Apostle as well as any other Apostle? have I not seen the Lord Jesus Christ? Wherefore the appeal to the ἔφρακέναι Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν, as a vindication of the ἀπόστολος εἶναι, if his opponents did not deny him the real apostolic character, because he had not seen the Lord as they, or rather the Apostle at the head of their party had done, and had not lived in direct communion with him? This also must be the genuine token of the Χριστοῦ εἶναι. But that these opponents of the Apostle belonged also to one class with the adherents of the party of Peter is clear from the following words, verse 5, μὴ οὖν ἔχωμεν ἑξουσίαν ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν, ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ ἄδελφοι τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ Κυρίας. The Χριστοῦ εἶναι held good in all these cases in the sense already discussed; it held good for the Apostles in general who had enjoyed communion with Jesus, it availed in a narrower sense for the ἄδελφοι Κυρίου, inasmuch as they stood in a still nearer connection to the Lord as his relatives; and it held good in the narrowest sense.
for Peter, inasmuch as Jesus himself had assigned him a certain precedence over the other Apostles, and he represented the whole relation between Jesus and the others in the most complete manner in his own person. But Paul thought that he himself, in the full consciousness of his apostolic dignity, and the rights and claims connected with it, ought not to take a secondary place, even to Peter. In token that he possessed the same rights as the other Apostles, and especially the right to live at the expense of the churches to whom he preached the Gospel, the Apostle appeals first, to what holds good in law and custom in common life, (verses 7, 8.) secondly, to a precept of the Mosaic Law, which indeed primarily referred to animals needed for the use of man, but which might equally be applied to the greatest things as to the least, (9-12); and thirdly, to the customs prevailing in the Mosaic sacrificial worship, (13.) But however well grounded his claim to be an Apostle might be on these accounts, still he had never made any use of them, because such a practice did not seem to him to be consistent with the plan of the Gospel, and would place himself in a mercenary light. Accordingly, living constantly in the consciousness of the chief aim to which he had devoted himself, he subjugated his whole personality to the interests of others and the regard to be paid to them, and his carnal nature he held in such subjection that it was forced to yield to the power of his spirit, (15-17). This whole section contains indeed a most ample refutation of the supposition that the opponents of the Apostle had ascribed the humility and unselfishness with which he preached the Gospel in the churches, to the self-evident consciousness of the Apostle, which did not allow him to dare to place himself in a situation to assume the same rights as the other Apostles. On account of this demeanour indicating only weakness and want of self-confidence, they thought they themselves had the less cause to be obliged to keep back the selfish and self-seeking πλεονεξία (2 Cor. xii. 14.) of which the Apostle elsewhere accuses them. But the more these charges were connected with the chief attack on his apostolic dignity the more it must have seemed to the Apostle to be for his interest to vindicate himself from them, and to place his behaviour in its true light. As here the Apostle's apology refers in its main point to the τὸ πράξεν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸν κύριον θεόν; without explaining more clearly the peculiar nature of this τὸ πράξεν he expresses his desire of holding fast in general to all that placed him on a level with the other Apostles. And he says also that as in any case a peculiar material revelation of the Lord could be predicated of himself, he accordingly (xv. 8.) declares in the same connection, that the Lord had appeared to him also as to the other Apostles. Just as the important exposition of the doctrine of the resurrection which follows seems to demand an equally authentic attestation of the chief points on which it relies, namely, that Jesus rose from the dead, and was really seen as so risen, so the theory cannot be excluded, that with regard to the chief points in which his opponents wished to involve the question of his apostolic authority, the Apostle evidently made use of the opportunity which here naturally offered itself, of placing himself in the same position with the disciples who were associated with Jesus during his life, and of vindicating his apostolic call by the criterion of a direct material appearance of the Lord.

The polemical references which the Apostle so freely uses in both Epistles are as openly and directly prominent in the second as in the first; still it is at the end of the Epistle that the Apostle confronts his opponents boldly without seeking any further compromise, and regards them steadfastly and keenly.

In the earlier part of the Epistle it is especially the passage v. 1-16, which contains a fresh interest full of meaning by its reference to his opponents. The Apostle assures the Corinthians at the outset in different terms of the love which should arouse their confidence, and seeks to convince them of the purity of his views and endeavours. In answer to the reproaches of his opponents he sets forth the results which had attended
his teachings through the strength given him by God, by means of the διακονία τῆς καυχῆς διαθήκης. The greater the superiority of the καυχὴ διαθήκης, the greater also is the superiority of the διακονία. But in striking contrast to this the Apostle, iv. 7, continues “are the sufferings of all kinds with which I as a weak fallible man have to struggle—sufferings which threaten every moment to overwhelm my strength—still I am preserved through them all by the might which conquers death through life, by which Jesus was raised from the dead. Therefore I do not allow my sufferings to hinder me in the duties of my office.” Sufferings only serve to educate the inward man, the true real men, for future glory; this idea makes the Apostle in chapter v., speak of the moment at which the earthly body in whose bonds we now groan, will be changed into a glorified heavenly body, v. 1-4. This confident expectation of a condition essentially belonging to our Christian consciousness, in which when we are absent from the body we are present with the Lord, or at least are in the most intimate connection with him, now requires in all our acts and efforts the most conscientious reference to Christ, by whom the judgment exactly corresponding to our moral conduct will be pronounced (5-14.) “This consciousness accompanies me in my apostolic labours, and you yourselves must bear me this witness; you ought to be comforted by that which in this respect testifies to my utmost consciousness, and holds good against my opponents, and maintains my honour against them, namely, that throughout I have not consulted my own person, my own interests. I labour in the spirit of the love by which Christ so offered himself up for us that we can only live in him; and all our former ties and relationships have ceased to exercise any decided influence on us, wherefore we see ourselves placed in a perfectly new sphere of consciousness and life. The principal actuating cause by which we are raised to this completely new order of things, is the reconciliation which God has effected through the death of Christ between himself and man. Whilst this reconciliation is precisely the peculiar burden of my apostolic preaching, the object of my labour; it is really only Christ in whose name I work—only God, whose voice is allowed to be heard through me. What then is there about my person which can justify my opponents in accusing me of a vain self-praise and of self-seeking views?” In this connexion the expression used by the Apostle, Χριστὸν κατὰ σάρκα γινόμενον, is especially worthy of remark. The Χριστὸς κατὰ σάρκα can only be the Christ or Messiah of Judaism, and accordingly the Apostle says in a sense which is as grammatically natural as satisfactory: “if it were the case that formerly I knew no other Messiah than the Messiah of Judaism—such an one as all the peculiar prejudices and material inclinations of my nation presented to me; and if I were not prepared to raise myself to the new stage of spiritual life on which I now stand—where I live in Christ who died for me, as for all, yet now I do not any longer acknowledge this conception of the Messiah as the true one. I have freed myself from all prejudices, from all the material ideas and expectations which had naturally taken hold of me from my nationality—which had devolved upon me as a born Jew.” If this is the sense of the passage, it can scarcely be thought otherwise than that the Apostle in the expression Χριστὸν κατὰ σάρκα γινόμενον wished to glance at his opponents who prided themselves especially as being τούς τοῦ Χριστοῦ δινατος. Was it not exactly a κατὰ σάρκα Χριστὸν γινόμενον, on which they took their ground when from the standpoint of Judaism and the conception of the Jewish Messiah they thought themselves obliged to deny to the Apostle the genuine apostolic character, and this because he had not been in that direct outward material communion with Jesus during his life on earth, of which those Apostles could boast who were originally called to the apostolic office by Jesus himself. The peculiar circumstance from which the οἶνος ἐν Χριστῷ must have been derived the Apostle says, on the contrary, was not so much the earthly and national appearance of Jesus, in which however the σάρξ in the above sense still
had its share, but rather the death of Jesus, in so far as the old life died with his death, and the new life which was to be awakened in us took its beginning. That which essentially distinguishes the national Jewish Messiah from the Christ of the true Christian consciousness, is the sufferings and death of Christ—the great significance of the death on the cross which the Apostle represents as above all the culminating point of the Christian doctrine, and which he not without reason brings forward with all his energy against his opponents in these two Epistles. Therefore if the earthly life of Jesus as the Messiah and the visible communion with him during his life on earth be taken to a certain extent as something existing for itself, and his whole appearance on earth be not rather looked at by the light of his death on the cross, thus stripping it of the earthly, this is still a Χριστοῦ κατὰ σάρκα γυναῖκα, we still fall back on that which is directly presented to us, conditioned by its natural relations, to which we must first die: but, on the contrary, if we look at his death as the great turning point, in which the καινὴ κτίσις is brought to light,—in which the old things vanish away and all things become new,—then everything falls to the ground, which seemed to give the opponents, or rather the Apostles, on whose authority the opponents relied, their peculiar lofty precedence, owing to their direct communion with Jesus during his earthly life; but which really had its foundation in relations in which the Apostles, as born Jews, were involved. Therefore also he, the Apostle called so late, is enabled to place himself in the same rank with the witnesses of the resurrection of the Lord. He also has recognized in Jesus the One who, as the One who had died and was raised again to life, caused the full meaning of the Christian consciousness and life to appear to us, and established in us the true Χριστοῦ ἐλαι.

Another passage, x. 7, is very nearly allied to those we have above examined. In chap. x. the Apostle enters on the consideration of the reproach made against him by his opponents that he was wanting in personal energy. He declares that he will show, on the contrary, that he knows how to act with all energy and earnestness, with the greatest confidence as to results whenever a matter of importance is involved. At the same time he refutes the reproach made against him, that in him the genuine token is wanting of a Χριστοῦ ἐλαι. Unless we look arbitrarily on the outward appearance only, in what is the Χριστοῦ ἐλαι better than the ἐξουσία εἰς οἰκοδομήν—the strength and energy with which a man labours at the furtherance of the cause of Christianity? He does not say τὰ κατὰ τρόπωσιν βλέπετε, so much of the opponents themselves as of certain members of the Corinthian Church who had already given heed to them, and were in danger of allowing themselves to be still further led astray. "If in respect to my person you maintain what I must be κατὰ τρόπωσιν—this is a proof that you chiefly look at the outward appearance, and judge according to the outward appearance only," (πρόσωπον, as v. 12). These words are generally considered as referring to the so-called party of Christ, and Storr and Flatt understand them according to their view, with regard to their external relations to each other. As the Apostle is speaking of the Χριστοῦ ἐλαι, the reference is to those who considered themselves in a special manner τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ—certainly very naturally—only I can find nothing at all in this passage, which would justify the conclusion that οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ were a party at all! The Apostle is rather concerned with his opponents, inasmuch as in contradistinction to him they boasted of a closer outward communion with Jesus or with the immediate disciples of Jesus—and especially with Peter the first of the Apostles—and in this wished to place the real criterion of the Χριστοῦ ἐλαι.

But that these Χριστοῦ ὄντες belonged to one and the same class as the party of Peter, and the whole Judaising party of opposition, is clearly shown by the connection with what follows, where the Apostle speaks of the ὑπερλείπων ἀπόστολον. What he advances against his opponents in reference to the Χριστοῦ
calling, within the bounds which God has appointed to my circle of action, in favour of the cause of Christianity; insomuch as I was the first who brought Christianity to Corinth, and hope to have so planted it there, that its operations may open for me a yet wider circle of action. So little is it necessary for me to seek my glory in a foreign sphere, and so little can anything else than real worth be of any value in the cause of Christianity.” The contrast of which the Apostle here speaks, allows us with reason to suppose that the opponents not only worked against his authority, but also called in question his merit of being the special founder of the Corinthian Church. They indeed came to Corinth after the Apostle, but as they did not acknowledge Paul as a true Apostle, as Χριστοῦ δότα, they assumed to themselves the glory properly belonging to him, at least in so far as they pretended to have been the first to plant true Christianity.

With chapter x. 7, begins the section in which the Apostle turns completely against his opponents, and exhibits himself clearly in the freest outpouring of feeling with regard to his whole relation with them. The tone in which he expresses himself against them becomes, in chap. xi., stronger and more vivid—there is a cutting irony mingled with his words, and the picture which he holds up to us of his opponents stands forth in more decided and ever more repulsive features. “Ye hear indeed,” he says, xi. 1. to his readers, “patiently enough the sayings of the fools (my opponents who would exalt themselves with vain presumption), ye should give me a moment’s hearing when I as a fool speak to you in the same language. (For my vindication and my praise can only appear as folly from the high standpoint from which my opponents look down upon me). I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy (I am seized as by a holy jealousy) when I think that the love, to which I as the founder of the Christian Church in Corinth have the justest right, may be handed over to others who have only opposed all my aims. I have espoused you to one husband, to
present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear, as the serpent beguiled Eve through deceit, that your thoughts also may be turned away from the unfettered truth, against Christ. Indeed if one were to come who would preach another Christ whom I have not preached, or if ye were to receive another spirit from the One ye have received, or another gospel than the one ye have accepted (i.e. were it possible that there might be another Christianity, which must be taken as the real and true one now first preached to you by such another teacher, if I then had either not imparted the truth to you, or had done so only very incompletely and improperly) then indeed "ye might well bear with him." (It is this then which brings the Apostle into the most decided antagonism with his opponents—the question between the two parties consisted of nothing less than that of a true or a false Christianity. The opponents of the Apostle truly preached another Jesus and another Christianity, whilst they accused the Apostle of not preaching the true one.) "But even this is a perfectly unlikely supposition. That Christianity which I have preached to you is the only true one, and deserves all belief. For I suppose that I stand in nothing behind the very chiefest Apostles." The ὑπερλαμ ἀπόστολοι may have been the opponents of the Apostle themselves, those who are afterwards called ψευδαπόστολοι. But as these ψευδαπόστολοι, who in Corinth relied especially on the authority of the Apostle Peter, came to Corinth from Palestine—and without doubt stood in some connexion with the Jewish Apostles of Palestine—the ὑπερλαμ ἀπόστολοι may well have been the Apostles themselves whose disciples and delegates the ψευδαπόστολοι claimed to be. The expression ὑπερλαμ ἀπόστολοι may therefore signify the over-estimation which was sought to be ascribed to the authority of the Apostles in prejudice to that of Paul. This is also indicated by the expression οἱ δοκούντες στόλου δίνατi used Gal. ii. 9, in reference to James, Peter, and John, which is only a way of saying why they were considered as forming a certain party desirous of commanding public opinion. "However great," says the Apostle accordingly, "may be the success of the pretensions advanced by the other Apostles in my disfavour, nothing can assail the truth of the Christianity which I teach." In what follows, the Apostle declares that he thinks he has every right to claim recognition for his apostolic calling, inasmuch as by his whole behaviour towards the Corinthian Church he had publicly afforded an insight into the essence of the Christian doctrines as well as borne testimony by his whole life to the purity of his zeal for the cause of Christianity. "For," he declares firstly, "I have in the most disinterested manner never once made any claim upon you for my support, while my opponents in whom you trust (οἱ τοιοῦτοι ψευδαπόστολοι ἐργάται δόλων, μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἄπστολους χριστῶν, as he calls these false teachers who gave themselves out by name as the Apostles of Christ, verse 13), only endeavour with every art of guile and deceit to make some gain out of you, and use you as the instruments of their interested designs.—Verses 7-20." Secondly, he says, "My whole life has been a series of hardships, sacrifices, and dangers, which I have undertaken for the cause of Christianity," 20-23. This passage alone sets it beyond doubt that these opponents were born Jews, of genuine Israelite descent. They therefore must have undoubtedly belonged to the party of Peter, and upheld the authority of the Apostle Peter. The Apostle, continuing in a tone of irony, allows the opprobrious insinuation ἀφροσύνη of his opponents, in order that under this mask he may place himself on the same footing with his presumptuous, vain, self-asserting opponents, and in order to be enabled in his own vindication to speak in a manner which indeed appears to be only foolish, vain self-praise, but which would be rather preferred by the Corinthians, accustomed as they were to the speeches of his overbearing opponents (compare 19, 20, 21). He then asks the question (22), Ἡβραῖοι ἐσι; κόγω, Ἰσραηλίται ἐσι; κόγω σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ ἐσι; κόγω. He also says, if there is any idea of such a
καυχάσθαι κατὰ τὴν σόρα (18) of καυχάσθαι depending only on natural accidental advantages, it can apply to me equally with my opponents. But they do not only claim to be genuine Israelites, but also as such, ἔδεικεν τὸν Χριστὸν. If it appears to them merely folly on my part that I venture to claim equality with them with respect to the above-mentioned advantages, they will in all probability consider it as complete madness (παραφροσύνη here plainly means much more than the expression before used ἠφορησόμην), when they find that I shall even have to claim the advantage over them, inasmuch as I can appeal to something more real than to these advantages of theirs, as the actual proof of my apostolic ministry. These same persons who have so high an opinion of themselves as born Jews, also maintain that they are the true ἔδεικεν τὸν Χριστὸν. In the following chapters, also, the Apostle carries on the vindication of his apostolic authority, and indeed adds a third reason in proof of the right he has to make known his Apostolic office to the two he has already mentioned in chap. xii. This third reason consists in the extraordinary revelations which had fallen to his lot, especially an ecstasy into which he had been thrown during the first period of his apostolic career. Still he did not appeal to these revelations as a cause of boasting. Rather he bore about in his body a certain suffering which ever kept alive in him the feeling of his human weakness as a corrective of any exulted opinion of himself, and which caused him to put his whole trust in divine help. Above all, he had only been induced to say all that he had done in his own praise, because the Corinthians had said nothing in his vindication against his opponents, which they should properly have said. How far he was from being behind the other Apostles they themselves had the best right of judging, as he had borne witness among them in every way of his genuine apostolic manner of action and ministry; and nothing had been wanting in their Church of all that had fallen to the share of any other Church in Chris-
tarily evaded speaking of them in order to avoid any appearance of vain self-exaltation, so in this place where it behoves him to be silent on nothing which might serve in the vindication and establishment of his apostolic authority, he cannot omit appealing to them. But the more that he cannot conceal from himself, that this testimony to his apostolic call belongs to the sphere of his own immediate consciousness, the more solicitously in the whole contents of these two Epistles does he seek to make good those active proofs to which the character of objective reality could be least denied—namely, the great trials through which he had borne testimony to his apostolic ministry and the great success with which he had been attended in his efforts to further the cause of Christianity. Compare 1 Cor. iii. 8-15; ix. 15, &c.; xv. 10 (περισσότερον αὐτῶν τῶν ἱκονισάτων) 2 Cor. x. 12, &c.

The passage (2 Cor. iii. 1, &c.) gives, in a manner well worthy of attention, an explanation of the entire matter in dispute between the Apostle and his opponents, when it treats of a question of principle which from the beginning essentially divided the Apostle from the elder Apostles. Its subject matter is of ἵστοραὶ συστατικαὶ, of letters of “commendation” which certain persons (τινὲς as the τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου—Gal. ii. 12, opponents of the Apostle) had brought with them to Corinth. It can only have been sought to testify by these letters that the bearers were to be considered as real credible preachers of the Christian doctrine certified by recognized authority. Under what other names then, can these letters have been brought forward, except those of the elder Apostles, and in what else can the cause of the facts that such commendatory and certified letters were thought necessary, consist, except in the opposition of parties which were so widely severed from each other that any one who wished to appear as a teacher was obliged, in order not to be taken for a false teacher, to give open proof to which party he adhered, and to whose principles and teachings he gave credence. The more important the authority on which such messengers relied, and the more universally acknowledged it was, the more undoubtedly could they reckon on their reception and influence, and from what other place could they bring with them so satisfactory a legitimation as from Jerusalem.* The ἵστοραὶ συστατικαὶ, indicates besides that there is a higher authority standing in the background, behind the opponents with whom he is contending, and which the Apostle perceived as being antagonistic to his own—he therefore in these Epistles takes occasion to explain fully the principle of his apostolic authority. This he does in chapter iii. If no one were admitted to be a real, authenticated teacher of Christianity except he was recommended from Jerusalem and brought with him a “letter of commendation,” this could only be because no others were to be recognized as Apostles except the elder ones. This the Apostle could not concede, and yet with regard to his apostolic office and apostolic authority he only appealed to that κυρίων ὁ θεὸς ἀποκάλεσε τὸν νῦν αὐτὸν ἐν ἑμῖν, Gal. i. 15, and consequently to a mere fact of his own consciousness. And starting from these ἵστοραὶ συστατικαὶ he maintains, in order to produce some objective fact, that he also like his opponents has an Epistle of commendation, but indeed a very different one! His letters of commendation are the Corinthians themselves, and written indeed in his own heart. What they are as Christians, concerns him so nearly, that it becomes an essential

* That such a legitimation belonged to the principles of the Judaizers, and was customary among them, is clear from passages from the pseudo-Clementine writings, which serve also as an explanation of the ἵστοραὶ συστατικαὶ. In the 4th Book of the Recognitions, C. 84, the Apostle Peter says the devil sends abroad into the world, false Prophets, and false Apostles, and false Teachers who indeed speak in the name of Christ, but do the will of the devil; he exhorts them therefore to use caution, “et nulli doctorum credat nisi qui Jacobi fratris Domini ex Hierusalem, detulerit testimonium vel ejus quicumque post ipsum fuerit. Nisi enim quis ille secundet, et ibi fuerit probatus quod sit doctor idoneus et edelis ad praedicandum Christi verbum, nisi inquam inde detulerit testimonium, recupendus non est sed neque prohetae, neque apostolus in hoc tempore speretur a robis aliqns alias prater nos.” Compare Homily, II. 35.
part of his own self-consciousness. And because it shall not only be said what they are to him, but also what they are objectively with regard to his acceptance by others—he adds that these letters written in his inmost heart are also lying open before the eyes of the world, manifest to every man, laid before the general consciousness of the world, composed under the commission of Christ, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not in tables of stone, but on the fleshly tables of the heart; i.e. the legitimation of his apostolic authority, is the fact of the success of his preaching of the Gospel, the fact that through him the Corinthians had been constituted into a Christian Church. He who founds Christian Churches may with justice be considered as an Apostle of Christ, because there can be no question but that Christ is working in and through him. It is the result of the operation of the cause, of the principle, which must be pre-supposed before the idea of a decided operation can be formed, in the same manner as in 1 Cor. ix. 2, the Apostle says to the Corinthians in arguing against those who were not willing to allow his claim to be an Apostle: εἰ ἄλλος ὁ ὅν εἰμι ἀπόστολος, ἀλλὰ γε ὅμως εἰμι, ἢ γὰρ σφαγίς τῆς ἐμῆς ἀποστολῆς ἡμᾶς ἔστε ἐν καρδίᾳ. ἢ ἡ ἡμάρι ἀπολογία τοῖς ἐμὲ ἀνακρίνοντι ἀπὸ τὴν ἑστὶ. In the same way in Gal. ii. 7, he grounds his εἰπαγγέλλων τῆς ἀκροβυστίας on the fact that the same things which led Peter to εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς, operated powerfully in himself to bring forward εἰς τὰ ἐθνοῦ—i.e. so that the operation of this ἐνεργεία is the existence of the Gentile Christian Church. But the greater and more evident the success of his ministry, the more certain it is that he only derived its express apostolic authentication from God and Christ, whose servant he is—and he derives it from Christ as the founder of a new διαθήκη whose principle is the πνεῦμα. The more perfectly this principle is realized in him, the more able he is to bring forward a result corresponding to this principle. The question therefore can only be as to what it comprises and how he can prove its possession.
LIFE AND WORK OF PAUL.

[Part II.

The opponents with whom the Apostle was engaged at Corinth, considered themselves as διάκονοι Χριστοῦ. As they were not Apostles themselves, but were forced to support themselves on some apostolic authority, they must have considered those to whose authority they appealed as especially ἀποστόλοις Χριστοῦ, but only in the same sense in which they themselves claimed to be διάκονοι Χριστοῦ. They were not Apostles, but if, as the Apostle says, they were μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀποστόλους Χριστοῦ, then by ἀπόστολοι Χριστοῦ we must understand that they called the Apostles on whose authority they relied and whose representatives they desired to be, Apostles of Christ in the same emphatic sense in which they themselves wished to be διάκονοι Χριστοῦ, and the Apostle himself, x. 7, speaks of the Χριστοῦ εἶναι. In what else could the distinguishing criterion of their Χριστοῦ εἶναι consist, as distinguishing them from the Apostle Paul, except that the elder Apostles on account of the direct companionship in which they stood with Jesus during his earthly life might claim to be the only authenticated preachers and ministers of the Messianic salvation? And on what other standpoint could the Apostle himself rest in maintaining the apostolic authority than the very one which we see him assume in these two Epistles, obliged as he was to set the inward and spiritual in opposition to that which his opponents made so much of in a material sense, and to recognize the principle of true companionship and the genuine apostolic ministry only in the Spirit which is the Lord himself? Therefore it is self-evident how he could not justify himself to his nearest opponents in Corinth without referring to the Apostles whose representatives they claimed to be. That he was in no whit behind them, that he could claim for himself the same rights as they did, and bore in himself the same apostolic consciousness, is the view from which he proceeds to the highest point of his conflict with them, xi. 5; and to which he adheres throughout his whole discourse, as is shown by the repetition of this chief idea, xii. 11. Whilst far removed from approaching them in regard to the acknowledgment of their apostolic dignity, yet he cannot put up with its exclusive assertion on the part of his opponents. That he did not wish to dispute with them as to what they were in themselves, but only as to what they assumed to be in their own too high estimation, he gives us to understand by the strikingly selected expression οἱ ἐπιρράλθην ἀπόστολοι. The Apostles were placed in opposition to him, as if he were nothing in comparison with them (οὐδὲν ἐμαύει he says, xii. 11, in a true sense for him, but still in allusion to this) and as if he were of no value as an Apostle of Christ. If in maintaining his apostolic authority, he had only said that he was in no respect behind such opponents as he characterizes in chap. xi. as those ψεύδαπόστολοι, ἐργάζεται δόλα τε μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀπόστολους Χριστοῦ, what a mean opinion he must have entertained of himself and of his apostolic dignity? He could only have intended to measure himself with the veritable Apostles themselves, and σημεία τοῦ ἀπόστολον of which he speaks, xii. 12, can be understood as on no other comparison.

If, according to the meaning of the chief passage which we have already granted, all the matters in dispute between the Apostle and his opponents must be referred to the idea of the Χριστοῦ εἶναι, as far as this can be taken as the chief criterion of the apostolic authority (although in a very different sense), it was very probable that those who especially wished to be considered as of τοῦ Χριστοῦ, assumed also to be that Χριστοῦ εἶναι against whom the Apostle Paul was obliged to set up and hold fast with all possible determination his principle of apostolic authority.

We may then assume that the question respecting the party of Christ is here answered in as nearly correct a manner as is possible from the available data, but against the view here taken certain objections were raised, as soon as it was
brought forward, and these objections must here be shortly considered.*

It is granted that what is predicated of οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ is corroborated by many antithetical references in both Epistles, and may even appear as the only correct solution of the difficulty; but it is thought that by this theory the difficulty is not overcome, that the party of Christ is distinguished only by name from the party of Peter, whilst the relation of the parties stands in direct contradiction to the foregoing party names; or which is the same thing, that the identity of the party of Peter with that of Christ is nowhere indicated. If this is not indicated, we fail to find in 1 Cor. x. 7, any dispute with the party of Christ, but only the statement which the Apostle brings against his opponents of Peter's party, namely, that he was of Christ as well as they. Could we indeed find a passage in which it was said clearly and decidedly that the party of Peter was one and the same with that of Christ, the matter would be very easily decided. But as such a one is not to be found, we are led to a process of combination by which on comparing together what seem to be data having a certain connection, and by paying strict attention to the peculiar ten-

* Compare Neander, Gesch. der Pfanzung u. Leitung der christlichen kirche durch die Apostel. 1832, 1. Thl. p. 298. Billroth. Commentar. zu den Briefen des Paulus an die Korintherg. Leipzig. Einl. p. xix. Rücker, Der erste Brief Pauli an die Korinther. Leipzig, 1836. Schenkel. De Ecclesia Corinthiae primae factionibus turbata. Disquisitio critico-historica ad antiquissimum ecclesiae Christianae statum illustrandum pertinens, Basileae, 1838. Goldhorn Die Christuspartei zu Korinth. im Zeitalter der Apostel. im Illgen’s Zeitschr. für hist. Theol. 1840. Dähne Die Christuspartei in d. Apost. kirche zu Korinth. Halle, 1841. There may also be compared with these what I have on the other hand remarked in the Tübinger Zeitschr. für Theol. 1836, and in den Jährb. für wissensch. Kritik. 1839. In the commentary of Olshausen, Meyer, De Wette, Osiander, &c., the views of their predecessors are repeated, and combined now in one way, now in another, which only tends to convince one more of the necessity of bringing to a clear and firm point these strangely confused representations, which are so often contradictory, and this can only be done by a general historical view of the matter.

dencies of the author, we are enabled to arrive at a greater or less probable result. In what other light can the passage quoted be placed, when seen from this standpoint, if we remember that it is indisputable that in the passages which refer to the personal relations of the Apostle to his opponents, the criterion of apostolic authority (to maintain which against his opponents is the Apostle's task) is not treated of in a general Christian sense, but in an apostolic one. If accordingly we approach the reality of the matter by a process of combination, it is self-evident that the theory here adduced can only be considered from the points of view of relative probability, and then we must ask, what other theory than the one here adduced can be put forward with as great a claim to probability?

According to Neander, the adherents of the party of Christ must have been those who kept to Christ only, to the exclusion of the Apostle; those who recognised Christ only as Teacher, and who were desirous of receiving what he taught, as truth direct from himself without any mediation. This was such an arbitrary and subjective tendency, such an assumption of appropriation of the revelation vouchsafed by God, and at the same time such a breaking loose from the divinely arranged plan of development, that it could only result in an arbitrary proceeding manifesting itself in the forms in which the Christian doctrines themselves were received. It may easily have happened, that where one party desired to attach itself especially to Paul, another to Apollos, and a third to Peter, another might finally start up, which would not be called by any of these party names, but which constituted for itself in its own manner a different Christianity independent of apostolic preaching. The subjective form of thought which this party assumed may have been either more mystical or more rationalistic. Neander himself thinks that the rationalistic was the most prevailing tone, as according to his account the party of Christ must have been a philosophical sect, which made of Christ only a second,
perhaps a more exalted Socrates.* This is the principal view in opposition to my own, and it is divided from it, inasmuch as it endeavours, instead of identifying the parties of Christ and of Peter, to find as far as possible a specific difference between them. But what led to this idea, and how much it is wanting in even probable grounds, is shown by the modification which it has received from Rückert. He maintains that the party of Christ was not, as Neander says, composed of persons of philosophical culture who had made for themselves their own philosophical view of Christ; but he places us in this dilemma, that either the party of Christ took its stand as a party among the other parties, or set itself up as the only true Church over the rest of the sects. The first idea cannot be entertained, as Christ could not have been looked upon as a mere teacher such as Paul, Apollos, or Cephas, therefore the second must be accepted. The party of Christ placed itself at the head of the others, would neither be considered as of Paul nor of Apollos nor of Cephas, but acknowledged Christ alone as its Lord and Master; but it did not do this in the sense in which Paul desired once that all men should be χριστοῦ. In what sense then did it do this? The party of Christ must naturally have been a separate party, or it would not have been reckoned by the Apostle amongst the rest; further, it must have recognized Christ as Lord and Master, or it would not have designated itself by his name, but it could not have acknowledged him in a fitting manner, or else Paul would not have described it as merely a party. But what is all this but a series of purely abstract definitions, out of which we can get no concrete idea.

* Neander thus indicates in the first edition, the opinion that the party of Christ must have held of him. In the following edition this very striking indication of Neander's views is suppressed, on what ground is not stated. But of course this parallel shows in the most decided manner that these disciples of Christ who placed him on the same footing as Socrates would not have been allowed to continue within the pale of Christendom. The name itself of τοῦ Χριστοῦ, contradicts the theory of Neander. Whilst the name betokened them to be a sect, and bespeaks real Christianity in this sect in a special sense, this opinion held by it of Christ, would make of it a completely unchristian sect.

of what specially constituted this party. If we cannot even say what it was negatively, nor even what made it positively a party, we cannot think of it as a party at all. It cannot have been a philosophic sect, as Rückert expressly calls it; but can it have been, according to Neander's distinction, a mystical one? Schenkel, Goldhorn, and Dähne at least consider the adherents of the party of Christ to have been visionaries, in a sense which involves a yet further antagonism between their theories and my own. Whilst I see the chief importance of the Christ to the party of Christ, consists in his bodily connection with his disciples through the intercourse of outward material life, according to the opinion of these critics he must have been a spiritual Christ revealing himself in visions from heaven. The disciples of Christ boasted of a special inward union with Christ, by means of which they declared themselves independent of all the unlimited distinctive authority of the Apostles, but this their glory they did not rest on a special outward relation with Christ, but only on an inward one, revealed from heaven in visions, to which they appealed instead of to the apostolic doctrinal traditions. To this Schenkel refers what is said by the Apostle, 2 Cor. xii. 1, of his ἀποκαλύφθη, and ἀποκαλύθη, as the Apostle in this place only and nowhere else (and, as he himself says here, only forced to do so by his opponents) speaks of his ἀποκαλύφθη and ἀποκαλύθη. His opponents must have been boasting of their special visions and revelations of Christ, and because they gloriied in such, they had thrown off all apostolic authority. This therefore clearly shows that the party of Christ had called themselves by the name of Christ and not by that of an Apostle, because they held all Apostles as of no value. The reason of this must have lain in the occurrences at the feast of Pentecost. From the thoroughly direct manner in which the Divine Spirit descended from heaven upon them, it must have been concluded that nothing was to be obtained from apostolic instruction, and this conviction must have been strengthened by the sudden con-
version of the Apostle Paul in consequence of a heavenly vision. We cannot accordingly wonder that since that time there arose men who were only willing to rely on the Spiritual Christ. But what are we to think of this Spiritual Christ? With the precarious suppositions on which the hypothesis rests, he floats before us so completely in the air that in neither Epistle does he stand on the firm ground of a real existence. How can we assume that the Apostle shared those visions and revelations of which he speaks with those very opponents with whom he was contending? We may indeed see, in this party of Christ, now indicated in one way, now in another, those neutrals independent of all apostolic authority, those adherents of a philosophical or Spiritual Christ (a wider modification of one and the same idea) and we may also see the specific division between the party of Christ and that of Peter which the words of the Apostle seem to require. But we cannot get at any clear and definite idea of the party in question; neither is it likely, that if it was so characteristically different from all others, this difference must have been palpable in the way and manner in which the Apostle spoke of these parties. Where then does he speak of a party so peculiarly and so essentially different from all others? or how can it be supposed that he indeed did battle with all the others, but passed over in complete silence that very one which stood in the rudest antagonism not only to Pauline but to apostolic Christianity, and which threatened to destroy its foundations. If we agree with Neander, that what the Apostle in the first chapter of the first Epistle says of the disagreements between the Corinthian parties applies equally to the party of Christ, we can indeed appeal in confirmation of this to the declaration of the Apostle himself, iv. 6, where he speaks of a μεταχειρισμός in reference to himself and Apollos, and this can only be understood as implying that what was before said in immediate reference to the parties of Paul and Apollos may now be applied also to both the others. But the same difficulty presents itself here also. If what is said of one applies also to the others, it must be possible to bring them altogether under the same idea. But how can this be possible if the party of Christ was so far divided from the three other parties in refusing to recognize an apostolic authority? This distinction is not made by the Apostle, and the recognition of an apostolic authority is very naturally not treated of generally in the chief passages of the two Epistles, but only in those special ones in which the Apostle feels himself compelled to make good his claim in opposition to that of the other Apostles.

But if all these modifications of the chief opposition to the views taken by me will not suffice to give a clear and distinct definition of the party of Christ, and cannot be founded on data contained in the two Epistles, we find ourselves again face to face with the question, whether it is so impossible, on the supposition of the identity of the parties of Christ and of Cephas, that the Apostle should have been justified in speaking of them as of two separate parties? This is in truth the only argument which can be advanced against my theory, and I can see no difficulty in it which does not vanish as soon as we go closer into the relations of the parties in the Corinthian Church.

The chief opposition undoubtedly concerned the Apostle Paul. The authority of the Apostle Peter was set up against his. But this relation of opposition may have had a double aspect. The party called itself after Paul, the other after Peter; there was here nothing so far disparaging to or excluding the Apostle Paul: party stood opposed to party; each one held to its own Apostle as its head; but as soon as we penetrate a little further, and wish to arrive at the reason why Peter was followed and not Paul? why the preference must be given to one rather than to the other? and when this reason can only be found on looking at the matter from the Jewish standpoint on which the chief opponents of the Apostle in Corinth stood, and found only in the fact that Peter, not Paul, had been a personal disciple of Christ, then this state of opposition becomes an exclusive one; a principle is established involving as a neces-
sary consequence that Paul was not to be considered as a true Apostle, because the most essential requirements of true apostolic authority were wanting in him. In the extreme ranks of the opposition against the Apostle stood those persons who were designated under the name of the party of Christ, and the nature of the matter requires that the party of Christ in this sense must be represented as those from whom proceeded this opposition against the Apostle Paul, founded on distinct grounds, those Judaising false teachers who had come to Corinth with their letters of recommendation (2 Cor. ii. 1). For the whole party the name was brought forward of the Apostle Peter, to be used in direct opposition to the name of the Apostle Paul, and concealing the ground of the opposition. This view of the relation between the parties of Peter and of Christ is not only very easily put in agreement with the passage 1 Cor. i. 12, but is even confirmed by it. For as the Apostle here first speaks of himself, then of Apollos, then of Cephas, and last of Christ, it is clear that here a relation is intended to be understood in which Apollos stood nearer to him than Cephas, and the party of Christ was still further from him than that of Cephas. Therefore, also, the Apostle immediately and characteristically grasps the whole question in its most extreme point which is here treated of, the name of the party of Christ; beginning his reply boldly with the words μετ’ ἡμίσας τοῦ Χριστοῦ: is this name (Χριστοῦ, as a party name) not the most undoubted proof that Christ is torn in pieces by your party spirit? Each party must as a Christian party have desired to claim a share in Christ; then, if there was a peculiar “party of Christ,” how was the one Christ divided in whom all things were to be united and all differences were to vanish? This the Apostle says just as if the party of Christ were the peculiar seat of the opposition against him, and the centre of the prevailing party spirit in Corinth.

If one is thoroughly satisfied on this point I do not in fact see what can further be alleged against the view in question.

The whole contents of both Epistles stand in the most fitting relation to it. Let it be granted that no further reference to the name of the party of Christ can be perceived, the matter itself on which it alone depends agrees in the most complete manner with all that this view implies. Both names indicate the same party, so that what is said against the party of Peter, holds good with regard to the party of Christ. Indeed if both parties had together formed the opposition to the Apostle Paul in the Corinthian Church we can fully comprehend and enter into the earnest and trenchant polemics against an anti-Pauline Judaising Christianity which runs through both Epistles. But the name does not so completely vanish from the Epistles that this theory does not also receive the necessary confirmation from this point also. As Billroth remarks, not without reason, “Although among the passages treating of the party of Christ, the passage 2 Cor. x. 7 only serves decidedly as a proof of my theory, yet this passage renders any doubt superfluous, and the want of more passages containing special mention of the party of Christ is very simply explained by the name of the party itself.” It is true, if once the matter is firmly established, that in many passages we cannot mistake the allusions to the name of the party of Christ, but such passages cannot be used as direct proofs, because the name Χριστοῦ has a peculiar meaning in every case. But the name of the party of Christ appears all the more remarkable in the passage above quoted. We see plainly that in the Χριστοῦ ἢντι there is here a question of something which the opponents and false teachers, whom the Apostle fought against, employed in order to make good their own side against the Apostle (εἰ τις πέποθεν ἵνα μετὰ Χριστοῦ, ἢντι, τοῦτο λογιζόμεθα πάλιν ἢντι ἵνα ποιῆσαι καθὼς καὶ οὕτως Χριστοῦ φύλο καὶ ἡμῖν Χριστοῦ). How fitting is the allusion which the Apostle, in pursuance of his former plan, here makes to the name of those who maintained that they were especially and exclusively οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. In this name was concentrated in its most extreme form all the opposition against the Apostle,
and in this name also was there founded a reason for all that was brought against him, against which, from this standpoint, any vindication would seem to be in vain. With great reason therefore the Apostle calls this name to his own mind and that of his readers, whilst he proposes to himself, partly to establish that fact which he considers as the most direct and undeniable token of his apostolic authority, and partly to stand forth against his enemies without any further consideration or evasion, in the most open and decided manner, and to represent them in their complete nakedness, as ψευδαπόστολοι, ἔργα ταῦτα μετασχηματίζομεν τις ἀπόστολους Χριστοῦ. This polemic of the Apostle contained in the foregoing passages, as well against the party of Peter as the party of Christ, attains its natural conclusion in the assertion that the opponents were what they claimed to be only in appearance, in a false deceitful sense, and that they were not true but only false ἀπόστολοι Χριστοῦ.

But we must now direct our attention to the point how according to this theory of the relations of the Corinthian parties, the whole polemic of the Apostle, and the whole arrangement of composition of both these Epistles conditional on it, agree together in the most harmonious unity. Each of the parties named in 1 Cor. i. 12, has its just right given it in the polemic of the Apostle, each has its appointed place assigned it in the list given in this passage, and each has exactly the fitting thing said for it in its turn. The first important section of this polemic, 1 Cor. i. 12, iv. 21, is first of all directed against the party of Paul and that of Apollos, and on this account does not even hint at the peculiar antagonism between Pauline and anti-Pauline Christianity. The Apostle combats both these parties as is his usual manner and custom, and especially places himself throughout this discussion in as wide and general a sphere of vision as possible, although this attitude, prompted by a deep impression of the true spirit of Christianity is so often wanting in the fundamental conception of partizanship. That he here also had already in view both the other parties, he himself indicates iv. 6, τούτα μετασχημάτισα, &c. This is commonly taken as referring to iii. 4, &c. But the Apostle, in iii. 22, speaks of Cephas and Apollos with himself, and why could he not have mentioned Cephas also in iii. 4, 5? I would rather refer this μετασχηματίζειν to the whole section, i. 12. All that the Apostle says in this section, the relation of the σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ to the σοφία τοῦ κόσμου, testifies in the most natural way to the existing difference between the parties of Paul and Apollos. Whilst the Apostle ascribes the love of the Corinthians for the σοφία κόσμου, to their sensuality, or that they were σαρκικοὶ and not πνευματικοὶ, iii. 1, and points out as the source of their divisions and party strife, the carnal mind that still dwelt in them, and kept them so low a level of Christian life, in whose consciousness they then ought to examine themselves, and see how little they were fitted to set themselves up as judges of their teachers; all these exhortations naturally applied also to the party of Peter. The sectarian spirit showed itself also in that party in the same carnal tendency devoted to egotistical interests; and the over self appreciation taking pleasure in haughty empty speeches with which the Apostle reproachfully credits party spirit in general, must apply especially to the party of Peter. But besides it must not be overlooked how the Apostle in 1 Cor. iii. 5, as well as in 2 Cor. xi. 13, speaks of διάκονοι Χριστοῦ. Without doubt the party of Peter arrogated to itself the name διάκονοι Χριστοῦ, and with regard to this it must not be considered as accidental that the Apostle, 1 Cor. iii. 5, had already spoken of the disputes of the Corinthian parties about the idea of the διάκονοι, the true ministers of the Lord. We may see also from the section 1 Cor. i. 12, iv. 24, how from the beginning the Apostle never lost sight of this opposition, but at first evades it with a certain forbearance and reticence, and then gradually proceeds from the indirect to the direct combat with his opponents.
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This transition he makes 1 Cor. ix. 1, for here his polemic, after treating hitherto of the parties of Paul and Apollos, turns to that of Cephas. Accordingly he neither avoids indicating this party by its name, nor coming forward with the assertion that he had the same rights with the rest of the Apostles, with the brethren of the Lord and with Cephas, whom he mentions by name, ix. 5.

The indirect polemic passes into the direct, 1 Cor. ix. 1, &c. but attains its extreme height only in the second part of the second Epistle, x. 13. Still here the Apostle speaks of various different matters before finally approaching his opponents: we see that it costs him a certain inward struggle to take this last but absolutely necessary step. He first says everything else that he has to bring against the Corinthians, but still always has his eye on his opponents. Then when everything else is said and everything is ready, he comes forward against his opponents in the way we have already seen—in a discourse in which the more the subject is pursued to its climax, the more the peculiarities of the party of Christ are treated of and justice done to it, as far as it can be divided from the party of Peter, according to the passage already pointed out, 1 Cor. i. 12.

Besides the existence of parties, which is the chief point of which the Apostle never loses sight throughout the two Epistles, there were in the Corinthian Church many more special circumstances, more or less disturbing to the regulation of the Christian life. With respect to these phenomena the Apostle explains himself for the most part in a very explicit manner, partly on account of the questions which had arisen about them, in a letter from the Corinthians to him, before his Epistle. The chief circumstances of this kind were the following—an unchaste relation causing great scandal, in which some one in the Corinthian Church had lived with his step-mother (chap. v.), to which category also belong the other immoralties prevailing among the Corinthian Christians, which are repeatedly and earnestly reproved by the Apostle, v. 9, &c. xvi. 12, &c. 2 Cor. xii. 21: the custom of bringing law disputes before Gentile judges, and even of judging Christians by their law, vi. 2; the question as to the advantage of married or celibate life, chap. vii. as well as that of participation in Gentile sacrificial feasts and the use of meat offered to idols, chap. viii.—the liberty which the Corinthian Christians permitted themselves of covering the head in the Christian assemblies, chap. xi. 1, &c. An abuse of the solemn institution of the Lord's supper, xi. 17; the difference of opinion as to the value of the so-called λαλεῖν γλώσσαις, especially in its relation to the προφητείαν, chap. xii. 14; and finally the question as to the resurrection from the dead, which was denied by some of the members of the Corinthian Church. All these occurrences, and the questions agitated in consequence of them, give us a very clear and vivid picture of the condition of the Corinthian Church; yet it would be most interesting, to know more decidedly how the various parties were concerned in these various occurrences, and what share the Corinthian party spirit had in them. We can however be sure only of this, that the Gentile Christian element was throughout overwhelmingly preponderant. And yet that the Judaizing opponents of the Apostle, who had even here thrust themselves on him and established themselves firmly, were enabled to form this energetic opposition against him which he so earnestly resisted.

The relation of the second Epistle to the first deserves to be somewhat more closely examined. It has been already remarked that the polemic of the Apostle against those opponents, whom he attacks in the first Epistle, is pursued in the second, and that precisely the strongest declarations with which the Apostle most directly meets his opponents with all decision and energy, are found in the last chapter of the second Epistle. But all the more strong is the contrast between the sharp and vehement tone of this last chapter, and the temper shown in the first part of the Epistle, in which the
Apostle betrays the greatest uneasiness and apprehension both with regard to the reception of his former letter, and his entire relation to the Corinthians, and takes great pains in the most pressing manner and with the most anxious care to secure for himself, by repeated assurances of his love and sympathy, the confidence of the Corinthians, which he feared was cooling towards him. Different theories have been advanced in the endeavour to explain this striking change of tone in the second Epistle—however the chief question is, what reason the Apostle could have had to have been in such great uneasiness and anxiety as to the impression made by his first letter. The contents of our first Epistle do not seem to furnish a sufficient motive for this anxiety. On this account, as well as because in both Epistles not only a mission of Timothy is mentioned, but also of Titus, (and in this the two Epistles do not seem to be in harmony) we are irresistibly drawn to the conclusion that our second Epistle does not stand in that close connection with the first which is commonly supposed. Our second Epistle, it is maintained,* does not refer to the occurrences which are brought before us in the first, but to the reception of a letter carried by Titus which we no longer possess. In fact there do occur in our second Epistle several passages, such as ii. 3, 4, vii. 12, which although they generally refer directly to the circumstances treated of, 1 Cor., still on closer inspection present great difficulties with regard to this theory; and their evidence is calculated to give us occasion to suppose that something intervened between our two Epistles with regard to the relation of the Apostle to the Corinthians, besides the news brought to the Apostle by Titus about the operation of the first Epistle. The whole tone and character of the reproof in 1 Cor. is not conceived and carried out in the manner we should expect from Paul according to his usual custom. It is therefore highly probable that in the Epistles mentioned in 2 Cor. ii. 3, those things especially which are there spoken of, had been made far more prominent and of far higher importance, in accord with the whole subject of the Epistles, than those passages in 1 Cor. respecting the person accused of incest. If therefore the ῥᾶρα ῥήσα, 2 Cor. ii. 3, really referred to something which the Apostle had written with respect to this relation, which of course is highly probable, we are led to conclude that it was not intended to apply to the first Epistle, but to a subsequent one, wherein Paul had written about this subject in a yet more vehement manner. Meanwhile it is indeed also possible that this did not refer at all to that incestuous person and the Apostle’s remarks on him, but to some other special person of whom Paul had heard through Timothy, and whom he had accordingly spoken of in his Epistle sharply and sternly. The verse next following, 2 Cor. iii. 5, does not necessarily oblige us to think of this incestuous man, but if we give up the idea of this reference we must also resign the possibility of ascertaining exactly what the special matter was, and can only surmise in general that some one of the immediate precepts of the Apostle had been disregarded in a peculiarly striking manner. I cannot consider this opinion to be well grounded, and it seems to me to be much more probable, considering the characteristics of the Apostle, that the generally accepted relation between the two Epistles that we possess, should not be disturbed. We need only remember with what vehemence and indignation he speaks of the occurrence mentioned in 1 Cor. v. 5, and how this occurrence, as soon as the Apostle has said what he had to say on the chief subject of his letter, is the first special circumstance to which he addresses himself. The Apostle takes up this matter seriously enough, and at the same time treats it so notoriously as a decidedly exceptional thing, that it is against all probability that the peculiar occurrence which is spoken of in the same decided manner 2 Cor. ii. 5,* should have been any other than the one referred to 1 Cor. v. If we take further into consideration,

* *Compare Bleek, Erörterungen über die Cor. Briefe Theol. Stud. u. Krit, 1830.*
what the Apostle writes to the Corinthians with regard to this individual, in the most solemn manner, with all the emphasis of his apostolic authority, and which he also sets forth as his absolute command, we can well understand what anxiety and care this affair must soon after have occasioned him. To speak plainly he had written a letter which he himself must have regarded as a rash and overhasty one, and in which, by neglecting its evident consequences, he had laid himself open to his opponents. Indeed, he afterwards retracted the grounds on which he had proceeded, for he expresses himself pleased with something which was the exact opposite of that which according to his first, decided declaration had taken place. The most natural sense of the passage in question, 1 Cor. v. 3, I find to be that given by the most modern commentators, namely, that the Apostle, by virtue of the strength of Christ that dwelt in him, credited himself with the authority to give over the criminal to the power of Satan, and this indeed through some disease which should fall upon him at that moment in which he should be cast out from Christian fellowship in the most solemn manner by the assembled Church, where the Apostle himself was only present in his miraculously operating spirit. How the expression παραδόθη τῷ σατανᾶ is to be taken, is here indicated by the Apostle in a sentence twice repeated in this case, of a miraculous punishment of bodily sickness (for nothing else than this can be understood by διῆλθον τῷ σατανᾷ), and the excommunication recorded in verses 2 and 13, to arrange which the Church was to be assembled. But neither of these, as we see from the second Epistle, had happened.

The miraculous punishment did not proceed from the Apostle, nor the exclusion of the criminal from the Church, from the Corinthians.* I agree also with Rückert's explanation of the meaning of the second passage belonging to this matter, 2 Cor. ii. 6; the Apostle certainly says openly, v. 6, he is willing to be contented with the punishment decreed by the Corinthians, and does not require any of a more severe kind, which he could not have said if he had really demanded any such. From v. 10, it is clearly enough to be seen that the χαρισμάτων did not now first proceed from him, but had been originated before without any question of him, so that he now could only acquiesce in what had taken place in order not to put himself in open disagreement with them by persistence in his former commands. The Corinthians accordingly had confined themselves to a mere reproof, and even what had been done in reproving this man had not been the work of the Church as a whole but only of a part of the community. But if the matter stood thus, as Rückert very justly remarks, Paul must have found himself in no inconsiderable dilemma. His commands had not been followed; only a part of the community, although it might have been the largest part, had taken the matter to heart, the remainder, as might have been expected by the feeling of the Church towards him, had not even done this—his authority was greatly set at nought. What was he to do now? Insist on his former orders? He might be sure that he should find no truer obedience, and the scandal would be all the greater. He could not enforce obedience, and the affair would only make a bad impression on all sides. There was here nothing else to be done but what in similar cases had been dictated by prudence—to give another turn to the matter—by which an open breach might be avoided, and the evil not indeed cured, but concealed until in better times the proper attitude might be again assumed. This turn was to approve of what had been done, even although it had been done without his consent, to represent it as his wish, and to bring the whole matter under a Christian point of powerful energy, as σωτήρ, τίματα, and δυνάμεις. Compare 1 Cor. x. 21. 10-28, 2 Cor. xii. 12. But in a case like that in 1 Cor. v. 4, this is so decidedly expressed, and there is so little question of a real miracle, that elsewhere the same state of things may also be suspected.
view. This was now publicly done, partly through the concession that the punishment which the man had undergone may have been sufficient, partly through the admonition to forgive him. The whole tone in which the Apostle wrote our Epistles to the Corinthians, the restlessness and anxiety, are very naturally explained by this position which he with great justice assumed. He had taken a step whose consequences now first were clearly evident to him.* It must now especially have appeared very doubtful to him with regard to his opponents, for as we see from the Apostle’s Epistles themselves his opponents did not forbear from making use of this overthrow of his authority. When he is absent, said they, he can indeed make severe speeches and is full enough of boastful vain-glory, but when it comes to real action, he does not trust himself to be personally present, (x. 10-11. Compare iii. 1, v. 12.) Without doubt this was the reason which caused the Apostle to vindicate himself so solicitously as he does in the beginning of his Epistle, with regard to his long contemplated journey to Corinth, which had not yet been carried out. An Epistle written under such circumstances must of course contain a predominant apologetic tendency, but the apology is by no means a merely personal one, it passes immediately into a general one, into an apologetic examination of his apostolic office, which he represents in both its phases, bringing salvation to some, and working ruin to others; representing it also in its difference from the ministry of the Old Covenant, and in its ennobling consciousness experienced by himself; and as soon as he has satisfactorily fulfilled this apologetic aim, and inspired the Corinthians with new confidence, he encounters his opponents with fresh courage, and a

* Rückert has no hesitation in saying with regard to 1 Cor. v. 5, “This is a matter which we cannot direct of the stamp of passion which never can turn to be of any use. And that he dictatorially issued commands to a Church by which his authority was much lowered, and which he had no means of enforcing, does not redound to his credit.” Who will blame the unprejudiced critic that he says this openly?
had not performed what he had undertaken, and his opponents on this account may have been justified in accusing him, (as they doubtless did) of a want of sincerity and of interested motives, which must have weakened in a great degree, all confidence in his apostolic authority. He protests against all the obviously unfavourable views which might be taken of his non-appearance; but as we do not here learn from him how often he had been in Corinth, and of which time he is here speaking, we must conclude that there is no mention made of an actual journey, but only of an intended one, and of plans of travel. All the more may we expect to find precise information about the number of his journeys when he gives the positive reasons for his not going to Corinth. "Εκρίματι δὲ ἵματι τούτῳ, says the Apostle, 2 Cor. ii. 1. ἐγὼ μὴ πάλιν ἐν λάσπω τρέχω ἵματι ἱλαθών, and nothing seems more simple than to conclude that as the Apostle had already once been to Corinth, ἐν λάσπω, and that this was not on the occasion of his first visit, it must have been that when he wrote our second Epistle he had already been twice at Corinth. But where can we find an appropriate time to which we may assign this second journey? If it were before our first Epistle that the occasion arose for his having gone to Corinth for the second time, and that he could only have gone ἐν λάσπω, we must have in our first Epistle an indication of one kind or other to this effect, as the despatch of an Epistle earlier than our first could not have been passed over in it. It is especially worth consideration that the general question whether the Apostle went two or three times in all to Corinth is scarcely at all treated of, but attention is directed to the special character of the second journey which represents him as having been in Corinth between his first journey and the writing of our first Epistle, but only ἐν λάσπω, that is under circumstances which laid him under a strong obligation, indeed which left nothing else possible, than to depart with the threat of taking still harsher measures against the Corinthians if they did not improve. But this theory makes the whole contents of
our first Epistle to the Corinthians, and the tone in which the
Apostle speaks of the whole condition of the Church and of its
various failings, simply impossible. Of what nature can those
irregularities have been, which already had existed and had
disturbed the good understanding between the Apostle and
the Church? We have no alternative but to suppose that they
were irregularities of the same kind as those which he re-
proved in so many ways in our first Epistle. The more specially,
and urgently that he here speaks of the different failings and
crimes of the Church, the less is it to be supposed that at a still
earlier period he has had any other reason for displeasure. He
speaks of everything which is treated of in our first Epistle as
of something with which he had become acquainted, and of
which he had been obliged to speak only shortly before, as he
himself expresses it. It is a question of fresh circumstances
and relations now first entered into, about which, as we see
clearly, he for the first time speaks to the Corinthians. Of
the parties into which the Church was divided, he had
first heard through the household of Chloe, (1 Cor. i. 11.)
He had also only heard generally of the prevailing immorality,
and the particular case which seemed to require a special step
on his part, v. 1. The misunderstanding which he has to
correct, v. 9, in regard to the μὴ συνανταγμένον τὸν πάρονιν, which
he had mentioned to the Corinthians in a letter previous to
our first Epistle, could scarcely have existed, if the affair had
been before verbally treated of. The questions relating to mar-
rried life, which he explains in detail in chap. vii. had been first
raised in a letter to the Corinthians, vii. 7. And as we may
clearly see from the whole explanation of the Apostle that there
has been no question of all these things between him and the Cor-
inthians, so this is likewise obvious with regard to all the other
subjects on which, in the rest of his Epistle, he partly expresses
his anger and disapprobation, and partly gives advice and pre-
cepts. No where do we meet with the slightest indication that
the Apostle had had previous cause to find fault with the Cor-

inthians on these or similar subjects; that any differences had
arisen between him and them; that he had given any advice
which had not been followed, or uttered any threats which had
not been heeded. Still less can we take as probable a journey
of this kind as occurring between our two Epistles. If our
first Epistle will not leave us room to suppose any such im-
portant break in time, which must be accounted for by the
theory of a further journey taken by the Apostle, it may be
concluded from the second Epistle as expressly as from the
first, that nothing could have previously taken place which it
would be necessary for us to possess as an explanation, without
our being able to perceive that such was the case. But it must
be asked, is it so essential to make the words, 2 Cor. ii. 1,
ἐν λατρείᾳ and πάλιν refer so directly to each other, that a second
ἐν λατρείᾳ must follow at once on a journey ἐν λατρείᾳ? How would
it then be if the Apostle had changed the place of the participle
ἀποκαθιστάω, which he would correctly have connected with πάλιν,
and if he had taken it with the following ἀληθείᾳ, as would be
generally done in an epistolary style, especially when we must
suppose the affair to have been already known.

According to the foregoing remarks what forcible reason can
remain for taking the τρεῖς τούτο, 2 Cor. xii. 14, in any other
sense than the following—"twice already I have proposed to
myself to come to you without it being possible to me to fulfil
my intention, but now that my thrice repeated design is about to
be realized, I will declare to you what attitude I shall assume to-
wards you." On a casual glance the passage xiii. 1, which begins
with the words τρεῖς τούτο ἢχομαι τρέμει ὑπάς, would seem to
silence all doubts on the subject of a third journey, but on a
stricter examination it gives a still more complete solution of
the question respecting this journey. What then is there to
prevent these words being taken grammatically and made to
express the idea that the Apostle only says he has now for the
third time formed an intention of visiting them? And if,
instead of here finding an indication of a second journey already
previously taken,—as when he speaks of a journey— he may really mean only an intended one, and the Epistle as a whole may be designed as a vindication of a journey intended indeed, but not yet carried out,—is it not self-evident in this connection what “the word of two or three witnesses” must signify? Can we not easily comprehend what he intends to say, when the passage quoted is taken in its peculiar sense? there is nothing more natural than to suppose that he means to say in an emphatic manner, “if according to the principles of the Mosaic Law what is attested by two or three witnesses is to be considered as true and legal, then this thrice intended journey of mine is to be taken in its full meaning; it is certain that it will receive immediate fulfilment.” If we are convinced not only of the possibility but the probability of the above explanation, we shall be prepared to assume as the authentic result of our investigation that this passage sets forth as the last, special declaration of the Apostle, that he had only been once in Corinth and was now going there for the second time. Considered grammatically the words ὅς παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον do not refer so much to an actual as to a proposed occurrence. (Compare I Cor. v. 3.) In the vivid desire of the Apostle to give now at least no more room for doubt with regard to his immediate visit to Corinth, and to hold up his plighted word as about to be certainly realized, absence becomes presence to him, he considers himself already for the second time in Corinth, and thus being present, although absent, he tells them what must infallibly happen.

Let us give up the fiction of a journey for which we can find no reasonable grounds; and without which everything connected with the subject becomes far clearer, simpler, more natural and historically probable.

CHAPTER III.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

The Epistle to the Romans is not only chronologically connected with the two Epistles to the Corinthians; there is an inward link between them, and it is from the standpoint of the Epistle to the Romans that we first get an insight into the rich result of the Spiritual Life which the Apostle exhibited in his own person, as well as into the strict logical sequence with which he developed and carried out his Christian principles, and into the grandeur of the circumstances in which he moved.

We have already remarked the relation in which the Epistle to the Galatians and that to the Romans stand to each other, in the interest of a bold and deep-laid system founded on essential principles, and how their whole contents are to be explained by this system which is pursued and developed throughout. This systematic character of the Epistle to the Romans, comprehending a grand harmony of ideas, distinguishes it completely from the two Epistles to the Corinthians, which are rather characterized by the variety of their contents, and the abundance of profound spiritual ideas allied to and explained by the different relations of life. This aspect of the Epistle is also manifest in the attitude assumed by the Apostle with regard to the opposition, which it was the continued aim of his apostolic efforts to combat and overcome. He had not fulfilled his mission as the Apostle to the Gentiles, whilst the absolute importance which Judaism, and the Jewish Christianity identified with it, claimed for themselves as well in their principles as in their ultimate consequences, was not separated from them, and reckoned according to its merely relative value.