so, these persons would be mainly found  
among the Jewish converts or Judaizers ;  
and the matters treated in ch. vii.—ix. may have been subjects of doubt mainly with  
these persons.   
  
**and I of Christ**] A  
rendering has been proposed which need  
only be mentioned to be rejected: viz,  
that St. Paul haying mentioned the three  
parties, then breaks off, and adds, *speaking  
in his own person*,” “*and I (I Paul) am of  
Christ,*” *not of any of these preceding*.  
The words seems to apply to those who  
make a merit of *not being attached to any*  
human *teacher*,—who therefore slighted  
the apostleship of Paul. To them frequent allusion seems to be made in this  
and in the second Epistle, and more especially in 2 Cor. x. 7—11. For a more  
detailed discussion of the whole subject,  
see the Introduction, as referred to above.  
  
  
**13.**] **Is Christ** (the *Person* of  
Christ, as the centre and bond of Christian  
unity,—not, the *gospel* of Christ, nor the  
*Church* of Christ, nor the *power* of Christ,  
i.e His right over all) **divided** (‘into  
*various parts*,’ one under one leader,  
another under another,— which in fact  
amounts to His being divided against Himself)? The question applies to *all/ addressed*,  
not to the last. In that case the words would  
mean ‘Has Christ become the property of  
one part only? which they cannot do.  
  
  
**was Paul crucified for you?** ] literally,  
**Surely Paul was not crucified for you?** By  
repudiating all possibility of *himself* being  
the Head and *name-giver* of their church,  
he does so even more strongly for Cephas  
and Apollos: for he *founded* the church at  
Corinth. On the expression, *baptized into  
the name of*, see **Matt**. **xxviii.** **19**.  
  
  
**14.]** It may seem surprising that St. Paul  
should not have referred to the *import of  
baptism itself* as a reason to substantiate  
his argument. He does not this, but  
tacitly assumes, between ver. 13 and 14,  
the probability that his having baptized  
any considerable number among the Corinthians would naturally have led to the  
abuse against which he is arguing.  
  
  
**I thank God, &c.**] ‘*I am (now) thankful to  
God, who so ordered it that I did not*,’ &c.  
Crispus, the former ruler of the synagogue,  
Acts xviii. 8. Gaius, afterwards the host of  
the Apostle, and of the church, Rom. xvi.  
23.   
  
**15**.] lest represents the purpose,  
not of the Apostle’s conduct at the time,  
but of the divine ordering of things: ‘God  
so arranged it, that none might say,’ &c.  
  
  
**16.]** He subsequently recollects  
having baptized Stephanas and his family  
(see ch. xvi. 15, 17),—perhaps from information derived from Stephanas himself,  
who was with him:—and he leaves an  
opening for any others whom he may possibly have baptized and have forgotten it.  
The last clause is important as against  
those who maintain the *absolute omniscience* of the inspired writers on *every  
topic which they handle*.   
  
**17**.] This  
verse forms the transition to the description of his preaching among them. His  
mission was *not to baptize* :—a trace already, of the separation of the offices of  
baptizing and preaching.   
  
Chrysostom  
says: “To baptize a man under instruction, and already believing, is in the power  
of any one whatever: for the free will  
of the candidate does all, and the grace of  
God: but when the instruction of unbelievers is to be carried on, much toil is