

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

University, and a deserved tribute to his representative position in this country. The result is a volume of great interest—*Religion and Life* (Milford; 6s. net). Dr. Selbie reminds us, more than any other writer of the present time, of Dr. Dale. His style, both of thought and writing, is 'massive.' There is also a calm confidence in his own position that is reassuring. But these qualities are based on both scholarship and thinking. In the volume before us they are illustrated afresh. *Religion and Life* is an apologetic for Christianity, the best kind of apologetic, namely, a persuasive and broad-minded presentation of it. There are chapters on 'Religion and History,' on 'The Psychological Interpretation of Religion,' on 'Belief in God,' on 'Religion and Ethics,' on 'The Christian Contribution,' and on 'Eternal Life.' The very topics are appetizing, and the treatment is satisfying and immensely helpful. Dr. Selbie is 'up-to-date' in the sense that he knows the best thought, positive and negative, of our day. But he is always steady in his treatment, and his many readers will find his book a constant source of stimulus and pleasure.

A beautiful volume of Bible stories is called *The Greatest Gift*, written by Mr. Maurice Kerr and Miss Eleanor E. Helme, and published by the Religious Tract Society (7s. 6d. net). The book is on the same lines, and of the same appearance, as 'The Precious

Gift,' which is well known and widely valued. The stories here are told very simply for little children. It is, indeed, doubtful whether some of them (the Flood, for example, and the Sacrifice of Isaac) should appear in such a collection, and for such a constituency, at all. But these are few in number, and for the most part the matter is suitable and suitably presented. The book is beautifully printed, and it is adorned by thirty-two coloured plates by Harold Copping.

Ventures in Belief, edited by Mr. Henry P. Van Dusen (Scribner's; 7s. 6d. net), contains a dozen essays, by the same number of American writers, on various themes connected with the Christian faith. Each essay is prefaced by a short biographical sketch of the writer. These sketches are, on the whole, useful and informing, but they would have been more pleasing had they been a little less eulogistic. The essays are, as one might expect, of varying degrees of excellence. Some are rather slight, but others are notably good, particularly those by Wieman on the Physical World, Fosdick on the Church, and Rufus Jones on Prayer. The general standpoint of the writers may be described as liberal evangelical, and the book, issued under the auspices of the Student Christian Movement of America, is designed especially for the youth of the colleges, though it should prove none the less helpful to many of an older generation.

2 Corinthians xi. 12.

BY THE REVEREND J. F. MOZLEY, M.A., LONDON.

2 CO 11¹² reads: ὁ δὲ ποιῶ, καὶ ποιήσω, ἵνα ἐκκόψω τὴν ἀφορμὴν τῶν θελότων ἀφορμὴν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καυχῶνται εἰρεθῶσιν καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς. These words present a great difficulty. St. Paul gives a reason why he will continue to refuse to take money from the Corinthian church. To do so would give his enemies a handle against him in the matter wherein they boast. It is clear, therefore, that their boast had something to do with money. There are three main lines of interpretation.

I. The second ἵνα is parallel with the first (or perhaps dependent on ἐκκόψω), and describes Paul's intention. By refusing money he will cause that in the matter of their boasting they be found even

as he; *i.e.* they boast of refusing support, but any fair-minded inquirer will find that they have no advantage over Paul. This is the simplest interpretation, and in itself makes excellent sense (so Chrysostom, Calvin, Neander, etc.); but an insuperable objection is found in v.²⁰ ('If a man devour you,' etc.), which is thought to prove that the opponents took money from the church. It is replied, however, that they might have taken money privately or on the sly, and yet boasted publicly of their disinterestedness and of their unwillingness to burden the church. Yet even so the further objection is raised that 1 Co 9 and 2 Co 11 imply that Paul was singular in his refusal

of support. This interpretation, therefore, has gained no support in recent years. To it we will return later.

II. Some (e.g. Beza, Heinrici) understand the grammar of the sentence and the general situation much as above, but take the second *ἵνα* to express St. Paul's final aim. He will force them in the matter of their boasting to come up to his level, i.e. to give up their secret ways of gaining and to become disinterested in deed as well as in word. His example will shame them out of their covetousness. But this interpretation, in addition to the disadvantages which it shares with the last, has some fresh disadvantages of its own. It is altogether off the point; there is no question of Paul benefiting or converting his foes; he is in the thick of the struggle, hard put to to defend himself against them. Moreover, to get them to give up one piece of hypocrisy, while they continued to oppose him in other ways, would be a change of little value to Paul.

III. Nearly all recent commentators, therefore (e.g. Menzies, Plummer, Windisch, Goudge), understand the verse in a quite different way. The second *ἵνα* is not parallel to the first, but goes closely with *ἀφορμὴν*, and expresses the opponents' wish and not Paul's. They desire an occasion of forcing him down to their level. They openly accept money and boast of it as a mark of apostleship, and would like to goad him to do the same. But this view has grave objections, as indeed Windisch points out. (i) To take *ἵνα* with *ἀφορμὴν* is against the run of the sentence. (ii) As the change would be on Paul's side, one would expect *εἰρεθῶμεν καθὼς καὶ αὐτοί*. (iii) If they boast of taking money as a mark of their superiority, how can they possibly wish Paul to imitate them? The answer given is that, though they openly boast, they secretly are ashamed and feel that Paul's example is nobler than theirs, and *ἐν ᾧ καυχῶνται* refers to the shame beneath the boast. But this is very strained and obscure, and seems hardly possible.

What, then, is to be done? Windisch suggests altering the text, but is there not something to be said for the first interpretation? Let us consider the situation more closely. St. Paul had from the first refused regular support in Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia, though sometimes he accepted spontaneous gifts from trusted friends at a distance and may perhaps have taken hospitality, e.g. in Lydia's house at Philippi. In 1 and 2 Th. (both letters written from Corinth), and in Ac 20^{33f.} he gives three reasons for this: (a) he will not burden his

beloved converts; (b) he would set an example of orderly work and self-sacrifice; (c) he will not offer any one the chance of charging him with covetousness. This third reason is hinted at rather than openly stated.

In 1 Co 9 he deals at some length with the matter, some question evidently having been raised about it in Corinth. He vehemently claims the same right of maintenance as the other apostles, but glories in refusing to use the right. He will not be a hindrance to the gospel; nay, his gratuitous preaching is an extra bit of sacrifice, gladly embraced by him as a mark of his zeal for Christ and his readiness to become all things to all men. It is important, however, to observe that in this chapter he is only comparing himself with genuine apostles, e.g. Peter and James, men whom, despite differences, he reckoned as true allies. The phrase, 'If others partake of this right over you' (v. 12), will naturally refer to Apollos and other faithful teachers of the Corinthian church. If, therefore, St. Paul is singular in 1 Co 9, that proves nothing about the false apostles of 2 Co.; for in 1 Co. these men are not in view at all.

But in 2 Co. the situation is entirely changed. The false teachers have arrived with letters of commendation and intrude shamelessly in Paul's sphere. They set up as true apostles of Christ, and attack violently Paul's appearance, methods, motives, and claims. The field was not unfavourable. The Corinthian church was not conspicuous (cf. 1 Co.) for steady unity or cool judgment; also Paul was a long way off, and unscrupulous men might discredit him before he had a chance to reply. When once suspicion was aroused about his genuineness, his past career would be mercilessly criticised and sinister meanings found in actions that had hitherto appeared harmless or even laudable. Thus it came about that he found himself the target of charges that seem palpably absurd or contradictory. He was said to be cowardly, fickle, crooked in his dealing, and wanting in love towards his Corinthian converts. As to money, two charges were made. (a) That he had 'burdened' and 'made gain' out of the church (γ² 12¹⁴⁻¹⁸). That the latter verb (*πλεονεκτεῖν*) is used in the very common sense of covetousness or money gain is proved by its being linked in 12^{14f.} with 'burden' (*καταβαρεῖν, καταναρκεῖν*); for Paul, having rebutted the charge that he himself burdened the church, turns to the alternative version that he had 'made a gain' of them through Titus. (b) That his refusal of support was a slight on Corinth and showed his want of affection, seeing that he had

even in Corinth taken money from other churches (11^{10f.} 12¹³).

But did the false apostles claim to preach gratuitously? We have no evidence for it, unless in our disputed verse; but on the face of things it is likely enough. Despite introductory letters, they could not win control of the church without dislodging Paul from its affections. But Paul always had warm friends, and these would fight vigorously for him. In point of fact the newcomers never won over the church as a whole; for Paul, shortly after writing 2 Co., stayed three months in Corinth, and neither in Acts nor in the Epistle to the Romans (written in those three months) is there any hint of special internal trouble in the church; nay, more, he left Corinth with the Corinthian collection for the Jerusalem saints, which had been suggested before by him and was now successfully accomplished. The situation had been alarming and dangerous, but St. Paul and his friends weathered the storm. But, unless the false apostles could succeed in winning over the bulk of the church, it is hard to see how they can have received regular church support. Would the Pauline party allow church money to be paid to strangers who at once began to attack the revered Founder of the church? Until the newcomers made good their own footing and discredited Paul, it seems improbable that they can have done anything more than take money and support from their own partisans. It was first necessary to win over Paul's friends. These spoke gratefully of Paul's love for them, e.g. of his gratuitous ministry. It would be natural enough for the newcomers to reply that they also were disinterested in their love and had no intention of burdening the church. This claim might be insincere, but it would be a useful weapon under the circumstances. Doubtless, as they became more secure, their confidence grew, and their high-handed behaviour led to St. Paul's vehement charges against them of enslaving, devouring, entrapping, smiting in the face (11²⁰). But the single word 'devour,' especially occurring in a verse so passionate in feeling and so pictorial in language, is not enough to prove that they openly demanded and received church money as their right. It might refer to the hospitality and support taken from their partisans, or to other underhand or private gains.

Let us now consider 11¹⁻¹⁵ and see whether it fits into such a situation. 'Bear with me,' he begins

(vv.1-6), 'for I fear you may be misled; you bear with the newcomers and I am not behind them. I may be rude in speech, but not in knowledge, as I have shown in all ways towards you.' His mind now turns to his past sacrifices; it cuts him to the quick to be now charged with want of love and even with covetousness. 'Gained out of you, did I?' he retorts (vv.7-12), 'no doubt, then, my preaching to you for nothing was a sin! If I gained out of anybody, it was out of Macedonia (ἀλλας ἐκκλησίας, very emphatic); for them I robbed in order to minister to you. I never was a burden on you, nor will I be in future. No one shall stop me of this boasting in Achaia, whatever I may have done as regards Macedonia. Some of you say it is because I love you not, but God knows that is a false charge. My reason is that I thus deprive my foes of a handle; for despite all their boasts of disinterestedness they cannot make themselves out to be more disinterested than I am.' As he dictates the last words, he thinks of the real character of these men underneath their boasts, and bursts out: 'For such are false apostles, Satanic hypocrites, etc., who will come to a bad end' (vv.13-15).

Now this interpretation takes our disputed v.12 in a natural and straightforward way. It also gives force to the strong word 'robbed' (ἐσύλησα) which is suddenly introduced in v.8. For in vv.7-9 Paul is not, as is usually supposed, defending himself against the charge of refusing support and therefore of being no true apostle, but against the charge of covetous dealing. He sarcastically takes up the word συλᾶν as a stronger variant of the word πλεονεκτεῖν. Perhaps, indeed, συλᾶν had also been used by his enemies against him.

Some, however, may feel that under this interpretation the statement in v.12 becomes rather a mild one. For St. Paul, knowing them to be hypocrites, yet takes their boast at its face value and defends himself against it. Yet Paul sometimes uses such under-statements. There is another in this very passage (v.5; cf. 12¹¹). 'I reckon,' he says, 'that I am in nothing behind the super-apostles,' whereas in fact he knew, and says later, that he was far above them and that they were not apostles at all. So also in v.12 he is content for a moment with a defensive argument (perhaps with a touch of irony); but in the next verses he bursts out with his real opinion and vigorously denounces their deceit and false pretensions.