the subjects which divided them: see Phil.  
ii, 2. **in the same mind** regards **disposition**, **in the same judgment, opinion.**  
  
  
**11.**] We cannot fill up them [**which  
are of the house**] **of Chloe** (simply **them of  
Chloe** in the original), not knowing whether they were *sons or servants*, or other  
members of her family. Nor can we say  
whether Chloe was an *inhabitant of Corinth, or some Christian woman* known to  
the Corinthians *elsewhere*, *or an Ephesian*, having friends who had been in  
Corinth.   
  
**12.**] Respecting the matter of  
fact to which the verse alludes, I have given  
references in the Introduction, § ii. 10, to  
the principal theories of the German critics,  
aud will only here re-state the conclusions  
which I have there endeavored to substantiate: (1) that these designations are  
*not used* as pointing to *actual parties  
formed and subsisting* among the Corinthians, but (2) *as representing the*SPIRIT WITH WHICH THEY CONTENDED  
*against one another*, being the sayings of  
*individuals*, and *not of parties*: as if it  
were said, ‘You are all in the habit of  
alleging against one another, some your  
special attachment to Paul, some to Apollos,  
some to Cephas, others to no mere human  
teacher, but barely to Christ, to the exclusion of us his Apostles.’ (3) That these  
sayings, while they are not to be made the  
basis of any hypothesis respecting *definite  
parties* at Corinth, do nevertheless *hint at  
matters of fact*, and are *not merely* by  
way of example: and (4) that this view of.  
the verse, which was taken by Chrysostom,  
Theodoret, Theophylact, and Calvin, is  
*borne out*, and indeed *necessitated*, by ch.  
iv. 6 (see there).   
  
**I am of Paul**] This  
profession, of being guided especially *by  
the words and acts of Paul*, would probably belong to those who were the first  
**fruits of, or directly converted under, his**ministry. Such persons would contend for  
his apostolic authority, and maintain doctrinally his teaching, *so far being right*;  
but, as usual with partisans, would magnify  
into importance practices and sayings of  
his which were in themselves indifferent,  
and forget that theirs was a service of perfect freedom under one Master, even Christ.  
With these he does not deal *doctrinally* in  
the Epistle, as there was *no need for it:*  
but involves them in the same censure as  
the rest, and shews them in ch. ii., iii., iv.  
that he had no such purpose of gaining personal honor among them, but only of building them up in Christ.   
  
**I of Apollos**]  
Apollos (Acts xviii. 24, ff.) had come to  
Corinth after the departure of Paul, and  
being eloquent, might attract some, to  
whom the bodily presence of Paul seemed  
weak and his speech contemptible. It  
would certainly appear that some occasion  
had been taken by this difference, to set  
too high a value on external and rhetorical  
form of putting forth the gospel of Christ.  
This the Apostle seems to be blaming (in  
part) in the conclusion of this, and the next  
chapter. And from ch. xvi. 12, it would  
seem likely that Apollos himself had been  
aware of the abuse of his manner of teaching which had taken place, and was unwilling, by repeating his visit just then, to  
sanction or increase it.   
  
**I of Cephas**]  
All we can say in possible explanation of  
this is, that as Peter was the *Apostle of the  
circumcision*,—as we know from Gal. ii.  
11 ff. that his course of action on one occasion was reprehended by Paul, and as that  
course of action no doubt had influence and  
found followers, it is very conceivable that  
some of those who in Corinth lightly esteemed Paul, might take advantage of this  
honored name, and cite against the Christian liberty taught by their own spiritual  
founder, the stricter practice of Peter. If