

BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS

Definitions and Distinctions

1. Hermeneutics is the science of interpretation, and Exegesis is the practical application of the principles of this science in ascertaining or in setting forth (the meaning of a passage or a statement. These principles are founded on the laws of thought as related to verbal usage and find their justification in the dictates of common sense.

2. As conclusions in mathematics can derive no force from the authority of mathematicians, since all that is truly scientific is independent of such authority, so the results of exegesis conducted under the faithful application of the laws of Hermeneutics must be received without reference to any supposed authority of exegetes. An authoritative expositor is as needless as an authoritative chemist, except in the case of inspired exposition of what had been previously only partially revealed. It follows that Hermeneutics as a science, embracing fixed principles that are founded on common sense, effectually excludes all claims to the office of authoritative or infallible interpretation for mankind.

3. It will follow with equal certainty that the right of private or individual interpretation involves no license to pursue fancies in exegesis, no freedom from the control or wholesome guidance of laws that do not vary, but the liberty to follow (his scientific leading to legitimate results apart from dogmatic dictation from any source. When the claim to establish an authoritative standard in exposition is urged as necessary to prevent unlimited variation or wild extravagance in interpretation, it is clear that both the

unwarranted claim and the argument for its supposed necessity are alike based upon the false assumption that there is no science of Hermeneutics. As a science with laws to be strictly observed in interpretation, Hermeneutics stands equally opposed to authoritative dictation, on the one hand, and to lawless exegesis, on the other.

4. The Author of revealed truth, indisputably intending to be understood, has so embodied in expressions of this truth the meaning to be thus imparted for the benefit of mankind, that nothing but a false exegesis involving the neglect or the deliberate reputation of the principles of Hermeneutics can obscure the true sense of the divine word. He who sets forth this divine sense of Sacred Scripture presents no mere interpretation but that which, existing apart from all exegesis, may nevertheless be readily perceived under a thoughtful and faithful application of those laws of interpretation which common sense approves and which can never with safety or propriety be disregarded by any exegete.

Biblical Hermeneutics, in short, simply brings the earnest interpreter to a position on which the light of divine truth is allowed to fall in all the fulness and clearness of its own teaching. Its testimony on any subject, whether given in one place or in several, must be taken in its entirety without abridgment or modification, so that the Holy Scriptures may interpret themselves in the broad clear light of their own divine teaching. And what we call the laws of interpretation are simply certain sensible directions to be followed as indispensable for bringing the learning mind of man into uninterrupted contact with the instructing mind of God.

SUBJECTIVE CONDITIONS

6. It is needful that the interpreter of the Scriptures should not only submit to the guidance of Hermeneutical laws but that he also should approach the divine word in certain states of mind

that are conditional to his success. A *special capacity* by nature for the highest success in this as in other lines of study is an important prerequisite. *Discipline* through study and exegetical exercise will in some measure increase this capacity, and thus proportionately qualify those whom nature has not so well adapted to this work. In all cases *freedom*, from the bias of prejudice, partisan feeling and prepossession of every kind, is absolutely indispensable. This Hermeneutical freedom is exceedingly comprehensive. It is, in the first place, freedom from all intellectual prepossessions. It is, in the second place, freedom from every moral bias, such as a lack of candor or sincerity. And the interpreter must not only be free from the dogmatism of others, but must especially be exempt from all dogmatism of his own.

7. These mental qualifications of the interpreter, or subjective conditions of reliable exegesis, deserve additional explanation and emphasis. The specific Hermeneutical capacity embraces three leading elements: discriminating ability, analytical power, and logical acumen. Sharpness of discrimination is necessary and lack of this power would hinder the process of a true interpretation. Interpreters should correctly distinguish between the ideas embodied in expressions they may closely resemble each other in form yet differ essentially in significance. Much of Holy Scripture is given in the form of reasoning, and a failure to grasp clearly the connection between premises and conclusions will interrupt the process of satisfactory interpretation. The cultivation of the powers to which reference is here made, in as high degree as possible, will render correct exegesis the more easy and delightful. Such an interpreter, applying faithfully the principles of Hermeneutics, in full possession of intellectual freedom and sincerity with himself and with God, will find the divine word to be not only intelligible, but so convincing as to dispel the darkness of unbelief.

VERBAL CANONS

8. Among the principles indispensable to the safe guidance of

the interpreter there are certain canons of usage that may be said to partake largely of the nature of axioms. (1) *A word of more than one meaning may be properly used either affirmatively or negatively in a given proposition, while a word of only one meaning cannot be so used without contradiction.* Thus Paul teaches us that men are justified, “without works,” Rom. 4:5, while James as clearly affirms that men are justified, “by works.” Each apostle furnishes the ground on which the harmony of the two may be seen. Paul speaks of “works” by which “faith is made void,” Rom. 4:14, and James speaks of “works” by which faith is “made perfect.” Jas. 2:22. When Luther discovered a difference of meaning in their use of the term “works,” he no longer spoke of the Epistle of James as “an epistle of straw.”

9. (2) *Whatever may be the varieties of meaning a word may have in different connections, it can have but one import in any given instance of its occurrence.* When Jesus said to unconverted Jews, Jno. 5:40, “ye will not come to me, that ye may have life,” he could just as truly have said, according to Rom. 8:6, you have no life, no spirituality of mind or renewal of heart, that you may come unto me. The latter is the condition of coming to him while the former is conditioned on coming. The life antecedent to coming is subjective life or spiritual renewal. The life that is consequent on coming is the objective bestowment of salvation through remission of sins. And it is obvious that the life which is the consequent of coming to Jesus can never be the antecedent condition of coming, nor *vice versa*. The word “life” cannot signify both in any given instance of its occurrence. In like manner a conjunction or a preposition, connecting several antecedent conditions with a consequent blessing, cannot denote any difference of relation in the case.

10. (3) *Words, unlike numerals, may be used with a greater or a less comprehensiveness of import by virtue of their connection with other words.* In no combination of numbers does the numeral 5 ever expand in value to 6 or, by contraction, become equal to 4. But

words are susceptible in some measure of expansion and contraction in force, according to the connection in which they may be used; The word “righteous” is used with far greater comprehensiveness in Luke 1:6 and similar instances, than the measure of its import in Rom. 5:7 and in many other places of its occurrence. The *carnal man*, as described in Rom. 8:5-8, is the godless man, as standing in full contrast with children of God; but this term is applied, with less meaning, of course, to believing “babes in Christ” in 1 Cor. 3:1. And the word is still further contracted in force when applied by Paul to himself, Rom. 7:14, under a comparison with the faultless law of God. It is one of the chief sources of erroneous exegesis that men adopt a sort of arithmetical method of interpretation, and deal with words as if they were numerals, in overlooking the obvious contextual import which they often acquire.

11. (4) *This property inherent in words follows of necessity a correct translation or definition so that the latter can take the place of the former without detriment to the sense.* In this way may be tested the merits or demerits of a definition of translation. The name Jesus means Saviour and as Jesus the Nazarene is emphatically the one only Saviour of men, to say that Jesus came into the world to redeem mankind is to say that our Saviour did this.

12. (5) *All words are susceptible of a figurative application, but no word, has properly a figurative meaning.* No lexicographer would think of extending the signification of the word “fox” so as to include one of the Herodian family. When, in reference to Herod the tetrarch Jesus said to certain Pharisees, “Go and say to that fox,” etc., he simply made a *figurative application* of this term to Herod, because of his resemblance in certain respects to the animal denoted by that word. So too, when by the figure of speech called *Metonymy*, the name of an act is transferred to its effect, as when an object ceremonially unclean was said to be sprinkled from its uncleanness, referring to the purification effected by this act, we have only a *figurative use* of the word “sprinkle” with no change of

meaning whatever *in relation to the act* universally expressed by the term. Even when the figurative application is pushed still further into the realm of the spiritual, as in the expression, “having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience,” *the meaning of the word*, as denoting a certain act, remains without modification.

13. (6) *As the words of a living language are constantly liable to change of meaning, a figurative application of frequent occurrence may gradually become the current meaning of a word and the original import become obsolete.* The expression *to prevent* formerly meant, according to its etymology, *to come before*, and so, by consequence, *to hinder*. The latter is at present the current import of the term, while the former has become obsolete. Usage may effect a change of signification through the influence of a variety of causes. “Great care therefore,” says Ernesti, “is necessary in the interpreter to guard against rash etymological exegesis, which is often very fallacious. Etymology often belongs rather to the history of language than to the illustration of its present meaning, and rarely does it exhibit anything more than a specious illustration.” Usage in later literature must determine whether a given word has undergone a change of meaning. Accordingly, the patristic usage of the “Greek fathers” of the early church may teach us whether or not any term of the New Testament employed by them has, by virtue of religious association, departed from its original classical import. They would know from their religious training whether any word of their vernacular had undergone such change.

GENERIC LAWS

14. There are two fundamental laws of interpretation which are here called “generic” because of their relation to certain subordinate and subsidiary rules to be stated and illustrated hereafter. If the title, “fundamental laws” should be preferred by any one, he may consider himself at liberty to follow his own inclination or taste in this matter of names. The Hermeneutical principles embodied in these laws are of such primary importance as to

constitute the basis of all correct exegesis. The first is the *Law of Harmony*, which, as presupposing the unity of truth, requires such interpretations and applications of a given passage as is consistent with other undoubted Scripture teaching. The Saviour himself enforced by his own example the propriety of this law. When at the time of the temptation Satan saw that Jesus repelled his first suggestion by quoting the Scripture, whose teaching was thus honored, the tempter sought to justify his second suggestion by quoting Scripture on his side. The purport of this cunning device was that Jesus should manifest his trust in God and in his divine promise by casting himself over a precipice, since he had Scriptural assurance of being borne up by angelic hands so as to experience no injury. How now was this perversion of Scripture met by our Saviour? He replies: "*It is written again, Thou shall not tempt the Lord thy God.*" He thus enforces the idea that no interpretation and application of Scripture can be regarded as admissible that plainly conflicts with divine teaching in other places. It is obvious therefore that the law of harmony underlies all justifiable exposition.

15. The second of the two great principles to which reference is made above we will call *the Law of Opposition, or Negation, which may be formulated as follows: In all cases a writer or speaker is liable to suffer injustice, if his statements are interpreted without reference to the contrast before his own mind.* What an author would regard as the precise opposite of any important assertion of truth made by him is always, by way of negation, the exact measure of the length and breadth of the signification of that assertion. Hence, any interpreter who would take the assertion out of this relation of opposition and place it in a contrast of his own construction would of necessity do the author injustice. Here indeed is the underlying source of nearly all incorrect interpretation. When Paul said before the Jewish Sanhedrim, Acts 23:6, "Brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee," he spoke with reference to the doctrinal issue between the Pharisees and the Sadducees both of which parties were represented in the council. Touching their points of difference he was at that time, as he always had been, on the side

of the Pharisees. Now as the Pharisees are described in Paul's own epistles as self-righteous legalists depending on human merit, what kind of interpretation would that be which would represent the apostle as repudiating in his statement before the Sanhedrin his great doctrine of salvation through the grace of God in Christ? It would furnish indeed, a true specimen of a vast amount of exegesis to be found in sermons and religious books. He proclaimed himself a Pharisee only as to the doctrinal difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees.

HERMENEUTICAL RULES.

16. (1). *Interpret every expression in the light of the context, or connection with contiguous statements.* Any exposition given without regard to the context is necessarily unsafe: any exposition given in direct conflict with the context is necessarily false. In recognizing the connection in thought, the unity of truth in a context, this rule is subsidiary to the great "Law of Harmony." And where the context shows a contrast before the mind of the author the rule is also subsidiary to the "Law of Opposition." Jesus in giving instruction to his disciples and enjoining an important duty, Matt. 5:48, speaks as follows: "ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." It has been supposed that the Master here holds up an absolute standard of perfection in character and requires his followers to constantly strive to reach it, knowing that in this life they could never fully do so. And the last clause, indeed, seems to justify this exposition, namely, the expression, "*as your heavenly father is perfect.*" This interpretation, nevertheless, is certainly inconsistent with the context which clearly explains the last clause as well as the nature and limited range of the perfection required. The word "therefore" logically connects the passage with the foregoing instruction and shows that the required duty had already been described in the context. Jesus was not discoursing about Christian character in general, but the kind of love that his disciples must manifest as extending even to enemies and standing thus in contrast with that of the publicans who loved

only those who loved them. The children of the heavenly Father are expected to be in the amplitude of their love like him, who “makes his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust.” Such imitation of the Father by the children in not restricting kindness and blessing to friends is described as perfection in love, as contrasted with the meager love in the heart of the publicans. Hence the requirement: “*Ye therefore, shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.*” The term “perfect” is therefore used relatively.

17. (2). *Interpret in the light of all that is presented in other passages having any bearing on the matter in hand.* Scriptures that stand in this relation to one another are commonly called, “parallel passages.” It is obvious that two or more passages cannot be regarded as subject to the application of this rule unless they are really “parallel.” In most cases, indeed, this can be determined by simple inspection, but there are some instances in which a careful scrutinizing of the context of each passage is requisite. When, in 2 Cor. 5:7, Paul says: “we walk by faith, not by sight,” he is commonly understood as substantially saying what he states, in 2 Cor. 4:18; “We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.” Yet the two passages are not parallel, the contrast presented in the one being widely different from that brought to view in the other; In 2 Cor. 4:18, the sight referred to is of things “temporal” and the contrasted implied faith through which believers, look “at the things which are not seen” is the higher principle of action. In 2 Cor. 5:7, the “sight” referred to is of the heavenly to be hereafter enjoyed and the “faith” of the contrast is the lower principle of action. Observe the way the passage reads: “Whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord (for we walk by faith, not by sight);” we are willing “rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.”

18. But the interpreter may not only err in treating as parallel

passages that are only apparently so: he may so deal with those that are really parallel as to obscure the fulness and clear ness of their combined teaching and even to bring them into virtual conflict. The following rule is requisite to make the use of parallel Scriptures subsidiary to the fundamental "Law of Harmony." (3). *Through the suggestive power of words, as indicated by a Verbal Canon above given, a condensed form of expression of necessity implies all that is expressly stated in more elaborate representations of the same matter.* The axiomatic character of this rule, whose importance could scarcely be exaggerated, is recognized by common sense the moment it is formulated. Its essentiality to sound exegesis is readily perceived. Yet no Hermeneutical principle is more frequently or more flagrantly disregarded in interpolation. To offset a passage which obviously Conflicts with a cherished theory by citing another that may plausibly be construed for the support of that theory is not only to set at naught the harmony of the Scriptures but to proceed in exposition simply under the influence of dogmatic prepossession. To be governed by the axiom above presented will preclude this. When God says to his people through his prophet: "Hear, and your soul shall live," shall we understand that hearing the divine voice, according to the restricted sense ordinarily expressed by that term, is the sole condition of spiritual life? Should we not rather correct such mistake under the application of the rule before us by turning to Jas. 1:22-25. "But be you doers of the word, and not hearers only, deluding your own selves. * * * He that looks into the perfect law, the law of liberty, and so continues, being not a hearer that forgets, but a doer that works, this man shall be blessed in his doing." See also the context of the passage itself. "Incline your ear, and come unto me; hear, and your soul shall live." All that is expressed in the more elaborate statement, "Incline your ear, and come unto me," is tersely condensed in the one word "hear," and enforced as conditional to the life of the soul.

19. (4). *No interpretation of a passage can be accepted that is manifestly inconsistent with the known purpose of the author, whether regard*

be had to the general design of the treatise as a whole, or to the special design of the section or paragraph to which the passage belongs. In some cases the purpose of the writer is declared, as in Jno. 20:30, 31; but in most instances it is to be discovered by a careful reading of the whole treatise with a thoughtful comparison of its several parts with one another. As John tells us that the object of his record of the supernatural works of Jesus was to produce faith in him as the predicted Messiah, which implies that such was also the object of the other three “Gospels,” any interpretation of passages in these books which would explain the miraculous as having simply a benevolent end in view and thus seek to justify the expectation of miracles now, cannot be regarded as legitimate. As a thoughtful perusal of Romans shows the main object of the Epistle to be the demonstration of the freeness and universality of God’s grace in the offer of mercy to mankind without respect of persons, that exposition of certain passages in the ninth chapter or other parts, of the Epistle which would limit the saving purpose of God to a part of the human race to the exclusion of the remainder involves an inconsistency in the inspired author that effectually disproves the interpretation. In its bearings on the special design of particular sections or paragraphs the rule here under consideration is subsidiary to the great “Law of Opposition.” For when a writer is combating some radical error, like a delusive reliance on supposed meritorious claims, it is a manifest injustice to his teaching to overlook his true design and so take his expressions out of the contrast before his own mind and construe them as directed against something else that the interpreter himself may be opposing. Thus to reject legalism as a ground of divine blessing is not to reject religious activity as a condition of such blessing.

20 (5). *Very often a passage cannot be understood apart from the historical circumstances connected with its composition.* This general description embraces especially the time of the writing; the special surroundings of those addressed; their peculiar sentiments and party affiliations, and the like.. What is commonly called,

“The Lord’s Prayer,” Matt. 6:9-13, which has generally been supposed by the religious world to be a model for Christians in all ages, contains no recognition whatever of the mediation of the Lord Jesus and asks for nothing at all in his name. How can this be explained except by considering the fact that it was taught as appropriate *before* Jesus was exalted to the right hand of God to be “both Lord and Christ” in his mediatorial reign under which the imperative direction now is, “whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him.” So of other instructions as to religious duties and special conditions of blessing before the inauguration of the New Economy in Christ. Touching other features of the rule before us a single illustration must suffice. It is said of the Sadducees, in Acts 4:2, that they came upon Peter and John “being sore troubled because they taught the people, and proclaimed in Jesus the resurrection from the dead.” This can be understood only by remembering that the Sadducees denied the doctrine of a resurrection and future state of existence. Only those devoted to such unbelief with partisan zeal could be “sore troubled” that the glorious hope of immortality is made good for mankind by the triumph of Christ Jesus over death and the grave. “Sore troubled” that a new and unanswerable argument refutes the doctrine of their party by showing that their own existence was not to end in dust!

21. (6). *When a writer indicates emphasis upon a word or thought this emphasis must be recognized to obtain the true and full significance of the passage.* In the original, emphasis is frequently marked by placing the emphasized word at the beginning of a statement. Thus Paul, in 1 Cor. 3:9, rebukes the exaltation of the ministerial instruments of the divine will to the position of lordship or headship in the church by his emphasis upon the word “God” to show the sovereign relation which God alone sustains to the church. In Green’s translation the passage reads as follows: “*God’s* work-fellows we are: *God’s* husbandry you are, *God’s* building.” Emphasis here has argumentative force evincing the thought that Paul,

Apollos and others were but “*ministers through whom*” the Corinthians had believed, and *not lords in whom* they had believed. Sometimes emphasis is indicated by contrast, as when a less important thing is seemingly denied or forbidden to enhance the superiority of something enforced as infinitely higher. Thus Jesus, in John 6:27, says: “Work not for the meat which perishes, but for the meat which abides unto eternal life.” See another instance, in 1 Pet. 3:3, 4.

SPECIAL HERMENEUTICAL PRINCIPLES.

22. The laws of interpretation which have now been set forth are of universal application. They must regulate the course of an interpreter whatever may be the nature of the composition on which he is at work, whether it be literal or figurative, prosaic or poetic, historic or prophetic. But there are certain peculiarities in figurative language which require the application of special laws, and so also as regards Hebrew poetry and prophetic diction.

A. Interpretation of Figures.

(A). Definitions.

23. Before submitting any rules in the case it seems proper to define figurative language and to point out the principal figures of speech that are found in the Scriptures. A figure of speech is the extension of a word or expression beyond its ordinary acceptance for the sake of ornament or force. But there is always an underlying relation of some sort as the ground of this ornament or verbal force by which the figurative usage is justified. The kind of relation in any given case is discernible in the kind of figure employed. Thus we have the following figures.

(1). *Metaphor*; a figure which applies the name of one thing to another because of some resemblance, real or supposed, between them. “Ye are a temple of God.”

(2). *Simile*; a figure which indicates resemblance by a formal comparison using for this purpose such terms as like, as, etc. "All flesh is as grass, and all the glory thereof as the flower of grass."

(3). *Allegory*; a figure which is also based on resemblance, and indirectly suggests one thing through the representation of another. In Ps. 80:8-14, Israel is allegorically represented by a vine. Parables and fables are allegorical representations. Dr. Carson has clearly shown that allegory is not "metaphor continued" as some rhetoricians have held. He distinguishes them as follows. "(a). Allegory presents to immediate view the secondary object only; metaphor always presents the principal also. (b). Metaphor always imagines one thing to be another; allegory never, (c). Every thing asserted in the allegory applies to the secondary object; every thing asserted in the metaphor applies to the principal. (d). In the metaphor there is but one meaning; in the allegory there are two, a literal and a figurative, (e). Allegory is a veil; metaphor is a perspective glass. The former always in some respects conceals the principal object."

(4). *Metonymy* is a figure which exchanges the name of one thing for that of another on account of some relation between them. The principal varieties of the figure will indicate the kind of relation in each case. (a). The name of the cause is used when reference is made to the effect. Luke 16:29: "They have Moses and the prophets," *i. e.*, *their writings*. (b). The effect is named when the cause is meant. Luke 2:30: "mine eyes have seen thy salvation," *i. e.*, *have, "seen the Lord's Christ," the source of salvation*. Cf verse 26. (c). An abstract term is used to represent a concrete reality. Rom. 8:10: "The spirit is *life* because of righteousness," *i. e.*, *the spirit is living*. (d). The virtual is represented as the actual. 1 Cor. 15:31: "I die daily." (e). The name of the container is used to denote the thing contained. 1 Cor. 11:26: "As often as you" "drink the cup."

(5). *Synecdoche*, as well defined by Dr. Blair, is a figure in

which “anything less or anything more is put for the precise object meant.” Its principal varieties, (a). The whole is put for a part. Luke 2:1: “All the world”=Roman Empire, (b). A part is put for the whole. Acts. 27:37: the word “soul,” is used to signify the whole man. (c). The genus is put for species. Mark 16:15: “Creature” or creation=moral and intelligent creature or creation, (d). The species is used to denote the genus. Rom. 1:16: “Greek” =Gentile. (e). A definite number is used for an indefinite 1 Cor. 14:19: “five”=very few; “ten thousand”=very many.

(6). *Antithesis* is a grouping of opposites in a formal contrast. It may be single, twofold, threefold, etc., according to the number of opposite thoughts on each side of the contrast. In Rom. 6:23 we have a threefold, or triple antithesis. “The wages of sin is death; but the free gift of God is eternal life.” This form of antithesis is of very frequent occurrence and often aids greatly in interpretation. The use of the antithetical arrangement as a help to interpretation is subsidiary to the great “Law of Opposition.”

(7). *Paradox* is a figure in which opposites are seemingly affirmed of one and the same subject. “He that finds his life shall lose it.” Matt. 10:39. “When I am weak, then am I strong.” 2 Cor. 12:10. The force of the figure is in the apparent opposition when there is agreement discoverable by considering the difference of meaning in the terms that are employed. When Paul felt his own weakness as a man he could realize that he was “strong in the Lord, and in the strength of his might.”

(8). *Irony* is a figure in which what is meant is the opposite of that which is asserted. “No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you.” Job. 12:2. See also Elijah’s ironical ridicule of the prophets of Baal. 1 Ki. 18:27.

(9). *Allusion* is a figure in which a truth is designated by a sort of indirect ironical application of a name falsely employed by others as descriptive of the subject. 1 Cor. 1:21: “It was God’s

good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save those who believe,” *i. e.*, through what the philosophic Greeks regarded as “foolishness.” See verse 23.

(10). *Hyperbole* is a manifest and impressive exaggeration for the purpose of expressing the full force and increasing the vividness of the subject presented. “Mine eyes run down with rivers of water.” Ps. 119:136.

(11). *Climax* is such an arrangement of matter that the thought, in regular gradation, *rises from a lower to a higher, or falls from a higher to a lower*, conception. Climax ascending: “All are yours; and ye are Christ’s; and Christ is God’s.” 1 Cor. 3:23. Climax descending: “God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, divers kinds of tongues.” 1 Cor. 12:28.

(12). *Personification* is a figure that clothes inanimate objects with the attributes of things animate. “All the trees of the field shall clap their hands.” Is. 55:12.

(13). *Paronomasia* is a play upon words, a figure in which a word is repeated with a variation in the sense. “Follow me; and leave the dead to bury their own dead.” Matt. 8:22.

(14). *Interrogation*, as a figure of speech, is the asking of a question not for information but to make a strong affirmation or denial. “Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect.” Rom. 8:33.

(15). *Anthropomorphism* is a figure which ascribes human features or elements of the human form to God. “The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and his ears unto their supplication. 1 Pet. 3:12.

(16). *Anthropopathy* is a figure that ascribes human affections to God. “It repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart.” Gen. 6:6.

(B). Rules.

24. (1). *The interpreter must carefully distinguish between a figurative word and a figurative thing, not looking for a representative object where a mere figure of speech occurs, and vice versa.* When Paul says of the rock from which the Israelites drank that, “the rock was Christ;” he used no figure of speech but pointed to a representative object as a type of him who is the blessed source of “living water.” And when Ananias said to Saul: “Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name,” he did employ a figure of speech in his use of the term “wash,” but made no reference to baptism as a symbolic ordinance or representative institution, any more than Elisha would have indicated a symbolic institution had he said to Naaman, Go to the Jordan and wash away your leprosy. To use a figure of speech is one thing, and to confer upon some object, or ascribe to it a representative character is wholly a different thing.

25. (2). *We can regard neither a word nor a thing as figurative unless it would involve an absurdity or unreasonable court, to do otherwise.* Fanciful exegesis would soon fill the whole Bible with imaginary tropes and fantastic analogies, if interpreters have no law for legitimate distinction between the literal and the figurative. When Jesus said: “I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman,” we must understand him to speak figuratively for it would be absurd to take his language as literal. And when in the institution of the commemorative supper he said of the loaf: “This is my body,” and of the wine: “This is my blood,” while he does not use a *figure of speech*, he confers on *the things* of which he speaks a figurative significance or clothes them with a *representative or symbolic character*. The manifold and very gross absurdities involved in the supposition that he speaks of the loaf as his actual body and of

the wine as his actual blood ought to lead all men of sense and reflection to see at once that we have here another illustration of the uniform usage which prevails in describing the relation of symbols to things symbolized, as when Paul says of Sarah and Hagar in describing their typical significance: "These women are two covenants," and of the water-furnishing "rock" in the wilderness: "the rock was Christ."

26. (3). *Figures must not be pressed beyond the point or points of resemblance on which is based the lesson intended.* The parables of our Saviour have especially suffered injustice in this respect at the hands of careless interpreters. The true import of a figure must be gathered from the context and the author's design.

27. (4). *The harmony of a figurative description must be preserved throughout its interpretation.* When Paul says to the Corinthians: Ye are "God's building," and then cautions the ministerial builders of this spiritual house to "take heed" as to the kind of materials used in its erection describing the right sort as "gold, silver, costly stones," and the unsuitable kind as "wood, hay, stubble," it is a manifest disregard of the harmony of the figure, and hence a false interpretation, to represent these materials as different doctrines preached by those engaged in building up this personal house composed of believers in Christ. The figure is evidently the same as that used by Peter in saying: "Ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house." 1 Pet. 2:5.

B. Interpretation of Hebrew Poetry.

28. The influence of Hebrew modes of thought and expression even upon the literature of the New Testament is seen in the reproduction of the poetic parallelism of the Hebrews, and erroneous exegesis has sometimes resulted from a failure to recognize this literary phenomenon. Bishop Lowth, we believe, was the first to point out this striking characteristic of Hebrew poetry. He distinguished three forms of poetic parallelism and to these a fourth

form has been added by Bishop Jebb. Parallelism is such an arrangement of corresponding expressions that there is “a certain equality, resemblance or relationship between the members of each period; so that in two lines or members of the same period, things shall answer to things, and words to words, as if fitted to each other by a kind of rule or measure.” The following are its several forms.

19. (1). *Synonymous Parallelism* is the substantial presentation of the same thought under different forms of expression. “When the Lord brings back the captivity of his people, Then shall Jacob rejoice, and Israel shall be glad.” Ps. 14:7. “Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.” Is. 2:3. See this form of Hebrew parallelism reflected in one of many examples in the New Testament: “With the heart man. believes unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.” Rom. 10:10. Manifestly, in the writer’s mind, the passage “unto salvation” through confession is the passage “unto righteousness” through belief, and each of the two parallel expressions implies much more than it asserts. Earnest faith in the heart puts one in the way that leads to “righteousness,” or “salvation and sincere confession of that faith with the mouth commits one to the same way, and so leads on to the same blissful result.

30. (2). *Antithetic Parallelism* is that in which the two members “correspond, one with another, by an opposition of terms and sentiments.” Is. 1:19, 20: “If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land: but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword.” This form of parallelism is identical with the figure of antithesis.

31. (3). *Synthetic or Constructive Parallelism* is that in which the correspondence of several’ parallel members is maintained by a further development in each of the main thought expressed in the first. “The law of the Lord is perfect, restoring the soul: The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The precepts

of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring for ever: the judgements of the Lord are true, and righteous altogether.” Ps. 19:7-9. Of this and the two preceding forms of parallelism Bishop Jebb observes that “separately, each kind admits of many subordinate varieties,” and that “in combinations of verses, the several kinds are perpetually intermingled; circumstances which at once enliven and beautify the composition, and frequently give peculiar distinctness and precision to the train of thought.”

32. (4). *Introverted Parallelism* is that in which the stanzas are so arranged that, whatever may be their number, the first will be parallel with the last, the second with the next to the last, and so on towards the center. The following suffices for illustration:

“My son, if thine heart be wise,
My heart shall be glad, even mine:
Yea, my reins shall rejoice,
When thy lips speak right things.”

Prov. 23:15, 16

C. Interpretation of Prophecy.

33. In speaking of Hermeneutics as a science involving principles which properly applied conduct the interpreter to conclusions which cannot, any more than other scientific results, be accepted on the ground of authoritative decision or dogmatic dictation, exceptional reference was made to a kind of interpretation that does not strictly come within the province of ordinary exegesis. Inspired exposition of typical arrangements, of prophetic symbolism, or of unfulfilled predictions must, of course, be received on the authority of the inspired interpreter; and as with the supernatural *interpretation* of prophecy, so with the superhuman origin of prophecy itself. The power to penetrate the realm of the supernatural rises above the mere application of scientific meth-

ods. “No prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit.” 2 Pet. 1:20, 21. Now to ignore the two limitations here indicated and to use this passage in opposition to the individual right of interpreting the Scriptures in general under the safe guidance of Hermeneutical laws, is to be guilty of dishonest trifling both with the word of God and with the highest interests of mankind. The passage expressly limits what it says to “prophecy of Scripture,” and in the reason assigned for the assertion made in the case it still further restricts what it says to the *origin* of prophetic utterance in unfolding that which was previously unknown. It affirms that this supernatural interpretation, or unravelment of divine counsels, was not subject to human option and hence proceeded, not from human foresight, but from the illuminating power of inspiration under which “men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit.” But in the context of this passage we learn that we have this “word of prophecy made more sure,” or confirmed in the explanatory light of its fulfilment, to which as thus easily understood by ordinary interpretation men may “take heed, *as unto a lamp shining in a dark place.*”

34. (1). Accordingly the first guiding principle, or rule, on this subject may be stated as follows: *The full meaning of prophecy may be found by ordinary intelligence only in the clear light of its undoubted fulfilment.* It required the thrilling scenes of Calvary to explain the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. Even the prophets themselves “sought and searched diligently” as to the full import of much that was announced through them by the Spirit when “it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow them.”

35. (2). *But in many prophecies there is a blending of type and anti-type indicating a twofold fulfilment, the one temporal and partial and the other spiritual and complete.* To interpret predictions without reference to this prophetic feature, as do rationalistic exegetes, is not

only to fail to give such explanation as the terms of many of them demand, but also it is to set aside the authoritative exposition of inspired interpreters. Thus Peter, commenting, in Acts 2:25-31, on the language employed by David, in Ps. 16:8-10, shows that the expressions used by the psalmist in reference to himself could only apply to him as the type of Christ who as “the fruit of his loins” would come forth to fulfil the prophecy as no other ever had or ever could. David’s existing tomb stood as monumental evidence of the fact that his flesh had seen corruption and that his soul had not been called from the spirit land into a reunion with his body and that therefore the resurrection which he predicted had not been fulfilled in his own person, but in that of his greater Son, the antitype in prophetic view. A similar double reference is found in the Saviour’s predictions concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, recorded in Matthew 24, enabling us to understand what would otherwise remain inexplicable. In connection with his description of the overthrow of the doomed city he refers, especially in ver. 29-33, to events that have not as yet taken place and then, in ver. 34, says: “Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all these things be accomplished.” In the fearful and tremendous destruction of Jerusalem, many of the Saviour’s prophetic expressions found a literal fulfilment while the rest were typically fulfilled in this dreadful foreshadowing of the final overthrow of the wicked.

36. (3). Arising from the relation of the prophet to the matters predicted by him appears another peculiar feature of prophetic discourse that must be taken into account to understand correctly much of this kind of Biblical literature. *In a sort of figurative way the prophet himself is represented as doing that which results, either directly or indirectly, from his divinely authorized announcements.* “Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and turn again, and be healed.” Is. 6:9, 10. Now the Saviour him-

self in quoting and applying this language has clearly brought out its true meaning. In Matt. 13:14, 15, we read his infallible exposition of the passage: "Unto them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, which says, by hearing ye shall hear, and shall in no wise understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall in no wise perceive: For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest haply they should perceive with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should turn again, and I should, heal them." Even the event that is directly predicted is ascribed, on the principle under consideration, to the agency of the prophet because of the certainty of its following his unerring announcement. Hence the form of expression employed by Jehovah in giving Jeremiah his prophetic commission: "See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to pluck up and to break down, and to destroy and to overthrow; to build, and to plant." Jer. 1:10. This figurative representation of the matter finds its justification in the fact that, since the predicted event, when near at hand, always followed the prophetic announcement before the very eyes of beholders, the prophet himself seemed to bring it about. It was, no doubt, on this account that wicked kings of Israel and of Judah often held the prophets responsible for the state of things that followed and harmonized with their predictions.

THE EXEGETICAL ANALYSIS EXPLAINED

As prefatory to the analysis of the Epistles presented in the following pages it seems proper to give some explanation of the nature and object of this exegetical process. Expositors are in the habit, to some extent, of dividing the text, as the drift of the sense may indicate, into sections and paragraphs; but this needful work is not deemed sufficient, and our analysis accordingly is pushed much further and made far more minute. Effort is made to take hold of and exhibit the very fibers of thought that enter into the constitution of each paragraph: to enumerate these ideal elements and express their relation to one another. Suppose a writer makes a statement and then gives a reason and afterwards illustrates either the affirmation or the reason assigned, we will have before us three distinct elements of thought which may be numbered and their connection set forth. Suppose one of these elements has two distinct features, one positive, for example, and the other negative, the analysis may designate these two sub-elements respectively as (a) and (b). Suppose either of these sub-elements should be susceptible of division still more minute, we could indicate this by the letters (a) and (b), etc., as far as the division may extend. And suppose further that an element of thought marked by any of these letters should be substantially repeated by way of explanation or otherwise, this repetition may be indicated by a repetition of the appropriate letter in connection with the figure. We illustrate from 1 Cor. 3. 1: The religious state of the Corinthians described—"And I, brethren, (a) could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, (b) but as unto carnal, (b²) as unto babes in Christ."

We thus see that among the elements of thought composing a paragraph there are some that are more or less complex and

hence in each instance susceptible of analysis into divisions and sub-divisions as far as the nature of the case will admit. And the analysis will disclose the number of elements in every paragraph and their significance in relation to each other. The exegetical student is thus enabled to follow closely the connection and sequence of thought on which a correct interpretation so largely depends, and in this way the exegetical analysis itself, apart from answers to questions at the end of the paragraphs, will furnish the much greater part of the exegesis. It appears therefore better to undergo this labor than to rest satisfied with the divisions of sections into paragraphs with notes or answers to queries appended to each. In the work as printed for the use of the class room the queries will, in a large measure, remain unanswered to develop in students, as far as possible, their capacity to think with the aid of the references given.

Now and then in the analysis an element will present itself in which the main assertion will be broken by modifying clauses where transposition will be necessary for the expression of subelements. But this occasional transposition will be the only liberty taken with the text, which will generally be followed as translated in the Revised Version. Where there are important deviations from this, the best of all Versions, such departures will either be vindicated in answers to queries or reference will be made to some standard author in a foot-note as justifying the rendering. The aim in this book is, of course, not to undertake the work of translation but simply that of interpretation. Yet all who have given sufficient attention to the matter or who have prosecuted to any considerable extent the labor of an exegete will indorse the statement that the correct rendering of a passage is sometimes found to depend, in no little degree, upon the right interpretation. It would not be difficult to show that erroneous translations of passages here and there have proceeded from a failure to apply faithfully to the original the laws of Hermeneutics.

**ANALYSIS OF
FIRST
CORINTHIANS**

SECTION FIRST

THE INTRODUCTION

1:1-9

I. The Apostolic Greeting, 1:1-3.

1. The writer officially described=Paul, (a) called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ (B) through the will of God, 1.

2. Designation of his associate=and Sosthenes our brother,

3. Description of those immediately addressed=unto the church of God which is at Corinth, (a) to those who are sanctified in Christ Jesus, (b) called to be saints, 3.

4. Those remotely addressed=with all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place, their Lord and ours:

5. Benediction=Grace to you and peace (a) from God our Father (b) and the Lord Jesus Christ. 3.

Queries.

(1). What the apostle's idea of a church of Christ, as seen from its two characteristics, in element 3; ver. 3? See also 1. Pet. 2:5.

(2). What is it to be "sanctified in Christ Jesus"? 3.

Among the Jews whatever was set apart to God was sanctified, and in the higher spiritual setting apart in Christ the cleansing through his blood is required and in Christian usage this last has become the leading thought. *Cf.* Heb. 13:12. The modern conceit of sinless perfection does not enter into Scriptural usage. *Cf.* 1 Jno. 1:8. Some, indeed, who are here said to be "sanctified in Christ" were only spiritual babes. *Cf.* 3:1.

(3). How does Paul's use here of the term "saint" differ from the Romish perversion of the word? 2.

(4). What implied in the extension of the teaching of the Epistle to "all who in every place call upon the name of the Lord

Jesus Christ”?

(5). What implied in associating the Son with the Father as the source of grace “and peace”? 3. Cf. Jno. 14:9-11; Philippians 2:6.

II. Expression of Gratitude on Account of the Spiritual Advantages of the Corinthians, 1:4-9

1. Thanksgiving=I thank my God always concerning you, 4.
2. Ground and occasion of the gratitude=for the grace of God which was given you in Christ Jesus;
3. This grace specified—that in everything you were enriched in him, (a) in all utterance (b) and all knowledge; 5.
4. Ground of this enrichment—even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you: 6.
5. Consequence=(a) so that you come behind in no gift; (b) waiting for the revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ; 7.
6. Encouraging assurance—who shall also confirm you unto the end, 8.
7. Ulterior result—that ye be unproveable in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.
8. Ground of this assurance=God is faithful, through whom you were called into the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. 9.

Queries.

(1). What the Scriptural import of the word grace and how used in element 2; ver. 4?

(a). See Eph. 2:4-7; Tit. 3:4-7, for its proper meaning, (b). Here, as seen in ver. 4, 5, applied to the effect in believers.

(2). How wait for the revealing, or coming, of the Lord Jesus?
7.

(a). Not necessarily expecting this during their own lifetime as this would conflict with 2 Thes. 2:1-5; 2 Pet. 3:4-10. (b). But ever holding themselves in readiness for that great day, not knowing

when it might come. Cf. 2 Pet. 3:11-14; Matt. 24:30-42.

(3). What the character of the promise in elements 6, 7; ver. 7, 8?

Absolute in form but conditional in sense. Cf. Ezek. 33:13-16.

SECTION SECOND

CONCERNING PARTISAN STRIFE AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

1:10-4:21

I. Exhortation to Christian Unity and Reproof of Party Spirit, 1:10-17.

1. Motive to enforce the exhortation=Now I beseech you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, 10.

2. Contents of the exhortation=(A) that you all speak the same thing, (b) and that there be no divisions among you; (b²) but that you be perfected together (a) in the same mind (b) and in the same judgement.

3. Occasion of the exhortation=For it has been signified unto me concerning you, my brethren, by those who are of the household of Chloe, that there are contentions among you. 11.

4. Explanation=Now this I mean, (a) that each one of you says, I am of Paul; (b) and I of Apollos; (c) and I of Cephas; (d) and I of Christ. 12.

5. Folly of this emphatically exposed=(a) Is Christ divided? (b) was Paul crucified for you? (c) or were ye baptized into the name of Paul? 13.

6. Ground of thanksgiving in view of their course=I thank God that I baptized none of you, save Crispus and Gaius; 14.

7. Explanatory reason=lest any man should say that you were

baptized into my name. 15.

8. Parenthetical statement on an appeal to memory=(a) And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: (b) besides, I know not whether I baptized any other. 16.

9. The fact of his baptizing but few accounted for=For Christ sent me (a) not to baptize, (b) but to preach the gospel: 17.

Queries.

(1). Why exhort to unity through the name of Christ? 10.

Consult verse 12 and consider the relation of this name to spiritual oneness.

(2). How possible to “be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgement”? 10.

Notice what is condemned and apply the “Law of Opposition.”

(3). Why include among the partisans those who claimed to be “of Christ”? 12.

(4). State the logical force of the questions “was Paul crucified for you?” and “were ye baptized into the name of Paul?”

(5). What bearing has Paul’s lack of memory here, ver. 16, upon the question of his inspiration? 16.

Consult Jno. 14:26 as to when the memory of apostles would be touched by the Spirit. It was not necessary that they should be inspired except as to matters that vitally concerned their teaching.

(6). How not sent to baptize? and how did baptism stand related to his commission?

As one sent “to preach the gospel” he was to preach baptism among other duties required by the gospel, but not specially to administer it with his own hands. And he rejoiced that providentially this important work was mainly committed to others lest the Corinthians should seem to have some apology for their improper use of his name. “It is evident,” says Alford, “that this is said in no derogation of baptism, for he did on occasion baptize—and it would be impossible that he should speak lightly of the ordinance to which he appeals (Rom. 6:3) as the seal of our union with

Christ.” The context, indeed, clearly shows that Paul is not aiming to disparage baptism, but to rebuke the Corinthians for exalting human names to the position of that divine name which in the great commission stands connected with this ordinance. “Were ye baptized into the name of Paul”? Wear that name alone into which you were baptized (Matt. 28:19.) and thus be undivided in recognizing the lordship of Jesus alone.

(7). What bearing has the teaching of this paragraph on the now existing denominationalism?

II. The Doctrine of the Cross and Its True Mode of Presentation as Opposed to Partisan Tendencies 1:17-31.

1. Concluding element of last paragraph as transitional to this=Christ sent me (a) not to baptize, (b) but to preach the gospel: 17.

2. The manner required=not in wisdom of words,

3. Explanatory reason=lest the cross of Christ should be made void.

4. The correct presentation justified by the nature of the gospel=(a) For the doctrine of the cross is to those who are perishing foolishness; (b) but unto us who are being saved it is the power of God. 18.

5. Scriptural anticipation of its effect=For it is written, (a) I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, (b) and the prudence of the prudent will I reject. 19.

6. Evidence of the fulfilment of this prediction=(A) Where is the wise? (a) where is the scribe? (b) where is thrf disputer of this world? (b) has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world? 20.

7. Occasion and manner of this fulfilment=For seeing that in the wisdom of God (a) the world through its wisdom knew not God, (b) it was God’s good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save those who believe. 21.

8. This failure of the world to know God in its own way practically evinced=(a) Seeing that Jews ask for signs, (b) and Greeks

seek after wisdom: 22.

9. Their consequent rejection of the divine way=but we preach Christ crucified, (a) unto Jews a stumblingblock, (b) and unto the Gentiles foolishness; 23.

10. The effect different when their own methods are abandoned=but unto those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, (a) Christ the power of God, (b) and the wisdom of God. 24.

11. Ground of this result=Because (a) the foolishness of God is wiser than men; (b) and the weakness of God is stronger than men. 25.

12. Practical illustrative proof on the negative side=For behold your calling, brethren, how that not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: 26.

13. Continued on the positive side=(A) but (a) God chose the foolish things of the world, (b) that he might put to shame those that are wise; (b) and (a) God chose the weak things of the world, (b) that he might put to shame the things that are strong; (c) and the lowly things of the world, and the things that are despised, did God choose, (a) yea and the things that are not, (b) that he might bring to nought the things that are: 27, 28.

14. The negative result thus gained=that no flesh should glory before God. 29.

15. Underlying ground as seen in God's relation to us=But of him are you in Christ Jesus, 30.

16. And brought out more clearly in Christ's relation to us =who was made unto us (a) wisdom from God, (b) and righteousness (c) and sanctification, (d) and redemption:

17. Positive result=that, according as it is written, He that glories, let him glory in the Lord. 31.

Queries.

(1). How the cross of Christ "made void" by the wisdom of words? 17.

(a). It would lay a human rather than a divine basis of faith, 2:4, 5. (b). It would fail to crucify the flesh which it does when

rightly presented. Gal. 6:14.

(2). Account for the expression “the foolishness of the preaching.” 21. Cf. 23.

(3). What the “doctrine of the cross”?¹ 18.

(a). As described in 23, 24, it is that in the preaching of the cross or death of Christ which was “a stumblingblock” to Jews and “foolishness” to Greeks, but to believers, the saving wisdom and power of God in Christ, (b). As more fully described in 30 it is that wherein Christ is “made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption.” (c). A chief element of this “doctrine of the cross” is emphasized by Peter when he says: (1 Pet. 2:24) that Christ “bear our sins in his body upon the tree,” identifying this with Isaiah’s prophetic evangelism that “with his stripes we are healed.” This same “doctrine of the cross” is as offensive to-rationalists in our time as it was in the days of Paul.

III. Exemplification of These Principles in the Apostle’s Preaching at Corinth, 2:1-5.

1. Description of his manner of preaching=And I, brethren, when I came unto you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, proclaiming to you the mystery of God. 1.

2. This required by the nature of his theme=For I determined (a) not to know anything among you, (b) save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. 2.

3. Disclaims anything as due to his own efficiency=And I was with you (a) in weakness, (b) and in fear, (c) and in much trembling. 3.

4. Fuller description of his manner of preaching=And my speech and my preaching (a) were not in persuasive words of wisdom, (b) but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: 4.

5. End in view=that your faith should not stand (a) in the

¹ Logos staurou=stauology=Cross-doctrine: the religious meaning of the cross and not simply the story of the crucifixion. Hence, Alford’s rendering, “doctrine of the cross” is preferable to that of the Revised Version, “word of the cross.”

wisdom of men, (b) but in the power of God. 5.

Queries.

(1). Why speak of the testimony concerning Christ as “the mystery of God”? 1. *Cf.* 7-12.

(2). When Paul asserts that in his preaching he knew only Jesus Christ, why add; “*and him crucified*”? 2.

See above on “the doctrine of the cross.” To Paul, evidently, Christ was no Christ at all apart from his death.

(3). What, according to the context, is *excluded*, and how much is *included*, in limiting preaching to “Jesus Christ, and him crucified”?

All that is foreign to the gospel like the philosophic wisdom of the Greeks, is certainly excluded. But the idea that Christ himself may be placed in contrast with any element of his own teaching, or any requirements of his gospel never entered into the mind of Paul.

(4). How the apostle in weakness, and in fear while at Corinth? *Cf.* Acts 18:9, 10.

(5). How was his preaching “in demonstration of the spirit and of power”? 4.

Note the antithesis which will preclude limitation to miraculous manifestations.

IV. Concerning the Wisdom of God and the Method of Its Importation, 2:6-16.

1. A claim to higher wisdom asserted=Howbeit we speak wisdom among the perfect: 6.

2. This wisdom negatively described=yet a wisdom (a) not of this world, (b) nor of the rulers of this world, which are coming to nought:

3. Positively described=(A) but we speak God’s wisdom (a) in a mystery, (a²) even the wisdom that has been hidden, (b) which God foreordained before the worlds unto our glory: (b²) which none of the rulers of this world knows: 7, 8.

4. Proof of their ignorance in the case=for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory: 8.

5. Scriptural evidence that this divine wisdom was utterly unknown.=*(a)* but [we speak] as it is written, *(b)* [speaking] things *(a)* which eye saw not, *(b)* and ear heard not, *(c)* and which entered not into the heart of man, *(a b c)* Whatsoever things God prepared for those who love him. 9.

6. The divine method of making them known=But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit: 10.

7. Ground of the Spirit's agency in the case=*(a)* for the Spirit searches all things, *(b)* yea, the depths of God.²

8. Simile illustrating the unique relation of the Spirit to these things=*(a)* For who among men knows the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him? *(b)* even so the things of God none knows, save the Spirit of God. 11.

9. Consequent need of apostolic enduement with spiritual power=*(a)* But we received, *(a)* not the spirit of the world, *(b)* but the spirit which is of God; *(b)* that we might know the things that are freely given to us by God. 12.

10. The next step in this process of communication described =Which things also we speak, *(a)* not in words taught by man's wisdom, *(b)* but in words taught by the Holy Spirit; *(b²)* combining spiritual things with spiritual. 13.

11. Though thus brought to all, this divine wisdom is still unknown to some=Now the natural man receives not the things of the Spirit of God: 14.

12. Explanatory reason=for they are foolishness unto him; 14.

13. The underlying cause=*(a)* and he cannot know them, *(b)* because they are spiritually judged.

14. The high plane of the spiritual man in contrast=*(a)* But he that is spiritual judges all things, *(b)* and he himself is judged of no man [that is not spiritual]. 15.

² "Depths of God" is Green's rendering and brings out the force and beauty of the passage. As the depths of the sea must be explored to bring forth the hidden treasures, so with the depths of God.

15. Evidence of this=(A) For who (a) has known the mind of the Lord, (b) that he should instruct him? (b) But we have the mind of Christ. 16.

Queries.

(1). Who “the perfect” that are capable of understanding the divine wisdom? ver. 6. Cf. 3:1.

(2). Show from ver. 7-11 that the term “mystery” in Scriptural usage denotes the undiscoverable, rather than the incomprehensible, matters of revelation as distinguished from that which may be known through philosophy or science.

(3). How the spiritual things spoken “in words taught by the Holy Spirit”? 13.

(a). Not that the Spirit dropped, as it were, every word into the minds of the apostles, for this would be irreconcilable with differences of style on their part. (b). But, as the context shows, the Spirit so guarded the faculty of expression as to preclude the use of unsuitable terms, just as it influenced the memory only when it became necessary.

(4). Who “the natural man” that regarded the divine wisdom as “foolishness”? 14. Cf. 1:23.

(5). Show that the spiritual man is not the converted man as distinguished from the unconverted-not the regenerate as such. 15. Cf. 3:1.

(6). Explain, accordingly, the incapacity both of the natural man (1:14) and of the “babes in Christ” (3:1) for judging spiritual things.

(a). The former by using a false standard of measurement, philosophic wisdom, rejected the only means of spiritual enlightenment. (b). The latter, though accepting the true means, had made only a beginning of Christian development. The full grown or spiritually enlightened stands in contrast with both. Hence the incapacity for properly judging of spiritual things was due to lack of training (ver. 2, 3) not to any native or constitutional defect.

V. Reproof of the Corinthians for Lack of Spiritual Wisdom as Evinced by Their Carnal Divisions, 3:1-4.

1. Description of their religious state=And I, brethren, could not speak unto you (a) as unto spiritual, (b) but as unto carnal, (b²) as unto babes in Christ. 1.

2. The teaching adapted to this infantile condition=(a) I fed you with milk, (b) not with meat; 2.

3. Explanatory reason=(a) for ye were not able to bear it: (b) nay, not even now are ye able; (b²) for ye are yet carnal: 2, 3.

4. Proof of this=for whereas (a) there is among you jealousy and strife, (b) are ye not carnal, (b²) and walk after the manner of men? 3.

5. More specific statement of this proof=For are ye not men?

(a) When one says, I am of Paul; (b) and another, I am of Apollos; 4.

Queries.

(1). How “babes in Christ,” *i. e.*, *regenerate persons*, said to be “carnal”? 1.

Apply here-the third “Verbal Canon” and “Law of Opposition.”

(2). How carnal “babes” to become spiritual men? *Cf.* 1 Pet. 2:2.

(3). What light does the inability of these “carnal” persons to receive higher spiritual birth throw on 2:14?

VI. Proper Estimate of Ministers as Determined by Their Work. 3:5-15.

1. Office of Paul and Apollos=(a) What then is Apollos? and what is Paul? (a b) Ministers through whom ye believed; 5.

2. True source of their ministerial efficiency=and each as the Lord gave to him.

3. Their work metaphorically described=(a) I planted, (b)

Apollos watered; 6.

4. Result due to divine agency alone—but God gave the increase.

5. Logical conclusion=(a) So then neither is he that plants anything, (a²) neither he that waters; (b) but God that gives the increase? 7.

6. Equality of ministers with only a difference of labour and reward=(a) Now he that plants and he that waters are one: (b) but each shall receive his own reward according to his own labour. 8.

7. Their subordination to God in their ministerial equality =God's co-workers [with each other] we are: 9.

8. Consequent assertion of the divine sovereignty over the Corinthian church=(A) God's husbandry ye are, (n) God's building.

9. Metaphorical description of his own work at Corinth= I laid a foundation; (a) according to the grace of God which was given unto me, (b) as a wise masterbuilder 10.

10. The work of others who came after him—and another builds thereon.

11. A caution to these—but let each man take heed how he builds thereon.

12. Reason for not extending this caution to the work of laying the foundation=(a) For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, (b) which is Jesus Christ. 11.

13. Ground of the caution just given—but if any man builds on the foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble; (a) each man's work shall be made manifest: (b) for the day shall declare it, (b²) because it is revealed in fire; (a²) .and the fire itself shall prove each man's work of what sort it is. 12, 13.

14. Statement of consequences=(a) If any man's work shall abide which he built thereon, he shall receive a reward. (b) If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: 14, 15.

15. The result as to the builder—but he himself shall be saved; 15.

16. Condition of this result—yet so as through fire.

Queries.

(1). Through what instrumentality came the faith and consequently the salvation of the Corinthians? Cf. 5; 1:21.

(2). While being thus honored as instruments in the work of salvation how can it be said that neither is he that plants nor he who waters anything? 7.

It is not they in any measure, but God altogether who gives the increase. Apply Law of Opposition.

(3). Vindicate against Alford and others the view given in the analysis of the “fellow-workers” mentioned in ver. 9.

To suppose that it is “contrary to usage” to represent here the planter (Paul) and the waterer (Apollos) as co-workers with each other under God as his servants in this fellowship of service is to beg the question and that too in the face of two very clear proofs to the contrary supplied by the passage itself and its context. (a). The emphasis in the original is upon the word God three times used and placed each time at the beginning of a clause; “*God’s* fellow-workers we are: *God’s* husbandry you are, *God’s* building.” The construction is exceptional in placing the genitive in the first place with strong emphasis and there is no usage elsewhere similar to it. Paul had said that “he who plants and he who waters are one,” as co-workers in the fellowship of the same service. Well, whose laborers are they as thus co-working with, each other? The answer emphatically is “*God’s*.” (b). The whole context shows that Paul is here exposing the overestimate of ministers by the Corinthians in virtually elevating them above the sphere of minister or servant to that of Lord. “Neither is he who plants anything, neither he who waters; but God who gives the increase.” To represent them therefore *in this connection* as “fellow-workers with God” would be utterly foreign to the drift of thought and rather confirmatory of the Corinthian idea.

(4). As the building here referred to is personal (ver. 9 and 16) what are the materials that enter into it?

It is strange that Commentators in general represent these as “various matters of doctrine” proclaimed by the ministerial

builders. Meyer, for example, after presenting this view says: "Our exposition is, in fact, a *necessity*, because it alone keeps the whole figure in harmony with itself throughout. For if the *foundation* which is laid be the contents of the first preaching of the gospel, namely *Christ*, then the *material wherewith the building is carried on* must be the contents of *the further instruction given.*" This exposition, instead of being a "necessity" by preserving "the whole figure in harmony with itself throughout" is, in fact, an absurdity through the *destruction* of that very harmony. If, as Meyer admits, "the building is the *church*, ver. 9, which is being built * * * the church as a building with a personal foundation, and consisting of persons" how can doctrines rather than persons be regarded as the materials that enter into this building? And as Christ is confessedly, "a personal foundation," it cannot be instruction concerning Christ that constitutes this foundation, nor "the further instruction given" that constitutes the material of the building. The simple conception is that Christ is presented not as a doctrine but as a person, and believers are represented as being brought through a personal faith into personal relations with Christ himself; and this is the building of which the apostle speaks.

(5). How are these materials to be tested by fire and how classified with reference to this test? 13.

We need not suppose any reference to the fire of the final judgement as do expositors in general; for whether the work of each builder will prove to be genuine and so abide as incombustible gold, silver and costly stones, in the presence of fire; or worthless, as combustible wood, hay and stubble will be determined by a fire in this world. *Cf.* 1 Pet. 4:2; 1:6, 7.

(6). How the builder suffer loss, if his work is burned?

Examine the antithesis. Suffer the loss of his reward.

(7). How will the builder himself be saved as through fire? 15. If he comes out of it as gold and does not perish as stubble or hay.

(8). How can worthless material as wood, hay and stubble be said to be built upon Christ? 12-14.

Just as the dead branch is mechanically connected with the true vine. Jno. xv. 2.

VII. Indication of the Source of the Pernicious Tendencies at Corinth and Admonitions Respecting the Same. 3:16-23.

1. The sacredness of God's people intimated=Know ye not (a) that ye are a temple of God, (b) and that the Spirit of God dwells in you? 16.

2. A warning indicative of this sacredness=If any man destroys the temple of God, him shall God destroy; 17.

3. Explanatory ground of this warning=(a) for the temple of God is holy, (b) which temple ye are.

4. Admonition touching the true source of this mischief= Let no man deceive himself, (a) If any man thinks that he is wise among you in this world, (b) let him become a fool, that he may become wise. 18.

5. The admonition justified=For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. 19.

6. Scriptural evidence of this statement=(a) For it is written, He that takes the wise in their own craftiness: (Job 5:13) (b) and again, The Lord knows the reasonings of the wise, that they are vain. 19, 20; Ps. 94:11.

7. Hortatory conclusion=Wherefore let no one glory in men. 21.

8. Explanatory reason=For all things are yours; (a) whether Paul, (b) or Apollos, (c) or Cephas, (d) or the world, (e) or life, (f) or death, (g) or things present, (h) or things to come; 21, 22.

9. Reason expanded into climax=(a) all are yours; (b) and ye are Christ's; (c) and Christ is God's. 22, 23.

Queries.

(1). What, according to the context, is the difference between the use of the word "temple" in ver. 16, and its use in 6:19?

(2). How is one to "become a fool that he may become wise"?

ver. 18, 19. Cf. 2:6.

VIII. Corollary of the Foregoing Discussion .Selling Forth the True View of Ministerial Worth and Responsibility. 4:1-5.

1. Correct estimate of himself and his co-workers=Let a man so account of us, (a) as of ministers of Christ, (b) and stewards of the mysteries of God. 1.

2. Chief requisite in the case=Here, moreover, it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful. 2.

3. This test not subjected to human judgement=But with me it is a very small thing (a) that I should be judged of you, (b) or of man's judgement: (b²) yea, I judge not mine own self. 3.

4. Reason for regarding such judgement as inapplicable= For I know nothing against myself; (a) yet am I not hereby justified: (b) but he that judges me is the Lord. 4.

5. Consequent admonition=Wherefore judge nothing before the lime, until the Lord come, 5.

6. Ground of his just judgement in the case=who will (a) both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, (b) and make manifest the counsels of the hearts;

7. Final result=and then shall each man have his praise from God.

Queries.

(1). What the nature of the faithfulness demanded of the Lord's ministerial "stewards"? 2.

(a). In the light of 2 Tim. 2:2 as compared with 1 Tim. 4:16, among other passages, it may be seen that nothing short of an unswerving adherence to the simple gospel of Christ is divinely regarded as filling the required measure of this faithfulness. (b). And from this it is clear that a false religious liberalism that would tamper with the affairs of God is paralleled only by the "unrighteous steward" of Luke 16:1-12 who was very liberal with the property of another!

(2). How “judge nothing” “until the Lord shall come”? 5. Here apply the Law of Opposition.

IX. Reasons for Lowliness Unforced by a Contrast between the Assumed Self-sufficiency of the Corinthians and the Real Condition of the Apostles. 4:6-13.

1. Mode of handling his theme=Now these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and Apollos for your sakes; 6.

2. His object in this=that in us you might lean: not to go beyond the things which are written;

3. Ulterior end=that no one of you be puffed up for the one against the other.

4. Argument against this partisan emulation=(a) For who makes thee to differ? (a²) and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? (b) but (a) if thou didst receive it, (b) why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received it? 7.

5. Derision of their self-sufficiency by an ironical climax= (a) Already are you filled, (b) already you are become rich, (c) you have reigned without us: 8.

6. Serious wish parenthetically inserted=(a) yea .and I would that you did reign, (b) that we also might reign with you.

7. Reason for this in continued parenthesis=For, I think, (a) God has set forth us the apostles last of all, as men doomed to death: (b) for we are made a spectacle unto the world, (a) even to angels, (b) and to men. 9.

8. Ironical derision resumed=(a) We are fools for Christ's sake, but you are wise in Christ; (b) we are weak, but you are strong; (c) you have glory, but we have dishonour. 10.

9. The last thought expanded in a literal description=Even unto this present hour (a) we both hunger, and thirst, (b) and are naked, (c) and are buffeted, (d) and have no certain dwelling-place; (e) and we toil, working with our own hands: 11,12.

10. Description of their deportment under this treatment=(a) being reviled, we bless; (b) being persecuted, we endure; (c) being

defamed, we intreat: 12, 13.

11. This picture of apostolic suffering for others completed in climax—(a) we are made as the filth of the world, (b) the off-scouring of all things, even until now. 13.

Queries.

(1). Was the transfer of the matters here considered a transfer to Paul and Apollos as only some of those concerned or a transfer of that to them which wholly pertained to others? 6. Cf. 1. 14-17.

(2). How “not to go beyond what is written” in our esteem for men? 6. Cf. 1:31.

(3). Explain the argument in element 4; ver. 7, against partisan emulation.

Granting the excellency that was claimed whence was it derived? Glory in nothing borrowed.

X. The Apostle’s Explanation of the Character and Spirit of His Re-proofs and Admonitions, 4:14-21.

1. His purpose in what he had written=(a) I write not these things to shame you, (b) but to admonish you as my beloved children. 14.

2. Justification of this parental mode of address=(a) For though you should have ten thousand tutors in Christ, (b) yet have ye not many fathers: (b²) for in Christ Jesus I begat you through the gospel. 15.

3. Exhortation based on this, his relation to them=I beseech you therefore, be ye imitators of me. 16.

4. Reference to a paternal effort as already made to secure this end=For this cause have I sent unto you Timothy, (a) who is my beloved and faithful child in the Lord, (b) who shall put you in remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, 17.

5. More specific indication of the “ways” referred to=even as I teach everywhere in every church.

6. A false view of Timothy’s mission alluded to=Now some

are puffed up, as though I were not coming to you. 18.

7. Avowal of his purpose in opposition to this=But I will come to you shortly, if the Lord will; 19.

8. Predicted result=and I will know, (a) not the word of those who are puffed up, (b) but the power.

9. Ground of this procedure=For the kingdom of God (a) is not in word, (b) but in power. 20.

10. Alternative as to the manner of his coming submitted=What will your (a) shall I come unto you with a rod, (b) or in love (b²) and a spirit of meekness? 21.

Queries.

(1). Comparing 4:15 with 3:5 what do we learn as to the spiritual results of Paul's ministry, and what light is thus thrown on the subject of spiritual influence?

(2). What special propriety in the reference in this connection to Timothy as the apostle's son in the faith? 17.

A father sends one child to other children (ver. 15) in thoughtful manifestation of parental tenderness.

SECTION THIRD

CONCERNING LICENTIOUSNESS

5:1-6:20

I. Censure of the Deliberate Toleration of a Gross Case of Incest. 5:1-8.

1. Ground of complaint=It is actually reported (a) that there is fornication among you, (b) and such fornication as is not even among the Gentiles, (b²) that one of you has his father's wife. 1.

2. Their state of mind in the pretence of this sin=(a) And you

are puffed up, (b) and did not rather mourn, that he who had done this deed might be taken away from among you. 3.

3. The apostle's position in reference to this matter=For I verily, being absent in body but present in spirit, have already, as though I were present, judged him that has so wrought this thing, 3.

4. Consequent decision in the case=in the name of our Lord Jesus, you being gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus, to deliver such a one unto Satan 4, 5.

5. Object of this=(a) for the destruction of the flesh, (b) that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. 5.

6. Contrast between their supposed excellency and their real condition as resulting from this sin=(a) Your glorying is not good. (b) Know you not that a little leaven leavens the whole lump? 6.

7. Consequent exhortation=(a) Purge out the old leaven, (b) that you may be a new lump, (b²) even as you are [by profession] unleavened. 7.

8. Ground of this exhortation=For our passover also has been sacrificed, even Christ:

9. Hortatory conclusion=wherefore let us keep the feast, (a) not with old leaven, (a²) neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, (b) but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth. 8.

Queries.

(1). Why the allegation in ver. 2 that the Corinthians were "puffed up"? 2.

Paul had *already*, especially in 4:6-8, referred to this self-conceit and supercilious vanity of the Corinthians over their supposed spiritual excellency and Christian wisdom and he now contrasts this imaginary state of excellence with the *real condition of moral degradation* to which the deliberately tolerated "leaven" of corruption in their midst was bringing the whole church. To suppose, as do some, that they were "puffed up" *over the case of incest itself* is absurd and arises from a careless forgetfulness of what had

been previously written.

(2). How the apostle's spirit present at Corinth to act with the church in this case? 4.

Through the instructions which his supernatural ly enlightened spirit here gives.

(3). What the deliverance to Satan to which reference is made in 5? Cf. 2, 7, 13,

(4). How for the destruction- of the flesh that the spirit may be saved? 5. Cf. Gal. 5:17-21; Col. 3:5, 6.

(5). Explain the allusions in the concluding exhortation. Analogy to Jewish passover.

II. Correction of Their Misunderstanding of a Commandment Previously Given as to Association with Fornicators. 5:9-13.

1. Reference to an injunction formerly given=I wrote unto you in my epistle to have no company with fornicators; 9.

2. Negative explanation=(a) not altogether with the fornicators of this world, (b) or with the covetous and extortioners, or with idolaters; 10.

3. Reason for not including these=for then must you needs go out of the world:

4. Positive explanation=but now I write unto you (A) not to keep company, if any man that is named a brother, (a) be a fornicator, (b) or covetous, (c) or an idolater, (d) or a reviler, (e) or a drunkard, (f) or an extortioner; (B) with such a one no, not to eat. 11.

5. Justification of this limitation=(a) For what have I to do with judging those who are without? (b) Do not you'judge those who are within, (a²) whereas those who are without God judges? 12, 13.

6. Injunction to use in the case of the incestuous man their power of judging those within=Put away the wicked man from among yourselves. 13.

Queries.

(1). What eating not allowed in 11?

No reference here to the Lord's supper, but to a social meal which among the Orientals was the highest expression of social recognition.

(2). Why restrict the prohibition to those within? 12.

From the nature of its object which was the reformation of those for whose conduct the church was responsible.

III. Digressive Censure of Litigation before Outside Tribunals, Suggested by the Above Mentioned Province of Believers to Judge All Within, 6:1-11.

1. Strong reprobation of lawsuits among brethren=Dare any of you, having a matter against his neighbor, (a) go to law before the unrighteous, (b) and not before the saints? 1.

2. Argument *a fortiori* evincing the absurdity of. this course =(a) Or know you not that the saints shall judge the world? (b) and if the world is judged by you, are you unworthy to judge the smallest matters? 2.

3. Second argument *a fortiori*=(a) Know you not that we shall judge angels? (b) how much more, things that pertain to this life? 3.

4. Consequent injunction=If then you have to judge things pertaining to this life, set those to judge who are of no account in the church. 4.

5. Their need of this admonition=I say this to move you to shame. 5.

6. Consequent reproachful inquiry=Is it so, (a) that there cannot be found among you one wise man, (a²) who shall be able to decide between his brethren, (b) but (a) brother goes to law with brother, (b) and that before unbelievers? 5, 6.

7. Emphatic censure of their course=Nay, already it is altogether a defect in you, that you have lawsuits one with another. 7.

8. Suggestion of a preferable course=(a) Why not rather take

wrong? (b) why not rather be defrauded?

9. Their course the very reverse of this=Nay, but (a) you yourselves do wrong, and defraud, (b) and that your brethren. 8.

10. Consequent interrogative warning=Or know you not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? 9.

11. The warning repeated and emphasized by a detailed specification=(a) Be not deceived: (b) there shall inherit the kingdom of God. (a) Neither fornicators, (b) nor idolaters, (c) nor adulterers, (d) nor effeminate, (e) nor abusers of themselves with men, (f) nor thieves, (g) nor covetous, (h) nor drunkards, nor revilers, (j) nor extortioners, 9, 10.

12. The former relation of Corinthian believers to these characters=And such were some of you: 11.

13. Their present condition in contrast=(a) but you were washed, (b) but you were sanctified, (c) but you were justified.

14. The sphere within which these results are effected=(a) in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, (b) and in the Spirit of our God.

Queries.

(1). How the saints to judge the world? 2. *Cf.* Rev. 3:21.

(2). How shall we judge angels? 3. Connect Jude 6 with the last reference.

(3). Why follow the marginal reading of the Revised Version in verse 4?

Because the reading as pointed in the text of this Version would imply that the Corinthians were setting some incompetent persons in the church to judge in the case and are here reprov'd for so doing. But the fact is they were going outside of the church entirely for judges and Paul's relative injunction in the matter is that it would be better to take the least suitable in the church to act as judges than to go outside. The next verse shows that he would, of course, have them to select wise and suitable brethren to judge in the case.

(4). What the underlying ground for the prohibition of litiga-

tion among Christians? Cf. Jno. 18:36.

(5). Set forth the different phases of salvation presented in element 13; ver. 11.

“Washed”=cleansed through pardon. Cf. Acts 22:16: “sanctified”=set apart to God through this cleansing. Cf. Heb. 13:12; also 9:14: “justified”=accepted of God as righteous through this same cleansing. Rom. 4:6-8.

(6). How all this effected “in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God”?

“The sense is,” says Canon Evans, “you were baptized, you were consecrated, you were justified all in the hallowed circle of his redemptive name, and in the pure and light-shedding sphere of the Spirit of God.” Cf. Matt, 28:19.

IV. Remonstrance against Confounding Gentile Libertinism with Christian Liberty. 6:12-20.

1. Assertion of liberty in things indifferent with the first limitation=(a) All things are lawful for me; (b) but not all things are expedient. 12.

2. Assertion of liberty with the second limitation=(a) All things are lawful for me; (b) but I will not be brought under the power of any.

3. Illustration=(a) Meats for the belly, (b) and the belly for meats: 13.

4. Transitory character of this relation=but God shall bring to nought both it and them.

5. Wide difference from this in the relations of the body asserted=(a) But the body is not for fornication, (b) but for the Lord; (b²) and the Lord for the body:

6. Permanency of this relation=(a) and God both raised the Lord, (b) and will raise up us through his power. 14.

7. Its consequent sacredness emphasized=Know you not that your bodies are members of Christ? (a) shall I then take away the members of Christ, (b) and make them members of a harlot? (b²) God forbid. 15.

8. The great contrast of results adduced as an argument=(a) Or know you not that he that is joined to a harlot is one body? (a²) for, The twain, says he shall become one flesh, (b) But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit. 16, 17.

9. Consequent positive warning=Flee fornication. 18.

10. Additional argument to deter them based on the heinous character of this sin=(a) Every sin that a man does is with out the body; (b) but he that commits fornication sins against his own body.

11. Final ground of prohibition=Or know you not (A) that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit (a) which is in you, (b) which you have from God? (B) and you are not your own; 19.

12. Proof of a divine ownership=for you were brought with a price: 20.

13. Consequent exhortation=glorify God therefore in your body.

Queries.

(1). How other sins without the body and this against the body? ver. 18. *Cf.* ver. 16.

(2). How the citation of verse 16 a proof that “he who is joined to a harlot is one body” with her? 16.

(3). What implied in element 6; verses 13, 14, as to the nature of the resurrection? See also xv. 44.

This is a sample of the material contained in
*Exegetical Analysis of the Epistles: Notes on First and Second
Corinthians, Galatians, and Hebrews*
by Isaiah Boone Grubbs

To order single copies, visit:
store.gospelarmory.com/product/exegetical-analysis-of-the-epistles/

To place a bulk order (10 or more copies)
at a discounted price, visit:
www.gospelarmory.com/bulk/

Thank you!

