

attached to the name of Abraham) than in Mosaism. I do not think this is entirely justified. There are elements in the story as given in Genesis worthy of the "merciful and gracious" name ascribed to God in Exod. xxxiv. 6; I refer of course to the truly Divine saying, "I will not destroy it for ten's sake" (Gen. xviii. 32). I cannot therefore join in any disparagement of this poetic and significant group of narratives in Gen. xviii., xix. But Biblical theologians are content if the narratives of which their materials are partly composed are *true*, though not in all cases real—*wahre, obwohl nicht immer wirkliche, Geschichten* (comp. Prof. Wordsworth, *Bampton Lectures* for 1881, p. 138). The elements derived by Biblical theology from Gen. xviii., xix., are the combination of justice and compassion in the dealings of God with men, and the mysterious solidarity of men both for good and for evil.

T. K. CHEYNE.

"I HAVE RECEIVED OF THE LORD."

I CORINTHIANS xi. 23.

I CONFESS that I cannot extract full satisfaction from any of the current interpretations of this difficult passage. There are minds, indeed, that can rest content with believing that the risen Christ on some occasion communicated to the converted Paul an historical account, such as he could have obtained from the common tradition of the primitive Church; and some indeed press even for the actual words as part of the revelation. To other minds, however, what appears an unnecessary multiplication of revelations, is antecedently improbable and so far incredible; nor do they derive much comfort from the suggestion that "we need

not wonder if words so important were specially communicated to the one prominent apostle who was not present at the Last Supper," or any sensible relief from being told that the preposition (*ἀπὸ*) used in the phrase "from the Lord" leaves scope for the operation of "an angel, or the direct voice of the Spirit, or a divinely-sent human messenger."¹ Their initial difficulty is still the same. The more rationalistic contrivance, on the other hand, of understanding "from the Lord" to mean "from the Lord as the original giver, but through the medium of His followers, the recognised depositaries of tradition," appears to some (as it does to me) to do violence somewhat to the structure of the Apostle's language, and to be at any rate seriously incomplete as an explanation of his drift. The alternative, that the tradition first learned by St. Paul from the ordinary source, was subsequently confirmed to him by a revelation, is little better than an attempt to suppress one difficulty by the invocation of a greater; for it means nothing less than this, that the Lord paid the Twelve the doubtful honour of guaranteeing their historical truthfulness.

Before endeavouring to state what I cannot but think a more reasonable view, it will be well perhaps to clear the path. And, first, I would submit that no stress can be laid upon the preposition *ἀπὸ*, one way or the other. Without entering into a disquisition on the special distinction between *ἀπὸ* and *παρά* in such a connexion, it will be sufficient to point out that Meyer, who claims *παρά* as the natural preposition for immediate reception, is flatly contradicted by Canon Evans, a no less brilliant and painstaking scholar, who frankly and tersely expounds: "Here *of* means *straight from*; *ἀπὸ* not *παρά*: Meyer quite wrong here." Bishop Lightfoot, too, in his note on Galatians i. 12 ("Neither did I receive it from man") declares altogether against *immediate* transmission being specially in-

¹ Compare Mr. Beet on the passage.

volved in either preposition. And, if I may venture to have an opinion after a study of Pauline instances, I believe that there is at least as much to be said for Canon Evans as for Meyer, Winer, Buttmann, and all their English followers. But, after all, in this passage, ἀπό may have been chosen merely for the sake of change, to avoid the threefold jingle, παρέλαβον, παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, παρέδωκα.

Yet an objector may say: "There is the ἐγώ: it is emphatic, and obviously opposed to the ὑμῖν. 'I have received from the Lord as straight as you have received from me.'" There is something, I think, in this; but too much must not be made of it. For it is by no means certain that the classical emphasis of the personal pronouns always clings to them in New Testament Greek; and the purists in this respect have the air of being somewhat in straits to find a natural emphasis for the ἐγώ in "I send you forth as sheep among wolves" (Matt. x. 16); or, again, in "I died to the law, that I might live to God" (Gal. ii. 19). In the passage, "Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is offended, and I burn not?" (2 Cor. xi. 29)—the absence of ἐγώ in the first clause and its presence in the second, cannot be explained in accordance with any strict rule. Such laxity seems to call for special recognition in the simpler narrative style of the Gospels. But to come nearer home. The ἐγώ is omitted in a passage hard by and closely akin to ours (1 Cor. xv. 3) where Paul is summarising the cardinal points of doctrine (ἐν πρώτοις) in the Gospel he had originally preached to his Corinthian hearers. His expression elsewhere, "my Gospel" (e.g. Rom. ii. 16), and his claim to have received this Gospel "not from man" (Gal. i. 12), would have made ἐγώ very suitable here; and at first sight partly justify those who append "from the Lord" to their translation of παρέλαβον. Certainly, to any but the sacramental mind, the contents of Paul's Gospel here detailed are at least as important as the institution of

the Last Supper; for on some of these historical facts the significance of that Supper was based. And yet he leaves the δ καὶ παρέλαβον ("which also I received") to be strictly parallel to the previous δ καὶ παρελάβετε ("which also ye received"),—both clauses without any expressed pronoun; and both apparently referring to the ordinary channels of tradition. For, among the points of his preaching he mentions the appearances of the Lord to Cephas and to James, and, last of all, the appearance to himself. Undoubtedly Cephas and James had learned of this last appearance from the lips of Paul: it is surely unreasonable then to suppose that Paul had learned of the appearances to James and Cephas, straight from the Lord Himself.

Other interpreters lay the whole emphasis on the ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ("from the Lord"). As if Paul were saying: "Many ordinances I have made for your governance, that all things may be done decently and in order; but these have been appointed according to the best of my own judgment—by 'me, not the Lord':¹ *this* ordinance is from the Lord—the Lord, not me': it is the '*Lord's* Supper': it is He who says, 'This do': it is His death ye show forth, His body and His blood ye partake of, His judgment and His chastening ye have to fear." This exegesis is tempting, but it appears to ignore too much the ἐγὼ παρέλαβον.

The use of the singular number of the verb is sometimes adduced as a proof of the immediateness of the transmission from the Lord. But Paul had been the teacher and the organizer of the Corinthian Church; its order and its customs were due to him, however much, just now, they came short of his model; and, therefore, I submit that it would have been unnatural for him here to say: "*We* received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." And especially so to the Corinthians. Even at this stage

¹ See 1 Cor. vii. 12.

some of them were questioning his commission and authority (1 Cor. ix. 1-8), and a tone of unavoidable self-assertion pervades both Epistles. He is forced to remind them that in his Gospel and his apostleship, he is, "at any rate to them" (1 Cor. ix. 2), not a whit behind the other apostles; that his commission is as full and as direct as theirs. To the Corinthians he was more likely to use *I* than *we*.

But in what sense is he speaking truthfully if he owed his knowledge of the story of the Last Supper to others? I believe that the *facts*, like those mentioned in the fifteenth chapter, came to him in the ordinary way; and yet I cannot believe that Paul is resting, first of all and consciously, upon tradition, when, to rebuke the disorder and disunion of the Corinthian Church, he recalls the solemnity and significance of the institution he had delivered to them, as received by him from the Lord. The point would be blunted if a direct commission were not claimed. But this need not have been in itself a revelation of historical facts; it *must* have been a revelation of their import. And, indeed, it is the import of the facts—their imperious significance for Christian fellowship—that is the ground of his argument and his censure. Paul, as Christ's directly commissioned messenger, summons the Corinthians to conform to the spirit of his message.

Does it then follow that the Apostle is open to the charge of confusing letter and spirit, the objective and the subjective, the Christ without and the Christ within? Far from it. To confuse is one thing; to merge, another. To the Apostle there were not two Christs, the past and the present: the past co-existed with the present, and a greater than the past was there. The internal Christ was only the perfected phase of the historical. The Christ of the past, still existing, yet one with the Christ of the present, had taken up His abode in the Apostle: the Christ of the past, a

memory of sanctity; the Christ of the present, a sanctifying faith.¹ On stepping-stones of the Christ of history, the Christ after the flesh, he had risen to the Christ of faith, Christ the quickening Spirit; and this "Lord" was, above all other conceptions of Him, the "Lord" of Paul. Without Him, Paul's memory would have been but the storehouse of dead traditional facts; but with Him came the breath of life; till, having "received from the Lord" the soul of his Gospel, Paul cared not always to refer to another source the existence and origin of the body.

And thus, with the letter only from tradition, the spirit from revelation, Paul may well be pardoned for merging history in faith, and claiming to have received the whole message from the Lord.

JOHN MASSIE.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD
TESTAMENT.

III.

THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS.

IN the early chapters of this book the reader will notice for himself several small alterations which it is unnecessary to particularize in detail, but which considerably elucidate the different observances prescribed.

i. 3. *That he may be accepted.* This is the meaning regularly borne by the phrase employed (לְרִצּוֹנִי); see xxiii. 11 A.V., and cf. xxii. 19 f.; Jer. vi. 20; Isa. lvi. 7), and is expressed by LXX. (δεκτὸν), Vulg. (acceptabilis), Onkelos (יקריב יתה לרעוא ליה), and the Peshitto (ܠܘܥܘܒܝܘܬܐܝܗܘܢ). A.V. follows a Talmudic interpretation accepted by Aben Ezra and other Jewish authorities, and adopted by many of the

¹ Compare Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 70.