

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

additional chapters on such subjects as Pacifism, Marx, Moral Judgment, and The Spiritual Principle in Man.

Dr. R. H. Malden, Dean of Wells, has completed a series of lectures which was begun in 1935 with the Old Testament and continued in 1936 with the Deutero-Canonical books. They are published under the title, *The Authority of the New Testament* (Milford ; 4s. 6d. net). The title may mislead ; and a better title would be, 'The Nature and Contents of the New Testament.' It is the author's aim to sketch in popular terms the view of the New Testament which modern critical scholarship has established, and at the same time to point out that modern critical scholarship has not impaired the significance of the New Testament as the supreme and final authority in all matters relating to faith and morals. The author has succeeded well in his aim, showing himself, as in the previous volumes, a master of the art of popular exposition. The scope of the volume may be gathered from the main chapter headings, which are—(1) The Early Documents ; (2) The Gospels ; (3) The Canon and Inspiration ; and (4) Christian Ethics.

The story of the Scottish Church in Italy and Malta is presented in *Beyond the Alps*, by the Rev. Albert G. Mackinnon, M.A., D.D. (Oliphants ; 3s. 6d. net). It is a story of courage and faith that have been amply rewarded by the service they rendered to successive generations of Scottish people. All Presbyterians who have visited Rome

will remember the little church in which for so long Dr. Gordon Gray ministered, and told the history of Rome to interested hearers, and also the hospitable home in which he and others have entertained wandering Scots. Both in Rome and Malta the Scottish Church cause has gone through many vicissitudes, but it has always had its place and its function, and has done justice to both. Dr. Mackinnon has himself played no small part in the story he has to tell, and for years has worthily upheld the honour and usefulness of the Scottish Church in Italy. There will be many readers for this interesting little volume.

The Student Christian Movement Press has published cheap editions, in paper covers, at 1s. each, of two series of broadcast talks which originally appeared in 1935. They are *The Way to God*, the speakers being the Rev. F. A. Iremonger, Dr. W. R. Matthews, and the Rev. J. S. Whale ; and a second volume with the same title, the speakers being the Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J., Dr. Raven, and the Rev. G. F. Macleod, D.D. The first volume deals with two topics : What is Man ? and Does God Speak ? The second has three topics : Jesus Christ, 'Yesterday, To-day and For Ever,' and Abundant Life. In their cheap form, these excellent talks ought to have a very wide circulation. It is one of the greatest reasons for thankfulness that the tone of broadcasting is so sound, and in particular that the religious side of it is being developed so wisely and so positively.

Old Texts in Modern Translations.

I Corinthians i. 10 (Moffatt).

BY PROFESSOR J. F. M'FADYEN, D.D., SERAMPORE COLLEGE, INDIA.

'BROTHERS, for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ I beg of you all to drop these party-cries.' Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians gives a vivid picture of a Greek Church in its early days when the members were still wondering how far the new religion was going to lead them. For the most part they were men and women with no distinction of intellect or social status or birth ; but they had the nimble wit of the Greek and the Greek love of

discussion. As we read on, we can hear the Christian slave asking : 'If I am now a bond-servant of Jesus Christ, why must I remain in bondage to my human master ?' Some were carrying to its logical conclusion Paul's contention that the death of Jesus had ended the dominion of the Law, including, as they claimed, the moral law. Christian women had begun to resent their subordination to men in a Church where, they were

told, there was neither male nor female. There was keen competition as to which of the new spiritual gifts was to be regarded as most important. To their credit be it said that they were concerned about their new duties as well as their new privileges, and had begun to wonder how far their acceptance of hospitality was now restricted in a city in which so much of the meat consumed at table had first been sacrificed to some heathen deity and in which, as in modern India, invitations to festivals sometimes intimated that the function was to be held under the patronage of a 'god.' One wonders whether there is any modern parallel to a Church, composed for the most part of quite humble folks, realizing so keenly, in so short a space of time and in so many directions, the transforming power of the Christian religion.

The members of the Corinthian Church were discussing many problems: one problem they were not discussing, because they did not know it was a problem: the 'schisms' that were arising by the devotion of different groups to different party leaders. It is no accident that, immediately after the greeting and introduction, Paul plunges into this subject. To understand why to Paul these divisions seem so alarming, we have to keep in mind his teaching in the Epistle to the Ephesians; for it is reasonable to suppose that, at least in germ, probably in more developed form, Paul's thought on the relation of Jesus to world history was already formed. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, as Dr. E. F. Scott has said, 'Paul thinks of Christ as the central principle of existence. When he has gathered back to himself all the multitudinous strands which are now in confusion he will bring the world into harmony.' This work of creating harmony out of discord he accomplishes through His Church.

But what if the Church itself is torn into fragments, if the body of Christ through which he is to break down the barriers that separate men has itself erected barriers between its different groups? The Church has then become a house divided against itself, which cannot stand. There is treason in the very citadel of the Christian faith. No wonder Paul attacks the subject at once and devotes to it nearly one-fourth of the whole epistle. How many parties were there? 1¹² seems to suggest that there were four: A Paul party, an Apollos party, a Cephas party, and a Christ party. At first sight one is tempted to accept the suggestion that 'I of Christ' is an indignant interjection of Paul himself; yet 2 Co 10⁷ implies that then, or later, one or more members of the Church did make

an unctuous claim to belong in a pre-eminent way to Christ; just as some modern missionary societies abjure all names but 'Christian' or 'Disciples,' the only result of their idealism being that they add one more to the already painfully large number of sects.

Whether the 'brother' singled out in 4⁷ is the unnamed leader of another faction, and whether the ironical attack in the following verses is directed against his party or against the whole Church, is not clear. The point, and the only important point, was that the Church, through which Christ was to reunite the scattered fragments of the world, was itself divided into parties whose relation to each other was that of 'jealousy and strife' (3⁹).

What had caused the divisions? All that has been written on the subject has given us little beyond more or less probable guesses. Dr. Denney tells of a sermon he once heard in which the preacher began by explaining that he had not had time to prepare a regular sermon and so would just give a simple gospel address! It was not a simple gospel in that sense that Paul proclaimed in Corinth, but it was a gospel that began and ended in the Cross of Christ. Or rather, Paul was making an abbreviation which risked misunderstanding when he said that 'among you I resolved to ignore everything but Jesus Christ and him crucified.' Surely Paul could not preach the gospel in Corinth, or anywhere else, without making clear that the Christ crucified was also the Christ risen. There were many other things about Christ and the Christian life that needed to be said. In the course of his correspondence with the Corinthian Church Paul found himself constrained by force of circumstances to say many of them. But, to begin with at least, in his Corinthian preaching, reacting perhaps from the comparative failure of his trial of another method in Athens, he resolved to concentrate on the foundation truth of the Christian religion, the Crucifixion of Christ. To Paul the Crucifixion was not just an important incident; it was *the* incident in the history of the world, the event which gives the key to the interpretation of the history of the universe. In making the Crucifixion central the combined witness of the four Gospels shows that Paul was in line with the testimony of practically the whole Church. The Crucifixion marked the end of an epoch, the end of the reign of law, the end of the dominion of Satan. It would have been more in accordance with the mind of Paul if the year of the Crucifixion rather than the year of the birth of Christ had been taken as the beginning of the Christian era.

In choosing the language in which to expound his gospel to the Corinthians Paul had but one aim : not to be clever or epigrammatic or flowery, but to be understood. One hopes Dr. Moffatt is correct in his translation, 'I never failed to make myself intelligible to you' (2 Co 11⁶). We need not take too seriously the criticisms of Paul's power as a speaker made by members of the opposition at Corinth (2 Co 10¹⁰, 11⁶). It may be that Paul preached best on paper ; but one whose public speech secured the results that Paul's undoubtedly did had no need to fear the unkindly comments of disgruntled Corinthians. Yet, in Corinth at least, Paul disdained all the arts of the orator and spoke with no thought of his own reputation but only to convict and convince. In all this Paul had his supporters : 'I of Paul.' Moreover, as he reminds the Church more than once, he was their 'father in God.' It was through him the gospel had been first brought to Corinth, and there would be those among his readers who would be loyal to the Apostle to whom they owed their very souls.

As for the Apollos party, the account given of Apollos in Ac 18^{24ff.} implies the writer's admiration for Apollos and none but the happiest relations between him and the circle to which Paul belonged. Nor is it quite necessary to assume that the leader whom Paul seems to be attacking in the passage beginning 1 Co 1¹⁷ and 2^{1ff.} is Apollos. Our suspicion that he is meant would be increased if we could accept the old translation 'eloquent' for the *λόγιος* of Ac 18²⁴, and it does not seem to be an impossible translation ; while his Alexandrian training would strengthen the identification. One would have liked to hear the story from Apollos' point of view. At a time when the fierce criticism of Paul, that had developed before he wrote the concluding chapters of 2 Co, had apparently already begun (1 Co 4³), Paul, who had the missionary's love for his first converts, would not be prejudiced in favour of a rival who now shared the position that he had once held alone. A man of Apollos' ability, learning, and zeal would recognize, as Paul himself recognized, that once the foundation had been laid, a superstructure must be built on it ; and on the difficult moral problems that were arising in Corinth there was room for difference of opinion even among Christian leaders. Paul tried to evolve a Christian philosophy of history : Apollos may well have essayed the same task. At best Paul knew only at second-hand of the doings of Apollos, and he would naturally be perturbed if the reports that reached him of the popularity of his brilliant successor

suggested that that popularity was gained at the expense of a distorted gospel.

At all events, whoever was responsible, Paul was persuaded that two mischievous things were happening in Corinth during his absence. The gospel was being advertised by means of rhetoric, 'the harlot of the arts.' Mr. Baldwin once had some strong things to say of the damaging effects in the political sphere of the meretricious use of certain dazzling phrases. Are they any less hurtful in the sphere of religion ? In New Testament times men and women were saved by believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, crucified and risen. Salvation by moral maxim does not seem any more practicable in our time than it was then.

Paul believed also that the philosophy of the philosophers was being dragged into the service of the gospel, with ruinous results. To understand Paul's perturbation we must remember the close connexion that he saw (Ro 1 and Eph) between a pretentious godless philosophy and moral anarchy. He believed both that the speculations of conceited 'wise' men dimmed their perception of moral truth and that moral licence blinded men to spiritual truth. He is afraid that, on the foundation he has laid, superstructures are being built that will not stand the test of the Day, that the sanctuary of God is being destroyed ; and in the later letter he definitely says that another Jesus is being proclaimed, a different Spirit, a different gospel.

In our day what Paul has to say about philosophy applies in an almost greater degree to science, or at least to the pronouncements of the scientist turned philosopher. Till lately we thought of science and philosophy as the preserve of a section of educated men. Now more or less accurate versions of at least the conclusions of scientists and philosophers are the property of the million. In the life of our day Paul would see a confirmation of his belief in the cause-and-effect relation between ungodly thinking and ungodly living. He makes it clear that his quarrel is not with philosophy, but with a philosophy that ignores the central fact in world history. The scientific method, we are told to-day, is the one method of reaching the truth about the world. The Cross of Christ, Paul would reply, is the one fact which, more than any other, illumines the meaning of the world and of history. Many a young Christian student must have realized vividly what Paul meant, when he entered a university and heard theories of the universe expounded by men who never seemed to have heard of Christ or His Crucifixion. 'Too good to be true' is the

verdict with which Priestley dismisses the story of the incarnate Son of God crucified for the sins of the world; and many a 'thinker' of the day would not even pay it that tribute.

Paul has two tests for the validity of any version of the gospel, and the two tests are inseparable: Is it based on the crucified Christ? Has it power, that is, can it do things? One of the surprises of the time is the surprise with which many discover that the Christian religion is meant to do things and actually does them. Are we not to-day trying to separate the two? We are conscious of loss of 'power'; but are we not also conscious of a largely diminished regard for the Cross of Christ, which for Paul was the source and the only source of 'power'? Is it not time we thought out afresh our relation to the Cross and delivered ourselves from the anomaly of our present position? The Cross is still the symbol of the Church. It appears plentifully in our ecclesiastical architecture and as a personal adornment. In most sections of the Church much importance, in some sections very great importance, is attached to the celebration of the sacrament that commemorates the Crucifixion. But the preaching of the Cross, on the somewhat rare occasions when it is preached, meets a need that is no longer keenly felt. Is it possible to present a version of the Christian gospel which is not primarily the story of the crucified Christ? Paul at least would have said 'no.'

Of the Cephas party again, we have no actual knowledge. The one later reference which Paul makes to it adds nothing to our information. It is reasonable to suppose here that we have the earliest appearance of the theory which has played so prominent a part in Church history: that the descent of the spirit from person to person and from generation to generation must be accompanied by physical contact. Peter had been in the most intimate circle of the disciples of Jesus. Whether Paul had ever seen Jesus or heard Him we do not know. Paul made no secret of the fact that his first real contact with the followers of Jesus had been of a violently hostile nature, and that his first vital contact with Jesus was with the risen Christ. If Paul could have foreseen a time when the glorification of Peter would split not only the Corinthian Church but Christendom, he would have had more to say about it and it would have made interesting reading.

One of the sayings of Jesus that enshrines eternal truth is that in the Parable of the Tares and the Darnel: 'An enemy hath done this.' Even the gospel of Jesus Christ has hardly begun to permeate

the world when men, most of them doubtless honestly believing that they are doing God service, are busy sowing weeds among the wheat. Gal, 1 Co and Col, to take only three examples, are largely occupied with Paul's resistance to perversions of the gospel which he believes to be deadly. One of his telling criticisms of those who uttered the party cries is that they exalt the teacher or the leader and correspondingly tend to dethrone Christ. Weymouth's translation may or may not be right in representing Paul as saying that he had deliberately abstained from the practice of baptism in Corinth in case converts would think they were being baptized into his name (1 Co 1¹⁴). At all events he thanks God that he did abstain, a very remarkable utterance coming from the great pioneer missionary. The Spirit of God blows where it lists, and our ability to influence its movements is strictly limited, far more limited than we commonly allow. Paul says quite bluntly: 'The man who plants and the man who waters are ciphers. It is God that gives the harvest.' We can, we must, do the work that God has given us to do; but when we have done it we are but servants. We cannot have revivals when and where we will. The glorification of the leader takes two forms. When people are turning their backs on the Church, we ask ourselves: 'What is wrong with us?' a healthy question provided we remember that Paul and the Master Himself had their failures. When the harvest is abundant, we tend to say or at least to feel: 'To us be the glory.' One of the happiest features in the very striking mass movement in the diocese of Dornakal in South India is that the Bishop makes no claim to special piety or wisdom or zeal for the missionaries and the Christian forces of the diocese. It is, he says in the true Pauline spirit, the work of God.

How would Paul's teaching on party spirit apply to the divisions of our own day? Later in this epistle Paul is to give regulations for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Into this celebration grave disorders had crept, but there is no hint that the members of the different parties could not all sit at the same Lord's Table. The recent Conferences in Oxford and Edinburgh have given one more proof that the conscience of the Church is seriously perturbed about our 'unhappy divisions,' but there is at times a certain vagueness about the reasons for calling our divisions unhappy. We sometimes find it difficult to join with much sincerity in the self-abasing confessions of sin on this subject to which we are from time to time invited. Why should we don sackcloth and ashes because some

churches prefer a hierarchy while others prefer a more democratic form of government; because some churches baptize infants, while others think that baptism is only for those who have made a voluntary decision to live the Christian life; or because some churches prefer prescribed forms of worship which others believe to limit both freedom and spontaneity? To speak about such divisions rending the seamless robe of Christ seems a misuse of language. It might even be claimed that Christian liberty necessitates the tolerance of a certain variety in creed and forms of worship if not also of Church government.

But our divisions, if not necessarily shameful in themselves, may easily become shameful. In the judgment of many, when we cannot acknowledge as fellow-Christians those whom we know that Paul and our Lord Himself would acknowledge, there is cause for grave searching of heart. Our divisions, again, may well cause us shame if they lead to unseemly competition and rivalry. Fortunately, at least on the mission field, this century has seen an immense advance in the co-operation of churches and a rapid Christianizing of their relations to each other; though there are still missionary societies that prefer to plough their lone furrow or even to plough their neighbour's furrow. We may well feel ashamed also when our divisions partake in any degree of the nature of caste. In South India the Roman Church allows converts from Hinduism to carry with them into the Christian Church the caste distinctions they had as Hindus. (But there is no need to go to India for illustrations. In a village church in Scotland one has worshipped, or tried to worship, in a pew intended for the local shepherd and his family, a pew in which it was difficult to stand upright, while spacious galleries, some of them empty, were reserved for the lords of the manor and their retainers.)

Paul shows his usual Christian sagacity in dealing with the problem of the party cries. Christ, he says,

is not divided. Differences of opinion of many kinds there will and must be among Christians; but none of them must be allowed to obscure our common devotion to our common Lord. He carries his praise of the Christians to the verge of flattery; for it is difficult to reconcile the testimony of 17: 'You come short in no charism,' with much in the rest of the epistle, and especially with the ironical outburst in 4th. But Paul is following the pedagogical maxim that criticism of failure must always be accompanied by recognition of achievement. Part of his rebuke is insinuated in the repeated use of the word 'brothers,' a word learned from the Master Himself. So long as Christians regard each other as members of one family, no difference of creed or worship can be an insurmountable barrier. Better unity of spirit with diversity of organization than a union in which there is no brotherly spirit.

In a compartmental church, whatever else may be said of it, there is always one notable cause of impoverishment. When the followers of Paul and Peter and Cephas are contending against each other, the partisans of each leader forget that the other leaders are also their possession. 'All things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas.' This is one of the heaviest prices we pay for our Church divisions, that most of us are in so large measure ignorant of the history and the achievements of churches other than our own. Even when we do know them, we approach them, as it were, from the outside. All who have had experience of Church union know the intangible but very real difference there is between worshipping in a Church as an outsider and worshipping as a member of the family. Here is one contribution that the clergy of all churches can make towards the solution of the Church problem: to teach their people to know and appreciate, even to claim as their own, the saints and the spiritual inheritance of other churches.

