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This Volume was in the Third Edition made uniform with the rest of the work as regards the revision and augmentation of the references, and the re-writing of the critical digest and consequent occasional changes in the text. The notes were also in parts considerably modified and augmented.

In this Fourth Edition, the readings of the Codex Sinaiticus have been incorporated in the Digest, and some consequent alterations have been made in the text.

Some changes, but not many, have been made in the notes.

Deanery, Canterbury,
July, 1865.
PROLEGOMENAE.

CHAPTER I.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. Of all the Epistles which bear the characteristic marks of St. Paul’s style, this one stands the foremost. See below, on its style, § 4. So that, as Windischmann observes, whoever is prepared to deny the genuineness of this Epistle, would pronounce on himself the sentence of incapacity to distinguish true from false. Accordingly, its authorship has never been doubted.

2. But that authorship is also upheld by external testimony:

(a) Irenæus, adv. Hær. iii. 7. 2, p. 182, quotes the Epistle by name: “Sed in ea quae est ad Galatas, sic ait: Quid ergo lex factorum? posita est usque quo veniat semen, cui promissum est &c.” (Gal. iii. 19.) Many allusions to it are found.

(b) Polycarp, ad Phil. cap. iii.: p. 1008.

Παύλου . . . ὁς καὶ ἄπων ὑμῖν ἔγραφεν ἐπιστολάς, εἰς ὅς ἔδωκεν ἐγκύπτητε, διανέθησε τοῖς ὑμῖν προφήταις τῆς προφητείας, ἣς ἐστὶ μῆτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν (Gal. iv. 26). And again, cap. v., p. 1009: εἰδότες οὖν, ὅτι θέδος οὐ μυκτηρίζεται . . . . (Gal. vi. 7.)

(γ) Justin Martyr, or whoever was the author of the Oratio ad Græcos, printed among his works, seems to allude to Gal. iv. 12, in the words γένεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι κἀγὼ ἡμην ὡς ὑμεῖς: and to Gal. v. 20, in these, ἐχθραὶ, ἔρεις, ἡγεσις, ἐριθεῖαι, θυμοί, κ. τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις, c. v., p. 5.

(δ) Besides these, there are many more distant allusions in the works of Ignatius, Polycarp, and Justin, which may be seen cited in Lardner and Windischmann, and Davidson, Introd. to N. T. vol. ii. pp. 318-19.
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SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. This Epistle was written ταῖς ἔκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας (ch. i. 2). Galatia (Γαλλογραμμία Strabo xii. 566, Gallogræcia Liv. xxxvii. 8, xxxviii. 12) was a district of Asia Minor (once part of Phrygia, Strabo xii. 571, ii. 130), bounded N. by Paphlagonia and Bithynia, E. by Pontus and Cappadocia (divided from both by the Halys), S. by Cappadocia and Phrygia, W. by Phrygia and Bithynia. Notwithstanding its mountainous character, it was fruitful, especially near the river Halys (Strabo xii. 567). The principal cities were Ancyra, Pessinus, and Tavium. Ancyra was declared the capital by Augustus. The inhabitants (Γαλάται, only a later form of Κόλται, Pausan. i. 3. 5,—also Gallograeci) were Gauls in origin. The Gallic tribes of the Trocmi and Tolistoboi, with the German tribe of Tectosagi (or Toctosages), crossed over from Thrace into Asia Minor, having formed part of the Gallic expedition which pillaged Delphi, in the third century B.C. (cir. 280.) In Asia they at first became mercenary troops under Nicomedes, king of Bithynia, but soon overran nearly the whole of Asia Minor, till Antiochus Soter and Eumenes drove them into its central portion, afterwards called Galatia. There they were at first ruled by tetrarchs, and afterwards (when their real independence had been taken from them by the Consul Manlius Vulso, B.C. 189,—see Livy xxxviii. 16—27) by kings; of whom the two Deiotari, father and son, are known to us, the former as having been defended by Cicero in a speech still extant, the latter as also a friend of the great orator's (Epp. ad Attic. v. 17). Amyntas, the successor of this latter, was their last king: at his death (B.C. 26) Galatia was reduced to a Roman province. See for full accounts, Strabo, book xiii. ch. 5: Livy, as above: the Introductions to this Epistle in Meyer, De Wette, and Windischmann: Winer's Realwörterbuch, art. Galatia: Conybeare and Howson, vol. i. p. 284 ff., edn. 2: and the learned dissertation on the question whether the Galatians were Teutons or Celts, appended to Prof. Lightfoot's edition of this Epistle.

2. The character of the people, as shewn in this Epistle, agrees remarkably with that ascribed to the Gallic race by all writers. They received the Apostle at his first visit with extreme joy, and shewed him every kindness: but were soon shaken in their fidelity to him and the Gospel, and were transferring their allegiance to false teachers.

3. The Galatian churches were founded by St. Paul at his first visit,

1 So Caesar, B. G. iv. 5: "infirmitatem Gallorum veritus, quod sunt in consilii capiundis mobiles, et novis pluresque rebus student, nihil his committendum existimavit." And Thierry, Hist. des Gaulois, Introduct.: "un esprit franc, impétueux, ouvert à toutes les impressions, éminemment intelligent: mais à côté de cela, une mobilité extrême, point de constance, ... beaucoup d'ostentation, enfin une désunion perpétuelle, fruit d'excessive vanité." C. & H. i. 285, note.
when he was detained among them by sickness (ch. iv. 13: see note and compare Acts xvi. 6), during his second missionary journey, about A.D. 51 (see chronol. table in Prolegg. to Acts, Vol. II.). Though doubtless he began his preaching as usual among the Jews (cf. Jos. Antt. xvi. 6, 2, for the fact of many Jews being resident in Ancyra), yet this Epistle testifies to the majority of his readers being Gentiles, not yet circumcised, though nearly persuaded to it by Judaizing teachers. At the same time we see by the frequent references to the O. T. and the adoption of the rabbinical method of interpretation by allegory (ch. iv. 21—31), that he had to do with churches which had been accustomed to Judaizing teaching, and familiarized with the O. T. See Meyer, Einl. p. 3. In the manifold preparations for the Gospel which must have taken place wherever Jews were numerous, through the agency of those who had at Jerusalem heard and believed on Jesus, we need not wonder at any amount of judaistic influence apparent even in churches founded by St. Paul himself: nor need any hypotheses respecting his preaching be invented to account for such a phenomenon.

SECTION III.
WITH WHAT OBJECT IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. Judaizing teachers had followed, as well as preceded, the Apostle in Galatia, and had treated slightly his apostolic office and authority (ch. i. 1, 11), giving out that circumcision was necessary (ch. v. 2; vi. 12). Their influence was increasing, and the churches were being drawn away by it (i. 6; iii. 1, 3; iv. 9—11; v. 7—12). Against these teachers he had already testified in person (i. 9; iv. 16, where see notes, and cf. Acts xviii. 23),—and now that the evil was so rapidly and seriously gaining ground, he writes this Epistle expressly to counteract it.

2. The object then of the Epistle was (1) to defend his own apostolic authority; and (2) to expose the judaistic error by which they were being deceived. Accordingly, it contains two parts, the apologetic (ch. i. ii.) and the polemic (ch. iii.—v. 12). These are naturally followed by a hortatory conclusion (ch. v. 13—end). See these parts subdivided into their minor sections in the notes.

SECTION IV.
ITS MATTER, AND STYLE.

1. The matter of the Epistle has been partly spoken of in the last section. In the first, or apologetic portion, it contains a most valuable historical résumé of St. Paul’s apostolic career, proving his independence of human authority, and confirming as well as illustrating the narrative in the Acts, by mentioning the principal occasions when he held intercourse with the other Apostles: relating also that remarkable interview.
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with St. Peter, so important for its own sake, and giving rise to his own precious testimony to Christian truth in ch. ii. 14—21.

2. The polemical portion has much in common with the Epistle to the Romans. But this difference is observable; that whereas in that Epistle, the whole subject is treated, as belonging to the great argument there handled, logically, and without reference to any special circumstances,—here all is strictly controversial, with immediate reference to the Judaizing teachers.

3. In style, this Epistle takes a place of its own among those of St. Paul. It unites the two extreme affections of his remarkable character: severity, and tenderness: both, the attributes of a man of strong and deep emotions. Nothing can be more solemnly severe than its opening, and ch. iii. 1—5; nothing more touchingly affectionate than some of its appeals, e. g. ch. iv. 18—20. It is therefore quite a mistake to characterize its tone as altogether overpowering and intimidating. A half-barbarous people like the Galatians, known for their simplicity and impressibility, would be likely to listen to both of these methods of address: to be won by his fatherly pleading, as well as overawed by his apostolic rebukes and denunciations.

4. There are several points of similarity in this Epistle to the peculiar diction of the Pastoral Epistles. The student will find them pointed out in the ref., and for the most part remarked on in the notes. They seem to indicate, in accordance with our interpretation of ch. vi. 11, that he wrote this Epistle, as those, with his own hand, without the intervention of an amanuensis. This matter will be found more fully treated below, ch. vii. on the Pastoral Epistles, § i. 32.

SECTION V.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. We have no date in the Epistle itself, which may enable us to determine the time when it was written. This can only be gathered from indirect sources. And consequently, the most various dates have been assigned to it: some, as Marcion in old times, and Michaelis, al., in modern, placing it first among St. Paul’s Epistles: and others, as Schrader and Köhler, last. The following considerations will narrow our field of uncertainty on the point:

2. If the reasoning in the note on the chronological table, Vol. II. Prolegg. pp. 26, 27, be correct,—the visit to Jerusalem mentioned Gal. ii. 1 ff. is identical with that in Acts xv. 1 ff. It will thence follow that the Epistle cannot have been written before that visit: i.e. (see Chron. Table as above) not before A.D. 50.

3. I have maintained, in the note on Gal. iv. 16, that the words

there used most naturally refer to the Apostle's second visit to the churches of Galatia, when Acts xviii. 23, he went through τῆς Γαλατικῆς χώρας . . . στρατιζων πάντως τοῖς μαθηταῖς. If so, this Epistle cannot date before that visit: i. e. (Chron. Table as above) not before the autumn of the year 54.

4. The first period then which seems probable, is the Apostle's stay at Ephesus in Acts xix., from autumn 54, till Pentecost 57. And this period is so considerable, that, having regard to the οὗτος ταχέως of ch. i. 6, it must be regarded as quite possible that our Epistle may have been written during it. The above is the view of Hug, De Wette, Olsh., Usteri, Winer, Neander, Greswell, Anger, Meyer, Wieseler, and many others.

5. The next period during which it might have been written is, his stay at Corinth, Acts xx. 2, 3, where he spent the winter of the year 57-8, and whence he wrote the Epistle to the Romans. This is the opinion of Conybeare and Howson (vol. ii. p. 162, edn. 2). They support their view entirely by the similarity of this Epistle and that to the Romans. "It is," they say (p. 163, note), "exactly that resemblance which would exist between two Epistles written nearly at the same time, while the same line of argument was occupying the writer's mind, and the same phrases and illustrations were on his tongue." It has also been maintained with much skill and learning, since the first edition of this volume appeared, by Prof. Lightfoot, in an article in the Journal of Sacred and Classical Philology for Jan. 1857: which article is reproduced in the Introduction to his edition of the Epistle, 1865. He traces the sequence of the lines of thought in the greater Epistles, and finds internal evidence enough to make him decide strongly that it is very improbable, that the two Epistles to the Corinthians intervened between those to the Galatians and Romans, or that to the Galatians between the second to the Thessalonians and the first to the Corinthians.

6. I own that these considerations seem to me weighty ones, and have caused me to modify the decided preference which I gave in my first edition to the earlier date. Still, I do not feel Prof. Lightfoot's argument to have settled the question. It might be that the elementary truths brought out amidst deep emotion, sketched, so to speak, in great rough lines in the fervent Epistle to the Galatians, dwelt long on St. Paul's mind (even though other subjects of interest regarding other churches intervened), and at length worked themselves out, under the teaching and leading of the Spirit, into that grand theological argument which he afterwards addressed, without any special moving occasion, but as his master-exposition of Christian doctrine, to the church of the metropolis of the world.

7. I think then that it must always remain a question between these two periods. In favour of the former of them it may be said that,
considering the οὔτως ταχέως\(^3\), we can hardly let so long a time elapse as the second would pass over,—and that probability is in favour of strong emotion having, in the prompting of God’s Spirit, first brought out that statement of Christian truth and freedom, which after-deliberation expanded, and polished, and systematized, in the Epistle to the Romans: and in favour of the latter may be alleged the interesting considerations respecting the grouping of St. Paul’s Epistles, and the parallels between 2 Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans, which Prof. Lightfoot has adduced.

8. Of course my objection to the date implied in the common subscription, ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ὀρφήν, adopted by Theodoret, Calov., Hammond, al., is even stronger than that stated above. Those who wish to see the matter discussed at more length, may refer to Davidson, Introd. ii. p. 292 ff., and to Prof. Lightfoot’s edition of the Epistle, pp. 35—55.

CHAPTER II.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. The ancient testimonies to the Apostle Paul having been the author of this Epistle, are the following:

(a) Irenæus adv. Haer. v. 2. 36, p. 294:

καθὼς ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος φησιν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστολῇ ὅτι μέλη ἐσμέν τοῦ σώματος, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν οὐσιών αὐτοῦ (Eph. v. 30). Again i. 5. 5, τούτω δὲ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος λέγει: πάν γὰρ τὸ φανεροῦμεν, φῶς ἐστὶν (Eph. v. 13).

(β) Clem. Alex. Strom. iv. § 65, p. 592 P.:

διὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους γράφει (cf. supra, § 61, φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος, where 1 Cor. xi. 3, &c. is quoted, § 62, ἐπιφέρει γοῦν, citing Gal. v. 16 ff.: and infra, § 66, καὶ τῇ πρὸς Κολοσσαῖς . . . from which it is evident that the subject of γράφει is ‘St. Paul’) ἑπτασασσόμενοι ἄλληλοι ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. Eph. v. 21—25.

(γ) ib. Ped. i. § 18, p. 108 P.:

ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐπιστέλλων πρὸς Κορινθίους φησίν, 2 Cor. xi. 2. . . . σαφέστατα δὲ Ἐφεσίους γράφων ἀπεκάλυψε τὸ ξητούμενον ἐδέ πῶς λέγον μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οὓς πάντες κ.τ.λ. Eph. iv. 13—15.

\(^3\) For I cannot accept the suggestion of Prof. Lightfoot, which would make ταχέως subjective to μετατίθεσθαι, ‘ye are so rapidly changing.’ I have treated on this view in my note on Rev. i. 1, where much depends on it.
2. Further we have testimonies to the Epistle being received as canonical Scripture, and therefore, by implication, of its being regarded as written by him whose name it bears: as e. g.:

(δ) Polycarp, ad Philippienses, c. xii., p. 1013 ff.:

"Ut his scripturis dictum est, 'Irascimini et nolite peccare,' et 'Sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram.'" Eph. iv. 26.

(e) Tertullian adv. Marcion. v. 17, p. 512 (see below, § ii. 17 c).

(ζ) Irenæus several times mentions passages of this Epistle as perverted by the Valentinians: e. g. ch. i. 10 (Iren. i. 3. 4, p. 16): iii. 21 (Iren. i. 3. 1, p. 11): v. 32 (Iren. i. 8. 4, p. 40): and in many other places (see the Index in Stierien's cdn.) cites the Epistle directly.

3. I have not hitherto adduced the testimony ordinarily cited from Ignatius, Eph. 12, p. 656, on account of the doubt which hangs over the interpretation of the words 4:

πάροδος ἐστε τῶν εἰς θεὸν ἀναρωνυμένων, Παῦλον συμμύσταται τοῦ ἐγνατμύστων τοῦ μεμαρτυρημένου, ἡξιομακρύστων, ὅτι γένοιτο μοι ὑπὸ τὰ ἱκνη εἰρεθῆναι ὅταν θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω, ὅς ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει ύμῶν ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦν.

I conceive however that there can be little doubt that these expressions are to be interpreted of the Epistle to the Ephesians. First, the expression συμμύσταται seems to point to Eph. i. 9, as compared with the rest of the chapter,—to ch. iii. 3—6, 9. And it would be the very perversity of philological strictness, to maintain, in the face of later and more anarhythous Greek usage, that ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ must mean, 'in every Epistle,' and not 'in all his Epistle.' Assuming this latter meaning (see note on Eph. ii. 21), the expression finds ample justification in the very express and affectionate dwelling on the Christian state and privileges of those to whom he is writing—making mention of them throughout all his Epistle 5.

3 Meyer, Einl. p. 24, prefers to consider both these citations as made from the O. T. Ps. iv. 4, and Deut. xxiv. 15 (?), on the ground of the title 'Scripture' never occurring of the N. T. in the apostolic fathers.

4 The chapter itself is wanting in the ancient Syriac version published by Mr. Cureton. But this will hardly be adduced as affecting its genuineness. Hefele's view, "pius ille monachus, qui versionem Syriacam elaboravit, omnia omisisse videtur que ipsi et usui suo ascetico minus congrua minusve necessaria putabat," seems to be the true one.

5 Pearson's remarks on this point are worth transcribing: "Hae a martyre non otiose aut frigide, sed vere, ino signanter et vigilantem dieta sunt. Tota enim Epistola ad Ephesios scripta, ipsos Ephesios, eorumque honorem et curam maxime spectat, et summe honorificam eorum membrorum ad posteros transmittit. In aliiis epistolis apostolos eos ad quos scribit sepe acriter objurgat aut parce laudat. Ilce omnibus modis perpetuo se Epheisiis applicat, illosque tanquam egregios Christianos tractat, evangelium salutis firmiter credentes, et Spiritu promissionis obsignatos, concives sanctorum, et domesticos Dei. Pro ipsis sepe ardentem orat, ipsos hortatur, obtestatur, laudat, utrumque sexum sedulo instruit, suum erga eos singularem affectum ubique prodit." Vindiciae Ignatianae, pt. ii. ch. 10, end.
4. In the longer recension of this Epistle of Ignatius, the testimony is more direct: in ch. vi., p. 737, we read,

ως Παύλου ὑμῖν ἔγραφεν ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἐν πνεῦμα κ.τ.λ. (Eph. iv. 4—6.)

And in ch. ix., p. 741,

δ' ως ἀγαλλώμενος ἡξώθην δ' ὃν γράφω προσομιλήσαι τοὺς ἁγίους τοὺς ὑσών ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, τοῖς πιστοῖς ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

5. As we advance to the following centuries, the reception of the authorship of St. Paul is universal. In fact, we may safely say that this authorship was never called in question till very recent times.

6. Among those critics who have repudiated our Epistle as not written by the Apostle, the principal have been De Wette and Baur. The ground on which they build their reasoning is, for the most part, the same. De Wette holds the Epistle to be a verbose expansion of that to the Colossians. He describes it as entirely dependent on that Epistle, and as such, unworthy of a writer who always wrote in freshness and fulness of spirit, as did St. Paul. He believes he finds in it every where expressions and doctrines foreign to his diction and teaching. This being so, he classes it with the Pastoral Epistles and the first Epistle of Peter, and ascribes it to some scholar of the Apostles, writing in their name. He is not prepared to go so far as Baur, who finds in it the ideas and diction of Gnostic and Montanistic times. On this latter notion, I will treat below: I now proceed to deal with De Wette's objections.

7. First of all, I would take a general view of their character, and say that, on such a general view, they, as a whole, make for, rather than against, the genuineness of the Epistle. According to De Wette, a gifted scholar of the Apostles, in the apostolic age itself, writes an Epistle in imitation, and under the name, of St. Paul. Were the imitation close, and the imitator detected only by some minute features of inadvertent inconsistency, such a phenomenon might be understood, as that the Epistle found universal acceptance as the work of the Apostle: but according to our objector, the discrepancies are wide, the inconsistencies everywhere abundant. He is found, in his commentary, detecting and exposing them at every turn. Such reasoning may prove a passage objectively (as in the case of Mark xvi. 9—20, or John vii. 53—viii. 11) to be out of place among the writings of a particular author, all subjective considerations apart: but it is wholly inapplicable when used to account for the success of a forger among his contemporaries, and indeed acts the other way.

8. Let us view the matter in this light. Here is an Epistle bearing the name of St. Paul. Obviously then, it is no mere accidental inser-

---

6 See Orig. contra Celsum, iii. 20, vol. i. p. 458; Tert. de Præser. Haer. c. 36, vol. ii. p. 49; De Monog. c. 5, ib. p. 935; Cypr. Testim. iii. 7, p. 737; Ep. lxxv. 8]
tion among his writings of an Epistle written by some other man, and on purely objective grounds requiring us to ascribe it to that other unknown author; but it is either a genuine production of the Apostle, or a forgery. Subjective grounds cannot be kept out of the question: it is a successful forgery: one which imposed on the post-apostolic age, and has continued to impose on the Church in every age. We have then a right to expect in it the phenomena of successful forgery: close imitation, skilful avoidance of aught which might seem unlike him whose name it bears;—construction, if you will, out of acknowledged pauline materials, but so as to shun every thing unpauline.

9. Now, as has been seen above, the whole of De Wette's reasoning goes upon the exact opposite of all these phenomena. The Epistle is unpauline: strange and surprising in diction, and ideas. Granting this, it might be a cogent reason for believing an anonymous writing not to be St. Paul's: but it is no reason why a forgery bearing his name should have been successful,—on the contrary, is a very sufficient reason why it should have been immediately detected, and universally unsuccessful. Let every one of De Wette's positions be granted, and carried to its utmost; and the more in number and the stronger they are, the more reason there will be to infer, that the only account to be given of a writing, so unlike St. Paul's, obtaining universal contemporary acceptance as his, is, that it was his own genuine composition. Then we should have remaining the problem, to account for the Apostle having so far departed from himself: a problem for the solution of which much acquaintance with himself and the circumstances under which he wrote would be required,—and, let me add, a treatment very far deeper and more thorough than De Wette has given to any part of this Epistle.

10. But I am by no means disposed to grant any of De Wette's positions as they stand, nor to recognize the problem as I have put it in the above hypothetical form. The relation between our Epistle and that to the Colossians, I have endeavoured to elucidate below (§ vi. and Prolegg. to the Col., § iv.). The reasonings and connexions which he pronounces unworthy of the Apostle, I hold him, in almost every case, not to have appreciated: and where he has appreciated them, to have hastily condemned. Here, as in the instance of 1 Tim., his unfortunate prejudgment of the spuriousness of the Epistle has tinged his view of every portion of it: and his commentary, generally so thorough and able, so fearless and fair, is worth hardly more than those of very inferior men, not reaching below the surface, and unable to recognize the most obvious tendencies and connexions.

11. The reader will find De Wette's arguments met in detail by Rückert (Comm. p. 289 ff.), Hemsen (der Apostel Paulus, pp. 629—38); and touched upon by Harless (Comm. Einleit. p. lxvi ff.), Neander (in a note to his Pfl. u. Leit. edn. 4, p. 521 ff.), and Meyer (Einl. 9)
and the viz. these text, following between jiaulo Epjiesians. come strengthening lische refers, others Apostle's account now writer terms instances known mainly ii. (irst stream ii. 7. See also “Ad Ephesios revera dabatur Epistola illa canonica, Paulo non Pseudo-paulo auctore:” a Prefectio which I read at Cambridge in 1849; the chronological view of which I have seen reason since to modify, but not its argument respecting this Epistle.

p. 20 ff.). Davidson also treats of them in full (Introd. to N. T. vol. ii. pp. 352—60), and Eadie very slightly (Introd. p. xxx f.) 7.

12. Baur's argument will be found in his 'Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi &c.' pp. 417—57. It consists, as far as it is peculiar to him, mainly in an attempt to trace in our Epistle, and that to the Colossians (for he holds both to be spurious), expressions and sentiments known to be those of Gnosticism and Montanism: and in some few instances to shew that it is not probable that these heresies took their terms from the Epistles, but rather the Epistles from them. This latter part, on which indeed the conclusiveness of the whole depends, is very slightly, and to me most inconclusively done. And nothing is said in Baur of the real account of the occurrence of such terms in the Epistle, and subsequently in the vocabulary of these heretics: viz. that the sacred writer laid hold of them and employed them, so to speak, high up the stream of their usage, before they became polluted by heretical additions and misconceptions,—the heretics, lower down the same stream, when now the waters were turbid and noxious: his use of them having tended to impress them on men's minds, so that they were ready for the purpose of the heretics when they wanted them. That those heretics used many other terms not known to these Epistles, is no proof that their account was the original one, and this of our Epistles borrowed from it, but simply proves nothing. Some of these terms were suited to the Apostle's purpose in teaching or warning: these he was led to adopt: others were not so suitable,—those he left alone. Or it may be that between his writing and their development, the vocabulary had received additions, which consequently were never brought under his notice. Eadie refers, for an answer to Baur, to Lechler, das apostolische u. nachapostolische Zeitalter, u. s. w. Haarlem, 1852, a work which I have not seen.

13. Taking then the failure of the above objections into account, and strengthening it by anticipation with other considerations which will come before the reader as we advance, we see no reason whatever against following the universal view of the Church, and pronouncing St. Paul to be, as he is stated to be (ch. i. 1), the author of our Epistle.

SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. In treating of this part of our subject, that city and church seem first to deserve notice, to which the Epistle, according to our present text, is addressed. We will first assume, that it was an Epistle to the Ephesians.
2. Ephesus, in Lydia, was situated in an alluvial plain (Herod. ii. 10) on the south side of and near the mouth of the Caystrus. "The city stood on the S. of a plain about five miles long from E. to W., and three miles broad, the N. boundary being Mount Gallesius, the E. Mount Pactyas, the S. Mount Coressus, and on the W. it was washed by the sea. The sides of the mountains were very precipitous, and shut up the plain like a stadium, or race-course." Lewin, i. p. 344. See his plan, p. 362: and the view of the site of Ephesus in C. and H. vol. ii. p. 83, edn. 2. For its ancient history, see Lewin, and C. and H. ib., and the art. 'Ephesus,' in Smith's Dict. of Geography. It was a place of great commerce (Strabo xiv. 644), but was principally noted for its beautiful temple of Artemis (Herod. i. 26; ii. 148. Strabo, l. c. Plin. v. 37. Pausan. vii. 2. 4; iv. 31. 6, &c.), which was at the head of its harbour Panormus, and was from very ancient times the centre of the worship of that goddess. This temple was burnt down by Herostratus, in the night of the birth of Alexander the Great (b.c. 355; see Plut. Alex. c. 3; Cicero de Nat. Deor. ii. 27), but rebuilt at immense cost (Strabo, l. c.), and was one of the wonders of the ancient world. On the worship of Artemis there, &c., see Acts xix. 24 ff. and notes, and Winer RWB. 'Ephesus.' The present state of the site of the city, the stadium, theatre, supposed basement of the temple, &c., are described in Smith's Dict. of Geogr., his Bible Dict., and in C. and H., as above.

3. St. Paul's first visit to Ephesus is related Acts xviii. 19—21. It was very short, as he was hastening to reach Jerusalem by the next Pentecost. The work begun by him in disputations with the Jews, was carried on by Apollos (ib. 24—26), and by Aquila and Priscilla (ib. 27). After visiting Jerusalem, and making a journey in the Eastern parts of Asia Minor, he returned thither (ib. xix. 1) and remained there πρεσβίαν (ib. xix.; xx. 31): during which period the founding of the Ephesian church must be dated. From what is implied in Acts xix. and xx., that church was considerable in numbers: and it had enjoyed a more than usual portion of the Apostle's own personal nursing and teaching. It will be important to bear this in mind when we come to consider the question of this section.

4. On his last recorded journey to Jerusalem he sailed by Ephesus, and summoned the elders of the Ephesian church to meet him at Miletus, where he took what he believed to be his last farewell of them, in that most characteristic and wonderful speech, Acts xx. 18—35.

5. At some subsequent time (see Prolegg. to the Pastoral Epistles), he left Timotheus behind in Ephesus, at which place the first Epistle was addressed to him (1 Tim. i. 3), and perhaps (?) the second. The state of the Ephesian church at the time of these Epistles being written, will be found discussed in the Prolegomena to them.

6. Ecclesiastical tradition has connected the Apostle John with
Ephesus: see Vol. I. Prolegg. ch. v. § i. 9 ff.; and his long residence and death there may with safety be assumed.

7. To this church our Epistle is addressed, according to our present text. And there is nothing in its contents inconsistent with such an address. We find in it clear indications that its readers were mixed Jews and Gentiles,—that they were in an especial manner united to the Apostle in spiritual privilege and heavenly hope:—that they resided in the midst of an unusually corrupt and profligate people.

8. Nor are minor indications wanting, which possess interest as connecting our Epistle with the narrative in the Acts. He had preached to them τὸ εἰςαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ, Acts xx. 24; and he commits them τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ib. ver. 32. In this Epistle alone, not in the contemporary and in some respects similar one to the Colossians, do we find such expressions as δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ch. i. 6,—τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ib. 7, and ii. 7,—and an unusual recurrence of χάρια in all its forms and energies. If he preached among them the good tidings of the grace of God, this may well be called the Epistle of the grace of God.

In no other of his writings, not even in the Epistle to the Romans, is grace so magnified and glorified. Again in Acts xx. 22 f. we read δεδεμένος ἐγὼ τῷ πνεύματι πορεύομαι εἰς Ἴρενοσαλήμ, τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ συναντήσοντα μοι μὴ εἴδως, πλὴν ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον κατὰ πόλιν διαμαρτύρεται μοι λέγων ὅτι δεσμὰ καὶ θλίψεις με μένωσιν. And accordingly, here only in his Epistles addressed to churches, and not in that to the Colossians, do we find him calling himself ὁ δέσμιος (ch. iii. 1; iv. 1).

He had not shrunk from declaring to them τὸ ἄνω τὴν βουλήν τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts xx. 27): and accordingly, in this Epistle alone is βουλή used by St. Paul of the divine purpose,—κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελῆματος αὐτοῦ, ch. i. 11.

In Acts xx. 28 it is said of God and the church, ἢν περιποιηθηκότα διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἱδίου: and in Eph. i. 14, we have the singular expression εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως, i.e. of that which He περιποιήσατο (see note there).

In Acts xx. 32, he commits them to God and the word of His grace, τῷ δυνάμειν οἰκοδομησαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν κληρονομίαν ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις τάσιν. Not to lay any stress on the frequent recurrence of the image of οἰκοδομή, as being common in other Epistles,—the concluding words can hardly fail to recall Eph. i. 18, τῆς δὲ πλούτου τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις,—Eph. i. 14, ὃ ἐστιν ἀφραβάτων τῆς κληρονομίας ἕμων,—and v. 5, οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ (see Acts xix. 8) τοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ.

9. I would not lay the stress which some have laid on the prevalence of the figure of 'the spiritual building' in this Epistle, as having any

9 ch. i. 3 ff. and passim.
1 ch. iv. 17 ff.; v. 1—13.
2 The other cases are in those addressed to individuals; 2 Tim. i. 8. Philem. vv. 1, 9. 12]
connexion with the famous temple of Diana. We should, I think, be suspicious of such supposed local and temporal references (see on 1 Cor. v. 7), unless the context (as e.g. in 1 Cor. ix. 24, 25) plainly points them out.

10. But various objections have been brought against the view that this Epistle was really addressed to the Ephesians. I will take these as recently summed up by Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, vol. ii. pp. 486 ff.

11. "First, it would be inexplicable that St. Paul, when he wrote to the Ephesians, amongst whom he had spent so long a time, and to whom he was bound by ties of such close affection (Acts xx. 17, &c.), should not have a single message of personal greeting to send. Yet none such are found in this Epistle." It may be well, in dealing with this, to examine our Apostle's practice in sending these greetings. They are found in greatest abundance in the Epistle to the Romans, written to a church which, as a church, he had never seen, but which, owing to its situation in the great metropolis, contained many of his own friends and fellow-labourers, and many friends also of those who were with him at Corinth. In 1 Cor., written to a church which he had founded, and among whom he had long resided (Acts xviii. 11), there is not one person saluted by name;—and one salutation only sent, from Aquila and Priscilla. In 2 Cor., not one personal salutation of either kind. In Gal., not one: a circumstance commonly accounted for by the subject and tone of the Epistle: and if there, why not here also? In Phil., not one: though an approach may be said to be made to a personal greeting in μᾶλστα τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας. In Col., the Epistle sent at the same time as this, and by the same messengers, several of both kinds. In 1 Thess. and 2 Thess., none of either kind. In 1 Tim., sent to Ephesus (see Prolegg. to Pastoral Epistles), none: in 2 Tim., several of both kinds: in Philemon, salutations from brethren, but not to any.

The result at which we thus arrive, without establishing any fixed law as to the Apostle's practice, shews us how little weight such an objection as this can have. The Philippians were his dearly beloved, his joy and his crown: yet not one of them is saluted. The Galatians were his little children, of whom he was in labour till Christ should be formed in them: yet not one is saluted. The Thessalonians were imitators of him and of the Lord, patterns to all that believed in Macedonia and Achaia: yet not one of them is selected for salutation. The general salutations found in several of these cases, the total omission of all salutation in others, seem to follow no rule but the fervour of his own mind, and the free play of his feeling as he writes. The more general

3 It is plain that the salutations sent from persons who were with the Apostle, would depend on his circumstances at the time, and on the connexion between those with him and the church to which he was writing. When he wrote from Corinth to Rome they were abundant.
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and solemn the subject, the less he seems to give of these individual notices: the better he knows those to whom he is writing, as a whole, the less he seems disposed to select particular persons for his affectionate remembrance. May we not then conceive it to be natural, that in writing to a church with which he had been so long and intimately acquainted, in writing too on so grand and solemn a subject as the constitution and prospects of Christ's universal church, he should pass over all personal notices, referring them as he does to Tychicus, the bearer of the Epistle? I own I am unable to see any thing improbable in this:—but it seems to me, as far as we can trace his practice, to be in accordance with it.

12. "Secondly, he could not have described the Ephesians as a church whose conversion he knew only by report" (ch. i. 15).

The answer to this is very simple. First, he nowhere says that he knew their conversion only by report, but what he does say is, ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ τὴν [ἀγάπην τὴν] εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους: an expression having no reference whatever to their conversion, but pointing to the report which he had received of their abounding in Christian graces;—and perfectly consistent with, nay, explained as it seems to me most simply on, the hypothesis of his having known their previous circumstances well. Any supposition of allusion to their conversion robs the καθ' ὑμᾶς of its fine distributive force, and misses the point of the sentence. But, secondly, if there were any doubt on this point,—if any were disposed to charge us with thus understanding the words merely as a help out of the difficulty,—their meaning is decided for us by the Apostle himself. Philemon is his ἀγαπητός and συνεργός (Philem. 1). He was his son in the faith (ib. ver. 19). Yet he addresses him in almost the same words, and in the same connexion with εἰχαριστῶν κ.τ.λ. He says, ἀκούὼν σου τὴν ἁγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν ἄν ἐχεις εἰς τὸν κύριον Ἰσραήλ καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους. It is strange that after this had been pointed out, the objection should ever have been again raised.

13. "Thirdly, he could not speak to them as only knowing himself (the founder of their church) to be an Apostle by hearsay (ch. iii. 2), so as to need credentials to accredit him with them" (iii. 4).

This objection, as will be seen by the notes on iii. 2, is founded on inattention to the force of εἰ γε, and of the aorist ἡκούσατε. The meaning is not, as E. V., 'If ye have heard,' implying a doubt whether they ever had heard, but as given in my note in loc., 'If, that is, ye heard,'—i. e. 'assuming that, when I was with you, ye heard;' and the words convey a reminiscence of that which they did hear. The ere-

4 In Conybeare's version he gives the force of εἰ γε, but, as so often, renders the aorist by a perfect, 'for I suppose that you have heard.'
dential view of ver. 4 falls with this mistaken rendering of ver. 2: not to mention that it could not for a moment stand, even were that other possible, the reference being to what was before written in ch. i. 5

14. "Fourthly, he could not describe the Ephesians as so exclusively Gentiles (ch. ii. 11; iv. 17), and so recently converted" (v. 8: i. 13; ii. 13).

To the former objection I reply, 1) that the Ephesian church, as other churches out of Judaea, would naturally be composed for the most part of Gentiles, and as such would be addressed in the main as Gentiles: so we have him writing to the Romans, xi. 13, ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν. And if exception be taken to this reference, and it be understood as rather marking off the Gentile portion of those to whom he was then writing, the same exception cannot be taken to 1 Cor. xii. 2, where, in writing to a mixed church (Acts xviii. 4, 8), he says, almost in the same words as in Eph. ii. 11, αὕτη διὶ ἡμᾶς ἡ ἡμεῖς, κ.τ.λ.: 2) that in this Epistle, of all others, we might expect to find the distinction between Jew and Gentile pass into the background, the subject being, the constitution and glories of the universal Church: 3) that, as before remarked (under 7), indications are not wanting of the mixed composition of the Ephesian Church. Surely the ἓν τῶν δύο κτίσεως ἐν αἰτίῳ εἰς ἑνα κακόν ἀνθρωπον (ii. 15) would not have been written to a Church exclusively Gentile.

To the latter objection I answer, that in no one of the passages cited is there the slightest intimation of their having been recently converted; —but, if any temporal conclusion can be drawn from them, all three testify rather to a considerable period having elapsed since that event. In ch. v. 8 we have, ἡτε γὰρ ποτὲ σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ: in i. 13, ἐν δὲ καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσφραγισθῆτε . . . : in ii. 13, ὡμεῖς οἱ ποτὲ δόντες μακρῶν ἐγενήθητε ἐγγύσ.

Of the first and third of these, we may observe that the same poté designates their unconverted state, by which he designates his own in Gal. i. 13, 23 bis, Tit. iii. 3: yet his conversion was by many years antecedent to that of the Ephesians. Of the second and third, that the aorists serve to remove both the things spoken out of the category of recent events. Had their conversion been recent, and its presence, as an act, still abiding, we should have read perfects here and not aorists. 6

15. Having endeavoured to give a reply to these internal objections to the Ephesian view of the Epistle, I go on to notice the external difficulties besetting the view which I have taken.

5 This indeed is confessed in Conybeare's note, in loc. p. 497.
6 The force of the former aorist is preserved in Conybeare's version, "you believed in him and received his seal!" but the latter is made into a perfect, "ye who were once far off have been brought near;" this not being one of those cases where ῥυπ makes such a rendering in English necessary. See note there.
16. They may be summed up in a discussion of the various reading in ch. i. 1 (see var. readings), by which ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is omitted from the text. Basil the Great, contra Eunom. ii. 19, vol. i. p. 254 f., says: τοῖς Ἐφεσίωσι ἐπιστέλλων ὥσ γνησίως ὠρμώντος τῷ ὄντι δὲ ἐπειρόμενοι, ὡς τὰς αὐτοὺς ἰδιαίτερως ὁμόμοιαν εἰπόν τοὺς ἁγίως τοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. οὕτω γὰρ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδόκασιν, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων εἴρηκαμεν. From this we infer, that Basil received our Epistle as really written to the Ephesians, but read ch. i. 1 without the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, both traditionally, and because he had seen it so read in ancient MSS. The testimony then does not touch the recognition of the Epistle as written to the Ephesians, but simply the insertion or omission of the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the text; a matter with which we will deal below.


(a) Jerome: “Quidam . . . putant . . . eos qui Ephesio sunt sancti et fideles essentiae vocabulo nuncupatos, ut . . . ab eo qui est, hi qui sunt appellentur. . . . Alii vero simpliciter non ad eos qui sint (al. sunt), sed qui Ephesio sancti et fideles sint, scriptum arbitrantur.” Ad Eph. i. 1, vol. vii. p. 545.

But doubtless this may point to the various reading, and I have allowed it in the Digest as a testimony that way: but it is by no means a decisive one. It may be fairly interpreted on the contrary hypothesis, as indeed Meyer takes it. “Eos qui Ephesio sunt sancti et fideles” represents τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ πιστοῖς. This he may be assumed to have read without dispute. Then he proceeds to say, that τοῖς οὖσιν was interpreted in two ways: either as an essentiae vocabulum, or as belonging to ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. His whole sentence need not point to any omission of the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.

(b) “Epiphanius quotes Eph. iv. 5, 6, from Marcion’s πρὸς Λαοδικέας.” C. and H. ib., note.

But to this I must demur, for Epiphanius in reality does no such thing. Having cited the words, εἰς κύριος, μία πίστις κ.τ.λ., he proceeds, οὐ γὰρ ἐδοξε τῷ ἑλευστάτῳ Μαρκίων ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ταύτην τὴν μαρτυρίαν λέγεν, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς Λαοδικέας (i. 3. 12, vol. i. p. 375). Therefore his testimony shews merely what we knew before, that Marcion, among his recognized Epistles of St. Paul, had καὶ πρὸς Λαοδικέας λεγομένης μέρη:—that this passage was one of such μέρη;—and that Epiphanius blames him for not quoting it from the Epistle to the Ephesians, where accordingly we infer that he himself read it.

(c) Tertullian. His testimony is the following, contra Marcion. v. 11, vol. ii. p. 500,—“Præter ce hic et de alia epistola quam nos ad Ephesios prescriptam habemus, haeretici vero ad Laodicenos:” and ib. e. 17, p. 512,—“Ecclesiæ quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos, sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando inter-
polare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator: nihil autem de
titulis interest, cum ad omnes apostolus scripserit, dum ad quosdam."

Hence it is commonly argued, and conceded even by Meyer (Einl.
p. 4), that Tertullian did not read the words "Ev 'Efesw, or he would
have charged Marcion with endeavouring to falsify the text as well as
to supply a new title. Certainly, it might be so: but it might also be,
that he used the word titulum in a wide sense, including the title and
the corresponding portion of the text. It might be again, since, as
Epiphanius tells us (see above), Marcion acknowledged only fragments
of an Epistle to the Laodiceans, that the beginning of our Epistle was
not among them.

18. If it be thought necessary to deal with the fact of the omission
of "Ev 'Efesw in B and other ancient MSS., we may find at least an
illustration of it in the words "Ev 'Rwh (Rom. i. 7) being omitted in G
al. It seems to have been done with reference to the catholic subject
of the Epistle, very possibly by churches among whom it was read, and
with a view to generalize the reference of its contents.

19. It is necessary now to deal with two hypotheses respecting the
readers to whom our Epistle was addressed; both obviously falling to the
ground with the genuineness of the words "Ev 'Efesw, but requiring also
separate treatment. The first of these is, that it was to the Laodiceans.
So (see above) Marcion: so Grot., Hammond, Mill, Pierce, Wetst., Paley,
and many more. But this idea has not even tradition to stand on. All
the consensus of the ancient Church is against it. It has nothing to
rest on but conjecture, arising out of the mention of an Epistle to
Laodicei.as, in Col. iv. 16, which seems to have induced Marcion to alter
the title. No single MS. fills in the gap produced by omitting "Ev
'Efesw with the words "Ev Laodicei. Again, if this had been really so,
is it conceivable that the Laodicean church would without protest and
without any remaining sign of their right to the Epistle, have allowed
that right to be usurped by the Ephesians and universally acknowledged
by the church as theirs? See other minor difficulties of the hypothesis
alleged by Meyer, Einl. pp. 9, 10, 19, and Harless, Einl. p. xxxix. This
failing, another way has been struck out, possessing much more plau-
sibility, and gaining many more adherents. It has been supposed that
the Epistle was enyclical, addressed to more churches than Ephesus
only. But I cannot help regarding this hypothesis as even less worthy

\[\text{Vol. III.—17}\]
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of our acceptance than the other. It has against it, 1) and chiefly, its total discrepancy with the spirit of the Epistle, which, to whomsoever sent, is clearly addressed to one set of persons throughout, coexisting in one place, and as one body, and under the same circumstances: 2) the improbability that the Apostle, who in two of his Epistles (2 Cor., Gal.) has so plainly specified their encyclical character, should have here omitted all such specification: 3) the even greater improbability that he should have, as on this hypothesis must be assumed, written a circular Epistle to a district of which Ephesus was the commercial capital, addressed to various churches within that district, yet from its very contents (as by the opponents' hypothesis) not admitting of application to the church of that metropolis, in which he had spent so long a time, and to which he was so affectionately bound: 4) the inconsistency of this hypothesis with the address of the Epistle, and the universal consensus of the ancient church, who, however they read that address, had no doubt of its being properly entitled. Nor is this objection removed by the form of the hypothesis suggested by C. and H., that copies were sent, differently superscribed, which superscriptions, perplexing the copyists, were left out, and then, as copies of the Epistle became spread over the world,—all imported from Ephesus, it was called 'the Epistle from Ephesus,' and so the name of Ephesus came into the text:—for this would, besides being very far-fetched and improbable, not account for the consensus throughout the church, in the Asiatic portion of which, at least, traces of the accurate addresses would be preserved. 5) Another objection, running counter to 1) but not therefore inconsistent with it, is that if it had been encyclical, some notice at least would have been found of special local (or rather regional) circumstances, as in those to the Corinthians and Galatians. The absence of such notice might easily be accounted for, if it were indeed written to the Ephesians alone: but not, if to various Asiatic churches, some of which were so far from having the Ephesians' intimacy with the Apostle, that they had never even seen him. There could be no reason for his addressing in common the churches of Laodicea, Hierapolis, Philadelphia, and others (I take the names from C. and H. ii. 489), except the existence of some common special dangers, and need of some common special exhortation, of neither of which do we find any hint. See various ramifications of this hypothesis dealt with and refuted in Meyer, Einl. pp. 11—13.

20. I infer then, in accordance with the prevalent belief of the Church in all ages, that this Epistle was VERITABLY ADDRESSED TO THE SAINTS IN EPHESUS, and to NO OTHER CHURCH.

2 See C. and H. ii. 489.
SECTION III.

ITS OCCASION, OBJECT, AND CONTENTS.

1. The contents of the Epistle afford no indication of its having sprung out of any special circumstances of the Ephesian church. Tychicus and Onesimus were being sent to Colossæ. The former was charged with a weighty Epistle to the church there, arising out of peculiar dangers which beset them; the latter, with a private apostolic letter of recommendation to his former master, also a resident at Colossæ. Under these circumstances, the yearning heart of St. Paul went forth to his Ephesians. He thought of them as a church in Christ of his own planting—as the mystic Body of Christ, growing onwards for an habitation of God through the Spirit. And, full of such thoughts, he wrote this Epistle to them at the same time with, or immediately subsequent to, his penning of that to the Colossians (on their relation, see below, § vi., and principally, Prolegg. to Col. § iv. 4 ff.).

2. This being so, the object of the Epistle is a general one—to set forth the ground, the course, the aim and end, of the Church of the Faithful in Christ. He speaks to the Ephesians as a type or sample of the Church universal. He writes to them not as an ecclesiastical father, united with others, Timotheus or the like, directing and cautioning them,—but as their Apostle and prisoner in the Lord, bound for them, and set to reveal God's mysteries to them.

3. To this intent and this spirit the contents admirably correspond. Through the whole Epistle, without one exception, we read of ἡ ἐκκλησία in the singular, never of ἐκκλησίαι in the plural. Of this Church, through the whole, he describes the origin and foundation, the work and course, the scope and end. Every where, both in its larger and smaller portions, this threefold division is found. I have endeavoured, in the notes, to point it out, as far as my space would enable me: and those who wish to see it traced yet further, will find this done even with more minuteness than I should be disposed in every particular to subscribe, in Stier's very elaborate and diffuse commentary. But in fact, the trichotomy respecting the Church rests upon another, and sublimer yet. Every where with him the origin and foundation of the Church is in the will of the Father, τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐφεργοῦσα καὶ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεληματος αὐτοῦ,—the work and course of the Church is by the satisfaction of the Son, by our νικωσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ,—the scope and end of the Church is the life in the Holy Spirit,—δύναμεν κραταίω δηναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἐσώ ἐνθρωπον.

4. The various sections will be found indicated in the notes. I will here give only a general summary of the Epistle.—In ch. i., after the introduction of the subject by an ascription of praise to the Father,
who chose us to be holy to Himself in Christ by the Spirit, he opens the counsel of the Father, whose will it was to sum up all things in Christ, and above all His Church, composed of Jews and Gentiles, believers in Christ, and sealed with His Spirit. Then with a sublime prayer, that the eyes of their hearts might be enlightened to see the magnitude of the matter, he brings in the Person of Christ, exalted above all for His Church's sake, to which God hath given Him as Head over all things. Thence he passes to the fact of their own vivification in and with Christ, and the fellowship of the mystery which he, the Apostle of the Gentiles, was set to proclaim to the world, viz. that spiritual life, by which, rooted and grounded in love, they might come to know the knowledge-passing love of Christ, that they might be filled up to all the fulness of God. Thus having laid forth the ground, course, and scope of the Church, he ends this first part of his Epistle with a sublime doxology.

The rest from ch. iv. 1, is principally hortatory: but here also we have the same tripartite division. For he begins by explaining the constitution of the Church, in unity and charity and spiritual gifts, by Christ: then he exhorts to all these graces which illustrate the Christian life,—laying the foundation of each in the counsel of God towards us,—and proposing to us their end, our salvation and God's glory. And this he carries into the common duties of ordinary life—into wedlock, and filial and servile relations. After this, in a magnificent peroration, he exhorts to the putting on of the Christian armour, by which the great end of the militant Church may be attained, to withstand in the evil day, and having accomplished all things, to stand firm. And most aptly, when this is concluded, he sums up all with the Catholic benediction and prayer of ch. vi. 23, 24.

SECTION IV.

AT WHAT TIME AND PLACE IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. When St. Paul wrote our Epistle, he was a prisoner; ch. iii. 1; iv. 1; vi. 20. This narrows our choice of time to two occasions, supposing it to have been written before the period when the history in the Acts terminates:

A) his imprisonment at Jerusalem and Cesarea (Acts xxii. 27—xxvi. 32), from Pentecost 58, to the autumn of 60 (see Chronological Table in Vol. II. Prolegg. pp. 23—25):

B) his imprisonment at Rome, commencing in February 61, and lasting to the end of the history in the Acts, and probably longer.

3 ver. 3 ff.
7 ver. 15 ff.
2 ch. iv. 1—16.

4 ver. 8 ff.
8 ver. 20 ff.
3 iv. 17. v. 21.

5 ver. 10.
9 ch. ii. 1 ff.
4 v. 22—vi. 9.

6 ver. 11 ff.
1 iii. 20 f.
5 vi. 10—20.
2. Further, the three Epistles, to the Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon, it can hardly be questioned, were sent at one and the same time. The two former are connected as well by their great similarity of contents, as by the fact that Tychicus was the common bearer of both: the two latter, by the common mention of Onesimus as sent to Colosse, and the common mention of Epaphras, Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, as sending salutations. In speaking therefore of the time and place of writing this Epistle, we are dealing with those others likewise.

3. The view (A) has been taken by some distinguished scholars of modern times in Germany; Schulz (Stud. u. Krit. 1829, p. 612 f.), Schneekenburger (Beitr. p. 144 f.), Schott, Böttger, Wiggers (Stud. u. Krit. 1811, p. 436 ff.), Thiersch (die Kirche im apostol. Zeitalter, 1852, p. 176), and Meyer (Einl. p. 15 ff).

4. The arguments by which it is supported are best and most compendiously stated by Meyer, and are as follows:

a) Because it is more natural and probable that the slave Onesimus fled from Colosse to Cæsarea, than that he undertook a long sea-voyage to Rome.

b) If our Epistle and that to the Colossians were sent from Rome, Tychicus and his fellow-traveller Onesimus would arrive first at Ephesus and then at Colossæ: in which case we might expect that St. Paul would, in his notice of Tychicus to the Ephesians (ch. vi. 21, 22), have named Onesimus also, as he has done in Col. iv. 8, 9, to gain for his beloved Onesimus a good reception in Ephesus also. Whereas, if Tychicus and Onesimus travelled from Cæsarea, they would come first, according to the purpose of Onesimus’s journey, to Colosse, where the slave would be left with his master,—and thence to Ephesus: in which case Onesimus would naturally be named in the Epistle to the Colossians, and not in that to the Ephesians.

c) In Eph. vi. 21, ἵνα δὲ εἴδοτε καὶ ἔμειν—καὶ shews that, when Tychicus should arrive at Ephesus, he would already have reported the affairs of the Apostle to some others. These others are the Colossians, whom Paul knew that he would visit first: which again speaks for Cæsarea, and not for Rome, as the place of writing. Had it been the latter, the καὶ would have appeared in Col. iv. 8, not in Eph. vi. 21.

d) In Philem. 22, the Apostle begs Philemon to prepare him a lodging, and seems to anticipate occupying it soon; which assumes a direct journey to Phrygia after his liberation, which he would reach almost contemporaneously with the arrival of Onesimus. Now it appears from Phil. ii. 24, that on his liberation from his Roman imprisonment, he intended to go to Macedonia, which is inconsistent with visiting Philemon.

5. The view (B) has been the general belief from ancient times down-
wards. Its upholders urge that every circumstance of the Epistle fits it; and reply to the considerations urged above,

a) That there is no weight in this: a fugitive slave would be in fact more likely than otherwise to get on board ship and take refuge in the great metropolis. And there, notwithstanding what Meyer says to the contrary, he would be more likely to escape the search of the 'fugitivarii,' whose knowledge and occupation, we may presume, were principally local, hardly in strict organization over the whole empire.

b) This evidently requires, to be good for any thing, the assumption, that it fell in with the Apostle's plan, to recommend Onesimus to the Ephesians. But in the absence of any allusion to personal matters in this Epistle,—in the reference of all such things to Tychicus,—accordant with the very general purpose and subject of the Epistle itself, this assumption cannot be received. Meyer argues that the general character of our Epistle cannot be pleaded with regard to the one passage in which is individual and personal. But surely, it is perfectly legitimate to say, even with regard to such a passage, that the same plan, which induced the Apostle to insert only one such passage in the Epistle, would also induce him to insert one personal notice only in such passage. To found an argument on any such omission in our Epistle, would be unsafe.

c) This, it is maintained, falls entirely to the ground on the different rendering of καὶ, adopted in the following commentary (see note in loc.);—viz. referring it, not to another party who were to receive notices of the Apostle, besides those to whom he was writing, but to the reciprocal introduction of ἵματι, 'you also concerning me, as I have been long treating concerning you.'

d) No argument can be raised on ground so entirely uncertain as this. It is very possible that altered circumstances may from time to time have changed the Apostle's plans; and that, as we have some reason to believe his projected journey to Spain (Rom. xv. 22—24) to have been relinquished, or at all events postponed,—so also other projected journeys may have been, according as different churches seemed to require his presence, or new fields of missionary work to open before him. Besides which, it may be fairly said, that there is nothing inconsistent in the two expressions, of Phil. ii. 23 and Philem. 22, with the idea of the Apostle projecting a land journey through Greece to Asia Minor: or at all events a general visitation, by what route he may not as yet have determined, which should embrace both Philippi and Colosse.

6. On the positive side of this view (B), it is alleged, that the circumstances of the Roman imprisonment suit those of these Epistles better than those of the Cæsarean. From Eph. vi. 19, 20, we gather that he had a certain amount of freedom in preaching the Gospel, which is
hardly consistent with what we read in Acts xxiv. 23 of his imprisonment at Cæsarea, where, from the necessity of the case, a stricter watch was requisite (cf. Acts xxiii. 21), and none but those ascertained to be his friends (οἱ ἰδίων αὐτοῦ) were permitted to see him. Among any such multitude of Jews as came to his lodgings on the other occasion, Acts xxviii. 23 ff., might easily be introduced some of the conspirators, against whom he was being guarded.

Besides, we may draw some inference from his companions, as mentioned in these Epistles. Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Marcus, Jesus Justus, Epaphras, Lucas, Demas, were all with him. Of these it is very possible that Lucas and Aristarchus may have been at Cæsarea during his imprisonment, for we find them both accompanying him to Rome, Acts xxvii. 1, 2. But it certainly is not so probable that all these were with him at one time in Cæsarea. The two, Lucas and Aristarchus, are confessedly common to both hypotheses. Then we may safely ask, In which of the two places is it more probable that six other of his companions were found gathered round him? In the great metropolis, where we already know, from Rom. xvi., that so many of the brethren were sojourning,—or at Cæsarea, which, though the most important place in Palestine, would have no attraction to gather so many of his friends, except the prospect of sailing thence with him, which we know none of them did?

Perhaps this is a question which never can be definitely settled, so as absolutely to preclude the Cæsarean hypothesis: but I own it appears to me that the whole weight of probability is on the Roman side. Those who firmly believe in the genuineness of this Epistle, will find another reason why it should be placed at Rome, at an interval of from three to five years after the Apostle’s parting with the Ephesians in Acts xx., rather than at Cæsarea, so close upon that event. In this latter case, the absence of all special notices would be far more surprising than it is at present.

7. We may then, I believe, safely assume that our Epistle was written from Rome,—and that probably during the period comprised in Acts xxviii. 30, before St. Paul’s imprisonment assumed that harsher character which seems to come before us in the Epistle to the Philosophians (see Prolegg. to that Epistle, § iii.).

8. This would bring the time of writing it within the limits A.D. 61—63: and we should not perhaps be far wrong in dating it A.D. 62.

SECTION V.

ITS LANGUAGE AND STYLE.

1. As might be expected from the account given of the object of our
Epistle in § iii., the thoughts and language are elevated and sublime; and that to such a degree, that it takes, in this respect, a place of its own among the writings of St. Paul: \( \psi ψηλόν \) σφόδρα γέμει τῶν νομιμάτων καὶ ὑπερόγκων ἰα γὰρ μηδαμῷ σχεδὸν ἐφθέγξατο, ταῦτα ἑναίθα δήλοι, Chrys., who subjoins examples of this from ch. iii. 10; ii. 6; iii. 5. Theophylact says, ἐτεὶ οὖν δεισιδαίμον τε ἣν οὕτῳ ἡ πόλις, καὶ οὕτω σαφῶς ἤκμα, πολλῇ σπουδῇ κέχρηται Πάυλος πρὸς τοὺς τοιούτους γράφων, καὶ τὰ βαθύτερα δὲ τῶν νομιμάτων καὶ ψηλότερα αὐτοῖς ἐπιστευέντες, ἀτε κατηχημένους ἤδη. So also Grotius, in his preface: “Paulus jam vetus in apostolico munere, et ob Evangelium Romæ vinctus, ostendit illis quanta sit vis Evangelii praediconum omnibus: quomodo omnia Dei consilia ab omni aequo eo tetenderint, quam admiranda sit in eo Dei efficacio, rerum sublimitatem adaequans verbis sublimioribus quam ulla unquam habuit linguæ humanae.” Witsius, in his Meletemata Leidensia (p. 192; cited by Dr. Eadie, Commentary on the Ephesians, Introd. p. xxxi) thus characterizes it: “Ita vero universam religionis Christianæ summam divina hac epistola exponit, ut exuberantem quandam non sermonis tantum evangelici παρρησίαν, sed et Spiritus Sancti vim et sensum, et charitatis Christianæ flammam quandam ex electo illo pectore emicantem, et lucis divinae fulgorem quendam admirabilem inde elucidentem, et fontem aquæ vivæ inde scaturientem, aut ebullientem potius, animadvertere liceat: idque tanta copia, ut superabundans illa cordis plenitudo, ipsa animi sensa intimosque conceptus, conceptus autem verba prolata, verba denique priora queaque subsequentia, premant, urgeant, obruant.”

2. These characteristics contribute to make our Epistle by far the most difficult of all the writings of St. Paul. Elsewhere, as in the Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Colossians, the difficulties lie for the most part at or near the surface: a certain degree of study will master, not indeed the mysteries of redemption which are treated of, but the contextual coherence, and the course of the argument: or if not so, will at least serve to point out to every reader where the hard texts lie, and to bring out into relief each point with which he has to deal: whereas here the difficulties lie altogether beneath the surface; are not discernible by the cursory reader, who finds all very straightforward and simple. We may deduce an illustration from secular literature. Every moderately advanced schoolboy believes he can construe Sophocles; he does not see the difficulties which await him, when he becomes a mature scholar, in that style apparently so simple. So here also, but for a different reason. All on the surface is smooth, and flows on unquestioned by the untheological reader: but when we begin to enquire, why thought succeeds to thought, and one cumbrous parenthesis to another,—depths under depths disclose themselves, wonderful systems of parallel allusion, frequent and complicated underplots; every word, the more we search, approves itself as set in its exact logical place; we see every phrase contributing, by its
own similar organization and articulation, to the carrying out of the organic whole. But this result is not won without much labour of thought, —without repeated and minute laying together of portions and expressions, —without bestowing on single words and phrases, and their succession and arrangement, as much study as would suffice for whole sections of the more exoteric Epistles.

3. The student of the Epistle to the Ephesians must not expect to go over his ground rapidly; must not be disappointed, if the week’s end find him still on the same paragraph, or even on the same verse, weighing and judging,—penetrating gradually, by the power of the mind of the Spirit, through one outer surface after another,—gathering in his hand one and another ramifying thread, till at last he grasps the main cord whence they all diverged, and where they all unite,—and stands rejoicing in his prize, deeper rooted in the faith, and with a firmer hold on the truth as it is in Christ.

4. And as the wonderful effect of the Spirit of inspiration on the mind of man is nowhere in Scripture more evident than in this Epistle, so, to discern those things of the Spirit, is the spiritual mind here more than any where required. We may shew this by reference to De Wette, one of the ablest of Commentators. I have mentioned above, § i. 6, that he approaches this Epistle with an unfortunate and unworthy prejudgment of its spuriousness. He never thinks of applying to it that humble and laborious endeavour which rendered his commentary on the Romans among the most valuable in existence. It is not too much to say, that on this account he has missed almost every point in the Epistle: that his Handbuch, in this part of it, is hardly better than works of third-rate or fourth-rate men: and just for this reason—that he has never come to it with any view of learning from it, but with the averted eyes of a prejudiced man. Take, as a contrast, the two laborious volumes of Stier. Here, I would not deny, we have the opposite course carried into extreme: but with all Stier’s faults of too minute classification,—of wearisome length in exegesis,—of unwillingness to lose, and attempts to combine, every divergent sense of the same passage,—we have the precious and most necessary endowment of spiritual discernment,—acquaintance with the analogy of the faith. And in consequence, the acquisition to the Church of Christ from his minute dissection of this Epistle has been most valuable; and sets future students, with regard to it, on higher spiritual ground than they ever occupied before.

5. It is not to be wondered at, where the subject is sui generis, and treated of in a method and style unusually sublime, that the ἀπαξι ονομα should be in this Epistle more in number than common, as well as the ideas and images peculiar to it. The student will find both these pointed out and treated of in the references and the notes. I would again impress on him, as against De Wette and others, that all such
phenomena, instead of telling against its genuineness, are in its favour, and that strongly. Any skilful forger would not perhaps make his work a mere cento from existing undoubted expressions of St. Paul, but at all events would write on new matter in the Apostle’s well-known phrasology, avoiding all words and ideas which were in his writings entirely without example.

SECTION VI.

ITS RELATION TO THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

1. I reserve the full discussion of this subject to the chapter on the Epistle to the Colossians. It would be premature, until the student is in full possession of the object and occasion of that Epistle, to institute our comparison between the two.

2. It may suffice at present to say what may be just enough, as regards the distinctive character of the Epistle to the Ephesians. And this may be done by remarking, that we have here, in the midst of words and images common to the two, an entire absence of all controversial allusion, and of all assertion as against maintainers of doctrinal error. The Christian state, and its realization in the Church, is the one subject, and is not disturbed by any looking to the deviations from that state on either hand, nor guarded, except from that fundamental and directly subversive error of impure and unholy practice.

CHAPTER III.

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILippiANS.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP AND INTEGRITY.

1. It has been all but universally believed that this Epistle was written by St. Paul. Indeed, considering its peculiarly Pauline psychological character, the total absence from it of all assignable motive for falsification, the spontaneity and fervour of its effusions of feeling, he must be a bold man who would call its authorship in question 1.

1 Meyer quotes from Riliolet, Commentaire, Genève, 1811: “Si parmi les écrits de Paul il est vu, qui plus d’autres porte l’empreinte de la spontanéité, et repousse toute apparence de falsification motivée par l’intérêt d’une secte, c’est sans contredit l’épître aux Philippiens.”
2. Yet this has been done, partially by Schrader (der Apost. Paulus, vol. v.; see especially p. 233, line 14 from bottom, and following), who supposed ch. iii. 1—iv. 9 interpolated, as well as shorter passages elsewhere, conceding however the Pauline authorship in the main: and entirely by Baur (Paulus Ap. Jesu Christi u.s.w., pp. 458—475), on his usual ground of later Gnostic ideas being found in the Epistle. To those who would see an instance of the very insanity of hypercriticism, I recommend the study of these pages of Baur. They are almost as good by way of burlesque, as the "Historic Doubts respecting Napoleon Buonaparte" of Abp. Whately. According to him, all unusual expressions prove its spuriousness, as being taken from other Epistles: all unusual expressions prove the same, as being from another than St. Paul. Poverty of thought, and want of point, are charged against it in one page: in another, excess of point, and undue vigour of expression. Certainly the genuineness of the Epistle will never suffer in the great common-sense verdict of mankind, from Baur’s attack. There is hardly an argument used by him, that may not more naturally be reversed and turned against himself.

3. In external testimonies, our Epistle is rich.

(a) Polycarp, ad Philipp. iii., p. 1008, testifies to the fact of St. Paul having written to them,

. . . . Παύλου . . . . δς καὶ ἄπων ὑμῖν ἔγραφεν ἐπιστολάς, εἰς ὑς ἐὰν ἐγκύπτητε, δινηθήσεσθε οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθείαν ὑμῖν πίστιν.

(β) And ib. xi., pp. 1013 f., he writes,

"Ego autem nihil tale sensi in vobis, vel audivi, in quibus laboravit beatus Paulus, qui estis (laudati) in principio epistolae ejus. De vobis etenim gloriatur in omnibus ecclesiis quæ Deum solœ tune cognoverant." Cf. Phil. i. 5 ff.

(γ) Irenæus, iv. 18. 4, p. 251:

"Quemadmodum et Paulus Philippensibus (iv. 18) ait: Repletus sum acceptis ab Epaphroditò, quæ a vobis missa sunt, odorem suavitatis, hostiam acceptabilem, placentem Deo."

(δ) Clement of Alexandria, Paedag. i. 6 [52], p. 129 P.:

αὐτοῦ ὁμολογοῦντος τοῦ Παύλου περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ὁμή ὡς ἡ ἡδον ἠλαβόν ἡ ἡδον τετελείωμαι κ.τ.λ. Phil. iii. 12—14.

In Strom. iv. 3 [12], p. 569 P., he quotes Phil. ii. 20: in id. 5 [19], p. 572, Phil. i. 13: in id. 13 [94], p. 604, Phil. i. 29, 30; ii. 1 ff., 17; i. 7; and ii. 20 ff., &c. &c.

(ε) In the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, in Euseb.

2 Not necessarily to be understood of more than one Epistle. See Coteler and Hefele in loc.
H. E. v. 2, the words ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οἷς ἄρταγμον ἤγγισατο τὸ εἶναι ἵνα θεῷ are cited. Cf. Phil. ii. 6.

(ξ) Tertullian, de recurr. carnis, c. 23, vol. ii. p. 826:
"Ipse (Paulus, from the preceeding sentence) cum Philippensibus serabit: sigua, inquit, concurram in resuscitationem quae est a mortuis, non quia jam accepi aut consummatus sum," &c. &c. Phil. iii. 11 ff.

(η) The same author devotes the 20th chapter of his fifth book against Marcion (p. 522 f.) to testimonies from this Epistle, and shews that Marcion acknowledged it. And de præscr. e. 36, p. 49, among the places to which 'authenticæ literæ' of the Apostle's 'recitatur,' he says, 'habes Philippos.'

(θ) Cyprian, Testt. iii. 39, p. 756:
"Item Paulus ad Philippenses: Qui in figura Dei constitutus," &c. ch. ii. 6—11.

4. It has been hinted above, that Schrader doubted the integrity of our Epistle. This has also been done in another form by Heinrichs, who fancied it made up of two letters,—one to the Church, containing chaps. i. ii., to ἐν κυρίῳ iii. 1, and iv. 21—23: the other to private friends, beginning at τὰ αὐτὰ ἡγράφειν, iii. 1, and containing the rest with the above exception. Paulus also adopted a modification of this view. But it is hardly necessary to say, that it is altogether without foundation. The remarks below (§ iv.) on its style will serve to account for any seeming want of exact juncture between one part and another.

SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS AND WITH WHAT OBJECT IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. The city of Philippi has been described, and the πρῶτη τῆς μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις, κολονία discussed, in the notes on Acts xvi. 12 ff., to which the student is referred. I shall now notice only the foundation and condition of the Philippian Church.

2. The Gospel was first-planted there by Paul, Silas, and Timotheus (Acts xvi. 12 ff.), in the second missionary journey of the Apostle, in A.D. 51. (See Chron. Table in Prolegg. to Acts.) There we read of only a few conversions, which however became a rich and prolific seed of future fruit. He must have visited it again on his journey from Ephesus into Macedonia, Acts xx. 1; and he is recorded to have done so (a third time), when, owing to a change of plan to avoid the machinations of his enemies, the Jews at Corinth, he returned to Asia through Macedonia; see Acts xx. 6. But we have no particulars of either of these visits.
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3. The cruel treatment of the Apostle at Philippi (Acts xvi. 1. c. 1 Thess. ii. 2) seems to have combined with the charm of his personal fervour of affection to knit up a bond of more than ordinary love between him and the Philippian Church. They, alone of all churches, sent subsidies to relieve his temporal necessities, on two several occasions, immediately after his departure from them (Phil. iv. 15, 16; 1 Thess. ii. 2): and they revived the same good office to him shortly before the writing of this Epistle (Phil. iv. 10, 18; 2 Cor. xi. 9).

4. This affectionate disposition may perhaps be partly accounted for by the fact of Jews being so few at Philippi. There was no synagogue there, only a προσευχή by the river side: and the opposition to the Apostle arose not from Jews, but from the masters of the dispossessed maiden, whose hope of gain was gone. Thus the element which resisted St. Paul in every Church, was wanting, or nearly so, in the Philippian. His fervent affection met there, and almost there only, with a worthy and entire return. And all who know what the love of a warm-hearted people to a devoted minister is, may imagine what it would be between such a flock and such a shepherd. (See below, on the style of the Epistle.)

5. But while this can hardly be doubted, it is equally certain that the Church at Philippi was in danger from Jewish influence: not indeed among themselves, but operating on them from without (ch. iii. 2),—through that class of persons whom we already trace in the Epistle to the Galatians, and see ripened in the Pastoral Epistles, who insisted on the Mosaic law as matter of external observance, while in practice they gave themselves up to a life of lust and self-indulgence in depraved conscience.

6. The slight trace which is to be found in ch. iv. 2, 3, of the fact related Acts xvi. 13, that the Gospel at Philippi was first received by female converts, has been pointed out in the notes there.

7. The general state of the Church may be gathered from several hints in this Epistle and others. They were poor. In 2 Cor. viii. 1, 2, we read that ἣ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία αἰτῶν ἐπερύσσεωσεν εἰς τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς ἀπλότητος αἰτῶν. They were in trouble, and probably from persecution: compare 2 Cor. viii. 2 with Phil. i. 28—30. They were in danger of, if not already in, quarrel and dissension (cf. ch. ii. 1—4; and i. 27; ii. 12, 14; iv. 2); on what account, we cannot say; it may be, as has been supposed by De W., that they were peculiarly given to spiritual pride and mutual religious rivalry and jealousy. This may have arisen out of their very progress and flourishing state as a Church engendering pride. Credner supposes (Davidson, p. 381), that it may have

3 This has been supposed, by Eichhorn, Storr, Flatt, &c., but certainly without reason. De W. and Dr. Davidson refer (i. 380) with praise to Schinz, Die christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi, ein exegetischer Versuch, 1833, which I have not seen.
been a spiritual form of the characteristic local infirmity, which led them to claim the title πρῶτη πόλις for their city; but this falls to the ground, if πρῶτη be geographically explained: see note Acts xvi. 12.

8. The object of the Epistle seems to have been no marked and definite one, but rather the expression of the deepest Christian love, and the exhortation, generally, to a life in accordance with the Spirit of Christ. Epaphroditus had brought to the Apostle the contribution from his beloved Philippians; and on occasion of his return, he takes the opportunity of pouring out his heart to them in the fulness of the Spirit, refreshing himself and them alike by his expressions of affection, and thus led on by the inspiring Spirit of God to set forth truths, and dilate upon motives, which are alike precious for all ages, and for every Church on earth.

SECTION III.

AT WHAT PLACE AND TIME IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. It has been believed, universally in ancient times (Chrys., Euthal., Athanas., Thdrt., &c.), and almost without exception (see below) in modern, that our Epistle was written from Rome, during the imprisonment whose beginning is related in Acts xxviii. 30, 31.

2. There have been some faint attempts to fix it at Corinth (Acts xviii. 11, so Oeder, in Meyer), or at Cæsarea (so Paulus and Böttger, and Riliet hesitatingly; see Meyer). Neither of these places will suit the indications furnished by the Epistle. The former view surely needs no refuting. And as regards the latter it may be remarked, that the strait between life and death, expressed in ch. i. 21—23, would not fit the Apostle’s state in Cæsarea, where he had the appeal to Cæsar in his power, putting off all events such a decision for some time. Besides which, the Καίσαρος οἰκία, spoken of ch. iv. 22, cannot well be the πραυτόριον τοῦ Ἰωάννου at Cæsarea of Acts xxiii. 35, and therefore it is by that clearer notice that the πραυτόριον of ch. i. 13 must be interpreted (see note there), not vice versâ. It was probably the barrack of the praetorian guards, attached to the palatium of Nero.

3. Assuming then that the Epistle was written from Rome, and during the imprisonment of Acts xxviii. ultt., it becomes an interesting question, to which part of that imprisonment it is to be assigned.

4. On comparing it with the three contemporaneous Epistles, to the Colossians, to the Ephesians, and to Philemon, we shall find a marked difference. In them we have (Eph. vi. 19, 20) freedom of preaching the Gospel implied: here (ch. i. 13—18) much more stress is laid upon his bondage, and it appears that others, not he himself, preached the Gospel, and made the fact of his imprisonment known. Again, from this same
passage it would seem that a considerable time had elapsed since his imprisonment: enough for "his bonds" to have had the general effects there mentioned. This may be inferred also from another fact: the Philippians had heard of his imprisonment,—had raised and sent their contribution to him by Epaphroditus,—had heard of Epaphroditus's sickness,—of the effect of which news on them he (Epaphroditus) had had time to hear, ch. ii. 26, and was now recovered, and on his way back to them. These occurrences would imply four casual journeys from Rome to Philippi. Again (ch. ii. 19, 23) he is expecting a speedy decision of his cause, which would hardly be while he was dwelling as in Acts xxviii. ultt.

5. And besides all this, there is a spirit of anxiety and sadness throughout this Epistle, which hardly agrees with the two years of the imprisonment in the Acts, nor with the character of those other Epistles. His sufferings are evidently not the chain and the soldier only. Epaphroditus’s death would have brought on him ΛΩΠΗ ἔπι ΛΩΠΗ (ch. ii. 27): there was then a ΛΩΠΗ before. He is now in an ἄγων—in one not, as usual, between the flesh and the spirit, not concerning the long-looked for trial of his case, but one of which the Philippians had heard (ch. i. 29, 30), and in which they shared by being persecuted too: some change in his circumstances, some intensification of his imprisonment, which had taken place before this time.

6. And if we examine history, we can hardly fail to discover what this was, and whence arising. In February, 61, St. Paul arrived in Rome (see Chron. Table in Prolegg. to Acts, Vol. II.). In 62⁴, Burrus, the praetorian prefect, died, and a very different spirit came over Nero's government: who in the same year divorced Octavia, married Poppea⁵, a Jewish proselytess⁶, and exalted Tigellinus, the principal promoter of that marriage, to the joint praetorian praefecture. From that time, Nero began 'ad deteriores inclinare': ΊSeneca lost his power: 'validior in dies Tigellinum': a state of things which would manifestly deteriorate the condition of the Apostle, and have the effect of hastening on his trial. It will not be unreasonable to suppose that, some little time after the death of Burrus (Feb., 63, would complete the δείκτια ὁλη of Acts xxviii. 30), he was removed from his own house into the πραιτώριον, or barrack of the praetorian guards attached to the palace, and put into stricter custody, with threatening of immediate peril of his life. Here it would be very natural that some of those among the praetorians who had had the custody of him before, should become agents in giving the publicity to "his bonds," which he mentions ch. i. 13. And

---

⁴ Tacit. Annal. xiv. 51. See Clinton’s Fasti Romani, i. p. 44.
⁵ Tacit. Annal. xiv. 60.
⁶ Jos. Antt. xx. 8. 11.
⁷ Tacit. Annal. xiv. 52.
⁸ Tacit. Annal. xiv. 57.
such a hypothesis suits eminently well all the circumstances of our Epistle.

7. According to this, we must date it shortly after Feb., 63: when now the change was fresh, and the danger imminent. Say for its date then, the summer of 63.

SECTION IV.

LANGUAGE AND STYLE.

1. The language of this Epistle is thoroughly Pauline. Baur has indeed selected some phrases which he conceives to savour of the vocabulary of the later Gnosticism, but entirely without ground. All those which he brings forward, ὡς ἀφαγομὲν ἠγέρσατο,—ἐκείνωσεν,—μορφὴ θεοῦ,—σχῆμα,—καταχθόνιον,—may easily be accounted for without any such hypothesis: and, as has been already observed in Prolegg. to Ephesians, peculiar expressions may just as well be held to have descended from our Epistle to the Gnostics, as vice versa.

2. The mention of ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι in ch. i. 1, has surprised some. I have explained in the note there, that it belongs probably to the late date of our Epistle. But it need surprise no one, however that may be: for the terms are found in an official sense, though not in formal conjunction, in speeches made, and Epistles written long before this: e. g. in Acts xx. 28; Rom. xvi. 1.

3. In style, this Epistle, like all those where St. Paul writes with fervour, is discontinuous and abrupt, passing rapidly from one theme to another\(^1\); full of earnest exhortations\(^2\), affectionate warnings\(^3\), deep and wonderful settings-forth of his individual spiritual condition and feelings\(^4\), of the state of Christians\(^5\) and of the sinful world\(^6\),—of the loving counsels of our Father respecting us\(^7\), and the self-sacrifice and triumph of our Redeemer\(^8\).

4. No epistle is so warm in its expressions of affection\(^9\). Again and again we have ἀγαπητοὶ and ἄδελφοι recurring: and in one place, ch. iv. 1, he seems as if he hardly could find words to pour out the fulness of his love—οὖστε, ἄδελφοι μου ἀγαπητοὶ καὶ ἐπιτόθητοι, χαρά καὶ στέφανος

---

\(^1\) e. g., ch. ii. 18, 19,—21, 25,—30, iii. 1,—2, 3, 4,—14, 15, &c.
\(^2\) See ch. i. 27, iii. 16, iv. 1 ff., 4, 5, 8, 9.
\(^3\) See ch. ii. 3, 4, 14 ff., iii. 2, 17—19.
\(^4\) See ch. i. 21—26, ii. 17, iii. 4,—14, iv. 12, 13.
\(^5\) See ch. ii. 15, 16, iii. 3, 20, 21.
\(^6\) See ch. iii. 18, 19.
\(^7\) See ch. i. 6, ii. 13, iv. 7, 19.
\(^8\) See ch. ii. 4—11.
\(^9\) See ch. i. 7, 8, ii. 1, 2, iv. 1.
CHAPTER IV.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

SECTION I.

AUTHORSHIP.

1. That this Epistle is a genuine work of St. Paul, was never doubted in ancient times: nor did any modern critic question the fact, until Schrader¹, in his commentary, pronounced some passages suspicious, and led the way in which Baur² and Meyerhoff³ followed. In his later work, Baur entirely rejects it⁴. The grounds on which these writers rest, are partly the same as those already met in the Prolegomena to the Ephesians. The Epistle is charged with containing phrases and ideas derived from the later heretical philosophies,—an assertion, the untenableness of which I have there shewn as regards that Epistle, and almost the same words would suffice for this. Even De Wette disclaims and refutes their views, maintaining its genuineness: though as Dr. Davidson remarks, "it is strange that, in replying to them so well, he was not led to question his own rejection of the authenticity of the Ephesian Epistle."

2. The arguments drawn from considerations peculiar to this Epistle, its diction and style, will be found answered under § iv.

3. Among many external testimonies to its genuineness and authen-
ticity are the following:

(a) Justin Martyr, contra Tryph. S5, p. 182, calls our Lord πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως (Col. i. 15), and similarly § 84, p. 181; 100, p. 195.

¹ Der Apost. Paulus, v. 175 ff.
³ Der Br. an die Col., &c. Berlin, 1838.
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(β) Theophilus of Antioch, ad Autolycum, ii. 22, p. 365, has: τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἐγίνησε προφορικόν, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως. These may perhaps hardly be conceded as direct quotations. But the following are beyond doubt:

(γ) Irenæus, iii. 14. 1, p. 201:

"Iterum in ea epistola quæ est ad Colossenses, ait: 'Salutat vos Lucas medicus dilectus.'" (ch. iv. 14.)

(δ) Clement of Alexandria, Strom. i. 1 [15], p. 325 P.:

κάν τῇ πρὸς Κολοσσαῖς ἐπιστολή, "νοθετοῦντες," γράφει, "πάντα ἀνθρωπὸν καὶ διδάσκοντες κ.τ.λ." (ch. i. 28.)

In Strom. iv. 7 [56], p. 588, he cites ch. iii. 12 and 14:—in Strom. v. 10 [61, ff.], p. 682 f.,—ch. i. 9—11, 28, ch. ii. 2 ff., ch. iv. 2, 3 ff. In id. vi. 8 [62], p. 771, he says that Παῦλος ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς calls τὴν Ἐλληνικὴν φιλοσοφίαν 'στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου' (Col. ii. 8).

(ε) Tertullian, de praescr. hæret. c. 7, vol. ii. p. 20:

"A quibus nos Apostolus refrænans nominatim philosophiam testatur caveri oportere, scribens ad Colossenses: videte, ne quis sit circumveniens vos &c."

(ch. ii. 8.)

And de Resurr. carnis, c. 23, vol. ii. p. 825 f.:

"Docet quidem Apostolus Colossensibus scribens . . . ." and then he cites ch. ii. 12 ff., and 20,—iii. 1, and 3.

(ζ) Origen, contra Cels. v. 8, vol. i. p. 583:

παρὰ δὲ τῷ Παύλῳ, . . . . τοιαύτ' ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κολοσσαῖς λέεκταν μηδεὶς ὡμᾶς καταβραβευόντω θέλων κ.τ.λ. (ch. ii. 18, 19.)

4. I am not aware that the integrity of the Epistle has ever been called in question. Even those who are so fond of splitting and portioning out other Epistles, do not seem to have tried to subject this to that process.

SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS AND WITH WHAT OBJECT IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. Colossians, or (for of our two oldest MSS.,—A writes one (a) in the title and subscription, and the other (o) in ch. i. 2; and B has a with o written above by 1. m. in the title and subscription, and o in ch. i. 2) Colossae, formerly a large city of Phrygia (ἀνίκετο [Xerxes] εἰς Κολοσσαῖς, πόλιν μεγάλην Φρυγίας, Herod. vii. 30: εξελαύνει [Cyrus] διὰ Φρυγίας . . . . εἰς Κολοσσαίς, πόλιν οἰκουμένην, εὐδαίμονα καὶ μεγάλην, Xen. Anab. i. 2. 6) on the river Lyceus, a branch of the Maeander (ἐν τῇ Λύκος ποταμὸς ἐς χάσμα γῆς ἐσβαλὼν ἀφανίζεται, ἔπειτα διὰ σταδίων ὡς μάλιστά κν

5 See this chasm accounted for in later ages by a Christian legend, Conyb. and Hows., chn. 2, vol. ii. p. 480, note.
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πέντε ἀναφανόμενος, ἐκδοῦ καὶ οὐτὸς ἐς τόν Μαίανδρον. Herod. ibid.). In Strabo’s time it had lost much of its importance, for he describes Apamea and Laodicea as the principal cities in Phrygia, and then says, περίκειται ὑπ’ ἡμῶν διάκονος τοῦ χριστοῦ, and as ὁ καὶ δηλώσας ἡμῖν τήν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην ἐν πνεύματι: and in speaking of their first hearing and accurate knowledge of the grace of God in truth, the Apostle adds καθὼς ἐμάθετε ἀπὸ Ἑπαφρᾶ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ συνδούλου ἡμῶν. As this is not7 καθὼς καὶ ἐμάθετε, we may safely conclude that the ἐμάθετε refers to that first hearing, and by consequence that Epaphras was the founder of the Colossian Church. The time of this founding must have been subsequent to Acts xviii. 23, where St. Paul went καθεξῆς through Galatia and Phrygia, στηρίζων πάντας τοὺς μαθητὰς: in which journey he could not have omitted the Colossians, had there been a Church there.

3. In opposition to the above conclusion, there has been a strong current of opinion that the Church at Colossæ was founded by St. Paul. Theodoret seems to be the first who took this view (Introd. to his Commentary). His argument is founded mainly on what I believe to be a misapprehension of ch. ii. 18, and also on a partial quotation of

6So also Theophylact on ch. i. 2, πάλις Φρυγίας αἱ Καλοσσαῖ, αἱ νῦν λεγόμεναι Χάραι.

7 The rec. has the καί; see var. readd. Its insertion would certainly prima facie change the whole face of the passage as regards Epaphras, and make him into an accessory teacher, after the ἡ ἡμέρα ἤκοισεν. Still, such a conclusion would not be necessary. It might merely carry on the former καθὼς καί, or it might introduce a particular additional to ἐπέγνωσε, specifying the accordance of that knowledge with Epaphras’s teaching.

8 His words are: ἐδει δὲ συνιδεῖν τῶν ἰητῶν τὴν διάνοιαν. Βούλεται γὰρ εἰπεῖν, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν μὴ τεθεαμένων με πολλῆν ἔχω φροντίδα. εἰ γὰρ τῶν μὴ λειτουρκῶν αὐτῶν μόνον τὴν μέριμναν περιέφερε, τῶν ἀπολαυσάντων αὐτοῦ τῆς θέας καὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας οὐδεμίαν ἔχει φροντίδα. Leaving the latter argument to go for what it is worth, it will be at once seen that the οὐ μόνον view falls into the logical difficulty mentioned in the note in loc., and fails to account for the αὐτῶν.
Acts xviii. 23, from which he infers that the Apostle must have visited Colosse in that journey, adducing the words δείξαθε τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν, but without the additional clause στηρίξων πάντας τοὺς μαθητὰς.

4. The same position was taken up and very elaborately defended by Lardner, ch. xiv. vol. ii. p. 472. His arguments are chiefly these:

1) The improbability that the Apostle should have been twice in Phrygia and not have visited its principal cities.

2) The Apostle's assurance of the fruitful state of the Colossian Church, ch. i. 6, 23; ii. 6, 7.

3) The kind of mention which is made of Epaphras, shewing him not to have been their first instructor: laying stress on the καθὼς καὶ in ch. i. 7 (rec. reading, but see above, par. 2), and imagining that the recommendations of him at ch. i. 7, 8, iv. 12, 13, were sent to prevent his being in ill odour with them for having brought a report of their state to St. Paul,—and that they are inconsistent with the idea of his having founded their Church.

4) He contends that the Apostle does in effect say that he had himself dispensed the Gospel to them, ch. i. 21—25.

5) He dwells on the difference (as noted by Chrysostom in his Pref. to Romans, but not with this view) between St. Paul's way of addressing the Romans and Colossians on the same subject, Rom. xiv. 1, 2, Col. ii. 20—23; and infers that as the Romans were not his own converts, the Colossians must have been.

6) From ch. ii. 6, 7, and similar passages as presupposing his own Foundership of their Church.

7) "If Epaphras was sent to Rome by the Colossians to enquire after Paul's welfare, as may be concluded from ch. iv. 7, 8, that token of respect for the Apostle is a good argument of personal acquaintance. And it is allowed, that he had brought St. Paul a particular account of the state of affairs in this Church. Which is another argument that they were his converts."

8) Ch. i. 8, "who declared unto us your love in the Spirit," is "another good proof of personal acquaintance."

9) Ch. iii. 16, as shewing that the Colossians were endowed with spiritual gifts, which they could have received only from an Apostle.

10) From ch. ii. 1, 2, interpreting it as Theodoret above.

11) From the ἄπειρον of ch. ii. 5, as implying previous presence.

12) From ch. iv. 7—9, as "full proof that Paul was acquainted with them, and they with him."

13) From the salutations in ch. iv. 10, 11, 14, and the appearance of Timotheus in the address of the Epistle, as implying that the Colossians were acquainted with St. Paul's fellow-labourers, and consequently with himself.
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14) From the counter salutations in ch. iv. 15.

15) From ch. iv. 3, 4, and 18, as "demands which may be made of strangers, but are most properly made of friends and acquaintance."

16) From the Apostle's intimacy with Philemon, an inhabitant of Colossæ, and his family; and the fact of his having converted him. "Again, ver. 22, St. Paul desires Philemon to prepare him a lodging. Whence I conclude that Paul had been at Colossæ before."

5. To all the above arguments it may at once be replied, that based as they are upon mere verisimilitude, they must give way before the fact of the Apostle never having once directly alluded to his being their father in the faith, as he does so pointedly in 1 Cor. iii. 6, 10; in Gal. i. 11; iv. 13: Phil. ii. 16; iii. 17; iv. 9: 1 Thess. i. 5; ii. 1, &c. Only in the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians, besides here, do we find such notice wanting: in that to the Romans, from the fact being otherwise: in that to the Ephesians, it may be from the general nature of the Epistle, but it may also be because he was not entirely or exclusively their founder: see Acts xviii. 19—28.

6. Nor would such arguments from verisimilitude stand against the logical requirements of ch. ii. 1. In fact, all the inferences on which they are founded will, as may be seen, full as well bear turning the other way, and ranging naturally and consistently enough under the other hypothesis. The student will find them all treated in detail in Dr. Davidson's Introduction, vol. ii. pp. 402—406.

7. It may be interesting to enquire, if the Church at Colossæ owed its origin not to St. Paul, but to Epaphras, why it was so, and at what period we may conceive it to have been founded. Both these questions, I conceive, will be answered by examining that which is related in Acts xix., of the Apostle's long sojourn at Ephesus. During that time, we are told, ver. 10,—τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ ἐτή δύο, ὡστε πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν Ἀσίαν ἀκόουσα τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου, Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλλήνας: —and this is confirmed by Demetrius, in his complaint ver. 26,—θεωρέωτε καὶ ἀκούστε ὅτι οἱ μόνοι Ἐφέσον, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν πάσης τῆς Ἀσίας ὁ Παύλος οὕτος πείσας μετέτηθεν ἰκανὸν ὀχλόν. So that we may well conceive, that during this time Epaphras, a native of Colossæ, and Philemon and his family, also natives of Colossæ, and others, may have fallen in with the Apostle at Ephesus, and become the seeds of the Colossian Church. Thus they would be dependent on and attached to the Apostle, many of them personally acquainted with him and with his colleagues in the ministry. This may also have been the case with them at Laodicea and them at Hierapolis, and thus Pauline Churches sprung up here and there in Asia, while the Apostle confined himself to his central post at Ephesus, where, owing to the concourse to the temple, and the communication with Europe, he found so much and worthy occupation.
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8. I believe that this hypothesis will account for the otherwise strange phænomena of our Epistle, on which Lardner and others have laid stress, as implying that St. Paul had been among them: for their personal regard for him, and his expressions of love to them: for his using, respecting Epaphras, language hardly seeming to fit the proximate founder of their Church:—for the salutations and counter salutations.

9. The enquiry into the occasion and object of this Epistle will be very nearly connected with that respecting the state of the Colossian Church, as disclosed in it.

10. It will be evident to the most cursory reader that there had sprung up in that Church a system of erroneous teaching, whose tendency it was to disturb the spiritual freedom and peace of the Colossians by ascetic regulations: to divide their worship by inculcating reverence to angels, and thus to detract from the supreme honour of Christ.

11. We are not left to infer respecting the class of religionists to which these teachers belonged: for the mention of νομομαθία and σάββατα in ch. ii. 16, at once characterizes them as Judaizers, and leads us to the then prevalent forms of Jewish philosophy, to trace them. Not that these teachers were merely Jews; they were Christians: but their fault was, the attempt to mix with the free and spiritual Gospel of Christ the theosophy and angelology of the Jews of their time, in which they had probably been brought up. Of such theosophy and angelology we find ample traces in the writings of Philo, and in the notices of the Jewish sect of the Essenes given us by Josephus.

12. It does not seem necessary to mark out very strictly the position of these persons as included within the limits of this or that sect known among the Jews: they were infected with the ascetic and theosophic notions of the Jews of their day, who were abundant in Phrygia: and they were attempting to mix up these notions with the external holding of Christianity.

13. There must have been also mingled in with this erroneous Judaistic teaching, a portion of the superstitious tendencies of the Phrygian character, and, as belonging to the Jewish philosophy, much of that incipient Gnosticism which afterwards ripened out into so many strange forms of heresy.

14. It may be noticed that the Apostle does not any where in this Epistle charge the false teachers with immorality of life, as he does the very similar ones in the Pastoral Epistles most frequently. The infer-

9 Cf. B. J. ii. 8. 2—13, where, beginning τρία γὰρ παρὰ Ἰουδαίως εἶδη φιλοσοφεῖται, he gives a full account of the Essenes. Among other things he relates that they took oaths συντηρήσεις τὰ τε τῆς αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν βιβλία, καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων ὄνοματα.

10 See Jos. Antt. xii. 3. 4, where Alexander the Great is related to have sent, in consequence of the disaffection of Lydia and Phrygia, two thousand Mesopotamian and Babylonian Jews to garrison the towns.
ence from this is plain. The false teaching was yet in its bud. Later down, the bitter fruit began to be borne; and the mischief required severer treatment. Here, the false teacher is εἰκὴ φυσιοῦμενος ἐπὸ τοῦ νῦν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ (ch. ii. 18): in 1 Tim. iv. 2, he is κεκαντηριασμένος τῆν ὁδὸν συνειδητοῖς: ib. vi. 5, διεθαρμένος τὸν νῦν, ἀπεστηρημένος τῆς ἀληθείας, νομίζων πορισμῶν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν. Between these two phases of heresy, a considerable time must have elapsed, and a considerable development of practical tendencies must have taken place.

15. Those who would see this subject pursued further, may consult Meyer and De Wette's Einleitungen: Davidson's Introduction, vol. ii. pp. 407—424, where the various theories respecting the Colossian false teachers are mentioned and discussed: and Professor Eadie's Literature of the Epistle, in the Introduction to his Commentary.

16. The occasion then of our Epistle being the existence and influence of these false teachers in the Colossian Church, the object of the Apostle was, to set before them their real standing in Christ: the majesty of His Person, and the completeness of His Redemption: and to exhort them to conformity with their risen Lord: following this out into all the subordinate duties and occasions of common life.

SECTION III.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. I have already shewn in the Prolegg. to the Ephesians that that Epistle, together with this, and that to Philemon, were written and sent at the same time: and have endeavoured to establish, as against those who would date the three from the imprisonment at Cesarea, that it is much more natural to follow the common view, and refer them to that imprisonment at Rome, which is related in Acts xxviii. ultt.

2. We found reason there to fix the date of the three Epistles in A.D. 61 or 62, during that freer portion of the imprisonment which preceded the death of Burrus: such freedom being implied in the notices found both in Eph. vi. 19, 20, and Col. iv. 3, 4, and in the whole tone and spirit of the three Epistles as distinguished from that to the Philippians.

SECTION IV.

LANGUAGE AND STYLE: CONNEXION WITH THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

1. In both language and style, the Epistle to the Colossians is peculiar. But the peculiarities are not greater than might well arise from the fact, that the subject on which the Apostle was mainly writing was
one requiring new thoughts and words. Had not the Epistle to the Romans ever been written, that to the Galatians would have presented as peculiar words and phrases as this Epistle now does.

2. It may be well to subjoin a list of the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα in our Epistle:

- ἀφέσκεια, ch. i. 10. 
- δωμάτιον, ib. 11. 
- ὄρατος, ib. 16. 
- πρωτεύω, ib. 18. 
- εἰρηνοποιώ, ib. 20. 
- μετακινώ, ib. 23. 
- ἀντανακλήσω, ib. 24. 
- πιθανολογία, ch. ii. 4. 
- στερέωμα, ib. 5. 
- συλλαγωγέω, ib. 8. 
- ϕιλοσοφία, ib. 8. 
- θεότης, ib. 9. 
- σωματικός, ib. 9. 
- ἀπεκδιδός, ib. 11. 
- χειρόγραφον, ib. 14. 
- προσχλώ, ib. 14. 
- ἀπεκδίδω, ch. ii. 15.; ch. iii. 9. 
- δειγματίζω, ib. 15. (?) (see Matt. i. 19.)

3. A very slight analysis of the above will shew us to what they are chiefly owing. In ch. i. we have seven: in ch. ii., nineteen or twenty: in ch. iii., seven: in ch. iv., two. It is evident then that the nature of the subject in ch. ii. has introduced the greater number. At the same time it cannot be denied that St. Paul does here express some things differently from his usual practice: for instance, ἀφέσκεια, δωματίον, πρωτεύω, εἰρηνοποιῶ, μετακινῶ, πιθανολογία, ἔμβατεω, μομφή, βραβεῖον, all are peculiarities, owing not to the necessities of the subject, but to style: to the peculiar frame and feeling with which the writer was expressing himself, which led to his using these unusual expressions rather than other and more customary ones. And we may fairly say, that there is visible throughout the controversial part of our Epistle, a loftiness and artificial elaboration of style, which would induce precisely the use of such expressions. It is not uncommon with St. Paul, when strongly moved or sharply designating opponents, or rising into majestic subjects and thoughts, to rise also into unusual, or long and compounded words: see for examples, Rom. i. 24—32; viii. 35—39; ix. 1—5; xi. 33—36; xvi. 25—27, &c., and many instances in the Pastoral Epistles. It is this σεμνότης of controversial tone, even more than the necessity of the subject handled, which causes our Epistle so much to abound with peculiar words and phrases.
4. And this will be seen even more strongly, when we turn to the Epistle to the Ephesians, sent at the same time with the present letter. In writing both, the Apostle's mind was in the same general frame—full of the glories of the Person of Christ, and the consequent glorious privileges of His Church, which is built on Him, and vitally knit to Him. This mighty subject, as he looked with indignation on the beggarly system of meats and drinks and hallowed days and angelic meditations to which his Colossians were being drawn down, rose before him in all its length and breadth and height; but as writing to them, he was confined to one portion of it, and to setting forth that one portion pointedly and controversially. He could not, consistently with the effect which he would produce on them, dive into the depths of the divine counsels in Christ with regard to them. At every turn, we may well conceive, he would fain have gone out into those wonderful prayers and revelations which would have been so abundant if he had had free scope: but at every turn, ὥσεν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ: the Spirit bound him to a lower region, and would not let him lose sight of the βλέπετε μὴ τεις, which forms the ground-tone of this Colossian Epistle. Only in the setting forth of the majesty of Christ's Person, so essential to his present aim, does he know no limits to the sublimity of his flight. When he approaches those who are Christ's, the urgency of their conservation, and the duty of marking the contrast to their deceivers, cramps and confines him for the time.

5. But the Spirit which thus bound him to his special work while writing to the Colossians, would not let His divine promptings be in vain. While he is labouring with the great subject, and unable to the Colossians to express all he would, his thoughts are turned to another Church, lying also in the line which Tychicus and Onesimus would take: a Church which he had himself built up stone by stone; to which his affection went largely forth: where if the same baneful influences were making themselves felt, it was but slightly, or not so as to call for special and exclusive treatment. He might pour forth to his Ephesians all the fulness of the Spirit's revelations and promptings, on the great subject of the Spouse and Body of Christ. To them, without being bound to narrow his energies evermore into one line of controversial direction, he might lay forth, as he should be empowered, their foundation in the counsel of the Father, their course in the satisfaction of the Son, their perfection in the work of the Spirit.

6. And thus,—as a mere human writer, toiling earnestly and conscientiously towards his point, pares rigidly off the thoughts and words, however deep and beautiful, which spring out of and group around his subject, putting them by and storing them up for more leisure another day: and then on reviewing them, and again awakening the spirit which prompted them, playfully unfolds their germs, and amplifies their sug-
gestions largely, till a work grows beneath his hands more stately and more beautiful than ever that other was, and carrying deeper conviction than it ever wrought:—so, in the higher realms of the fulness of Inspiration, may we conceive it to have been with our Apostle. His Epistle to the Colossians is his caution, his argument, his protest: is, so to speak, his working-day toil, his direct pastoral labour: and the other is the flower and bloom of his moments, during those same days, of devotion and rest, when he wrought not so much in the Spirit, as the Spirit wrought in him. So that while we have in the Colossians, system defined, language elaborated, antithesis, and logical power, on the surface—we have in the Ephesians the free outflowing of the earnest spirit,—to the mere surface-reader, without system, but to him that delves down into it, in system far deeper, and more recondite, and more exquisite: the greatest and most heavenly work of one, whose very imagination was peopled with the things in the heavens, and even his fancy rapt into the visions of God.

7. Thus both Epistles sprung out of one Inspiration, one frame of mind: that to the Colossians first, as the task to be done, the protest delivered, the caution given: that to the Ephesians, begotten by the other, but surpassing it: carried on perhaps in some parts simultaneously, or immediately consequent. So that we have in both, many of the same thoughts uttered in the same words; many terms and phrases peculiar to the two Epistles; many instances of the same term or phrase, still sounding in the writer's ear, but used in the two in a different connexion. All these are taken by the impugners of the Ephesian Epistle as tokens of its spuriousness: I should rather regard them as psychological phænomena strictly and beautifully corresponding to the circumstances under which we have reason to believe the two Epistles to have been written: and as fresh elucidations of the mental and spiritual character of the great Apostle.

11 See reff.: tables of these have been given by the Commentators. I will not repeat them here, simply because to complete such a comparison would require far more room and labour than I could give to it, and I should not wish to do it as imperfectly as those mere formal tables have done it. The student may refer to Davidson, vol. ii. p. 391.
CHAPTER V.
THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. This Epistle has been all but universally recognized as the undoubted work of St. Paul. It is true (see below) that no reliable citations from it appear in the Apostolic Fathers: but the external evidence from early times is still far too weighty to be set aside.

2. Its authorship has in modern times been called in question (1) by Schrader, and (2) by Baur, on internal grounds. Their objections, which are entirely of a subjective and most arbitrary kind, are reviewed and answered by De Wette, Meyer, and Dr. Davidson (Intro. to N. T. vol. ii. pp. 454 ff.)¹: and have never found any acceptance, even in Germany.

3. The external testimonies of antiquity are the following:

Irenæus adv. Haer. v. 6. 1, p. 299 f.: "Et propter hoc apostolus seipsum exponens, explanavit perfectum et spiritualem salutis hominem, in prima epistola ad Thessalonicenses dicens sic: Deus autem pacis sanctificet vos perfectos," &c. (1 Thess. v. 23.)

¹ I must, in referring to Dr. Davidson, not be supposed to concur in his view of the Apostle's expectation in the words ἡμεῖς οἱ Σωτῆς οἱ περιλειπόμενοι (1 Thess. iv. 15, 17). See my note there.

There is a very good statement of Baur's adverse arguments, and refutation of them, in Jowett's work on the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans, "Genuineness of the first Epistle," vol. i. 15—20. In referring to it, I must enter my protest against the views of Professor Jowett on points which lie at the very root of the Christian life: views as unwarranted by any data furnished in the Scriptures of which he treats, as his reckless and crude statement of them is pregnant with mischief to minds unaccustomed to biblical research. Among the various phenomena of our awakened state of apprehension of the characteristics and the difficulties of the New Testament, there is none more suggestive of saddened thought and dark foreboding, than the appearance of such a book as Professor Jowett's. Our most serious fears for the Christian future of England, point, it seems to me, just in this direction: to persons who allow fine aesthetic and psychological appreciation, and the results of minute examination of spiritual feeling and mental progress in the Epistles, to keep out of view that other line of testimony to the fixity and consistency of great doctrines, which is equally discoverable in them. I have endeavoured below, in speaking of the matter and style of our Epistle, to meet some of Professor Jowett's assertions and inferences of this kind.
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SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS AND WITH WHAT OBJECT IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. THESALONICA was a city of Macedonia, and in Roman times, capital of the second district of the province of Macedonia (Liv. xlv. 29 f.), and the seat of a Roman prætor (Cic. Planc. 41). It lay on the Sinus Thermaicus, and is represented to have been built on the site of the ancient Therme (Θέρμη ἡ ἐν τῷ Θερμαίῳ κόλπῳ οἰκημένη, ἐπ᾽ ἑστὶ καὶ ὁ κόλπος οὗτος τῆς ἐπωνυμίᾳ ξει, Herod. vii. 121), or peopled from this city (Pliny seems to distinguish the two: ‘medioque flexu littoris Thessalonica, libera conditionis. Ad hanc, a Dyrrhachio exv mil. pas., Therme.’ iv. 10) by Cassander, son of Antipater, and named after his wife Thessalonice, sister of Alexander the Great (so called from a victory obtained by his father Philip on the day when he heard of her birth). Under the Romans it became rich and populous (ἡ νῦν μάλιστα τῶν ἄλλων ἐκατόρει, Strab. vii. 7: see also Lucian, Asin. c. 46, and Appian, Bell. Civ. iv. 118), was an ‘urbs libera’ (see Pliny, above), and in later writers bore the name of “metropolis.” “Before the founding of Constantinople it was virtually the capital of Greece and Illyricum, as well as of Macedonia: and shared the trade of the Αἰγαίων with Ephesus and Corinth” (C. and H. edn. 2, vol. i. p. 380). Its importance continued through the middle ages, and it is now the second city in European Turkey, with 70,000 inhabitants, under the slightly corrupted name of Saloniki. For further notices of its history and condition at various times, see C. and H. i. pp. 378—83: Winer, RWB. sub voce (from which mainly the above notice is taken): Dr. Holland’s Travels: Lewin, vol. i. p. 252.

2. The church at Thessalonica was founded by St. Paul, in company with Silas and Timotheus, as we learn in Acts xvii. 1—9. Very little

---

2 So Strabo, vii. excerpt. 10: μετὰ τῶν Ἀλβων παταμῶν, ἡ Ῥωσσαλανίκη ἐστὶν πόλις, ἡ πρὸ τοῦ Ἐπιμελητῆρα κτισμά καὶ ἐστὶν Κασσάνδρου βασιλεύς ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς ἐκατον γυναικος, παιδὸς δὲ Φιλίππου τοῦ Ἀμάντου, ὑψάμην· μετακινεῖ δὲ τὰ περὶ πολίχνων εἰς ἀοίνων Χαλάστραν, Αἰνείαν (see Dion. Hal., Antiq. i. 49), Κίσων, καὶ τινὰ καὶ ἀλλα.

3 That this latter was with Paul and Silas, though not expressly mentioned in the
is there said which can throw light on the origin or composition of the Thessalonian church. The main burden of that narrative is the rejection of the Gospel by the Jews there. It is however stated (ver. 4) that some of the Jews believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few.

3. But some account of the Apostle’s employment and teaching at Thessalonica may be gathered from this narrative, connected with hints dropped in the two Epistles. He came to them, yet suffering from his persecution at Philippi (1 Thess. ii. 2). But they received the word joyfully, amidst trials and persecutions (ib. i. 6; ii. 13), and notwithstanding the enmity of their own countrymen and of the Jews (ii. 14 ff.). He maintained himself by his labour (ib. ii. 9), although his stay was so short, in the same spirit of independence which characterized all his apostolic course. He declared to them boldly and clearly the Gospel of God (ii. 2). The great burden of his message to them was the approaching coming and kingdom of the Lord Jesus (i. 10; ii. 12, 19; iii. 13; iv. 13—18; v. 1—11, 23, 24. Acts xvii. 7: see also § iv. below), and his chief exhortation, that they would walk worthily of this their calling to that kingdom and glory (ii. 12; iv. 1; v. 23).

4. He left them, as we know from Acts xvii. 5—10, on account of a tumult raised by the unbelieving Jews; and was sent away by night by the brethren to Beroea, together with Silas and Timotheus (Acts xvii. 10). From that place he wished to have revisited Thessalonica: but was prevented (1 Thess. ii. 18), by the arrival, with hostile purposes, of his enemies the Thessalonian Jews (Acts xvii. 13), in consequence of which the brethren sent him away by sea to Athens.

5. Their state after his departure is closely allied with the enquiry as to the object of the Epistle. The Apostle appears to have felt much anxiety about them: and in consequence of his being unable to visit them in person, seems to have determined, during the hasty consultation previous to his departure from Beroea, to be left at Athens, which was the destination fixed for him by the brethren, alone, and to send Timotheus back to Thessalonica to ascertain the state of their faith.

Acts, is inferred by comparing Acts xvi. 3, xvii. 14, with 1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1, 1 Thess. iii. 1—6.

We are hardly justified in assuming, with Jowett, that it was only three weeks. For “three Sabbaths,” even if they mark the whole stay, may designate four weeks: and we are not compelled to infer that a Sabbath may not have passed at the beginning, or the end, or both, on which he did not preach in the synagogue. Indeed the latter hypothesis is very probable, if he was following the same course as afterwards at Corinth and Ephesus, and on the Jews proving rebellious and unbelieving, separated himself from them: at which, or something approaching to it, the ἐκκλησία τῶν Παῦλον τῆς Σιάς of Acts xvii. 4 may perhaps be taken as pointing.

I cannot see how this interpretation of the difficulty as to the mission of Timotheus
6. The nature of the message brought to the Apostle at Corinth (Acts xviii. 5) by Timotheus on his arrival there with Silas, must be inferred from what we find in the Epistle itself. It was, in the main, favourable and consolatory (1 Thess. iii. 6—10). They were firm in faith and love, as indeed they were reputed to be by others who had brought to him news of them (i. 7—10), full of affectionate remembrance of the Apostle, and longing to see him (iii. 6). Still, however, he earnestly desired to come to them, not only from the yearnings of love, but because he wanted to fill up τὰ ὑπερήματα τῆς πίστεως αὐτῶν (iii. 10). Their attention had been so much drawn to one subject—his preaching had been so full of one great matter, and from the necessity of the case, so scanty on many others which he desired to lay forth to them, that he already feared lest their Christian faith should be a distorted and unhealthy faith. And in some measure, Timotheus had found it so. They were beginning to be restless in expectation of the day of the Lord (iv. 11 ff.),—neglectful of that pure, and sober, and temperate walk, which is alone the fit preparation for that day (iv. 3 ff.; v. 1—9),—distressed about the state of the dead in Christ, who they supposed had lost the precious opportunity of standing before Him at His coming (iv. 13 ff.).

7. This being so, he writes to them to build up their faith and love, and to correct these defects and misapprehensions. I reserve further consideration of the contents of the Epistle for § iv., ‘On its matter and style.’

SECTION III.

PLACE AND TIME OF WRITING.

1. From what has been said above respecting the state of the Thessalonian Church as the occasion for writing the Epistle, it may readily be inferred that no considerable time had elapsed since the intelligence of that state had reached the Apostle. Silas and Timotheus were with him (i. 1): the latter had been the bearer of the tidings from Thessalonica.

2. Now we know (Acts xviii. 5) that they rejoined him at Corinth, apparently not long after his arrival there. That rejoining then forms

lies open to the charge of “dying beneath the surface to pick up what is really on the surface,” and thus of “introducing into Scripture a hypercritical and unreal method of interpretation, which may be any where made the instrument of perverting the meaning of the text.” (Jowett, i. p. 120.) Supposing that at Berea it was fixed that Timotheus should not accompany St. Paul to Athens, but go to Thessalonica, and that the Apostle should be deposited at Athens and left there alone, the brethren returning, what words could have more naturally expressed this than διὸ μηκέτι στέγοντες εὐδοκήσαμεν καταλειψάναι ἐν Ἀθηναῖς μόνοι π;
our *terminus a quo*. And it would be in the highest degree unnatural to suppose that the whole time of his stay at Corinth (a year and six months, Acts xviii. 11) elapsed before he wrote the Epistle,—founded as it is on the intelligence which he had heard, and written with a view to meet present circumstances. *Corinth* therefore may safely be assumed as the place of writing.

3. His stay at Corinth ended with his setting sail for the Pentecost at Jerusalem in the spring of 54 (see chron. table in Prolegg. to Acts, Vol. II.). It would begin then with the autumn of 52. And in the winter of that year, I should be disposed to place the writing of our Epistle.

4. It will be hardly necessary to remind the student, that this date places the Epistle first, in chronological order, of all the writings of St. Paul that remain to us.

SECTION IV.

MATTER AND STYLE.

1. It will be interesting to observe, wherein the first-written Epistle of St. Paul differs from his later writings. Some difference we should certainly expect to find, considering that we have to deal with a temperament so fervid, a spirit so rapidly catching the impress of circumstances, so penetrated by and resigned up to the promptings of that indwelling Spirit of God, who was ever more notably and thoroughly fitting His instrument for the expansion and advance of His work of leavening the world with the truth of Christ.

2. Nor will such observation and enquiry be spent in vain, especially if we couple it with corresponding observation of the sayings of our Lord, and the thoughts and words of his Apostles, on the various great departments of Christian belief and hope.

3. The faith, in all its main features, was delivered once for all. The facts of Redemption,—the Incarnation, and the Atonement, and the glorification of Christ,—were patent and undeniable from the first. Our Lord’s own words had asserted them: the earliest discourses of the Apostles after the day of Pentecost bore witness to them. It is true that, in God’s Providence, the whole glorious system of salvation by grace was the gradual imparting of the Spirit to the Church: by occasion here and there, various points of it were insisted on and made prominent. Even here, the freest and fullest statement did not come first. “Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ” was ever the order which the apostolic proclamation took. The earliest of the Epistles are ever moral and practical, the advanced ones more
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doctrinal and spiritual. It was not till it appeared, in the unfolding of God's Providence, that the bulwark of salvation by grace must be strengthened, that the building on the one foundation must be raised thus impregnable to the righteousness of works and the law, that the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans were given through the great Apostle, reaching to the full breadth and height of the great argument. Then followed the Epistles of the imprisonment, building up higher and higher the edifice thus consolidated: and the Pastoral Epistles, suited to a more developed ecclesiastical condition, and aimed at the correction of abuses, which sprung up later, or were the ripened fruit of former doctrinal errors.

4. In all these however, we trace the same great elementary truths of the faith. Witness to them is never wanting: nor can it be said that any change of ground respecting them ever took place. The work of the Spirit as regarded them, was one of expanding and deepening, of freeing from narrow views, and setting in clearer and fuller light: of ranging and grouping collateral and local circumstances, so that the great doctrines of grace became ever more and more prominent and paramount.

5. But while this was so with these 'first principles,' the very view which we have taken will shew, that as regarded other things which lay at a greater distance from central truths, it was otherwise. In such matters, the Apostle was taught by experience; Christ's work brought its lessons with it: and it would be not only unnatural, but would remove from his writings the living freshness of personal reality, if we found him the same in all points of this kind, at the beginning, and at the end of his epistolary labours: if there were no characteristic differences of mode of thought and expression in 1 Thessalonians and in 2 Timotheus: if advance of years had brought with it no corresponding advance of standing-point, change of circumstances no change of counsel, trial of God's ways no further insight into God's designs.

6. Nor are we left to conjecture as to those subjects on which especially such change, and ripening of view and conviction, might be expected to take place. There was one most important point on which our Lord Himself spoke with marked and solemn uncertainty. The time of his own coming was hidden from all created beings,—nay, in the mystery of his mediatorial office, from the Son Himself (Mark xiii. 32). Even after his Resurrection, when questioned by the Apostles as to the time of his restoring the Kingdom to Israel, his reply is still, that "it is not for them to know the times and the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power" (Acts i. 7).

7. Here then is a plain indication, which has not, I think, been sufficiently made use of in judging of the Epistles. The Spirit was to testify of Christ: to take of the things of Christ, and shew them unto them. So that however much that Spirit, in His infinite wisdom, might be
pleased to impart to them of the details and accompanying circumstances of the Lord’s appearing, we may be sure, that the truth spoken by our Lord, “Of that day and hour knoweth no man,” would hold good with regard to them, and be traced in their writings. If they were true men, and their words and Epistles the genuine production of inspiration of them by that Spirit of Truth, we may expect to find in such speeches and writings tokens of this appointed uncertainty of the day and hour: expectations, true in expression and fully justified by appearances, yet corrected, as God’s purposes were manifested, by advancing experience, and larger effusions of the Spirit of prophecy.

8. If then I find in the course of St. Paul’s Epistles, that expressions which occur in the earlier ones, and seem to indicate expectation of His almost immediate coming, are gradually modified,—disappear altogether from the Epistles of the imprisonment,—and instead of them are found others speaking in a very different strain, of dissolving, and being with Christ, and passing through death and the resurrection, in the latest Epistles,—I regard it, not as a strange thing, not as a circumstance which I must explain away for fear of weakening the authority of his Epistles, but as exactly that which I should expect to find; as the very strongest testimony that these Epistles were written by one who was left in this uncertainty,—not by one who wished to make it appear that Inspiration had rendered him omniscient.

9. And in this, the earliest of those Epistles, I do find exactly that which I might expect on this head. While every word and every detail respecting the Lord’s coming is a perpetual inheritance for the Church,—while we continue to comfort one another with the glorious and heart-stirring sentences which he utters to us in the word of the Lord,—no candid eye can help seeing in the Epistle, how the uncertainty of “the day and hour” has tinged all these passages with a hue of near anticipation: how natural it was, that the Thessalonians receiving this Epistle, should have allowed that anticipation to be brought even yet closer, and have imagined the day to be actually already present.

10. It will be seen by the above remarks, how very far I am from conceding their point to those who hold that the belief, of which this Epistle is the strongest expression, was an idle fancy, or does not befit the present age as well as it did that one. It is God’s purpose respecting us, that we should ever be left in this uncertainty, looking for and hastening unto the day of the Lord, which may be upon us at any time before we are aware of it. Every expression of the ages before us, betokening close anticipation, coupled with the fact that the day has not yet arrived, teaches us much, but unteaches us nothing: does not deprive that glorious hope of its applicability to our times, nor the
Christian of his power of living as in the light of his Lord’s approach and the daily realization of the day of Christ.

11. In style, this Epistle is thoroughly Pauline,—abounding with phrases, and lines of thought, which may be paralleled with similar ones in his other Epistles: not wanting also in insulated words and sentiments, such as we find in all the writings of one who was so fresh in thought and full in feeling; such also as are in no way inconsistent with St. Paul’s known character, but in every ease finding analogical justification in Epistles of which no one has ever thought of disputing the genuineness.

12. As compared with other Epistles, this is written in a quiet and unimpassioned style, not being occasioned by any grievous errors of doctrine or defects in practice, but written to encourage and gently to admonish those who were, on the whole, proceeding favourably in the Christian life. To this may be attributed also the fact, that it does not deal expressly with any of the great verities of the faith, rather taking them for granted, and building on them the fabric of a holy and pure life. That this should have been done until they were disputed, was but natural: and in consequence not with these Epistles, but with that to the Galatians, among whom the whole Christian life was imperilled by Judaistic teaching, begins that great series of unfoldings of the mystery of salvation by grace, of which St. Paul was so eminently the minister.

6 It is strange that such words as the following could be written by Mr. Jowett, without bringing, as he wrote them, the condemnation of his theory and its expression home to his mind: “In the words which are attributed in the Epistle of St. Peter to the unbelievers of that day (? surely it is to the unbelievers of days to come,—a fact which the writer, by altering the reference of the words, seems to be endeavouring to dissipate), we might truly say that, since the fathers fell asleep, all things remain the same from the beginning. Not only do‘all things remain the same,’ but the very belief itself (in the sense in which it was held by the first Christians) has been ready to vanish away.” Vol. i. p. 97.

7 Baur has most perversely adduced both these as evidences of spuriousness: among the former he cites ch. i. 5, as compared with 1 Cor. ii. 4: i. 6, with 1 Cor. xi. 1: i. 8, with Rom. i. 8: ii. 4—10, with 1 Cor. ii. 4, iv. 3, 4, ix. 15, 2 Cor. ii. 17, v. 11, xi. 9: for his discussion of the latter, see his “Paulus Apostel, u.s.w.,” pp. 480, 490.
CHAPTER VI.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE TESSALONIANS.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. The recognition of this Epistle has been as general,—and the exceptions to it for the most part the same,—as in the case of the last.

2. The principal testimonies of early Christian writers are the following:

(a) Irenæus, adv. Hær. iii. 7. 2, p. 182:

"Quoniam autem hyperbatis frequenter utitur Apostolus (Paulus, from what precedes) propter velocitatem sermonum suorum, et propter impetum qui in ipso est Spiritus, ex multis quidem aliis est invenire. . . . Et iterum in secunda ad Thessalonicenses de Antichristo dicens, ait: Et tunc revelabitur," &c. ch. ii. 8, 9.

(β) Clement of Alexandria, Strom. v. 3 [17], p. 655 P.:

οίκ έν πάσι, φησίν ο άπόστολος, ή γνώσις, προεύχεσθε δε ινα ῥυσθομεν ἀπο των ατότων και ποιηρων ανθρώπων ου γαρ πάντων ή πίστις (2 Thess. iii. 1, 2).

(γ) Tertullian, de resurr. carnis c. 21, vol. ii. p. 828: following on the citation from the first Epistle given above, ch. v. § i. 3, . . . "et in secunda, pleniore sollicitudine ad eosdem: obsecore autem vos, fratres, per adventum Domini nostri Jesu Christi," &c. (ch. ii. 1, 2.)

3. The objections brought by Schmidt (Einl. ii. p. 256 ff.), Kern (Tübing. Zeitschrift für 1889, 2 heft.), and Baur (Paulus u.s.w. p. 488 ff.) against the genuineness of the Epistle, in as far as they rest on the old story of similarities and differences as compared with St. Paul’s acknowledged Epistles, have been already more than once dealt with. I shall now only notice those which regard points peculiar to our Epistle itself.

4. It is said that this second Epistle is not consistent with the first: that directed their attention to the Lord’s coming as almost immediate: this interposes delay,—the apostasy,—the man of sin, &c. It really seems as if no propriety nor exact fitting of circumstances would ever satisfy such critics. It might be imagined that this very discrepancy, even if allowed, would tell most strongly in favour of the genuineness.

5. It is alleged by Kern, that the whole prophetic passage, ch. ii. 1 ff., 5[1]
does not correspond with the date claimed for the Epistle. It is assumed, that the man of sin is Nero, who was again to return, Rev. xvii. 10,—δ' κατέχων, Vespasian,—the ἀποστασία, the falling away of Jews and Christians alike. This view, it is urged, fits a writer in A.D. 68—70, between Nero's death and the destruction of Jerusalem. But than this nothing can be more inconclusive. Why have we not as good a right to say, that this interpretation is wrong, because it does not correspond to the received date of the Epistle, as vice versa? To us (see below, § v.) the interpretation is full of absurdity, and therefore the argument carries no conviction.

6. It is maintained again, that ch. iii. 17 is strongly against the genuineness of our Epistle: for that there was no reason for guarding against forgeries; and as for πάσης ἐπιστολῆς, the Apostle had written but one. For an answer to this, see note in loc., where both the reason for inserting this is adduced, and it is shewn, that almost all of his Epistles either are expressly, or may be understood as having been, thus authenticated.

7. See the objections of Schmidt, Schrader, Kern, and Baur, treated at length in Lünemann's Einleitung to his Commentary, pp. 161—167: and in Davidson, Introd. vol. ii. pp. 484, end.

SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS, AND WITH WHAT OBJECT IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. The former particular has been already sufficiently explained in the corresponding section of the Prolegomena to the first Epistle. But inasmuch as the condition of the Thessalonian Church in the mean time bears closely upon the object of the Epistle, I resume here the consideration of their circumstances and state of mind.

2. We have seen that there were those among them, who were too ready to take up and exaggerate the prevalence of the subject of Christ's coming among the topics of the Apostle's teaching. These persons, whether encouraged by the tone of the first Epistle or not, we cannot tell (for we cannot see any reference to the first Epistle in ch. ii. 2, see note there), were evidently teaching, as an expansion of St. Paul's doctrine, or as under his authority, or even as enjoined in a letter from him (ib. note), the actual presence of the day of the Lord. In consequence of this, their minds had become unsettled: they wanted directing into the love of God and the imitation of Christ's patience (ch. iii. 5). Some appear to have left off their daily employments, and to have been taking advantage of the supposed reign of Christ to be walking disorderly.
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3. It was this state of things, which furnished the occasion for our Epistle being written. Its object is to make it clear to them that the day of Christ, though a legitimate matter of expectation for every Christian, and a constant stimulus for watchfulness, was not yet come: that a course and development of events must first happen, which he lays forth to them in the spirit of prophecy: shewing them that this development has already begun, and that not until it has ripened will the coming of the Lord take place.

4. This being the occasion of writing the Epistle, there are grouped round the central subject two other general topics of solace and confirmation: comfort under their present troubles (ch. i.): exhortation to honesty and diligence, and avoidance of the idle and disorderly (ch. iii.).

SECTION III.

PLACE AND TIME OF WRITING.

1. In the address of the Epistle, we find the same three, Paul, Silvanus, and Timotheus, associated together, as in the first Epistle. This circumstance would at once direct us to Corinth, where Silas and Timotheus rejoined St. Paul (Acts xviii. 5), and whence we do not read that they accompanied him on his departure for Asia (ib. xviii. 18). And as we believe the first Epistle to have been written from that city, it will be most natural, considering the close sequence of this upon that first, to place the writing of it at Corinth, somewhat later in this same visit of a year and a half (Acts xviii. 11).

2. How long after the writing of the first Epistle in the winter of A.D. 52 (see above, ch. v. § iii. 3) we are to fix the date of our present one, must be settled merely by calculations of probability, and by the indications furnished in the Epistle itself.

3. The former of these do not afford us much help. For we can hardly assume with safety that the Apostle had received intelligence of the effects of his first Epistle, seeing that we have found cause to interpret ch. ii. 2 not of that Epistle, but of false ones, circulated under the Apostle’s name. All that we can assume is, that more intelligence had arrived from Thessalonica: how soon after his writing to them, we cannot say. Their present state, as we have seen above, was but a carrying forward and exaggerating of that already begun when the former letter was sent: so that a very short time would suffice to have advanced them from the one grade of undue excitement to the other.

4. Nor do any hints furnished by our Epistle give us much more assistance. They are principally these. (a) In ch. i. 4, the Apostle speaks of his ἐγκαινίασθαι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ concerning the en-
durance and faith of the Thessalonians under persecutions. It would seem from this, that the Achaean Churches (see 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1; Rom. xvi. 1) had by this time acquired number and consistence. This however would furnish but a vague indication: it might point to any date after the first six months of his stay at Corinth. (b) In ch. iii. 2, he desires their prayers ἵνα ῥυθμόμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀντίπων καὶ ποιητὸν ἀνθρώπον. It has been inferred from this, that the tumult which occasioned his departure from Corinth was not far off: that the designs of the unbelieving Jews were drawing to a head: and that consequently our date must be fixed just before his departure. But this inference is not a safe one: for we find that his open breach with the Jews took place close upon the arrival of Silas and Timotheus (Acts xviii. 5—7), and that his situation immediately after this was one of peril: for in the vision which he had, the Lord said to him, οὕτε ἐπιθήσεται σοι τὸν κακὼσαί σε.

5. So that we really have very little help in determining our date, from either of these sources. All we can say is, that it must be fixed, in all likelihood, between the winter of 52 and the spring of 54: and taking the medium, we may venture to place it somewhat about the middle of the year 53.

SECTION IV.

STYLE.

1. The style of our Epistle, like that of the first, is eminently Pauline. Certain dissimilarities have been pointed out by Baur, &c. (see above, § i. 3): but they are no more than might be found in any one undoubted writing of our Apostle. In a fresh and vigorous style, there will ever be, so to speak, librations over any rigid limits of habitude which can be assigned: and such are to be judged of, not by their mere occurrence and number, but by their subjective character being or not being in accordance with the writer’s well-known characteristics. Professor Jowett has treated one by one the supposed inconsistencies with Pauline usage (vol. i. p. 139 f.), and shewn that there is no real difficulty in supposing any of the expressions to have been used by St. Paul. He has also collected a very much larger number of resemblances in manner and phraseology to the Apostle’s other writings. The student who makes use of the references in this edition will be able to mark out these for himself, and to convince himself that the style of our Epistle is so closely related to that of the rest, as to show that the same mind was employed in the choice of the words and the construction of the sentences.

2. One portion of this Epistle, viz. the prophetic section, ch. ii. 1—12, 54]
as it is distinguished from the rest in subject, so differs in style, being, as is usual with the more solemn and declaratory paragraphs of St. Paul, loftier in diction and more abrupt and elliptical in construction. The passage in question will be found on comparison to bear, in style and flow of sentences, a close resemblance to the denunciatory and prophetic portions of the other Epistles: compare for instance ver. 3 with Col. ii. 8, 16; vv. 8, 9 with 1 Cor. xv. 24—28; ver. 10 with Rom. i. 18, 1 Cor. i. 18, 2 Cor. ii. 15; ver. 11 with Rom. i. 24, 26; ver. 12 with Rom. ii. 5, 9, and Rom. i. 32.

SECTION V.

ON THE PROPHETIC IMPORT OF CH. II. 1—12.

1. It may be well, before entering on this, to give the passage, as it stands in our rendering in the notes:

"(1) But we entreat you, brethren, in regard of the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together to Him,—(2) in order that ye should not be lightly shaken from your mind nor troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by epistle as from us, to the effect that the day of the Lord is present. (3) Let no man deceive you in any manner: for [that day shall not come] unless there have come the apostasy first, and there have been revealed the man of sin, the son of perdition, (4) he that withstands and exalts himself above every one that is called God or an object of adoration, so that he sits in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. (5) . . . . (6) And now ye know that which hinders, in order that he may be revealed in his own time. (7) For the mystery already is working of lawlessness, only until he that now hinders be removed: (8) and then shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus will destroy by the breath of His mouth, and annihilate by the appearance of His coming: (9) whose coming is according to the working of Satan in all power and signs and wonders of falsehood, (10) and in all deceit of unrighteousness for those who are perishing, because they did not receive the love of the truth in order to their being saved. (11) And on this account God is sending to them the working of error, in order that they should believe the falsehood, (12) that all might be judged who did not believe the truth, but found pleasure in iniquity."

1 I must caution the reader, that the rendering given in my notes is not in any case intended for a polished and elaborated version, nor is it my object to put the meaning into the best idiomatic English: but I wish to represent, as nearly as possible, the construction and intent of the original. The difference between a literal rendering, and a version for vernacular use, is very considerable, and has not been enough borne in mind in judging of our authorized English version.
2. It will be my object to give a brief résumé of the history of the interpretation of this passage, and afterwards to state what I conceive to have been its meaning as addressed to the Thessalonians, and what as belonging to subsequent ages of the Church of Christ. The history of its interpretation I have drawn from several sources: principally from Lünemann's Schlussbemerkungen zu chap. ii. of his Commentary, pp. 204—217.

3. The first particulars in the history must be gleaned from the early Fathers. And their interpretation is for the most part well marked and consistent. They all regard it as a prophecy of the future, as yet unfilled when they wrote. They all regard the \textit{\pi\alpha\rho\omicron\sigma\ι\alpha} as the personal return of our Lord to judgment and to bring in His Kingdom. They all regard the adversary here described as an individual person, the incarnation and concentration of sin.

2 The following citations will bear out the assertion in the text: 

\textit{Irenæus}, adv. her. v. 25. 1, p. 322: “Ille enim (Antichristus) omnem suscipiens diaboli virtutem, veniet non quasi rex justus nec quasi in subjectione Dei legitimus: sed inimicus et injustus et sine leges, quasi apostata, et iniquus et homicida, quasi latro, diabolicam apostasiam in se recapitulans: et idola quidem separans, ad suadendum quod ipse sit Deus: se autem extollens unum idolum, habebus in semetipsa reliquorium idolorum varium errorem: ut hi qui per multis abominationes adorant diabolum, hi per hoc unum idolum serviant ipsi, de quo apostolus in Epistola quæ est ad Thessalonicenses secunda, sic ait” (vv. 3, 4).

Again, ib. 3, p. 323: “Usque ad tempus temporum et dimidium temporis” (Dan. vii. 25), hoc est, per triennium et sex menses, in quibus veniens regnabit super terram. De quo iterum et apostolus Paulus in secunda ad Thess., simul et causam adventus ejus annuntiata, sic ait” (vv. 8 ff.).

Again, ib. 30. 4, p. 330: “Cum autem devastaverit Antichristus hic omnia in hoc mundo, regnatit annis tribus et mensibus sex, et sedebit in templo Hierosolymis: tum veniet Dominus de colis in nubibus, in gloria Patris, illum quidem et obedientes ei in stagnum ignis mittens: adducens autem justis regni tempora, hoc est requietionem, septimum diem sanctificatum; et restituentes Abrahami promissionem hereditatis: in quo regno ait Dominus, multos ab Oriente et Occidente venientes, recumbere cume Abraham, Isaac et Jacob.”


\textit{Justin Martyr}, dial. cum Tryph. c. 110, p. 203: διός παρουσία αυτοῦ κατηγελομέναι εἰσί, μία μὲν ἐν ἧ παθητός καὶ ἠδοξός καὶ ἄτιμος καὶ σταυρούμενος κεκαρυκται, ἡ δὲ δευτέρα ἐν ἧ μετὰ δόξης ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν πάρεσται, ὡς καὶ ὁ τῆς ἁπτομασίας ἀνθρωπος, ὁ καὶ εἰς τῶν ὕμιστον ἔξαλλα λαλῶν, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀνομα τολμήσῃ εἰς ἦμᾶς τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς.

\textit{Origen}, contra Cels. vi. 45 f. vol. i. p. 667 f.: ἐχρημ δὲ τὸν μὲν ἔτερον τῶν ἄκρων, καὶ βέλτιστον, ὡς ἀνατομεῖθαι τοῦ θεοῦ, διὰ τὴν ὑπερχύριν τὴν δὲ τοῦτον κατὰ διάμετρον ἐναντίον, ὡς τὸν πονηρὸν δαιμόνιον, καὶ Σατανᾶ, καὶ διαβόλου . . . λέγει δὲ ὁ Παύλος, περὶ τούτου τὸ καλουμένου ἀντιχριστοῦ διδάσκαλον, καὶ παριστάτα μετὰ τίνος ἐπικρύφων τίνα πρότον ἑπιδημίσει, καὶ πάτε τῷ γίνει τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ διὰ τή. He then quotes this whole passage.
4. Respecting, however, the minor particulars of the prophecy, they are not so entirely at agreement. Augustine says (de civ. Dei, xx. 19. 2, p. 685: cf. also Jerome in the note),—“in quo templo Dei sit sessurus, incertum est: utrum in illa ruina templi quod a Salomone rege construction est, an vero in Ecclesia. Non enim templum alicujus idoli aut daemonis templum Dei Apostolus dicebat. And from this doubt about his ‘session,’ a doubt about his person also had begun to spring up; for he continues, ‘unde nonnulli non ipsum principem sed universum quodammodo corpus ejus, id est, ad eum pertinentem hominum multitudem simul cum ipso suo princeipe hoc loco intelligi Antichristum volunt.’

5. The meaning of to kadexon, though, as will be seen from the note, generally agreed to be the Roman empire, was not by any means universally acquiesced in. Theodoret says, tueis to kadexon twn 'Roumaiwn evnoias baasiliean, tin de tin 'hain tou pneuma tou. Kategoujseis yap, phs, tis tou pneuma tou charitos ekineis ou paragynetai, all' oih oin te paviasebaia pantelos tin 'hain tou pneuma tou . . . . all' oih de twn 'Roumaiwn baasiliean etera diaedeexeta baasiliea. dia yap tov tetotypou thesii kai de thewotatos Davth.

CHYSOSTOM in loc.: tis de ovtos estin; ara de Satemias; oudamou; all' atheypatos tis 'hain auton dechomenos twn energeian. kal atopalothei o atheypatos, phs, o uperairomenos esti pantai legomenon thesan h szaasma. o yap eidoelatrepelai abei ekineis, all' antithotes te estai, kai pantas katallupteis tois theois, kai keleeis prskeuven axtov anti tois theos, kai kathoristetai eis tin naivn tov theou, ou tov en Ierosolymi monoiv, all' alla kai eis ta pantaxou evkalasias.

And below: kal ti metat taiva; estin h parhyma. etapei yap oin de kurbioi 'Ithisou k.t.l. kathapei yap k.t.l. See the rest cited in the note on ver. 8.

CERIL OF JERUSALEM, Catech. xv. 12, p. 229: erchetai de o prorhymenos antichristos ovtos, 'etan plhrwsoni ois kaipoi tis Roumaiwn baasiliean, kai plhrasai loin to tis tov koumou svntelias. deka men omou 'Roumaiwn egeironetai baasilieis, en diafrois men ivos tistos, kata de tov auton baasilieontes karyon. met' de toitouz eindikatos o 'Antichristos ek tis magieis kaktetheias tin 'Roumaiwn eousovlar arpastas.

Theodoret's interpretation agrees with the above as to the personality of Antichrist and as to our Lord's coming. I shall quote some portion of it below, on de katevxon, and to muptirion.


Jerome, Epist. exxi., ad Algasiam, qu. 11, vol. i. p. 857 f.: "Nisi, inquit, veucter discessio primum . . . ut omnes gentes quae Romano imperio subjacent, recedant ab his, et revelatus fuerit, id est, ostensum, quem omnium prophetarum verba praeannuntiant, homo peccati, in quon omnium pecatorum est, et filius perditionis, id est diaboli: ipse est unum universorum perditioni, qui adversatur Christi, et ideo vocatur Antichristus; et excolitur supra omne quod dicitur Deus, ut enunteratur gentium deos, sive probatum omnem et veram religionem suo calcet pede: et in templo Dei, vel Hierosolymis (ut quidam putant), vel in ecclesia, ut verius arbitramur, seiderit, ostendens se, tanquam ipse sit Christus et filius Dei: nisi, inquit, fuerit Romanum imperium ante desolatum, et Antichristus praeceperit, Christus non veniet: qui ideo ita venturus est, ut Antichristum destruit."

Theodoret also: varn de theo tas ekklises ekalisen, en aiz arpases tis ton proedrynp, theon eautov anadekeinuva piarwmenos.
6. This μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας was also variously understood. Chrysostom says, Νέρωνα ἐνταῦθα φησίν, ὡσαντ' τίποτ' ὑπάρχον τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου καὶ γὰρ οὗτος ἐβούλετο νομίζεσθαι θέος. καὶ καλῶς ἐπί τοῦ μυστήριον οὐ γὰρ φανερός ὦς ἐκείνος, οὐδὲ ἀπρηκτικάς. εἰ γὰρ πρὸ χρόνων ἐκείνων ἀνεφέβη, φησίν, ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου ἐλεύθερο ταῦτα ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας, οἷς ἀναμετέχουσαν οὐκ ἠθέλημεν ἐνοθήσασθαι, εἰς καὶ φανερὸν αὐτῶν οἷς ἠθέλημεν ἐνοθήσασθαι. 

Then he mentions the various opinions on τὸ κατέχον, giving this as the view of some, that it was said "de malis et fictis qui sunt in ecclesia, donec perveniant ad tantum numerum qui Antichristo magnum populum faciat: et hoc esse mysterium iniquitatis quia videtur occultum..." then again quoting ver. 7, adds, "hoc est, donec exeat de medio ecclesie mysterium iniquitatis, quod nunc occultum est."

4 It is decisive against this latter view, as Lünemann has observed, that if τὸ κατέχον be God’s decree, τὸ κατέχον must be God Himself, and then the ὡς ἐκ μέσου γένηται could not be said.

5 An ingenuous and instructive confession, at the end of the fourth century, from one of the most illustrious of the fathers.
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7. The view of the fathers remained for ages the prevalent one in the Church. Modifications were introduced into it, as her relation to the state gradually altered; and the Church at last, instead of being exposed to further hostilities from the secular power, rose to the head of that power; and, penetrating larger and larger portions of the world, became a representation of the kingdom of God on earth, with an imposing hierarchy at her head. Then followed, in the Church in general, and among the hierarchy in particular, a neglect of the subject of Christ's coming. But meanwhile, those who from time to time stood in opposition to the hierarchy, understood the Apostle's description here, as they did also the figures in the Apocalypse, of that hierarchy itself. And thus arose,—the παρουσία being regarded much as before, only as an event far off instead of near,—first in the eleventh century the idea, that the Antichrist foretold by St. Paul is the establishment and growing power of the Popedom.

8. This view first appears in the conflict between the Emperors and the Popes, as held by the partisans of the imperial power: but soon becomes that of all those who were opponents of the hierarchy, as wishing for a freer spirit in Christendom than the ecclesiastical power allowed. It was held by the Waldenses, the Albigenses, the followers of Wickliffe and Huss. The κατέχον, which retarded the destruction of the papacy, was held by them to be the Imperial power, which they regarded as simply a revival of the old Roman Empire.

9. Thus towards the time of the Reformation, this reference of Antichrist to the papal hierarchy became very prevalent: and after that event it assumed almost the position of a dogma in the Protestant Churches. It is found in Bugenhagen, Zwingle, Calvin, &c. Osiander, Baldwin, Aretius, Erasm.-Schmid, Beza, Calixtus, Calovius, Newton, Wolf, Joachim-Lange, Turretin, Benson, Bengel, Macknight, Zacharie, Michaelis, &c.: in the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church, and in Luther's own writings: and runs through the works of our English Reformers. 7

10. The upholders of this view generally conceive that the Papacy will go on bringing out more and more its antichristian character, till at last the παρουσία will overtake and destroy it. The ἀποστασία is the fall from pure evangelical doctrine to the traditions of men. The singular, ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας, is taken collectively, to signify a 'series et successio hominum,' inasmuch as it is a monarchical empire which is in question, which remains one and the same, though its individual

6 What follows, as far as paragraph 24, is taken principally from Länemann's Schlussbemerkungen, as above: with the exception of the citations made in full, and personal opinions expressed.

7 See a very complete résumé of the passages on Antichrist in the Reformers, under the word, in the excellent Index to the publications of the Parker Society.
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head may change. The godlessness of Antichrist, described in ver. 4, is justified historically by the Pope setting himself above all authority divine and human, the words πάντα λεγόμενον θεόν, &c. being, in accordance with Scriptural usage, taken to mean the princes and governments of the world, and an allusion being found in σέβασμα to σέβαστός, the title of the Roman Emperors. The ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ is held to be the Christian Church, and the καθίσαυ to point to the tyrannical power which the Pope usurps over it. By τὸ κατέχων is understood the Roman Empire, and by δ κατέχων the Roman Emperor,—and history is appealed to, to shew that out of the ruins of that empire the papacy has grown up. The declaration, τὸ μνηστήριον ἣδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας, is justified by the fact, that the "semina erroris et ambitionis," which prepared the way for the papacy, were already present in the Apostle’s time. For a catalogue of the τέρατα ψεύδους, ver. 9, rich material was found in relics, transubstantiation, purgatory, &c. The annihilation of Antichrist by the πνεῦμα τοῦ στόρματος of the Lord, has been understood of the breaking down of his power in the spirits of men by the opening and dispersion of the word of God in its purity by means of the Reformation; and the καταργήσει τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, of the final and material annihilation of Antichrist by the coming of the Lord Himself.

11. In the presence of such a polemical interpretation directed against them, it could hardly be expected that the Roman Catholics on their side would abstain from retaliation on their opponents. Accordingly we find that such writers as Estius, al., interpret the ἀποστασία of the defection from the Romish Church and the Pope, and understand by Antichrist the heretics, especially Luther and the Protestant Church.

12. Even before the reference to the papacy, the interpreters of the Greek Church took Mohammed to be the Antichrist intended by St. Paul, and the ἀποστασία to represent the falling off of many Oriental and Greek Churches to Islamism. And this view so far influenced the Protestant Church, that some of its writers have held a double Antichrist,—an Eastern one, viz. Mohammed and the Turkish power,—and a Western, viz. the Pope and his power. So Melanethon, Bucer, Bullinger, Piscator, &c.

13. Akin to this method of interpretation is that which in our own century has found the apostasy in the enormities of the French Revolution, Antichrist in Napoleon, and τὸ κατέχων in the continuance of the German Empire: an idea, remarks Lünemann, convicted of error by the termination of that empire in 1806.

14. One opinion of modern days has been, that it is objectionable to endeavour to assign closely a meaning to the single details of the imagery used by St. Paul. This has led to giving the whole description a general, ideal, or symbolic sense. So Koppe, who thinks that the Apostle
is only following the general import of the Jewish expectations, resting on the prophecy of Daniel, that there should be a season of godlessness before the time of the end, the full eruption of which he expects after his own death: he himself being δο κατέχων. Similarly Storr,—who sees in ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας ‘potestas aliqua, Deo omnique religiioni adversaria, quae penitus incognita et futuro demum tempore se proditura sit,’ and in τὸ κατέχων, the ‘copia hominum, verissimo amore inflammatorum in Christianam religionem.’ Nitzsche again believes the ‘man of sin to be the power of godlessness’ come to have open authority, or the general contempt of all religion. Pelt, comm. in Thess. p. 204, sums up his view thus: ‘Mihi igitur eum Koppio adversarius ille principium esse videtur, sive vis spiritualis evangelio contraria, quae huc usque tamen in Pontifíciorum Romanorum operibus ac serie luculentissime sese prodit, ita tamen, ut omnia etiam mala, quae in ecclesiis comparent, ad eandem Antichristi évyrgein sint referenda. Eius vero παρουσία, i.e. summum fastigium, quod Christi reditum, qui nihil aliud est nisi regni divini victoria, antecedet, futurum adhuc esse videtur, quum illud tempus procul etiam nunc abesse putemus, ubi omnes terrae incolae in eo erunt ut ad Christi sacra transseant. κατέχων vero eum Theodoreti putarim esse Dei voluntatem illud Satanae regnum eohibentem, ne crumpat, et si mediae spectantur causae, apostolorum tempore maxime imperii Romani vis, et quovis aevó illa resistentia, quam mali artibus, quae religionem subvertere student, privati commodi et honoris augmentorum cupiditas opponere solet.’ And Pelt thinks that the symptoms of the future corruption of the Christian Church were already discernible in the apostolic times, in the danger of falling back from Christian freedom into Jewish legality, in the mingling of heathenism with Christianity, in false γρηγορία and ἀκρογορία, in angelolatry, in the ‘fastus a religione Christiana omnino alienus.’

15. Olshausen’s view is, that inasmuch as the personal coming of Christ is immediately to follow this revelation of Antichrist, such revelation cannot have yet taken place: and consequently, though we need not stigmatize any of the various interpretations as false, none of them has exhausted the import of the prophecy. The various untoward events and ungodly persons which have been mentioned, including the unbelief and godlessness of the present time, are all prefigurations of Antichrist, but contain only some of his characteristics, not all: it is the union of all in some one personal appearance, that shall make the full Antichrist, as the union in one Person, Jesus of Nazareth, of all the types and prophecies, constituted the full Christ. And the κατέχων is the moral and conservative influence of political states, restraining this great final outbreak. See more on this below.

8 So again Pelt, p. 185: ‘Tenentes, illum Christi adventum a Paulo non visibilem habitum.’
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16. On the other hand, some have regarded the prophecy as one already fulfilled. So Grotius, Wetstein, Le Clerc, Whitby, Schöttgen, Nosselt, Krause, and Harduin. All these concur in referring the παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου to the coming of Christ in the destruction of Jerusalem.

17. Grotius holds Antichrist to be the godless Caligula, who (Suet. Calig. 22, 33) ordered universal supplication to himself as the High God, and (Jos. Antt. xviii. 8. 2. Philo, Leg. ad Cai. § 31, vol. ii. p. 576) would have set up a colossal image of himself in the temple at Jerusalem: and in ὁ κατέχων he sees L. Vitellius, the proconsul of Syria and Judæa, whose term of office delayed the putting up of the statue,—and in ὁ ἄνωμος, Simon Magus. This theory is liable to the two very serious objections, 1) that it makes ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἡ ἀμαρτία and ὁ ἄνωμος into two separate persons: 2) that it involves an anachronism, our Epistle having been written after Caligula's time.

18. According to Wetstein, the ἄνθρωπος ἡ ἀμαρτία is Titus, whose army (Jos. B. J. vi. 6. 1), καυμαένοι αὐτοῦ τοῦ ναοῦ, καὶ τῶν πέρι ἀπάντων, κομίσαντες τὰς σημαίας εἰς τὸ ιερὸν, καὶ θέμεναι τῆς ἁνατολικῆς πύλης ἀντίκυρος, ἔθυσάν τε αὐταῖς αὐτόθι, καὶ τῶν Τίτον μετὰ μεγάστων εὐφημίων ἀπέφηναν αὐτοκράτορα. His κατέχων is Nero, whose death was necessary for the reign of Titus,—and his ἀποστασία, the rebellion and slaughter of three princes, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, which brought in the Flavian family. But this is the very height of absurdity, and surely needs no serious refutation.

19. Hammond makes the man of sin to be Simon Magus, and the Gnostics, whose head he was. The ἐτισινωγωγη ἐπ' αὐτόν, ver. 1, he interprets as the "major libertas coëundi in ecclesiasticos cœtus ad colendum Christum:" the ἀποστασία, the falling off of Christians to Gnosticism (1 Tim. iv. 1): ἀποκαλυφθήναι, the Gnostics "putting off their disguise, and revealing themselves in their colours, i.e. cruel, professor enemies to Christ and Christians:" ver. 4 refers to Simon "making himself the supreme Father of all, who had created the God of the Jews" (Iren. i. 24. 1, 2, p. 100 f.). By τὸ κατέχον, he understands the union yet subsisting more or less between the Christians and the Jews in the Apostle's estimation, which was removed when the Apostles entirely separated from the Jews: and ὁ κατέχων he maintains to be virtually the same with τὸ κατέχον, but if any masculine subject must be supplied, would make it ὁ νόμος. The μυστήριον τῆς ἀνωμίας he refers to the wicked lives of these Gnostics, but mostly to their persecution of the Christians. Ver. 8 he explains of the conflict at Rome between Simon and the Apostles Peter and Paul, which ended in the death of the former. Lünemann adds, "The exegetical and historical monstrosity of this interpretation is at present universally acknowledged."

— On the New Test. in loc.
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20. Le Clerc holds the ἀποστασία to be the rebellion of the Jewish people against the yoke of Rome: the man of sin, the rebel Jews, and especially their leader Simon, son of Giora, whose atrocities are related in Josephus: —πᾶς λεγόμ. θεός κ.τ.λ., denotes the government: —τὸ κατέχων is whatever hindered the open breaking out of the rebellion,—partly the influence of those Jews in office who dissuaded the war,—partly fear of the Roman armies: and δ ἐν κατέχον, on one side, the "præses Romanus,"—on the other, the "gentes proceres, rex Agrrippa et pontifices plurimi." The μυστήριον τῆς ἄνομίας is the rebellious ambition, which under the cloke of Jewish independence and zeal for the law of Moses, was even then at work, and at length broke openly forth.

21. Whitby takes the Jewish people for Antichrist, and finds in the apostasy the falling away of the Jewish converts to their old Judaism, alluded to in the Epistle to the Hebrews (iii. 12—14; iv. 11; vi. 4—6; x. 26, 27 al. fr.). His κατέχων is "the Emperor Claudius, who will let till he be taken away, i.e. he will hinder the Jews from breaking out into an open rebellion in his time, they being so signally and particularly obliged by him, that they cannot for shame think of revolting from his government."

22. Schöttgen (vol. i. p. 861 ff.) takes Antichrist to be the Pharisees, Rabbis, and doctors of the law, who set up themselves above God, and had impious stories tending to bring Him into contempt: the ἀποστασία, the rebellion against Rome: the κατέχων, "Christiani, qui precibus suis rem aliquando distulerunt, donec oraculo divino admoniti Hierosolymis abierunt, et Pellam secesserunt:" the μυστήριον τῆς ἄνομίας, "ipsa doctrina perversa," referring to 1 Tim. iii. 16.

23. Nösselt and Krause understand by Antichrist the Jewish zealots, and by the κατέχων, Claudius, as Whitby. Lastly, Harduin makes the ἀποστασία the falling off of the Jews to paganism,—the man of sin, the High Priest Ananias (Acts xxiii. 2),—the κατέχων, his predecessor, whose term of office must come to an end before he could be elected. From the beginning of his term, the ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας was working as a prophet of lies, and was destroyed at the taking of Jerusalem by Titus.

24. All these præterist interpretations have against them one fatal objection:—that it is impossible to conceive of the destruction of Jerusalem as in any sense corresponding to the παρωσία in St. Paul's sense of the term: see especially, as bearing immediately on this passage, 1 Thess. ii. 19; iii. 13; iv. 15; v. 23.

25. A third class of interpretations is that adopted by many of the modern German expositors, and their followers in England. It is best described perhaps in the words of De Wette (Einzl. Handb. ii. 132) : "He goes altogether wrong, who finds here any more than the Apostle's
subjective anticipation from his own historical position, of the future of the Christian Church;" and expanded by Mr. Jowett (vol. ii. p. 178), "Such passages (Eph. vi. 12) are a much safer guide to the interpretation of the one we are considering, than the meaning of similar passages in the Old Testament. For they indicate to us the habitual thought of the Apostle's mind: 'a falling away first,' suggested probably by the wavering which he saw around him among his own converts, the grievous wolves that were entering into the Church of Ephesus (Acts xx. 29): the turning away of all them of Asia (2 Tim. i. 15). When we consider that his own converts, and his Jewish opponents, were all the world to him,—that through them, as it were in a glass, he appeared to himself to see the workings of human nature generally, we understand how this double image of good and evil should have presented itself to him, and the kind of necessity which he felt, that Christ and Antichrist should alternate with each other. It was not that he foresaw some great conflict, decisive of the destinies of mankind. What he anticipated far more nearly resembled the spiritual combat in the seventh chapter of the Romans. It was the same struggle, written in large letters, as Plato might have said, not on the tables of the heart, but on the scene around: the world turned inside out, as it might be described: evil as it is in the sight of God, and as it realizes itself to the conscience, putting on an external shape, transforming itself into a person."

26. This hypothesis is so entirely separate from all others, that there seems no reason why we should not deal with it at once and on its own ground, before proceeding further. It will be manifest to any one who exercises a moment's thought, that the question moved by it simply resolves itself into this: Was the Apostle, or was he not, writing in the power of a spirit higher than his own? In other words, we are here at the very central question of Inspiration or no Inspiration: not disputing about any of its details, which have ever been matters of doubt among Christians: but just asking, for the Church and for the world, Have we, in any sense, God speaking in the Bible, or have we not? If we have,—then of all passages, it is in these which treat so confidently of futurity, that we must recognize His voice: if we have it not in these passages, then where are we to listen for it at all? Does not this hypothesis, do not they who embrace it, at once reduce the Scriptures to books written by men,—their declarations to the assertions of dogmatizing teachers,—their warnings to the apprehensions of excited minds,—their promises to the visions of enthusiasts,—their prophecies, to anticipations which may be accounted for by the circumstances of the writers, but have in them no objective permanent truth whatever?

27. On such terms, I fairly confess I am not prepared to deal with a question like that before us. I believe that our Lord uttered the words ascribed to Him by St. John (ch. xvi. 12, 13); I believe the
apostolic Epistles to be the written proof of the fulfilment of that promise, as the apostolic preaching and labours were the spoken and acted proof: and in writing such passages as this, and 1 Thess. iv. 13—17, and 1 Cor. xv., I believe St. Paul to have been giving utterance, not to his own subjective human opinions, but to truths which the Spirit of God had revealed to him: which he put forth indeed in writing and in speaking, as God had placed him, in a Church which does not know of the time of her Lord's coming,—as God had constituted his own mind, the vessel and organ of these truths, and gifted him with power of words,—but still, as being the truth for the Church to be guided by, not his own forebodings, for her to be misled by. What he may have meant by his expressions, is a question open to the widest and freest discussion: but that what he did mean, always under the above necessary conditions, is truth for us to receive, not opinion for us to canvass, is a position, the holding or rejecting of which might be very simply and strictly shewn to constitute the difference between one who receives, and one who repudiates, Christian revelation itself.

28. I now proceed to enquire, which, or whether any of all the above hypotheses, with the exception of the last, seems worthy of our acceptance. For the reason given above (24), I pass over those which regard the prophecy as fulfilled. The destruction of Jerusalem is inadequate as an interpretation of the coming of the Lord here: He has not yet come in any sense adequate to such interpretation: therefore the prophecy has yet to be fulfilled.

29. The interpretations of the ancient Fathers deserve all respect, short of absolute adoption because they were their interpretations. We must always in such cases strike a balance. In living near to the time when the speaking voice yet lingered in the Church, they had an advantage over us: in living far down in the unfolding of God's purposes, we have an advantage over them. They may possibly have heard things which we have never heard: we certainly have seen things which they never saw. In each case, we are bound to enquire, which of these two is likely to preponderate?

30. Their consensus in expecting a personal Antichrist, is, I own, a weighty point. There was nothing in their peculiar circumstances or temperament, which prevented them from interpreting all that is here said as a personification, or from allegorizing it, as others have done since. This fact gives that interpretation a historical weight, the inference from which it is difficult to escape. The subject of the coming of Antichrist must have been no uncommon one in preaching and in converse, during the latter part of the first, and the second century. That no echoes of the apostolic sayings on the matter should have reached thus far, no savour of the first outpouring of interpretation by
the Spirit penetrated through the next generation, can hardly be con-
ceived. So far, I feel, the patristic view carries with it some claim to
our acceptance.

31. The next important point, the interpretation of το ἑατέχον and ὅ
κατέχον, rests, I would submit, on different grounds. Let us for a
moment grant, that by the former of these words was imported the tem-
poral political power, and by the latter, he who wielded it. Such being
the case, the concrete interpretation most likely to be adopted by the
Fathers would be, the Roman Empire, which existed before their eyes
as that political power. But we have seen that particular power pass
away, and be broken up: and that very passing away has furnished us
with a key to the prophecy, which they did not possess.

32. On the μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας, as has been seen, they are divided:
but even were it otherwise, their concrete interpretations are just those
things in which we are not inferior to them, but rather superior. The
prophecy has since their time expanded its action over a wide and con-
tinually increasing historic field: it is for us to observe what they could
not, and to say what it is which could be thus described,—then at work,
ever since at work, and now at work; and likely to issue in that con-
centration and revelation of evil which shall finally take place.

33. On looking onward to the next great class of interpretations, that
which makes the man of sin to be the Papal power, it cannot be doubted,
that there are many and striking points of correspondence with the
language of the prophecy in the acts and professions of those who have
successfully held that power. But on the other hand it cannot be dis-
guised that, in several important particulars, the prophetic requirements
are very far from being fulfilled. I will only mention two, one sub-
jective, the other objective. In the characteristic of ver. 4, the Pope
does not and never did fulfil the prophecy. Allowing all the striking
coincidences with the latter part of the verse which have been so
abundantly adduced, it never can be shewn that he fulfils the former
part, nay so far is he from it, that the abject adoration of and submission
to λεγόμενοι θεοί and σεβάσματα has ever been one of his most notable
peculiarities. The second objection, of an external and historical cha-
acter, is even more decisive. If the Papacy be Antichrist, then has
the manifestation been made, and endured now for nearly 1500 years,

1 It must be plain to every unbiassed mind, that the mere logical inference, that the
Pope sets himself up above all objects of worship, because he creates objects of wor-
ship, and the maker must be greater than the thing made, is quite beside the purpose.
It entirely fails in showing hostility to, and lifting himself above, every one that is
called God or an object of worship. The Pope is the devoted servant of the false
gods whom he creates, not their antagonist and treader-down. I should not have
noticed so irrelevant an argument, had it not been made much of as against my view.
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and yet that day of the Lord is not come, which by the terms of our
prophecy such manifestation is immediately to precede. 34. The same remarks will apply even more forcibly to all those minor
interpretations which I have enumerated above. None of them exhausts
the sense of the prophecy: and the taking any one of them to be that
which is here designated, would shew the failure of the prophecy, not
its fulfilment: for they have been and have passed away, and the Lord
is not yet come.

35. We are thus directed to a point of view with regard to the pro-
phesy, of the following kind. The ἄνομος, in the full prophetic sense, is
not yet come. Though 1800 years later, we stand, with regard to him,
where the Apostle stood: the day of the Lord not present, and not to
arrive until this man of sin be manifested: the μυστήριον τῆς ἄνομίας
still working, and much advanced in its working: the κατέχον still hin-
dering. And let us ask ourselves, what does this represent to us? Is
it not indicative of a state in which the ἄνομία is working on, so to
speak, underground, under the surface of things,—gaining, throughout
these many ages, more expansive force, more accumulated power, but
still hidden and unconcentrated? And might we not look, in the pro-
gress of such a state of things, for repeated minor embodiments of this
ἄνομία,—ἄνομοι, and ἀντίχριστοι πολλοί (1 John ii. 18) springing up here
and there in different ages and countries,—the ἀποστασία going onward
and growing,—just as there were of Christ Himself frequent types and
minor embodiments before He came in the flesh? Thus in the Papacy,
where so many of the prophetic features are combined, we see as it were
a standing embodiment and type of the final Antichrist,—in the re-
markable words of Gregory the Great, the 'præcurs or Antichristi:' and
in Nero, and every persecutor as he arose, and Mohammed, and Napoleon,
and many other forms and agencies of evil, other more transient types
and examples of him. We may, following out the parallelism, contrast
the Papacy, as a type of Antichrist, having its false priesthood, its pre-
tended sacrifices, its 'Lord God' the Pope, with that standing Jewish
hierarchy of God's own appointing, and its High Priesthood by which
our Lord was prefigured: and the other and personal types, with those
typical persons, who appeared under the old covenant, and set forth so
plainly the character and sufferings and triumphs of the Christ of God.

36. According then to this view, we still look for the man of sin, in
the fulness of the prophetic sense, to appear, and that immediately
before the coming of the Lord. We look for him as the final and
central embodiment of that ἄνομία, that resistance to God and God's
law, which has been for these many centuries fermenting under the
crust of human society, and of which we have already witnessed so many


2 For surely this is the only possible understanding of our ver. 8 on the ordinary
acceptance of words.
partial and tentative eruptions. Whether he is to be expected personally, as one individual embodiment of evil, we would not dogmatically pronounce: still we would not forget, that both ancient interpretation, and the world’s history, point this way. Almost all great movements for good or for ill have been gathered to a head by one central personal agency. Nor is there any reason to suppose that this will be otherwise in the coming ages. In proportion as the general standard of mental cultivation is raised, and man made equal with man, the ordinary power of genius is diminished, but its extraordinary power is increased; its reach deepened, its hold rendered more firm. As men become familiar with the achievements and the exercise of talent, they learn to despise and disregard its daily examples, and to be more independent of mere men of ability; but they only become more completely in the power of gigantic intellect, and the slaves of pre-eminent and unapproachable talent. So that there seems nothing improbable, judging from these considerations, and from the analogy of the partial manifestations which we have already seen, that the centralization of the antichristian power, in the sense of this prophecy, may ultimately take place in the person of some one of the sons of men.

37. The great ἀποστασία again will receive a similar interpretation. Many signal apostasies the world and the Church have seen. Continually, those are going out from us, who were not of us. Unquestionably the greatest of these has been the Papacy, that counterfeit of Christianity, with its whole system of falsehood and idolatry. But both it, and Mohammedanism, and Mormonism, and the rest, are but tenta-mina and foreshadowings of that great final apostasy (ἡ ἀποστασία), which shall deceive, if it were possible, even the very elect.

38. The particulars of ver. 4 we regard variously, according as the ἄνωμος is a person or a set of persons, with however every inclination to take them literally of a person, giving out these things respecting himself, and sitting as described in the temple of God, whether that temple is to be taken in the strictly literal signification of the Jerusalem-temple (to which we do not incline), or as signifying a Christian place of assembly, the gathering-point of those who have sought the fulfilment of the divine promise of God’s presence,—and so called the temple of God.

39. The κατέξων and κατέξω, the one the general hindrance, the other the person in whom that hindrance is summed up, are, in this view, very plain. As the Fathers took them of the Roman Empire and Emperor, standing and ruling in their time, repressing the outbreak of sin and enormity,—so have we been taught by history to widen this view, and understand them of the fabric of human polity, and those who rule that polity, by which the great up-bursting of godlessness is kept down and hindered. I say, we have been taught this by history: seeing that as often as these outbursts have taken place, their course and devastations
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have been checked by the knitting up again of this fabric of temporal power: seeing that this power, wherever the seeds of evil are most plentiful, is strictly a coercive power, and that there only is its restraining hand able to be relaxed, where the light and liberty of the Gospel are shed abroad: seeing that especially has this temporal power ever been in conflict with the Papacy, restraining its pretensions, modifying its course of action, witnessing more or less against its tyranny and its lies.

40. The explanation of the μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας has been already anticipated. It, the ἀνομία, in the hearts and lives, in the speeches and writings of men, is and ever has been working in hidden places, and only awaits the removal of the hindering power to issue in that concentrated manifestation of ὁ ἄνωμος, which shall usher in the times of the end.

41. When this shall be, is as much hidden from us, as it was from the Apostles themselves. This may be set, on the one hand, as a motive to caution and sobriety; while on the other let us not forget, that every century, every year, brings us nearer to the fulfilment,—and let this serve to keep us awake and watchful, as servants that wait for the coming of their Lord. We are not to tremble at every alarm; to imagine that every embodiment of sin is the final one, or every falling away the great apostasy: but to weigh, and to discern, in the power of Him, by whom the prince of this world is judged: that whenever the Lord comes He may find us ready,—ready to stand on His side against any, even the final concentration of His adversaries; ready, in daily intercourse with and obedience to Him, to hail His appearance with joy.

42. If it be said, that this is somewhat a dark view to take of the prospects of mankind, we may answer, first, that we are not speculating on the phenomena of the world, but we are interpreting God's word: secondly, that we believe in One in whose hands all evil is working for good,—with whom there are no accidents nor failures,—who is bringing-out of all this struggle, which shall mould and measure the history of the world, the ultimate good of man and the glorification of His boundless love in Christ: and thirdly, that no prospect is dark for those who believe in Him. For them all things are working together for good; and in the midst of the struggle itself, they know that every event is their gain; every apparent defeat, real success; and even the last dread conflict, the herald of that victory, in which all who have striven on God's part shall have a glorious and everlasting share.
CHAPTER VII.

ON THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

SECTION I.

THEIR AUTHORSHIP.

1. There never was the slightest doubt in the ancient Church, that the Epistles to Timothy and Titus were canonical, and written by St. Paul.

(a) They are contained in the Peschito Syriac version, which was made in the second century.

(b) In the fragment on the Canon of Scripture first edited by Muratori and thence known by his name, generally ascribed to the end of the second century or the beginning of the third (see Routh, Reliq. Sacr. i. pp. 397 ff.), we read, among the Epistles of St. Paul "verum ad Philemonem una, et ad Timotheum duas (duae?) pro affectu et dilectione, in honore tamen Ecclesiae catholicae, in ordinatione ecclesiasticae disciplinæ sanctificata sunt."


In i. 16. 3, p. 83, quotes Titus iii. 10:

"οὗτος ὁ Παῦλος ἐγκελεδύστηκαι ἡμῖν μετὰ μιᾶν καὶ δευτέραν νομοθετικὰν παρατεῖσθαι."

And again, with ὃς καὶ Παῦλος ἐφησεν, iii. 3. 4, p. 177. In iii. 2. 3, p. 176, he says, τούτον τού Λίουν Παῦλος ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολαῖς μένηται.

(δ) Clement of Alexandria, Strom. ii. 11 [52], p. 457 P.:

"περὶ ἤς ὁ ἀπόστολος γράφων, ὁ Τιμόθεε, φησίν, τὴν παρακαταθήκην φύλαξεν ἐκτετραγωγος τὰς βεβήλους κινοφωνίας κ.τ.λ. 1 Tim. vi. 20."

Strom. iii. 6 [51], p. 531 P.:

"αὐτίκα περὶ τῶν βδελυγμομένων τὸν γάμον Παῦλος ὁ μακάριος λέγει . . . 1 Tim. iv. 1."
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Ib. [58], p. 536 P.:

thus may or else per diakónōn γυναῖκῶν ἐν τῇ ἐτέρα πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολῆ ὁ γενναῖος διατάσσεται Παύλος.
Strom. i. 14 [59], p. 350 P.:

tὸν δὲ ἔξοδον οἱ μὲν . . . οἱ δὲ Ἐπιμενήδην τὸν Κρήτα . . . οὐ μένιντα ὁ ἀπόστολος Παύλος καὶ τῷ πρὸς Τίτου ἐπιστολῆ ἐλέγον υἱῶν: Κρήτης ἐστὶ κ.τ.λ. (Tit. i. 12.)

These are only a few of the direct quotations in Clement.

(e) Tertullian:

De præscript. hæret. c. 25, vol. ii. p. 37: “Et hoc verbo usus est Paulus ad Timotheum: O Timothee, depositum custodi (1 Tim. vi. 20). Et rursum: Bonum depositum serva” (2 Tim. i. 14). And he further proceeds to quote 1 Tim. i. 18, vi. 13 ff.; 2 Tim. ii. 2 (twice).

Ib. c. 6, p. 18: “Nec diutius de isto, si idem est Paulus, quæ et alibi hæreses inter carnalia crimina enumerat scribens ad Galatas, et qui Tito 3 suggerit, hominem hereticum post primam corruptionem recusandum, quod perversus sit ejusmodi et delinuat, ut a semet-ipso damnatus.” (Tit. iii. 10, 11.)

Adv. Marcion. v. 21, p. 524, speaking of the Epistle to Philemon:

“Soli huic epistle brevitas sua profuit, ut falsaria manus Marcionis evaderet. Miror tamen, cum ad unum hominem literas factas reciperit, quod ad Timotheum duas et unam ad Titum de ecleisiastico statu compositas recusaverit.”

(ξ) Eusebius includes all three Epistles among the universally confessed canonical writings (ὁμολογοῦμενα), H. E. iii. 25.

It is useless to cite further testimonies, for they are found every where, and in abundance.

2. But we must notice various allusions, more or less clear, to these Epistles, which occur in the earlier Fathers.

(η) CLEMENT OF ROME (end of Cent. I.): Ep. 1 ad Cor. ch. 29, p. 269: προσέλθωμεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν ὄσιότητι ψυχῆς, ἀγνῶς καὶ ἀμώτους χεῖρας αἴροντες πρὸς αὐτόν. See 1 Tim. ii. 8.

(θ) IGNATIUS (beginning of Cent. II.): Ep. to Polycarp, § 6, p. 724: ἀρέσκετε ὑπὲρ ἀπειράτωσθε. See 2 Tim. ii. 4.

(i) POLYCARP (beginning of Cent. II.): Ep. ad Philipp. ch. 4, p. 1008: ἀρχὴ δὲ πάντων χαλεπῶν φαλαργίας εἰδότες οὖν ὅτι οἴδας εἰσπνῄγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' οἴδα εἴσενεγκεῖν τε ἔχομεν, ὁπλισώμεθα τοῖς ὀπλοῖς τῆς δικαιοσύνης: 1 Tim. vi. 7, 10.

3 Dr. Davidson, Introd. iii. 109, omits the word ‘Tito,’ as it would appear, from inadvertency.

4 Two other supposed references may be seen in Lardner, ii. p. 39, and Davidson, iii. p. 101; but they are too slight to authorize their introduction here.
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Ib. ch. 9, p. 1013: οὖ γὰρ τὸν νῦν ἡγάπησαν αἰῶνα. See 2 Tim. iv. 105.

(κ) HEGESIPPUS (end of Cent. II.), as cited by Eusebius (H. E. iii. 32), says that, while the ἱερὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων χορὸς remained, the Church παρθένοις καθάραι καὶ αὐθάρθυροι ἔμεινεν: but that, after their withdrawal, and that of those who had been ear-witnesses of inspired wisdom, ἡ σύνταξις τῆς ἀθέου πλάνης began, διὰ τῆς τῶν ἐτεροδιδασκάλων ἀπάτης: who, as no apostle was left, γυμνὴ λοιπὸν ἦν τῇ κεφαλῇ τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας κηρύγματι τὴν πειθόμνυμον γνώσιν ἀντικηρύτειν ἐπεξείρων. See 1 Tim. vi. 3, 206.

(λ) ATHENAGORAS (end of Cent. II.): Legat. pro Christianis 16, p. 291: πάντα γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐστιν αὐτὸς αὐτῷ, φῶς ἀπρόσιτον: 1 Tim. vi. 16.

(μ) THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH (end of Cent. II.): ad Autolyce. iii. 14, p. 389: ἔτι μὴν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις, καὶ εὐχεσθαι περὶ αὐτῶν, κελέει ἡμᾶς θεὸς λόγος ἀπὸς ἤρμην καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν. 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2. Tit. iii. 17.

ii. p. 95 (Lardner): διὰ ὥδατος καὶ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσία πάντας τοὺς προσώπας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.

(ν) To these may be added Justin Martyr (middle of Cent. II.).

Dial. c. Tryph. c. 47, p. 143: ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ θεοῦ. Tit. iii. 4.

3. Thus the Pastoral Epistles seem to have been from the earliest times known, and continuously quoted, in the Church. It is hardly possible to suppose that the above coincidences are all fortuitous. The only other hypothesis on which they can be accounted for, will be treated further on.

4. Among the Gnostic heretics, however, they did not meet with such universal acceptance. Clement of Alexandria, Strom. ii. 11 (p. 457 P.), after having quoted 1 Tim. vi. 20 ff., adds: ἡτὸ ταύτης ἐλεγχόμενοι τῆς φωνῆς, οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν αἱρέσεων τὰς πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἀθετοῦσι ἐπιστολάς. Tertullian (see above, under ε) states that Marcion rejected from his canon (recusaverit) the Epistles to Timothy and Titus. And Jerome, Pro/. ad Titum, vol. vii. p. 685, says: "Licet non sint digni fidei qui fidem primam irritam fecerunt, Marcionem loquer et Basilidem et omnes heretico qui vetus lantan testamentum: tamem cos aliqua ex parte ferre-mus, si saltam in novo continerent manus suas, et non auderent Christi (u/ipsi jaicitant) boni Dei Filii, vel Evangelistas violare, vel Apostolos . . . . . ut enim de caeteris Epistolis taceam, de quibus quicquid contra-rium suo dogmati viderant, eraserunt, nonnullas integras repudiandas

5 See other slighter parallels in Lardner and Davidson, ubi supra. The μέγα τῆς θεοσθείας μυστήρων, commonly adduced from Justin (in Eus. H. E. iii. 27), is not his, but forms part of the text of Eusebius. See Huther, Einl. p. 35.

6 See on Baur's attempt to meet this, below, par. 14 note.

7 Lardner gives διὰ διδάσκει ἡμᾶς δικαιοπραγεῖν, καὶ ἐνοπλίτειν καὶ καλωσοπίτειν, as an allusion to Tit. ii. 11, 12: but it is far too slight.
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crediderunt, ad Timotheum videlicet utramque, ad Hebreos, et ad Titum, quam nunc conamur exponere . . . . Sed Tatianus, Encratitarum patriarches, qui et ipse nonnullas Pauli Epistolas repudiavit, hanc vel maxime, id est, ad Titum, Apostoli pronunciandam credidit, parvipendens Marcionis et aliorum, qui cum eo in hae parte consentiunt, assertionem.” This last fact, Tatian’s acceptance of the Epistle to Titus, Huther thinks may be accounted for by the false teachers in that Epistle being more expressly designated as Jesus, ch. i. 10, 14; iii. 9.

5. From their time to the beginning of the present century, the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles remained unquestioned. At that time, Schmidt (J. E. C.) first, and afterwards Schleiermacher (in his Letters to Gass, 1807) attacked the genuineness of the first Epistle to Timothy; which on the other hand, was defended by Planck, Wegscheider, and Beckhaus. It soon began however to be seen, that from the close relation of the three Epistles, the arguments which Schleiermacher had used against one, would apply to all: and accordingly first Eichhorn, and then so decisively De Wette, denied the genuineness of all three.

6. The latter Commentator, in his Introduction (1826), combined the view of Schleiermacher, that 1 Tim. was a compilation from the other two, with that of Eichhorn, that all three were not the genuine productions of St. Paul: but at the same time allowed to the consent of the Church in all ages so much weight, that his view influenced only the historical origin of the Epistles, not their credit and authority.

7. This mere negative ground was felt to be unsatisfactory: and Eichhorn soon put forth a positive hypothesis, that the Epistles were written by some disciple of St. Paul, with a view of collecting together his oral injunctions respecting the constitution of the Church. This was adopted by Schott, with the further conjecture that St. Luke was the author.

8. The defenders of the Epistles found it not difficult to attack such a position as this, which was raised on mere conjecture after all: and Baur, on the other hand, remarked, “We have no sufficient resting-place for our critical judgment, as long as we only lay down that the Epistles are not Pauline: we must have established some positive data which transfer them from the Apostle’s time into another age.” Accordingly, he himself has laboured to prove them to have been written in the time of the Marcionite heresy; and their author to have been one who, not having the ability himself to attack the Gnostic positions, thought to uphold the Pauline party by putting his denunciations of it into the mouth of the Apostle.

§ 1.] THEIR AUTHORSHIP. [PROLEGOMENA.

---

8 Hug, Bertholdt, Feilmoser, Guerike, Bühl, Curtius, Klug, Heydenreich, Mack. See Huther, Einleitung, p. 38, from which many of the particulars in the text are taken.

9 Die sogenn. Pastoralbriefe des Apostel Paulus aufs neue Kritisch untersucht, 1835. 73]
9. This view of Baur's has been, however, very far from meeting with general adoption, even among the impugners of the genuineness of our Epistles. The new school of Tübingen have alone accepted it with favour. De Wette himself, in the later editions of his Handbuch (I quote from that of 1847), though he is stronger than ever against the three Epistles, does not feel satisfied with the supposed settling of the question by Baur. He remarks, "According to Baur, the Epistles were written after the middle of the second century, subsequently to the appearance of Marcion and other Gnostics. But, inasmuch as the allusions to Marcion, on which he builds this hypothesis, are by no means certain, and the testimonies of the existence of the Pastoral Epistles stand in the way (for it is hardly probable that the passage in Polycarp, c. 4 [see above, par. 2], can have been the original of 1 Tim. vi. 7, 10): it seems that we must assume an earlier date for the Epistles,—somewhere about the end of the first century."

10. With this last dictum of De Wette's, adverse criticism has resumed its former uncertain footing, and is reduced to the mere negative complexion which distinguished it before the appearance of Baur's first work. We have then merely to consider it as a negation of the Pauline origin of the Epistles, and to examine the grounds on which that negation rests. These may be generally stated under the three following heads:

I. The historical difficulty of finding a place for the writing of the three Epistles during the lifetime of St. Paul:

II. The apparent contact with various matters and persons who belong to a later age than that of the Apostles: and

III. The peculiarity of expressions and modes of thought, both of which diverge from those in St. Paul's recognized Epistles.

11. Of the first of these I shall treat below, in the section "On the times and places of writing." It may suffice here to anticipate merely the general conclusion to which I have there come, viz. that they belong to the latest period of our Apostle's life, after his liberation from the imprisonment of Acts xxviii. Thus much was necessary in order to our discussion of the two remaining grounds of objection.

12. As regards objection II., three subordinate points require notice:

(a) The heretics, whose views and conduct are opposed in all three Epistles.

It is urged that these belonged to later times, and their tenets to systems undeveloped in the apostolic age. In treating of the various places where they are mentioned, I have endeavoured to shew that the tenets and practices predicated of them will best find their explanation by regarding them as the marks of a state of transition between Judaism,

1 Handbuch: allgemeine Bemerkungen über die Pastoralbriefe, p. 121.
through its ascetic form, and Gnosticism proper, as we afterwards find it developed.  

13. The traces of Judaism in the heretics of the Pastoral Epistles are numerous and unmistakeable. They professed to be νομοδιδάσκαλοι (1 Tim. i. 7): commanded ἀπέχεσθαι βρομάτων (ib. iv. 3): are expressly stated to consist of μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς (Tit. i. 10): caused men προσέχειν Ἰουδαίοις μύθοις (ib. 14): brought in μάχας νομικάς (ib. iii. 9).

14. At the same time, the traces of incipient Gnosticism are equally apparent. It has been thought best, in the notes on 1 Tim. i. 4, to take that acceptance of γενεκλογίας, which makes it point to those lists of Gnostic emanations, so familiar to us in their riper forms in after history: in ch. iv. 3 ff., we find the seeds of Gnostic dualism; and though that passage is prophetic, we may fairly conceive that it points to the future development of symptoms already present. In ib. vi. 20, we read of ψευδώνυμος γνώσις, an expression which has furnished Baur with one of his strongest objections, as betraying a post-apostolic origin. But, granted the reference to gnosis, Gnostically so called, neither Baur nor any one else has presumed to say, when the term began to be so used. For our present purpose, the reference is clear. Again in 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18, we read of some of them explaining away the resurrection of the body, saying that it has passed already,—a well-known error of the Gnostics (see note in loc.).

15. It remains that we should shew two important facts, which may influence the reader’s mind concerning both the nature of these heretics, and date of our Epistles. First, they are not the Judaizers of the Apostle’s earlier Epistles. These his former opponents were strong upholders of the law and its requirements: identify themselves plainly with the ‘certain men from Judaea’ of Acts xv. 1, in spirit and tenets: uphold circumcision, and would join it with the faith in Christ. Then as we proceed, we find them retaining indeed some of their former features, but having passed into a new phase, in the Epistle to the Colossians. There, they have added to their Judaizing tenets, various excrescences of will-worship and superstition: are described no longer as persons who would be under the law and Christ together, but as vain,

---

2 See 1 Tim. i. 3, 4, 6, 7, 19; iv. 1—7; vi. 3 ff.; 2 Tim. ii. 16—23; iii. 6—9, 13; iv. 4; Titus i. 10, 11, 14, 16; iii. 9, 10.—and notes.

3 Baur makes much of the passage of Hegesippus quoted above, par. 2, κ, in which he says that this ψευδώνυμος γνώσις first became prevalent after the Apostles were removed from the Church. On this he founds an argument that our Epistle could not have appeared till that time. But the passage as compared with the Epistle proves the very reverse. The ψευδώνυμος γν. was secretly working in the Apostles’ time, and for that reason this caution was given: but after their time it began to be openly professed, and came forth, as Hegesippus says, with uncovered head.
puffed up in their carnal mind, not holding the Head (see Prolegg. to Col., § ii. 10 ff.).

16. The same character, or even a further step in their course, seems pointed out in the Epistle to the Philippians. There, they are not only Judaizers, not only that which we have already seen them, but κακοὶ ἐφηγματίς, ἢ καταστομῆ: and those who serve God in the power of His Spirit are contrasted with them. And here (Phil. iii. 13), we seem to find the first traces becoming perceptible of the heresy respecting the resurrection in 2 Tim. ii. 18, just as the preliminary symptoms of unsoundness on this vital point were evident in 1 Cor. xv.

17. If now we pass on to our Epistles, we shall find the same progress from legality to superstition, from superstition to godlessness, in a further and riper stage. Here we have more decided prominence given to the abandonment of the foundations of life and manners displayed by these false teachers. They had lost all true understanding of the law itself (1 Tim. i. 7): had repudiated a good conscience (ib. 19): are hypocrites and liars (ib. iv. 2), branded with the foul marks of moral crime (ib.): are of corrupt minds, using religion as a means of bettering themselves in this world (ib. vi. 5. Tit. i. 11): insidious and deadly in their advances, and overthrowing the faith (2 Tim. ii. 17): proselytizing and victimizing foolish persons to their ruin (ib. iii. 6 ff.): polluted and unbelieving, with their very mind and conscience defiled (Tit. i. 15): confessing God with their mouths, but denying Him in their works,. abominable and disobedient, and for every good work worthless (ib. i. 16).

18. I may point out to the reader, how well such advanced description of these persons suits the character which we find drawn of those who are so held up to abhorrence in the later of the Catholic Epistles, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews: how we become convinced, as we pass down the apostolic age, that all its heresies and false teachings must be thought of as gradually converging to one point,—and that point, godlessness of life and morals. Into this, Judaism, once so rigid, legality, once so apparently conscientious, broke and crumbled down. I may state my own conviction, from this phenomenon in our Pastoral Epistles, corroborated indeed by all their other phenomena, that we are, in reading them, necessarily placed at a point of later and further development than in reading any other of the works of St. Paul.

19. The second important point as regards these heretics is this: as they are not the Judaizers of former days, so neither are they the Gnostics of later days. Many minor points of difference might be insisted on, which will be easily traced out by any student of church history: I will only lay stress on one, which is in my mind fundamental and decisive.

20. The Gnosticism of later days was eminently anti-judaistic. The Jewish Creator, the Jewish law and system, were studiously held in con-
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tempt and abhorrence. The whole system had migrated, so to speak, from its Jewish standing-point, and stood now entirely over against it. And there can be little doubt, whatever other causes may have coop-erated to bring about this change, that the great cause of it was the break-up of the Jewish hierarchy and national system with the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. The heretical speculations had, so to speak, no longer any mooring-place in the permanence of the old law, and thus, rapidly drifting away from it, soon lost sight of it altogether, and learned to despise it as a thing gone by. Then the oriental and Grecian elements, which had before been in a state of forced and unnatural fusion with Judaism, cast it out altogether, retaining only those traces of it which involved no recognition of its peculiar tenets.

21. The false teachers then of our Epistles seem to hold a position intermediate to the Apostle’s former Judaizing adversaries and the subsequent Gnostic heretics, distinct from both, and just at that point in the progress from the one form of error to the other, which would suit the period subsequent to the Epistle to the Philippians, and prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. There is therefore nothing in them and their characteristics, which can cast a doubt upon the genuineness of the Epistles.

22. (b) [See above, par. 12], the ecclesiastical order subsisting when they were written. Baur and De Wette charge the author of these Epistles with hierarchical tendencies. They hold that the strengthening and developing of the hierarchy, as we find it aimed at in the directions here given, could not have been an object with St. Paul. De Wette confines himself to this general remark: Baur goes further into detail. In his earlier work, on the Pastoral Epistles, he asserts, that in the genuine Pauline Epistles there is found no trace of any official leaders of the Churches (it must be remembered that with Baur, the genuine Epistles are only those to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans): whereas here those Churches are found in such a state of organization, that επίσκοποι, πρεσβύτεροι, and διάκόνοι are significantly put forward: πρεσβύτεροι according to him being the name for the collective body of church-rulers, and επίσκοποι for that one of them who was singly entrusted with the government. In his later work (‘Paulus u.s.w.’), he maintains that the Gnostics, as the first heretics proper, gave the first occasion for the foundation of the episcopal government of the Churches. But even granting this, the very assumption would prove the earlier origin of our Epistles: for in them there is not the slightest trace of episcopal government, in the later sense. Baur’s own explanation of επίσκοποι differs entirely from that later sense.

23. The fact is, that the form of Church government disclosed in our Epistles is of the simplest kind possible. The diaconate was certainly, in some shape or other, coequal with the very infancy of the Church:
and the presbyterate was almost a necessity for every congregation. No Church could subsist without a government of some kind: and it would be natural that such an one as that implied in the presbyterate should arise out of the circumstances in every case.

24. The directions also which are here given, are altogether of an ethical, not of an hierarchical kind. They refer to the selection of men, whose previous lives and relations in society afford good promise that they will discharge faithfully the trust committed to them, and work faithfully and successfully in their office. The fact that no such directions are found in the other Epistles, is easily accounted for: partly from the nature of the case, seeing that he is here addressing persons who were entrusted with this selection, whereas in those others no such matter is in question: partly also from the late date of these letters, the Apostle being now at the end of his own course,—seeing dangerous heresies growing up around the Church, and therefore anxious to give those who were to succeed him in its management, direction how to consolidate and secure it.

25. Besides which, it is a pure assumption that St. Paul could not, from his known character, have been anxious in this matter. In the Acts, we find him ever most careful respecting the consolidation and security of the churches which he had founded: witness his journeys to inspect and confirm his converts (Acts xv. 36; xviii. 23), and that speech uttered from the very depth of his personal feeling and desire, to the presbytery of the Ephesian Church (ib. xx. 18—38).

26. We must infer then, that there is nothing in the hints respecting Church-government which these Epistles contain, to make it improbable that they were written by St. Paul towards the close of his life.

27 (c) [See above, par. 12.] The institution of widows, referred to 1 Tim. v. 9 ff., is supposed to be an indication of a later date. I have discussed, in the note there, the description and standing of these widows: holding them to be not, as Schleiermacher and Baur, deaconesses, among whom in later times were virgins also, known by the name of χήραι (τὰς παρθένους τὰς λεγομένας χήρας, Ign. ad Smyrn. c. 13, p. 717), but as De W., al., an especial band of real widows, set apart, but not yet formally and finally, for the service of God and the Church. In conceiving such a class to have existed thus early, there is no difficulty: indeed nothing could be more natural: we already find traces of such a class in Acts ix. 41; and it would grow up and require regulating in every portion of the Church. On the ἕνως ἀνδρῶς γυνῆ, which is supposed to make another difficulty, see note, 1 Tim. iii. 2.

28. Other details belonging to this objection II. are noticed and replied to in treating of the passages to which they refer. They are founded for the most part in unwarranted assumptions regarding the apostolic age and that which followed it: in forgetting that there
§ 1.] THEIR AUTHORSHIP. [PROLEGOMENA.

must have been a blending of the one age into the other during that later section of the former and earlier section of the latter, of both of which we know so little from primitive history: that the forms of error which we find prevalent in the second century, must have had their origin and their infancy in an age previous: and that here as elsewhere, 'the child is father of the man:' the same characteristics, which we meet full-grown both in the heretics and in the Church of the second century, must be expected to occur in their initiative and less consolidated form in the latter days of the Apostles and their Church 4.

29. We come now to treat of objection III.,—the peculiarity of expressions and modes of thought, both of which diverge from those in St. Paul's recognized Epistles. There is no denying that the Pastoral Epistles do contain very many peculiar words and phrases, and that the process of thought is not that which the earlier Epistles present. Still, our experience of men in general, and of St. Paul himself, should make us cautious how we pronounce hastily on a phenomenon of this kind. Men's method of expression changes with the circumstances among which they are writing, and the persons whom they are addressing. Assuming the late date for our Epistles which we have already mentioned, the circumstances both of believers and false teachers had materially changed since most of those other Epistles were written. And if it be said that on any hypothesis it cannot have been many years since the Epistles of the imprisonment, we may allege on the other hand the very great difference in subject, the fact that these three are addressed to his companions in the ministry, and contain directions for Church management, whereas none of the others contain any passages so addressed or of such character.

30. Another circumstance here comes to our notice, which may have modified the diction and style at least of these Epistles. Most of those others were written by the hand of an amanuensis; and not only so, but probably with the co-operation, as to form of expression and putting out of the material, of either that amanuensis or some other of his fellowHelpers. The peculiar character of these Pastoral Epistles forbids us from imagining that they were so written. Addressed to dear friends and valued colleagues in the ministry, it was not probable that he should have written them by the agency of others. Have we then, assuming that he wrote them with his own hand, any points of comparison in the other Epistles? Can we trace any resemblance to their peculiar diction in portions of those other Epistles which were undoubtedly or probably also autographic?

4 See the objection regarding the youth of Timotheus assumed in these Epistles, treated below in § ii., 'On the places and times of writing.'
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31. The first unquestionably autographic Epistle which occurs to us is that to Philemon: which has also this advantage for comparison, that it is written to an individual, and in the later portion of St. Paul's life. And it must be confessed, that we do not find here the resemblance of which we are in search. The single word ἐχθρηστος is the only point of contact between the unusual expressions of the two. It is true that the occasion and subject of the Epistle to Philemon were totally distinct from those of any of the Pastoral Epistles: almost all their ἰπαξ λεγόμενα are from the very nature of things excluded from it. Still I must admit that the dissimilarity is striking and not easily accounted for. I would not disguise the difficulty which besets this portion of our subject: I would only endeavour to point out in what direction it ought to guide our inference from the phenomena.

32. We have found reason to believe (see note on Gal. vi. 11) that the Epistle to the Galatians was of this same autographic character. Allowing for the difference of date and circumstances, we may expect to find here some points of peculiarity in common. In both, false teachers are impugned: in both, the Apostle is eager and fervent, abrupt in expression, and giving vent to his own individual feelings. And here we do not seek in vain. We find several unusual words and phrases common only to the two or principally occurring in them. Here again, however, the total difference of subject throughout a great portion of the Epistle to the Galatians prevents any very great community of expression.

33. We have a very remarkable addition to the Epistle to the Romans in the doxology, ch. xvi. 25, 26; appended to it, as we have there in-

---

5 I set down a list of the principal similarities which I have observed between the diction of the Gal. and the Pastoral Epp.:

1. τοῦ δόχου ἐκατόν περὶ κ.τ.λ., Gal. i. 4: compare ὁ δὸς ἐκατόν ἀντίλατρον ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ., 1 Tim. ii. 6; θέλω κατάντιν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, Tit. ii. 14. These are the only places where this expression is used of our Lord.

2. εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων, Gal. i. 5: compare the same expression in 1 Tim. i. 17, 2 Tim. iv. 18. The only other places where it occurs is in the last Epistle of the imprisoned Phil. iv. 20.

3. προΐκαστων, Gal. i. 14, found in 2 Tim. ii. 16, iii. 9, 13, and Rom. xiii. 12 only in St. Paul.

4. ἰδοὺ ἐνωπίων τοῦ θεοῦ, Gal. i. 20: the expression ἐν τ. θ. occurs elsewhere frequently in St. Paul, but in this asseverative sense is found only in the Past. Epp.: 1 Tim. v. 21, vi. 13, 2 Tim. ii. 14 (κυρίων), iv. 1.

5. στῦλος, Gal. ii. 9: in St. Paul, 1 Tim. iii. 15 only.

6. ἀνέρητος, Gal. iii. 1: in St. Paul (Rom. i. 14), 1 Tim. vi. 9, Tit. iii. 3 only.

7. μεσίται, Gal. iii. 20: in St. Paul (three times in Hebrews), 1 Tim. ii. 5 only.

8. ἐλπίς, objective, Gal. v. 5: compare Tit. ii. 13.

9. πνεύματι ἀγαθῷ, Gal. v. 18: construction, with ἀγαθῷ (Rom. viii. 14), 2 Tim. iii. 6 only.

10. καροφ ἰδίω, Gal. vi. 9: found 1 Tim. ii. 6, vi. 15, Tit. i. 3 only.
ferred, in later times by the Apostle himself, as a thankful effusion of his fervent mind. That addition is in singular accordance with the general style of these Epistles. We may almost conceive him to have taken his pen off from writing one of them, and to have written it under the same impulse.

34. There remain, however, many expressions and ideas not elsewhere found. Such are πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, 1 Tim. i. 15; iii. 1; iv. 9: 2 Tim. ii. 11: Tit. iii. 8,—a phrase dwelling much at this time on the mind of the writer, but finding its parallel at other times in his favourite πιστὸς ὁ θεός, and the like: cf. 1 Cor. i. 9; x. 13: 2 Cor. i. 18: 1 Thess. v. 24: 2 Thess. iii. 3: —ἐυσέβεια, εὐσεβῶς, 1 Tim. ii. 2; iii. 16; iv. 7; vi. 11: 2 Tim. iii. 5, 12: Tit. i. 1; ii. 12,—of which we can only say that occurring as it does in this peculiar sense only here and in 2 Peter, we should be disposed to ascribe its use to the fact of the word having at the time become prevalent in the Church as a compendious term for the religion of Christians: —σώφρον and its derivatives, 1 Tim. ii. 9, 15; iii. 2: 2 Tim. i. 7: Tit. i. 8; ii. 2, 4 ff., 12,—a term by no means strange to the Apostle's other writings, cf. Rom. xii. 3: 2 Cor. v. 13, but probably coming into more frequent use as the necessity for the quality itself became more and more apparent in the settlement of the Church (cf. also 1 Pet. iv. 7): —οὐγνὸς, ὁγιαίνων, of right doctrine, 1 Tim. i. 10; vi. 3: 2 Tim. i. 13; iv. 3: Tit. i. 9, 13; ii. 1 f., 8,—one of the most curious peculiarities of our Epistles, and only to be ascribed to the prevalence of the image in the writer’s mind at the time, arising probably from the now apparent tendency of the growing heresies to corrupt the springs of moral action: —μῦθος, 1 Tim. i. 4; iv. 7: 2 Tim. iv. 4: Tit. i. 14,—to be accounted for by the fact of the heretical legends having now assumed such definite shape as to deserve this name, cf. also 2 Pet. i.

6 The actual verbal accords are frequent, but even less striking than the general similarity:

ver. 25. εὐαγγέλιον μαυ: (Rom. ii. 16) 2 Tim. ii. 8 only.

κήρυγμα (1 Cor. i. 21, ii. 4, xv. 14): 2 Tim. iv. 17, Tit. i. 3 only.

χρόνοις αἰώνιοι: 2 Tim. i. 9, Tit. i. 2 only.

ver. 26. φανεραθέντος in this sense, St. Paul elsewhere, but also 1 Tim. iii. 16, 2 Tim. i. 10, Tit. i. 3.

κατ' ἐπίστασιν ... θεὸ, (1 Cor. vii. 6, 2 Cor. viii. 8,) 1 Tim. i. 1, Tit. i. 3 only.

μῦθοι σοφιθεὸν: 1 Tim. i. 17, var. readd.

I may add to these instances, those of accordance between the Pastoral Epistles and the speech of St. Paul in Acts xx.: viz.

δόμος, found only Acts xiii. 23, xx. 24, 2 Tim. iv. 7.

περιποιεῖσθαι, Paul, only Acts xx. 28, 1 Tim. iii. 13.

ἰματισμὸς, Paul, only Acts xx. 33, 1 Tim. ii. 9.

ἐπιθυμῶ, with a gen., only Acts xx. 33, 1 Tim. iii. 1.

ἀγων τοῦ κυρίου, Acts xx. 35, 1 Tim. vi. 3.

ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι, Paul, only Acts xx. 35, 1 Tim. vi. 2.

for προσέχειν, with a dative, see next paragraph.
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vi.:—ζητήσεις, 1 Tim. i. 4; vi. 4: 2 Tim. ii. 23: Tit. iii. 9,—which expression, if not exactly applied to erroneous speculations, is yet used elsewhere of disputes about theological questions; cf. Acts xv. 2; xxv. 20 (John iii. 25); the difference of usage is easily accounted for by the circumstances:—ἐπιφάνεια, instead of παρουσία, 1 Tim. vi. 14: 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8: Tit. ii. 13,—which has a link uniting it to 2 Thess. ii. 8, and may have been, as indeed many others in this list, a word in familiar use among the Apostle and his companions, and so used in writing to them:—διεστόθη, for κύριος, in the secular sense of master, 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2: 2 Tim. ii. 21: Tit. ii. 9,—which is certainly remarkable, St. Paul's word being κύριος, Eph. vi. 5, 9: Col. iii. 22; iv. 1,—and of which I know no explanation but this possible one, that the Eph. and Col. being written simultaneously, and these three also near together, there would be no reason why he might not use one expression at one time and the other at another, seeing that the idea never occurs again in his writings:—ἀρνείσθαι, 1 Tim. v. 8: 2 Tim. ii. 12 f.: iii. 5: Tit. i. 16; ii. 12,—common to our Epistles with 2 Pet., 1 John, and Jude, but never found in the other Pauline writings; and of which the only account that can be given is, that it must have been a word which came into use late as expressing apostasy, when the fact itself became usual, being taken from our Lord's own declarations, Matt. x. 33, &c.:—παρατείσθαι, 1 Tim. iv. 7: v. 11: 2 Tim. ii. 23: Tit. iii. 10,—a word the links of whose usage are curious. It is confined to St. Luke and St. Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews. We have it thrice in the parable of the great supper, Luke xiv. 18, 19: then in the answer of Paul to Festus, in all probability made by himself in Greek, Acts xxv. 11: and Heb. xii. 19, 25 bis. We may well say of it, that the thing introduced the word: had the Apostle had occasion for it in other Epistles, he would have used it: but he has not (the same may be said of γενεαλογία, 1 Tim. i. 4: Tit. iii. 9;—ματαιόδοξος, -για, 1 Tim. i. 6: Tit. i. 10;—κενοφωνία, 1 Tim. vi. 20: 2 Tim. ii. 16;—λογομαχία, -είν, 1 Tim. vi. 4: 2 Tim. ii. 14;—παραβήκη, 1 Tim. vi. 20: 2 Tim. i. 12, 14):—σωτήρ, spoken of God,—1 Tim. i. 1; ii. 3; iv. 10: Tit. i. 3; ii. 10, common also to Luke (i. 47) and Jude (25): the account of which seems to be, that it was a purely Jewish devotional expression, as we have it in the Magnificat,—and not thus absolutely used by the Apostles, in their special proclamation of the Son of God in this character;—we may observe that St. Jude introduces it with the limitation διὰ Ἰησοῦ χρ. τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν;—but in familiar writing one to another, when there was no danger of the mediatorship of Jesus being forgotten, this true and noble expression seems still to have been usual:—βεβηλος, 1 Tim. i. 9; iv. 7; vi. 20: 2 Tim. ii. 16,—common only to Heb. (xii. 16),—an epithet interesting, as bringing with it the fact of the progress of heresy from doctrine to practice, as also does ἀνόσιος, 1 Tim. i. 9; 82]
2 Tim. iii. 2:—διαβεβαιωσθαι, 1 Tim. i. 7: Tit. iii. 8, a word but slightly differing in meaning, and in its composition with διά (a natural addition in later times), from θεβαιων, which is a common expression with our Apostle, Rom. xv. 8: 1 Cor. i. 6, 8: 2 Cor. i. 21: Col. ii. 7 (Heb. ii. 3; xiii. 9):—προσέχειν, with a dat., 1 Tim. i. 4; iii. 8; iv. 1, 13: Tit. i. 14,—found also frequently in St. Luke, Luke xii. 1; xvii. 3; xxi. 34: Acts v. 35; viii. 6, 10, 11; xvi. 14: xx. 28 (Paul), and Heb. ii. 1; vii. 13: 2 Pet. i. 19:—a word testifying perhaps to the influence on the Apostle's style of the expressions of one who was so constantly and faithfully his companion:—ὑπομιμήσκειν, 2 Tim. ii. 14: Tit. iii. 1 (2 Pet. i. 12: 3 John 10: Jude 5):—a word naturally coming into use rather as time drew on, than "in the beginning of the Gospel:"—ἀποτρέποντας, ἐκτρ., 2 Tim. iii. 5: 1 Tim. i. 6; v. 15; vi. 20: 2 Tim. iv. 4 (Heb. xii. 13),—words owing their use to the progress of heresy; which may be said also of ἄποτρέχων, 1 Tim. i. 6; vi. 21: 2 Tim. ii. 18,—and of τυφώσθαι, 1 Tim. iii. 6; vi. 4: 2 Tim. iii. 4:—&c. &c.

35. There seems no reason why any of the above peculiarities of diction should be considered as imperilling the authenticity of our Epistles. The preceding paragraph will have shewn, that of many of them, some account at least may be given: and when we reflect how very little we know of the circumstances under which they were used, it appears far more the part of sound criticism to let such difficulties stand unsolved, under a sense that we have not the clue to them, than at once and rashly to pronounce on them, as indicative of a spurious origin.

36. Another objection brought by De Wette against our Epistles seems to me to make so strikingly and decisively for them, that I cannot forbear giving it in his own words before commenting upon it: "In the composition of all three Epistles we have this common peculiarity,—that from that which belongs to the object of the Epistle, and is besides for the most part of general import, the writer is ever given to digress to general truths, or so-called common-places (1 Tim. i. 15; ii. 4—6; iii. 16; iv. 8—10: 2 Tim. i. 9 f.; ii. 11—13, 19—21; iii. 12, 16: Tit. ii. 11—14; iii. 3—7), and that even that which is said by way of contradiction or enforcing attention, appears in this form (1 Tim. i. 8—10; iv. 4 f.; vi. 6—10: 2 Tim. ii. 4—6: Tit. i. 15). With this is combined another peculiarity common to them, that after such digressions or general instructions, the writer's practice is to recur, or finally to appeal to and fall back on previous exhortations or instructions given to his correspondent (1 Tim. iii. 14 f.; iv. 6, 11; vi. 2, 5 [rec.]: 2 Tim. ii. 7, 14; iii. 5: Tit. ii. 15; iii. 8)." In commenting on this, I would ask, what could be more natural than both these phænomena, under the circumstances, supposing St. Paul their author? Is it not the tendency of an instructor writing to his pupil to make these compendious references to truths well known and established between them? Would not
this especially be the case, as age drew on, and affectionate remembrance took the place of present and watchful instruction? We have hardly a stronger evidence for the authenticity of our Epistles, than our finding them so exactly corresponding with what we might expect from Paul the aged towards his own sons in the faith. His restless energies are still at work: we see that the ἐνδομάδος will keep him toiling to the end in his οἰκονομία: but those energies have changed their complexion: they have passed from the dialectic character of his former Epistles, from the wonderful capacity of intricate combined ratiocination of his subsequent Epistles, to the urging, and repeating, and dilating upon truths which have been the food of his life: there is a resting on former conclusions, a stating of great truths in concentrated and almost rhythmical antithesis, a constant citation of the 'temporis acti,' which lets us into a most interesting phase of the character of the great Apostle. We see here rather the succession of brilliant sparks, than the steady flame: burning words indeed and deep pathos, but not the flower of his firmness, as in his discipline of the Galatians, not the noon of his bright warm eloquence, as in the inimitable Psalm of Love (1 Cor. xiii.).

37. We may also notice, as I have pointed out in the notes on 1 Tim. i. 11 ff., a habit of going off, not only at a word, or into some collateral subject, as we find him doing in all his writings, but on the mention of any thing which reminds him of God's mercies to himself, or of his own sufferings on behalf of the Gospel, into a digression on his own history, or feelings, or hopes. See 1 Tim. i. 11 ff.; ii. 7: 2 Tim. i. 11 ff., 15 ff.; ii. 9, 10; iii. 10 f.; iv. 6 ff. These digressions do not occur in the Epistle to Titus, perhaps on account of the less intimate relation which subsisted between him and the Apostle. I cannot help considering them also as deeply interesting, betokening, as I have there expressed it in the note, advancing age, and that faster hold of individual habits of thought, and mannerisms, which characterizes the decline of life.

38. De Wette brings another objection against our Epistles, which seems to me just as easily to bear urging on the other side as the last. It is, the constant moral reference of all that is here said respecting the faith: the idea that error is ever combined with evil conscience, the true faith with good conscience. From what has been already said, it will be seen how naturally such a treatment of the subject sprung out of the progress of heresy into ethical corruption which we have traced through the later part of the apostolic age: how true all this was, and how necessary it was thus to mark broadly the line between that faith, which was the only guarantee for purity of life, and those perversions of it, which led downwards to destruction of the moral sense and of practical virtue.
§ I.] THEIR AUTHORSHIP. [PROLEGOMENA.

39. When however in his same paragraph (Allgem. Bemerkungen üb. die Pastoralbriefe, p. 117 c) he assumes that the writer gives a validity to moral desert, which stands almost in contradiction to the Pauline doctrines of grace, and cites 1 Tim. ii. 15; iii. 13; iv. 8; vi. 18 ff.: 2 Tim. iv. 8, to confirm this,—I own I am quite unable to see any inconsistency in these passages with the doctrine of grace as laid down, or assumed, in the other Epistles. See Rom. ii. 6—10: 1 Cor. iii. 14; ix. 17, 25; xv. 58: Phil. i. 19, and many other places, in which the foundation being already laid of union with Christ by faith, and salvation by His grace, the carrying on and building up of the man of God in good works, and reward according to the measure of the fruits of the Spirit, are quite as plainly insisted on as any where in these Epistles.

40. De Wette also finds what he calls, 'an apology for the law, and an admission of its possessing an ethical use,' in 1 Tim. i. 8. In my notes on that passage, I have seen reason to give it altogether a different bearing: but even admitting the fact, I do not see how it should be any more inconsistent with St. Paul's measure of the law, than that which he says of it in Rom. vii. And when he objects that the universalism of these Epistles (1 Tim. ii. 4; iv. 10; Tit. ii. 11), although in itself Pauline, does not appear in the same polemical contrast, as e. g. in Rom. iii. 29,—this seems very trifling in fault-finding: nothing on the contrary can be more finely and delicately in accordance with his former maintenance against all impugners of God's universal purpose of salvation to all mankind, than that he should, even while writing to one who did not doubt of that great truth, be constant to his own habit of asserting it.

41. There are many considerations pressed by the opponents of the Pauline authorship, which we can only mention and pass by. Some of them will be found incidentally dealt with in the notes: with others the student, who has hitherto followed the course of these remarks, will know how himself to deal. As usual, the similarities to, as well as discrepancies from, the other Epistles, are adduced as signs of spuriousness. The three Epistles, and especially the first to Timothy, are charged with poverty of sentiment, with want of connexion, with unworthiness of the Apostle as author. On this point no champion of the Epistles could so effectually defeat the opponents, as they have defeated themselves. Schleiermacher, holding 1 Tim. to be compiled out of the other two, finds it in all these respects objectionable and below the mark; Baur will not concede this latter estimate, and De Wette charges Schleier-

7 Huther gives a list of parallels against which this objection has been brought, and I transcribe it, that the reader may judge and refute for himself: 1 Tim. i. 12—14, as compared with 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10: 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12, with 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35: 2 Tim. i. 3—5, with Rom. i. 8 ff.: ii. 5, with 1 Cor. ix. 24: ii. 6, with 1 Cor. ix. 7 ff.: ii. 8, with Rom. i. 3: ii. 11, with Rom. vi. 8: ii. 20, with Rom. ix. 21: iii. 2 ff., with Rom. i. 29 ff.: iv. 6, with Phil. ii. 17: Tit. i. 1—4, with Rom. i. 1 ff.
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macher with having failed to penetrate the sense of the writer, and
found faults, where a more thorough exposition must pronounce a more
favourable judgment. These differences may well serve to strike out
the argument, and indeed all such purely subjective estimates, from the
realms of biblical criticism.

42. A word should be said on the smaller, but not less striking indica-
tions of genuineness, which we here find. Such small, and even
trilling individual notices, as we here meet with, can hardly have pro-
ceeded from a forger. Of course a careful falsarius may have taken
care to insert such, as would fall in with the known or supposed state of
the Apostle himself and his companions at the time: a shrewd and skilful
one would invent such, as might further any views of his own, or of the
Churches with which he was connected: but I must say I do not covet
the judgment of that critic, who can ascribe such a notice as that of 2 Tim.
iv. 13, τὸν φελόντα ὁν ἀπέλευσεν ἐν Τρώαδι παρὰ Κάρφω ἐρχόμενος φέρε, καὶ
tὰ βιβλία, μάλιστα τὰς μεριβράνας, to either the caution or the skill of a
forger. What possible motive there could be for inserting such minute
particulars, unexampled in the Apostle’s other letters, founded on no incident
in history, tending to no result,—might well baffle the acutest
observer of the phenomena of falsification to declare.

43. A concession by Baur himself should not be altogether passed
over. St. Paul in his farewell discourse, Acts xx. 29, 30, speaks thus:
εὖο ὁδα ὅτι ἐισελεύσονται μετὰ τὴν ἀφείαν μον λικοὶ βαρές εἰς υἱός μὴ
φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου, καὶ εἰ υἱῶν αὐτῶν ἀναστήσονται άνθρωποι λαλούντες
dιεστραμμένα τὸν ἀποστάν τοῦ μαθητῆς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκατῶν. Baur confesses that
here the defenders of the Epistles have firm ground to stand on. “Here
we see,” he continues, “the Apostle anticipating just what we find more
in detail in the Pastoral Epistles.” But then he proceeds to set aside
the validity of the inference, byquietly disposing of the farewell discourse,
as written “post eventum.” For those who look on that discourse very
differently, his concession has considerable value.

44. I would state then the general result to which I have come from
all these considerations:

1. External testimony in favour of the genuineness of our Epistles
is so satisfactory, as to suggest no doubt on the point of their
universal reception in the earliest times.

2. The objections brought against the genuineness by its oppo-
nents, on internal grounds, are not adequate to set it aside, or
even to raise a doubt on the subject in a fair-judging mind.

45. I therefore rest in the profession of the Epistles themselves, and
the universal belief of Christians, that they were veritably written
by St. Paul.

* I have preferred in this section giving those considerations which influence most
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TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING. [PROLEGOMENA.

SECTION II.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. A difficult problem yet remains: to assign, during the life of the Apostle, a time for the writing, which will suit the phenomena of these Epistles.

2. It will have been abundantly seen by what has preceded, that I cannot consent to place them in any portion of St. Paul's apostolic labours recorded in the Acts. All the data with which they themselves furnish us, are against such a supposition. And most of all is the state of heresy and false teaching, as indicated by their common evidence. No amount of ingenuity will suffice to persuade us, that there could have been during the long sojourn of the Apostle at Ephesus in Acts xix., such false teachers as those whose characters have been examined in the last section. No amount of ingenuity again will enable us to conceive a state of the Church like that which these Epistles disclose to us, at any time of that period, extending from the year 54 to 63, during which the other Epistles were written. Those who have attempted to place the Pastoral Epistles, or any of them, in that period, have been obliged to overlook all internal evidence, and satisfy themselves with fulfilling the requirements of external circumstances.

3. It will also be seen, that I cannot consent to separate these Epistles widely from one another, so as to set one in the earlier, and the others in the later years of the Apostle's ministry. On every account, they must stand together. Their style and diction, the motives which they furnish, the state of the Church and of heresy which they describe, are the same in all three: and to one and the same period must we assign them.

4. This being so, they necessarily belong to the latest period of the Apostle's life. The concluding notices of the Second Epistle to Timotheus forbid us from giving an earlier date to that, and consequently to the rest. And no writer, as far as I know, has attempted to place that Epistle, supposing it St. Paul's, at any date except the end of his life.

my own mind, to entering at full length on all the bearings of the subject. The reader will find a very good and terse compendium of the objections and their answers in Conybeare and Howson, vol. ii. pp. 657—660, edn. 2: and a full and elaborate discussion of both in Dr. Davidson's Introduction to the N. T. vol. iii. pp. 100—153. That portion of Dr. Davidson's work is very well and thoroughly done, in which he shews the insuperable difficulties which beset the hypothesis of a scholar of St. Paul having forged the Epistles at the end of the first century, as De Wette supposes. Huther's and Wiesinger's Einleitungen also contain full and able discussions of the whole question; especially the latter.

De Wette has fallen into a curious blunder in carrying out his own hypothesis. He argues that 1 Tim. must have been written after 2 Tim., because we find Hyme-
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5. The question then for us is, What was that latest period of his life? Is it to be placed at the end of the first Roman imprisonment, or are we to conceive of him as liberated from that, and resuming his apostolic labours?

6. Let us first try the former of these hypotheses. It has been adopted by chronologers of considerable note: lately, by Wieseler and Dr. Davidson. We approach it, laden as it is with the weight of (to us) the insuperable objection on internal grounds, stated above. We feel that no amount of chronological suitableness will induce us complacently to put these Epistles in the same age of the Church with those to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians. But we would judge the hypothesis here on its own merely external grounds.

7. In order for it to stand, we must find some occasion, previous to the imprisonment, when St. Paul may have left Timotheus at Ephesus, himself proceeding to Macedonia. And this time must of course be subsequent to St. Paul’s first visit to Ephesus, Acts xviii. 20, 21, when the Church there was founded, if indeed it can be said to have been then founded. On his departure then, he did not go into Macedonia, but to Jerusalem; which alone, independently of all other considerations, excludes that occasion 1.

8. His second visit to Ephesus was that long one related in Acts xix., the τρείς of Acts xx. 31, the ἔτη δύο of xix. 10, which latter, however, need not include the whole time. When he left Ephesus at the end of this time, after the tumult, ἔστη τὸν Περσίνην εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν, which seems at first sight to have a certain relation to πορευόμενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν of 1 Tim. i. 3. But on examination, this relation vanishes: for in Acts xix. 22, we read that, intending to go to Jerusalem by way of Macedonia and Achaia, he sent off from Ephesus, before his own departure, Timotheus and Erastus: so that he could not have left Timotheus behind in Ephesus. Again, in 1 Tim. iii. 14, he hopes to return to Ephesus shortly. But we find no trace of such an intention, and no attempt to put it in force, in the history. And besides, even if Timotheus, as has sometimes been thought from 1 Cor. xvi. 11, did return to Ephesus before the Apostle left it, and in this sense might have been left there on his departure, we must then suppose him to have almost immediately deserted the charge entrusted to him; for he is again, in the autumn of

næus, who is mentioned with reprobation, apparently for the first time, in 2 Tim. ii. 17 f.,—in a further stage of reprobation, judged and condemned, in 1 Tim. i. 20. He forgets that, the two Epistles being according to him forgeries, with no real circumstances whatever as their basis, such reasoning is good for nothing. He is in fact arguing from their genuineness to their spuriousness.

1 This was however supposed by Calvin to have been the time of writing 1 Tim.: on ch. iii. 14,—“omnia enim sperabat se venturum: ut venisset probabile est, si hanc epistolam scripsit quo tempore Phrygian peragrabat: sicuti refert Lucas Act. xviii. 23.”
§ 11. TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING. [PROLEGOMENA.

57, with St. Paul in Macedonia in 2 Cor. i. 1, and in Corinth in the winter (Rom. xvi. 21), and returned to Asia thence with him, Acts xx. 4: and thus, as Wieseler remarks, the whole scope of our Epistle, the ruling and ordering of the Ephesian Church during the Apostle’s absence, would be defeated. Grotius suggested, and Bertholdt adopted, a theory that the Epistle might have been sent on St. Paul’s return from Achaia to Asia, Acts xx. 4, and that Timotheus may, instead of remaining in Troas on that occasion, as related Acts xx. 5, have gone direct to Ephesus, and there received the Epistle. But, apart from all other difficulties, how exceedingly improbable, that such an Epistle should have preceded only by a few weeks the farewell discourse of Acts xx. 18—35, and that he should have sent for the elders to Miletus, though he himself had expressed, and continually alluded to in the Epistle, an intention of visiting Ephesus shortly!

9. These difficulties have led to a hypothesis that the journey from Ephesus is one unrecorded in the Acts, occurring during the long visit of Acts xix. That during that time a journey to Corinth did take place, we have inferred from the data furnished in the Epistles to the Corinthians: see Prolegg. to Vol. II. ch. iii. § v. During that journey, Timotheus may have been left there. This conjecture is at least worthy of full discussion: for it seems to fulfil most of the external requirements of the first Epistle.

10. Mosheim, who was its originator, held the journey to Greece to have taken place very early in the three years’ visit to Ephesus, and to have lasted nine months,—thus accounting for the difference between the two years and three months of Acts xix. 8, 10, and the three years of Acts xx. 31. Wieseler, however, has so far regarded the phenomena of the Epistle itself, as to shew that it would be very unlikely that the false teachers had early in that visit assumed such consistency and acquired such influence: and besides, we must assume, from the intimation in 1 Tim. i. 3 ff., that the false teachers had already gained some notoriety, and were busy in mischief, before the Apostle’s departure.

11. Schrader, the next supporter of the hypothesis, makes the Apostle remain in Ephesus up to Acts xix. 21, and then undertake the journey there hinted at, through Macedonia to Corinth, thence to Crete (where he founded the Cretan Churches and left Titus), to Nicopolis in Cilicia (see below, in the Prolegg. to Titus: sending from thence the first Epistle to Timotheus and that to Titus), Antioch, and so through Galatia back to Ephesus. The great and fatal objection to this hypothesis is, the insertion in Acts xix. 21—23 of so long a journey, lasting, according to

3 Ib. p. 296 ff.
Schrader himself, two years (from Easter 54 to Easter 56), not only without any intimation from St. Luke, but certainly against any reasonable view of his text, in which it is implied, that the intention of ver. 21 was not then carried out, but afterwards, as related in ch. xx. 1 ff.

12. Wieseler himself has adopted, and supported with considerable ingenuity, a modified form of Schrader's hypothesis. After two years' teaching at Ephesus, the Apostle, he thinks, went, leaving Timotheus there, on a visitation tour to Macedonia, thence to Corinth, returning by Crete, where he left Titus, to Ephesus. During this journey, either in Macedonia or Achaia, he wrote 1 Tim.,—and after his return to Ephesus, the Epistle to Titus: 2 Tim. falling towards the end of his Roman imprisonment, with which, according to Wieseler, his life terminated. This same hypothesis Dr. Davidson adopts, rejecting however the unrecorded visit to Corinth, which Wieseler inweaves into it: and placing the voyage to Crete during the same Ephesian visit, but separate from this to Macedonia.

13. It may perhaps be thought that some form of this hypothesis would be unobjectionable, if we had only the first Epistle to Timotheus to deal with. But even thus, it will not bear the test of thorough examination. In the first place, as held by Davidson, in its simplest form, it inserts into the Apostle's visit to Ephesus, a journey to Macedonia and back entirely for the sake of this Epistle. Wieseler's form of the hypothesis avoids, it is true, this gratuitous supposition, by connecting the journey with the unrecorded visit to Corinth: but is itself liable to these serious objections (mentioned by Huther, p. 17), that 1) it makes St. Paul write the first Epistle to the Corinthians a very short time after the unrecorded visit to Corinth, which is on all accounts improbable. And this is necessary to his plan, in order to give time for the false teachers to have grown up at Ephesus:—2) that we find the Apostle, in his farewell discourse, prophetically anticipating the arising of evil men and seducers among the Ephesians: whereas by any placing of this Epistle during the three years' visit, such must have already arisen, and drawn away many. 3) The whole character of the first Epistle shews that it belongs, not to a very brief and casual absence of this kind, but to one originally intended to last some time, and not unlikely to be prolonged beyond expectation. The hope of returning very soon (iii. 14)

5 See his Chronological Table at the end of his Apostel Paulus, vol. i.
6 "Why the Apostle went into Macedonia from Ephesus, cannot be discovered." Davidson, vol. iii. p. 13.
7 Dr. Davidson (iii. p. 14) refers for a refutation of this objection, to his subsequent remarks (pp. 32 f.) on the state of the Ephesian Church. But no sufficient refutation is there found. Granting the whole account of the Ephesian Church there given, it would be quite impossible to conceive that subsequently the Apostle should have spoken of the λόγος βαπτιστής as altogether future.
is faint: the provision made, is for a longer absence. Had the Apostle intended to return in a few weeks to Ephesus and resume the government of the Church there, we may safely say that the Epistle would have presented very different features. The hope expressed in ch. iii. 14, quite parenthetically, must not be set against the whole character of the Epistle,8 which any unbiassed reader will see provides for a lengthened super-intendence on the part of Timothy as the more probable contingency.

14. Thus we see that, independently of graver objections, independently also of the connexion of the three Epistles, the hypothesis of Wieseler and Davidson does not suit the requirements of this first Epistle to Timotheus. When those other considerations come to be brought again into view,—the necessarily later age of all three Epistles, from the heresies of which they treat, from the Church development implied by them, from the very diction and form of thought apparent in them,—the impossibility, on any probable psychological view of St. Paul's character, of placing writings, so altogether diverse from the Epistles to the Corinthians, in the same period of his life with them,—I am persuaded that very few students of Scripture will be found, whose mature view will approve any form of the above hypothesis.

15. It will not be necessary to enter on the various other sub-hypotheses which have been made, such as that of Paulus, that the first Epistle was written from Cesarea; &c. &c. They will be found dealt with in Wieseler and Davidson, and in other introductions.

16. Further details must be sought in the following Prolegomena to each individual Epistle. I will mention however two decisive notices in 2 Tim., which no advocate of the above theory, or of any of its modifications, has been able to reconcile with his view. According to that view, the Epistle was written at the end of the first (and only) Roman imprisonment. In ch. iv. 13, we have directions to Timotheus to bring a cloak and books which the Apostle left at Troas. In ib. ver. 20 we read "Erastus remained in Corinth, but Trophimus left I in Miletus sick." To what these notices point, I shall consider further on: I would now only call the reader's attention to the following facts. Assuming as above, and allowing only the two years for the Roman imprisonment,—the last time he was at Troas and Miletus was six years before (Acts xx. 6, 17); on that occasion Timotheus was with him: and he had repeatedly seen Timotheus since: and, what is insuperable, even supposing these difficulties overcome, Trophimus did not remain there, for he was at Jerusalem with St. Paul at the time of his apprehension, Acts xxi. 29. It will be easily seen by reference to any of the supporters of the one imprisonment, how this point presses them. Dr. Davidson tries to account for it by supposing Trophimus to have sailed with St. Paul from Cesarea in Acts xxvii., and to have been left at Myra, with the

---

8 See Davidson, ib. vol. iii. p. 14.
understanding that he should go forward to Miletus, and that under this impression, the Apostle could say Trophimus I left at Miletus (ἀπελιπτον ευ Μιλήτῳ) sick. Any thing lamenter, or more self-refuting, can hardly be conceived: not to mention, that thus also some years had since elapsed, and that the above insuperable objection, that Timotheus had been with him since, and that Trophimus the Ephesian must have been talked of by them, remains in full force.

17. The whole force then of the above considerations, as well of the internal character of the Epistles, as of their external notices and requirements, compels us to look, for the time of their writing, to a period subsequent to the conclusion of the history in the Acts, and consequently, since we find in them the Apostle at liberty, subsequent to his liberation from the imprisonment with which that history concludes. If there were no other reason for believing that he was thus liberated, and undertook further apostolic journeyings, the existence and phænomena of these Epistles would enforce such a conclusion upon us. I had myself, some years since, on a superficial view of the Pauline chronology, adopted and vindicated the one-imprisonment theory: but the further study of these Epistles has altogether broken down my former fabric. We have in them, as I feel satisfied any student who undertakes the comparison will not fail to discover, a link uniting St. Paul’s writings with the Second Epistle of Peter and with that of Jude, and the Epistles of St. John: in other words, with the later apostolic age. There are two ways only of solving the problem which they present: one of these is, by believing them to be spurious; the other, by ascribing them to a period of St. Paul’s apostolic agency subsequent to his liberation from the Roman imprisonment of Acts xxviii. ulti.

18. The whole discussion and literature of this view, of a liberation and second imprisonment of our Apostle, would exceed both the scope and the limits of these Prolegomena. It may suffice to remind the reader, that it is supported by an ancient tradition by no means to be lightly set aside: and to put before him the principal passages of early ecclesiastical writers in which that tradition is mentioned.

19. Eusebius, H. E. ii. 22, relates thus:

καὶ Δούκας δὲ ὁ τῶς πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων γραφῆ παραδόσει, ἐν τούτως κατέλυσε τὴν ιστορίαν, διετίαν ἀλην ἐπὶ τῆς Ρώμης τῶν Παύλου ἀνετον διατρύφαι, καὶ τὸν τῶν θεοῦ λόγον ἀκωλύτως κηρύσσαι ἐπισημειώμενοι. τότε μὲν οὐν ἀπολογογράμμοι, αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τὸν κηρύγματος διακονίας λόγον ἔχει στείλονται τῶν ἀπόστολων, δεύτερον δὲ ἐπιβάλλα τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει, τῷ καὶ αὐτὸν τελειωθῆ ἀρματηρίῳ. ἐν ὦ δεισμοὶ ἐχόμενος τὸν πρὸς Τιμόθεον δεύτεραν ἐπιστολὴν συντύπτει κ.τ.λ.

20. Clement of Rome, Ep. i. ad Corinth. c. 5, p. 17 ff. (the lacuna in the text are conjecturally filled in as in Hefele’s edition):

9 In pp. 5—7 of the Prædictio referred to above, ch. ii. § i. 11 note.
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21. The fragment of Muratori on the canon contains the following passage:

"Lucas optime Theophile comprehendit quia sub præsentia ejus singula gerebantur, sicut et semote passionem Petri evidenter declarat, sed profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscens..."

This passage is enigmatical, and far from easy to interpret. But all that we need dwell on is, that the journey of St. Paul into Spain is taken as a fact; and in all probability, the word 'omittit' being supplied, the writer means to say, that St. Luke in the Acts does not relate that journey.

22. This liberation and second imprisonment being assumed, it will naturally follow that the First Epistle to Timotheus and that to Titus were written during the interval between the two imprisonments;—the second to Timotheus during the second imprisonment. We shall now proceed to enquire into the probable assignment and date of each of the three Epistles.

23. The last notice which we possess of the first Roman imprisonment, is the Epistle to the Philippians. There (i. 26) the Apostle evidently intends to come and see them, and (ii. 24) is confident that it will be before long. The same anticipation occurred before in his Epistle to Philemon (ver. 22). We may safely then ascribe to him the intention, in case he should be liberated, of visiting the Asiatic and the Macedonian Churches.

24. We suppose him then, on his hearing and liberation, which cannot have taken place before the spring of A.D. 63 (see chronological table in—Prolegg. to Acts), to have journeyed Eastward: visiting perhaps Philippi, which lay on the great Egnatian road to the East, and passing into Asia. There, in accordance with his former desires and intentions, he would give Colosse, and Laodicea, and Hierapolis, the benefit of his apostolic counsel, and confirm the brethren in the faith. And there perhaps, as before, he would fix his head-quarters at Ephesus. I would not however lay much stress on this, considering that there might well

---

1 By some of those who deny a second imprisonment, τῷ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως is interpreted as if the gen. were one of apposition, 'his τέρμα, which was ἡ δύσης;' by others it is rendered the goal or centre of the West; by others, the Eastern boundary of the West: and by all it is taken to mean Rome. By those who hold a second imprisonment, it is taken to mean Spain or even Britain.

have been a reason for his not spending much time there, considering
the cause which had driven him thence before (Acts xix.). But that
he did visit Ephesus, must on our present hypothesis be assumed as a
certain fact, notwithstanding his confident anticipation expressed in
Acts xx. 25 that he should never see it again. It was not the first time
that such anticipations had been modified by the event. 3

25. It would be unprofitable further to assign, except by the most
distant indications, his course during this journey, or his employment
between this time and that of the writing of our present Epistles. One
important consideration, coming in aid of ancient testimony, may serve
as our guide in the uncertainty. The contents of our Epistles absolutely
require as late a date as possible to be assigned them. The same
internal evidence forbids us from separating them by any considerable
interval, either from one another, or from the event which furnished
their occasion.

26. Now we have traditional evidence well worthy of note, that our
Apostle suffered martyrdom in the last year, or the last but one, of
Nero. Euseb., Chron. anno 2083 (commencing October a.d. 67) says,
"Neronis 13°. Nero ad cetera scelera persecutionem Christianorum
primus adjunxit: sub quo Petrus et Paulus apostoli martyrium Romae
consummaverunt."

And Jerome, Catalog. Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum (c. 5, vol. ii. p. 538),
under Paulus, "Hic ergo, decimo quarto Neronis anno, codem die quo
Petrus, Romæ pro Christo capite truncatus, sepultusque est in via Os-
tiensi, anno post passionem Domini tricesimo septimo."

27. I should be disposed then to agree with Conybeare and Howson
in postponing both the occasions and the writing of the Pastoral
Epistles to very near this date. The interval may possibly have been
filled up, agreeably to the promise of Rom. xv. 24, 28, and the tradition
of Clement of Rome (quoted above, par. 20), by a journey to Spain, the
térmia τῆς δύσεως: or it may have been spent in Greece and Asia and
the interjacent islands.

As we approach the confines of the known ground again furnished by
our Epistles, we find our Apostle again at Ephesus. However the

3 Compare 2 Cor. v. 4, 5, with Phil. i. 23. Dr. Davidson (iii. pp. 16 ff.) lays great
stress on the oîda of Acts xx. 25, as implying certain apostolic foresight in the power of
the Spirit, and argues thence that a subsequent visit to Ephesus cannot have taken place.
For argument's sake, let it be so, and let us turn to Phil. i. 25, written, according to
Dr. Davidson, at the close of the Roman imprisonment, from which he was not liberated
but by death. There we read, oîda ὅτι μενω καὶ παρακενω πᾶσιν ὑμίν εἰς τὴν ὑμῶν
προκοσμίη καὶ χαρὰν τῆς πίστεως, ἵνα τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν περισσεύῃ ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦν ἐν
ἐμοὶ διὰ τῆς ὑμῆς παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Surely what is good on one side is
good on the other: and I do not see how Dr. Davidson can escape the force of his own
argument. He must take his choice, and give up one oîda or the other. He has
surrendered the latter: why may not we the former?
intervening years had been spent, much had happened which had wrought changes on the Church, and on himself, since his last visit. Those heresies which were then in the bud, had borne bitter fruit. He had, in his own weak and shattered frame, borne about, for four or five more years of declining age, the dying of the Lord Jesus. Alienation from himself had been spreading wider among the Churches, and was embittering his life. Supposing this to have been in A.D. 66 or 67, and the 'young man Saul' to have been 34 or 35 at his conversion, he would not now be more than 64 or 65: but a premature old age would be every way consistent with what we know of his physical and mental constitution. Four years before this he had affectionately pleaded his advancing years in urging a request on his friend Philemon (Philem. 9).

28. From Ephesus, leaving Timotheus there, he went into Macedonia (1 Tim. i. 3). It has been generally assumed, that the first Epistle was written from that country. It may have been so; but the words παρεκάλεσά σε προσμείναι ἐν Εφέσῳ πορεύομενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν, rather convey to my mind the impression that he was not in Macedonia as he was writing. He seems to speak of the whole occurrence as one past by, and succeeded by other circumstances. If this impression be correct, it is quite impossible to assign with any certainty the place of its being written. Wherever it was, he seems to have been in some field of labour where he was likely to be detained beyond his expectations (1 Tim. iii. 14, 15): and this circumstance united with others to induce him to write a letter full of warning and exhortation and direction to his son in the faith, whom he had left to care for the Ephesian Church.

29. Agreeably with the necessity of bringing the three Epistles as near as may be together, we must here place a visit to Crete in company with Titus, whom he left there to complete the organization of the Cretan Churches. From the indications furnished by that Epistle, it is hardly probable that those Churches were now founded for the first time. We find in them the same development of heresy as at Ephesus, though not the same ecclesiastical organization (cf. Tit. i. 10, 11; 15, 16; iii. 9, 11, with i. 5). Nor is the former circumstance at all unaccountable, even as combined with the latter. The heresy, being a noxious excrecence on Judaism, was flourishing independently of Christianity,—or at least required not a Christian Church for its place of sustenance. When such Church began, it was at once infected by the error. So that the Cretan Churches need not have been long in existence. From Tit. i. 5, they seem to have sprung up στοράδην, and to have been on this occasion included by the Apostle in his tour of visitation: who seeing how much needed supplying and arranging, left Titus there for that purpose (see further in Prolegg. to Titus, § ii.).

30. The Epistle to Titus, evidently written very soon after St. Paul left Crete, will most naturally be dated from Asia Minor. Its own
notices agree with this, for we find that he was on his way to winter at Nicopolis (ch. iii. 12), by which it is most natural to understand the well-known city of that name in Epirus. And the notices of 2 Tim. equally well agree with such an hypothesis: for there we find that the Apostle had, since he last communicated with Timotheus, been at Miletus and at Troas, probably also at Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 13, 20). That he again visited Ephesus, is on every account likely: indeed, the natural inference from 2 Tim. i. 18 is, that he had spent some time (possibly of weakness or sickness—from the expression ὅσα δεικνύοντες: but this inference is not necessary, see note there) at that city in the companionship of Timotheus, to whom he appeals to confirm what he there says of Onesiphorus.

31. We may venture then to trace out this his last journey as having been from Crete by Miletus, Ephesus, Troas, to Corinth (?): and thence (or perhaps direct by Philippi without passing up through Greece: or he may have gone to Corinth from Crete, and thence to Asia) to Nicopolis, where he had determined to winter (Tit. iii. 12). Nicopolis was a Roman colony (Plin. iv. 1 or 2: Tacit. Ann. v. 10), where he would be more sure against tumultuary violence, but at the same time more open to direct hostile action from parties plotting against him in the metropolis. The supposition of Mr. Conybeare (C. and H. ii. 573, edn. 2), that being known in Rome as the leader of the Christians, he would be likely, at any time after the fire in 64, to be arrested as implicated in causing it, is not at all improbable. In this case, as the crime was alleged to have been committed at Rome, he would be sent thither for trial (C. and H. ib. note) by the duumviri of Nicopolis.

32. Arrived at the metropolis, he is thrown into prison, and treated no longer as a person charged with matters of the Jewish law, but as a common criminal: κακοπαθῶ μέχρι δειμῶν ὡς κακοῦργος, 2 Tim. ii. 9. All his Asiatic friends avoided him, except Onesiphorus, who sought him out, and was not ashamed of his chain (2 Tim. i. 16). Demas,

4 See a complete account of Nicopolis in Wordsworth’s Pictorial Greece, pp. 310—312; Conybeare and Howson, vol. ii. p. 572, edn. 2; Smith’s Dict. of Geography, sub voce.

It is very improbable that any of the comparatively insignificant places elsewhere called by this name is here intended. An enumeration of them will be found in Smith’s Dict. of Geogr. as above. The only two which require mention are, 1) Nicopolis in Thrace, on the Nessus (Νικόπολις ἡ περὶ Νέσσων, Ptol. iii. 11, 13), supposed by Chrysostom and Theodoret (ἡ δὲ Ν. τῆς Ὠρφας ἐστὶ, Chrys.: τῆς Ὠρφας ἐστιν ἡ Ν., τῇ δὲ Μακεδονία πελάξει, Thdt.) to be here intended. This certainly may have been, for this Nicopolis is not, as some have objected, the one founded by Trajan, see Schrader, vol. i. p. 117: but it is hardly likely to have been indicated by the word thus absolutely put: 2) Nicopolis in Cilicia, which Schrader holds to be the place, to suit his theory of the Apostle having been (at a totally different time, see above, par. 11) on his way to Jerusalem. I may mention that both Winer (RWB.) and Dr. Smith (Dict. of Geogr. as above: not in Bibl. Dict.) fall into the mistake of saying that St. Paul dates the Epistle from Nicopolis. No such inference can fairly be drawn from ch. iii. 12.
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Crescens, and Titus had, for various reasons, left him. Tychicus he had sent to Ephesus. Of his usual companions, only the faithful Luke remained with him. Under these circumstances he writes to Timotheus a second Epistle, most likely to Ephesus (ii. 17; iv. 13), and perhaps by Tychicus, earnestly begging him to come to him before winter (iv. 21). If this be the winter of the same year as that current in Tit. iii. 12, he must have been arrested immediately on, or perhaps even before, his arrival at Nicopolis. And he writes from this his prison, expecting his execution (ἐγὼ γὰρ ἦδη σπένδομαι, καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἐμῆς ἀναλύσεως ἐπέστηκεν, 2 Tim. iv. 6).

33. We hear, 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17, of his being brought up before the authorities, and making his defence. If in the last year of Nero, the Emperor was absent in Greece, and did not try him in person. To this may perhaps point the μαρτυρίας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων of Clement of Rome (see above, par. 20): but it would be manifestly unwise to press an expression in so rhetorical a passage. At this his hearing, none of his friends was bold enough to appear with or for him: but his Christian boldness was sustained by Him in whom he trusted.

34. The second Epistle to Timotheus dates after this his first apology. How long after, we cannot say: probably some little time, for the expression does not seem to allude to a very recent occurrence.

35. After this, all is obscurity. That he underwent execution by the sword, is the constant tradition of antiquity, and would agree with the fact of his Roman citizenship, which would exempt him from death by torture. We have seen reason (above, par. 26) to place his death in the last year of Nero, i. e. late in A.D. 67, or A.D. 68. And we may well place the Second Epistle to Timotheus a few months at most before his death.

5 One objection which is brought against the view taken above of the date of the Pastoral Epistles, is drawn from 1 Tim. iv. 12, μηδεὶς σου τὴν νεότητος καταφρονεῖτω. It is argued (recently by Dr. Davidson, vol. iii. p. 30 f.) that supposing Timotheus to have been twenty when the Apostle first took him for his companion,—at the date which we have assigned to the first Epistle, he would not be less than thirty-four or thirty-five when the Epistle was written; “an age,” adds Dr. Davidson, “at which it was not likely he should be despised for his youth.” But surely such an age would be a very early one at which to be set over such a Church as that of Ephesus; and at such an age, an ecclesiastical officer whose duty was to rebuke elders, unless he comported himself with irreproachable modesty and gravity, would be exceedingly liable to be slighted and set aside for his youth. The caution seems to me quite to stand in its place, and to furnish no valid objection whatever to our view.
CHAPTER VIII.

ON THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHEUS.

The Authorship, and Time and Place of Writing, have been already discussed: and much has been said on the style and diction of this in common with the other Pastoral Epistles. It only remains to consider, 1. The person to whom the Epistle was written: 2. Its especial occasion and object.

SECTION I.

TO WHOM WRITTEN.

1. Timotheus is first mentioned Acts xvi. 1 ff. as dwelling either in Derbe or Lystra (ἐκεῖ, after both places have been mentioned), but probably in the latter (see on Acts xx. 4, where Δεπσαίος cannot be applied to Timotheus): at St. Paul’s second visit to those parts (Acts ib. cf. xiv. 6 ff.). He was of a Jewish mother (Ευνική, 2 Tim. i. 5) and a Gentile father (Acts xvi. 1, 3): and had probably been converted by the Apostle on his former visit, for he calls him his γνησίων τέκνων έν πιστη (1 Tim. i. 2). His mother, and his grandmother (Λοΐς, 2 Tim. i. 5), were both Christians,—probably also converts, from having been pious Jewesses (2 Tim. iii. 14, 15), during that former visit.

2. Though as yet young, Timotheus was well reported of by the brethren in Lystra and Iconium (Acts xvi. 2), and hence, forming as he did by his birth a link between Jews and Greeks, and thus especially fitted for the exigencies of the time (Acts ib. ver. 4), St. Paul took him with him as a helper in the missionary work. He first circumcised him (ib. 3), to remove the obstacle to his access to the Jews.

3. The next time we hear of him is in Acts xvii. 14 ff., where he with Silas remained behind in Bereo on occasion of the Apostle being sent away to Athens by sea. From this we infer that he had accompanied him in the progress through Macedonia. His youth would furnish quite a sufficient reason why he should not be mentioned throughout the occurrences at Philippi and Thessalonica. That he had been at this latter place, is almost certain: for he was sent back by St. Paul (from Bereo, see Prolegg. to 1 Thess. § ii. 5 f.) to ascertain the state of the Thessalonian Church (1 Thess. iii. 2), and we find him rejoining the Apostle, with Silas, at Corinth, having brought intelligence from Thessalonica (1 Thess. iii. 6).

4. He remained with the Apostle at Corinth, and his name, together with that of Silas (Σιλβανος), appears in the addresses of both the Epistles
to the Thessalonians, written (see Prolegg. to 1 Thess. § iii.) at Corinth. We have no express mention of him from this time till we find him “ministering” to St. Paul during the long stay at Ephesus (Acts xix. 22): but we may fairly presume that he travelled with him from Corinth to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 18, 19), either remaining there with Priscilla and Aquila, or (which is hardly so probable) going with the Apostle to Jerusalem, and by Antioch through Galatia and Phrygia. From Ephesus (Acts xix. 22) we find him sent forward with Erastus to Macedonia and Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10: see on this whole visit, Vol. II. Prolegg. to 2 Cor. § ii. 4). He was again with St. Paul in Macedonia when he wrote the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (2 Cor. i. 1: Vol. II. Prolegg. ibid.). Again, in the winter following we find him in his company in Corinth, where he wrote the Epistle to the Romans (Rom. xvi. 21): and among the number of those who, on his return to Asia through Macedonia (Acts xx. 3, 4), went forward and waited for the Apostle and St. Luke at Troas.

5. The next notice of him occurs in three of the Epistles of the first Roman imprisonment. He was with St. Paul when he wrote to the Colossians (Col. i. 1), to Philemon (Philem. 1), and to the Philippians (Phil. i. 1). How he came to Rome, whether with the Apostle or after him, we cannot say. If the former, we can only account for no mention of him being made in the narrative of the voyage (Acts xxvii., xxviii.) by remembering similar omissions elsewhere when we know him to have been in company, and supposing that his companionship was almost a matter of course.

6. From this time we know no more, till we come to the Pastoral Epistles. There we find him left by the Apostle at Ephesus to take care of the Church during his absence: and the last notice which we have in 2 Tim. makes it probable that he would set out (in the autumn of A.D. 67?), shortly after receiving the Epistle, to visit St. Paul at Rome.

7. Henceforward, we are dependent on tradition for further notices. In Eus. H. E. iii. 42, we read Τιμόθεος γε μην της εν Ἐφέσῳ παροικίας ἵστορεται πρῶτος τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν εἴληχεναι: an idea which may well have originated with the Pastoral Epistles, and seems inconsistent with the very general tradition, hardly to be set aside (see Prolegg. Vol. i. ch. v. § i. 9 ff.), of the residence and death of St. John in that city. Nicephorus (H. E. iii. 11) and the ancient martyrlogies make him die by martyrdom under Domitian. See Winer, sub voce: Butler’s Lives of the Saints, Jan. 24.

8. We learn that he was set apart for the ministry in a solemn manner by St. Paul, with laying on of his own hands and those of the presbytery (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6); in accordance with prophetic utterances of the Spirit (1 Tim. ib. and i. 18); but at what time this

---

1 On the notice of him in Heb. xiii. 23, see Prolegg. to Vol. IV. ch. i. § i. 160; ii. 34.
took place, we are not informed: whether early in his course, or in Ephesus itself, as a consecration for his particular office there. This latter seems to me far the more probable view.

9. The character of Timotheus appears to have been earnest and self-denying. We may infer this from his leaving his home to accompany the Apostle, and submitting to the rite of circumcision at his hands (Acts xvi. 1 ff.),—and from the notice in 1 Tim. v. 23, that he usually drank only water. At the same time it is impossible not to perceive in the notices of him, signs of backwardness and timidity in dealing with the difficulties of his ministerial work. In 1 Cor. xvi. 10 f., the Corinthians are charged, ἵνα δὲ ἠλθής Τιμόθεος, βλέπετε ἵνα ἀφόβως γενήσεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς· τὸ γὰρ ἔργον κυρίου ἐργάζεται ὦς κακώς μήτε ὦν αὐτὸν ἐξουθενήσῃ, προσέμψατε δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν εἰρήνῃ. And in the notes to the two Epistles the student will find several cases, in which the same traits seem to be referred to. They appear to have increased, in the second Epistle, where the Apostle speaks earnestly, and even severely, on the necessity of Christian boldness in dealing with the difficulties and the errors of the day.

10. I subjoin a chronological table of the above notices in the course of Timotheus, arranging them according to that already given in the Prolegg. to Acts, and to the positions taken in the preceding chapter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.D.</td>
<td>Converted by St. Paul, during the first missionary journey, at Lystra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Taken to be St. Paul’s companion and circumcised (Acts xvi. 1 ff.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sent from Berea to Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 14; 1 Thess. iii. 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Silas, joins St. Paul at Corinth (Acts xviii. 5; 1 Thess. iii. 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With St. Paul (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With St. Paul (2 Cor. i. 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Winter.</td>
<td>With St. Paul (Rom. xvi. 21).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 or 63.</td>
<td>With St. Paul in Rome (Col. i. 1; Phil. i. 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63—66.</td>
<td>Uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 or 67.</td>
<td>Left by St. Paul in charge of the Church at Ephesus. (First Epistle.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 or 68.</td>
<td>(Second Epistle.) Sets out to join St. Paul at Rome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterwards.</td>
<td>Uncertain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 See notes on 1 Tim. v. 23; 2 Tim. i. 5, 7; iii. 10; and cf. besides 1 Tim. iv. 12.
3 It is possible that there may have been a connexion between these indications and the tone of the message in Rev. ii. 1—6: see note there.
SECTION II.

OCCASION AND OBJECT.

1. The Epistle declares its own occasion. The Apostle had left the Ephesian Church in charge to Timotheus: and though he hoped soon to return, was apprehensive that he might be detained longer than he expected (1 Tim. iii. 14, 15). He therefore despatched to him these written instructions.

2. The main object must be described as personal: to encourage and inform Timotheus in his superintendence at Ephesus. But this information and precept regarded two very different branches of his ecclesiastical duty.

3. The first was, the making head against and keeping down the growing heresies of the day. These are continually referred to: again and again the Apostle recurs to their mention: they evidently dwelt much on his mind, and caused him, in reference to Timotheus, the most lively anxiety. On their nature and characteristics I have treated in the preceding chapter.

4. The other object was, the giving directions respecting the government of the Church itself: as regarded the appointing to sacred offices, the selection of widows to receive the charity of the Church, and do service for it,—and the punishment of offenders.

5. For a compendium of the Epistle, and other details connected with it, see Davidson, vol. iii.

CHAPTER IX.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHEUS.

SECTION I.

TO WHAT PLACE WRITTEN.

1. It has been very generally supposed, that this Epistle was written to Timotheus while the latter was still at Ephesus.

2. The notices contained in it seem partially to uphold the idea. In ch. i. 16—18, Onesiphorus is mentioned as having sought out the Apostle.
at Rome, and also having ministered to him at Ephesus: and in ch. iv. 19, the household of Onesiphorus is saluted. Such a notice, it is true, decides nothing: but comes in aid of the supposition that St. Paul was writing to Ephesus. Our impression certainly is, from ch. i. 18, that Onesiphorus resided, when living, at Ephesus.

3. Again, in ch. ii. 17, we find Hymenæus stigmatized as a teacher of error, who can hardly be other than the Hymenæus of 1 Tim. i. 20 (see notes there). Joined with this latter in 1 Tim. appears an Alexander: and we again have an Alexander ὁ χαλκεύς mentioned as having done the Apostle much mischief in our ch. iv. 14: and there may be a further coincidence in the fact that an Alexander is mentioned as being put forward by the Jews during the tumult at Ephesus, Acts xix. 33.

4. Besides, the whole circumstances, and especially the character of the false teachers, exactly agree. It would be very difficult to point out any features of difference, such as change of place would be almost sure to bring out, between the heretical persons spoken of here, and those in the first Epistle.

5. The local notices come in aid, but not with much force. Timotheus is instructed to bring with him matters which the Apostle had left at Troas (ch. iv. 13), which he would pass in his journey from Ephesus to Rome. Two other passages (ch. iv. 12, 20) present a difficulty: and Michaelis, who opposes this view, urges them strongly. St. Paul writes, Τεχικὸν δὲ ἀπέστειλα εἰς Ἐφέσου. This could hardly have been so written, as a simple announcement of a fact, if the person to whom he was writing was himself in that city. This was also felt by Theodoret,—δῆλον ἐντεύθεν ὡς οἶκ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ διήγεν ἄλλ' ἐτέρωθε ποικ ἑαυτοῖς τὸν καιρὸν δὲ μακάριος Τιμόθεος. The only answer that I can give, may be derived from the form and arrangement of the sentence. Several had been mentioned, who had left him of their own accord: then, with δὲ, introducing a contrast, he states that he had sent Tychicus to Ephesus. If any stress is meant to be laid on this circumstance, the notice might still consist with Timotheus himself being there: “but do not wonder at Tychicus being at Ephesus, for I sent him thither.” This however is not satisfactory: nor again is it, to suppose with Dr. Davidson (iii. 63) that for some reason Tychicus would not arrive in Ephesus so soon as the Epistle. He also writes, Τρόφιμον δὲ ἀπέλιπον ἐν Μιλητῷ ἀσθενοῦτα. This would be a strange thing to write from Rome to Timotheus in Ephesus, within a few miles of Miletus itself, and respecting Trophimus, who was an Ephesian (Acts xxi. 29). It certainly may be said that there might be reasons why the notice should be sent. It might

1 See note there. The latter hypothesis mentioned in it, that he was put forward to clear the Jews, is at least possible: and then he might well have been an enemy of the Apostle.
be intended, to clear Trophimus from the charge which appears to be laid against Erastus, that he had remained behind of his own accord in his native land. With the Apostle's delicate feeling for all who were connected with him, he might well state this (again with a §) respecting Trophimus, though the fact of his remaining at Miletus might be well known to Timotheus, and his own profession of sickness as the reason.

6. There is a very slight hint indeed given in ch. iv. 11, which may point the same way. Timotheus was to take up Mark and bring him to Rome. The last notice we have had of Mark, was a recommendation of him to the Colossian Church (Col. iv. 10), and that in a strain, which may import that he was to be a resident labourer in the Gospel among them. If Mark was at Colossæ, he might be easily sent for from Ephesus to accompany Timotheus.

SECTION II.

OCCASION AND OBJECT.

1. It only remains to enquire respecting this Epistle, what special circumstances occasioned it, and what objects are discernible in it.

2. The immediately moving occasion seems to have been one personal to the Apostle himself. He was anxious that Timotheus should come to him at Rome, bringing with him Mark, as soon as possible (ch. i. 4; iv. 9, 11, 21).

3. But he was uncertain how it might be with himself: whether he should live to see his son in the faith, or be 'offered up' before his arrival. He sends to him therefore, not merely a message to come, but a letter full of fatherly exhortations and instructions, applicable to his present circumstances. And these seem not to have been unneeded. Many of his former friends had forsaken him (ch. i. 15; iv. 10), and the courage and perseverance of Timotheus himself appeared to be giving way (see above, Prolegg. to 1 Tim. § i. 9). The letter therefore is calculated in some measure to supply what his own mouth would, if he were permitted to speak to him face to face, still more fervently urge on him. And thus we possess an Epistle calculated for all ages of the Church: in which while the maxims cited and encouragements given apply to all Christians, and especially ministers of Christ, in their duties and difficulties,—the affecting circumstances, in which the writer himself is placed, carry home to every heart his earnest and impassioned eloquence.

4. For further notices, I again refer to Dr. Davidson, vol. iii. pp. 48 —75.
EXCURSUS ON PUDENS AND CLAUDIA.

1. In 2 Tim. iv. 21, we read as follows:

ἀνεπάφτεται ἐν Εὐθυμίῳ καὶ Πολύδης καὶ Λύνος καὶ Κλαυδία καὶ οἱ ἄδελφοι πάντες.

2. Martial, lib. iv. Epigr. 13, is inscribed 'ad Rufum, de nuptiis Pudentis et Claudiae peregrinae: and the first lines run thus:

"Claudia, Rufa, meo nubite peregrina Pudenti: 
Macte esto teædis, o Hymenæ, tuæ."

3. An inscription was found at Chichester in the early part of the last century, and is now in a summer-house in the gardens at Goodwood, running thus, the lacunæ being conjecturally filled in:

[N]eptuni et Minervae templum
[pr]o salute d[omn]ns divine
[ex] auctoritatis Claudi.
[Co]gidubni r. leg. aug. in Brit.
[cole]gium fabror. et qui in eo
[a sacris] sunt d. s. d. donante aream
[Pud]ente Pudentini fil.

4. Now in Tacitus, Agricol. 14, we read, "quodam civitate (in Britain) Cogidubno regi donatae (is ad nostram usque memoriam fidelissimus mansit) vetere ac jampridem recepta populi R. consuetudine, ut haberet instrumenta servitutis et reges." From this inscription these 'civitates' appear to have constituted the kingdom of Sussex. We also gather from the inscription that Cogidubns had taken the name of his imperial patron, [Tiberius] Claudius: and we find him in close connexion with a Pudens.

5. It was quite natural that this discovery should open afresh a point which the conjectures of British antiquarians appeared before to have provisionally closed. It had been imagined that Claudia, who was identified with the Claudia Rufina of Martial, xi. 53 ('Claudia ceruleis quum sit Rufina Britannis Edita, quam Latiae pectora plebis habet'), was a native of Colchester, and a daughter of Caractacus, whom they supposed to have been admitted into the Claudian gens.

6. A new fabric of conjecture has been now raised, more ingenious and more probable. The Pudens of Martial is (i. 32) a centurion, aspiring to the "meriti praemia pilii," i.e. to be made a primipilus: which ambition we find accomplished in lib. v. 48: and his return to Rome from the North to receive the honour of equestrian rank is anticipated in lib. vi. 58. He may at some time have been stationed in Britain—possibly attached in capacity of adjutant to King Cogidubns. His presentation of an area for a temple to Neptune and Minerva may have been occasioned by escape from shipwreck, the college of carpenters (shipbuilders) being commissioned to build it to their patrons, Neptune and Minerva; or, as Archd. Williams (p. 24) seems to think, by a desire to introduce Roman arts among the subjects of the client king. If the British maiden Claudia was a daughter of King Tiberius Claudius Cogidubns, there would be no greater wonder in her thus being found mentioned with Pudens.

7. But conjecture is led on a step further by the other notices referred to above. Claudia is called Rufina. Now Pomponia, the wife of the late commander in Britain,

2 In Archdeacon Williams's pamphlet on Pudens and Claudia. I have also consulted an article in the Quarterly Review for July, 1855, entitled "the Romans at Colchester," in which Archdeacon Williams's view is noticed,
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Aulus Plautius, belonged to a house of which the Rufi were one of the chief branches. If she were a Rufa, and Claudia were her protégée at Rome (as would be very natural seeing that her father was received into alliance under Aulus Plautius), the latter would naturally add to her very undistinguishing appellation of Claudia the cognomen of Rufina. Nor is the hypothesis of such a connexion purely arbitrary. A very powerful link appears to unite the two ladies—viz. that of Christianity. Pomponia, we learn from Tacitus (Ann. xii. 32), was (in the year 57) ‘superstitionis externæ rea,’ and being ‘mariti judicio permissa,’ was by him tried, ‘prisco instituto, propinquis corrumpit,’ and pronounced innocent. Tacitus adds, that after many family sorrows, ‘per XL annos non cultui nisi lugubri, non animo nisi maesto, egit. Iisque illi imperante Claudio, impune, mox ad gloriam vertit.’ Now it is not at all an improbable explanation of this, that Pomponia may have been a Christian: and the remarkable notice with which our citation from Tacitus concludes may point to the retirement of a Christian life, for which the garb of sorrow would furnish an excuse and protection 3.

8. If then such a connexion as this subsisted, it would account for the conversion of the British maiden to Christianity: and the coincidences are too striking to allow us to pass over the junction of Pudens with her in this salutation. They apparently were not married at this time, or the Apostle would hardly have inserted a third name, that of Linus, between theirs. And this is what we might expect: for the last year of Nero, which is the date we have assigned to the Epistle, is the earliest that can be assigned to any of Martial’s pieces, being the year in which he came to Rome.

9. Two of the Epigrams of Martial, i. 32 and v. 48, mention facts which involve Pudens in the revolting moral licence of his day. But there is no reason for supposing them to refer to dates subsequent to his conversion and marriage. Martial’s Epigrams are by no means in chronological order, and we cannot gather any indications of this fact with certainty from them.

10. Again, a difficulty has been found in the heathen invocation in the marriage epi-

gram. But, as remarked in the article referred to in the note, we have no allusion to Christian marriage rites during the first three or four centuries, and it is not at all improbable that the heathen rites of the confarreatio may, at this early period at least, have been sought by Christians to legalize their unions. When we do find a Christian ceremonial, it is full of the symbolism of the confarreatio. And it seems to be shewn that this was so in the case before us, by the epithet of sancto, (in the line ‘Di bene, quod sancto peperit fecunda marito,’ Mart. xi. 53,) implying that all rites had been duly observed 4.

11. If the above conjectural but not purely arbitrary fabric of hypothesis is allowed to stand, we have the satisfaction of knowing that Claudia was a woman not only of high character, but of mental acquirement (‘Romanam credere matres Italides possint, Atthides esse suam,’ Mart. ib.), and the mother of a family of three sons, and possibly daughters as well (Mart. ib.).

---

3 Archdeacon Williams (p. 38) fancies he sees in this cultus lugubris and animus maestus signs that she gave way in the trial, and thus saved herself, and that the same circumstance may account for so noble a lady not being mentioned by St. Paul.

4 This ‘sancto’ Archdeacon Williams thinks represents ἄγλυφ, and implies the Christianity of Pudens. Surely this is very improbable.
CHAPTER X.

THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

SECTION I.

TO WHOM WRITTEN.

1. The time and place of writing this Epistle have been before discussed (see above, ch. vii. § ii. 29 f.). It appears to have been sent from Ephesus, or perhaps from Macedonia, during the last year of the Apostle's life (A.D. 67), to Titus, who was left in charge with the Churches in the island of Crete. We shall now gather up the notices which remain to us respecting Titus himself.

2. It is by no means easy to construct an account of Titus. At first sight, a strange phenomenon presents itself. The narrative in the Acts never once mentions him. And this is the more remarkable, because of all the companions of St. Paul he seems to have been the most valued and trusted. No adequate reason has ever been given for this omission. There must be some, it is thought, which we cannot penetrate. Was he identical with some one or other of St. Paul's companions, known to us in the Acts under another name? None seems to satisfy the conditions. Or are we to regard the notice in 2 Tim. iv. 10 as indicative of his ultimate desertion of the Apostle, and thus to seek for a solution of the problem? But even with such a supposition, we shall not touch the narrative of the Acts, which we believe to have been published some years previous to the writing of that Epistle. So that we must be content to leave the problem unsolved, and to put together the few notices which we possess, as given of a person distinct from any mentioned in the Acts.

3. The first notice of Titus, in respect of time, occurs in Gal. ii. 1, 3. We there learn that he was of Gentile origin; and that he was taken by Paul and Barnabas to the council of the Apostles and elders which was convened at Jerusalem to consider of the question of the obligation of the Mosaic law. The narrative in the Acts speaks merely of των ἀλλατων being sent with the two Apostles. But we see clearly the reason why Titus should be marked out in Gal. ii. for separate mention. He was an uncircumcised Gentile, and the independence of action of St. Paul is shewn by his refusing to listen for a moment to the proposal, which appears to have been urged, for his circumcision. In the Acts, no such reason for special mention of him existed. And this considera-
tion will shew, that we are perhaps not justified in assuming from this incident that Titus held any position of high confidence or trust at this time. We find him in close companionship with the Apostles, but that is all we can say. He was certainly converted by means of St. Paul himself, from the γνησίῳ τέκνῳ of Tit. i. 4.

4. Our next notice of him is found in 2 Cor., where it appears (ch. xii. 18) that he, with two other brethren, whose names are not mentioned, was sent forward by St. Paul from Ephesus, during his long visit there, to Corinth, to set on foot a collection (ch. viii. 6) for the poor saints at Jerusalem, and also to ascertain the effect of the first Epistle on the Corinthians. St. Paul, on his departure from Ephesus, waited at Troas, where great opportunities of usefulness were opening before him (ch. ii. 12) ; but so anxious was he for the return of Titus (Τίτον τὸν ἀδελφὸν μου), that he "left them and passed into Macedonia" (ib. 13). There he met with Titus, who brought him a satisfactory account of the effect of the first Epistle (ch. vii. 6—15) : and from that which St. Paul there says of him, his effective zeal and earnestness in the work of the Gospel is sufficiently shewn. Further proof of these is given in his undertaking of his own accord the delicate task of completing the collection (ch. viii. 6, 16, 17 ff.): and proof also of the Apostle's confidence in him, in the terms in which he commends him to the Corinthians. He calls him his own κοινωνός (ch. viii. 23): appeals to his integrity, and entire unity of action with himself (ch. xii. 18).

5. From this time (a.d. 57 : see Vol. II. Prolegg. to 2 Cor. § ii. 3), to the notices furnished by our Epistle (a.d. 67), we know nothing of Titus. At this latter date we find him left in Crete by St. Paul, obviously for a temporary purpose: viz. to "carry forward the correction of those things which are defective" (ch. i. 5), and among these principally, to establish presbyteries for the government of the various Churches, consisting of επίσκοποι (ib. ver. 7). His stay there was to be very short (ch. iii. 12), and he was, on the arrival of Tychicus or Artemas, to join the Apostle at Nicopolis. Not the slightest trace is found in the Epistle, of any intention on the part of St. Paul to place Titus permanently over the Cretan Churches: indeed, such a view is inconsistent with the date furnished us in it.

6. Titus appears to have accordingly rejoined the Apostle, and afterwards to have left him for Dalmatia (2 Tim. iv. 10). Whether from this notice we are to infer that he had been with him in Rome, is quite uncertain. It would seem more probable that he had gone from Nicopolis, or at all events from some point on the journey. We can hardly, on mature consideration of the expressions in 2 Tim. iv. 10, entirely get rid of the impression, that Titus had left the Apostle of his own accord. There is, as has been above observed, an apparent contrast intended between those who are classed with Demas,—they being even included
under his ἐπορεύθη, without another verb expressed—and Tychicus, who had been sent on a mission by the Apostle. Still, it would be unfair to lay any stress on this, in a matter so well admitting of charitable doubt: and we may be well permitted, with Mr. Conybeare, to “hope that his journey to the neighbouring Dalmatia was undertaken by desire of St. Paul.”

7. The traditionary notices of the after life of Titus are too evidently grounded on a misunderstanding of our Epistle, to be worth much. Eus. H. E. iii. 4, says, Τμόθεως γε μὴν τῆς ἐν Ἑφέσῳ παροικίας ἱστορεῖται πρῶτος τῆς ἔπισκοπῆς εἰληχέναι (see on this above, Prolegg. to 1 Tim. § i. 7), ὡς καὶ Τίτος τῶν ἐπί Κρήτης ἐκκλησιῶν. And so Theodoret assumes, on 1 Tim. iii. 1.

8. Butler informs us (Lives of the Saints, Jan. 4) that Titus is honoured in Dalmatia as its principal Apostle: that he again returned from Dalmatia to Crete, and finished a laborious and holy life by a happy death in Crete, in a very advanced old age, some say in his 94th year: that he is looked on in Crete as the first archbishop of Gortyna, which metropolitical see is now fixed at Candia, the new capital, built by the Saracens after the destruction of Gortyna. But all this fabric too manifestly bears the appearance of having been raised on the above misapprehension, to possess any traditional worth.

SECTION II.

THE CHURCHES OF CRETE.

1. When, and by whom, these Churches were founded, is quite uncertain. Crete abounded with Jews of wealth and influence. We find proof of this in Jos. Antt. xvii. 12. 1, Κρήτη προσεϊπέθει (the Pseudo-Alexander) Ἰουδαίων ὀπόσως εἰς δομιλιάν ἅρφικετο, ἐπίγαγεν εἰς πίστιν, καὶ χρημάτων εὐπορηθεὶς δόσει τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπί Μῆλον δημήτρει: and again B. J. ii. 7. 1, τοὺς ἐν Κρήτῃ Ἰουδαίων ἐξαπατήσας καὶ λαμπρῶς ἐφοδιώθεις, διέπλυνεν εἰς Μῆλον: Philo, leg. ad Caïum, § 36, vol. ii. p. 587,—οὖ μὸνον αἱ ἡπείροι μεσται τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν ἀποικίων εἶσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ νῆσων αἱ δοκιμωταῖ τῇ Εὔβοιᾳ, Κύπρῳ, Κρήτῃ. In Acts ii. 11 Cretans are named among those who heard the utterance of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. It is probable therefore, that these Churches owed their origin to the return of individuals from contact with the preaching of the Gospel, and had therefore as yet been unvisited by an Apostle, when they first come before us towards the end of St. Paul’s ministry.

2. It is plain that no certain evidence can be deduced, as to the existence of these Churches, from no mention being made of them when St. Paul passed by Crete on his voyage to Malta in Acts xxvii. We have no reason to suppose that he was at liberty to go where he pleased
while remaining in port, nor can we reason, from the analogy of Julius’s permission at Sidon, that similar leave would be given him where perhaps no personal relation subsisted between him and the inhabitants. Besides which, the ship was detained by a contrary wind, and probably expecting, during a good part of the time, to sail every day.

3. The next point requiring our attention is, the state of those Churches at the date of our Epistle. If it appear, on comparison, that the false teachers in them were more exclusively Jewish than those at Ephesus, it must be remembered, that this would be a natural consequence, the origin of the Churches being that which we have supposed. And in that case the Apostle’s visit, acting as a critical test, would separate out and bring into hostility this Judaistic element, and thus lead to the state of things which we find in this Epistle.

4. Various objections are brought by De Wette against the Epistle, as not corresponding with the facts, in its assumptions and expressions. The first of them, that “it professes to have been written shortly after the founding of the Churches, but sets forth a ripeness and abundance of heretical teaching quite inconsistent with such recent foundation,” falls to the ground on our hypothesis of their origin. They were old in actual date of existence, but quite in their infancy of arrangement and formal constitution.

5. With our hypothesis also falls his second objection: viz. that “the great recent success of the Apostle there makes the severity of his characterization of the inhabitants, and that upon another’s testimony (ch. i. 12), quite inexplicable. We should rather have looked for thankful recognition, as in other Epistles.” But, supposing Christianity to have grown up there in combination with the national vices, and a thorough work of purification to be wanted, then we need not be surprised at the Apostle reminding Titus of the character of those with whom he had to deal, appealing to the testimony of their own writers to confirm the fact.

6. His third objection, that “the heretical teachers must have grown up under the eyes of Titus since the Apostle’s absence, and thus must have been better known to him than to St. Paul, whereas here we have St. Paul informing him about them,”—is grounded on pure assumption, arising from mistake. The false teachers had been there throughout, and, as we have said, had been awaked into activity by the Apostle’s presence and teaching. He knew, from long and bitter experience, far more of them than Titus could do: and his notices and warnings are founded on this longer experience and more thorough apostolic insight.

7. His fourth, that “in relation to the moral and ecclesiastical state of the Cretan Christians, as disclosed in the Epistle, a duration of the Gospel among them of some length must be assumed,—from the stress laid on previous purity of character in those to be chosen to church-
offices,”—also falls to the ground on our hypothesis of the origin and previous duration of the Churches.

8. The fifth is,—that “it is most unnatural and startling to find not one reference to what the Apostle had taught and preached in Crete, when in 1 Thess., an Epistle written under similar circumstances, we find so many.” But we entirely deny the parallelism. The Thessalonian Church had been founded by himself; he was torn away from it in the midst of his teaching: every reason existed for constantly recalling what he had said to them, either to enforce it, or to guard it from misunderstanding. Such was not the case here. He was writing of a Church which he had not himself founded: whose whole situation was different: and writing not to the Church itself, but to one whom he had commissioned to set it in order, and who knew, and needed not reminding of, what he had preached there.

9. It only remains under this head, that we should say something of the character of the Cretans which St. Paul has quoted from Epimenides, ch. i. 12,—Krήτες ἀεὶ πεύχοιται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.

10. Meursius, in his very complete and elaborate treatise on Crete, has accumulated nearly all the testimonies of the ancients respecting them. From his pages I take a few, that the student may be able to illustrate the character by them.

11. On their avarice, we have the testimony of Livy, xlv. 45, “Cretenses spem pecunie secuti: et quoniam in dividendo plus offensionum quam gratiae erat, quinquaginta talenta iiis posita sunt in ripa diripienda;”—of Plutarch, Paul. Εἰμί. c. 23, τὸν ἐπὶ στρατιωτῶν, ἐπικολούθησαν οἱ Κρήτες, οὐ δὲ εἶναι, ἀλλὰ τοῖς χρήμασιν, ὥσπερ κηρύσσεις μέλλαται, προσλαμπροῦντες:—of Polybius, vi. 46. 3, ὁ περὶ τὴν αἰσχροκέρδειαν καὶ πλεονεξίαν τρόπος οὕτως ἐπιχωρίαζε παρ’ αὐτοῦ, ὡστε παρὰ μόνοις Κρήτηνεω τῶν ἀπάτων ἀνθρώπων μηδὲν αἰσχρὸν νομίζεσθαι κέρδος.

12. On their ferocity and fraud, Polybius vi. 46. 9, Κρήταιες ἐν πλεονεξίας ὕδα τε καὶ κατὰ κοινὸν στάσεις καὶ φόνοις καὶ πολέμιοις ἐμφυλίοις ἀναστρεφο- μένοις: and iv. 8. 11, Κρήτης δὲ καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλασσα πρὸς μὲν ἐνθέρας καὶ ληστείας καὶ κλοπῶν πολεμίων, καὶ νυκτερινῶς ἐπιθέσεις καὶ πάσας τὰς μετὰ δόλου καὶ κατὰ μέρος χρειὰς ἀνυπόστατον, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἐξ ὑμολογίου καὶ κατὰ πρόσωπον φαλαγγιδών ἐφοδιών, ἀγεννεῖς καὶ πλάγιοι ταῖς ψυχαῖς:—Strabo, x. c. 4, περὶ δὲ τῆς Κρήτης ὁμολογεῖται διότι . . . ὕστερον πρὸς τὸ χέρον μετεβαλεν ἐπὶ πλειστον. μετὰ γὰρ τοὺς Τυρρηνοὺς, οἱ μάλιστα ἐδόξωσαν τὴν καθ’ ἡμᾶς θάλασσαν, οὕτως εἰσὶν οἱ διαδεχόμενοι τὰ λεγόμενα:—an Epigram of Leonides, Anthol. iii. 22,—αἱ ἄνες αὐτῇ καὶ ἀλφιβόροι οὕτε δίκαιοι Κρήτες τῆς Κρήτην οὕτε δικαιοσύνην;

13. On their mendacity, Polybius vi. 47. 5, καὶ μὴ οὕτε καὶ ἰδίαν ὑπὸ δολιωτέρα Κρήταιεων εὑρὸ τις ἄι, πλὴν τελείως ἄλγον, οὕτε καθόλου ἐπι- βουλίας ἀδικώτερα:—again, the proverb, Κρής πρὸς Ἀλκμήνην, is thus
explained by Diogenianus, Cent. v. prov. 92,—ἐπὶ τῶν πανούργων χρωμένων πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγεται:—Psellus, de operat. Deem., πλὴν ἰσθι μοῦ αὐτὸν ἐφραψωδηκέναι με ταῦτα περατευόμενον, κατὰ τοὺς Κρῆτας καὶ Φολινίκας. And the word κρητίζειν was an expression for 'to lie.' Suidas has κρητίζειν πρὸς Κρῆτας, έπειδή ψεύσται καὶ ἀπατεώνες εἶσαι: see also Polyb. viii. 21. 5. And their general depravity was summed up in the proverb, quoted by Constant. Porphyrogen. de them. lib. i., τρὶά κάππα κάκιστα: Καππαδοκία, Κρῆτη, Κυλικία.

CHAPTER XI.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. The testimonies to the Pauline authorship of this Epistle are abundant.

(a) Tertullian, in enumerating the Epistles of St. Paul with which Marcion had tampered, concludes his list thus (adv. Marc. v. 21, vol. ii. p. 524):

"Soli huic epistolæ brevitæs sua profuit ut falsarias manus Marcionis evaderet. Miror tamen, cum ad unum hominem litteras factas receperit, quod &c." (see the whole passage cited above, ch. vii. § i. 1. c.)

(β) Origen, Hom. xix. in Jer. 2: vol. iii. p. 263:

„ὅπερ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ἐπιστάμενος ἔλεγεν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Φιλῆμον ἐπιστολῇ τῷ Φιλῆμον περὶ Ὅμηράμων ἵνα μὴ κατ' ἀνάγκην τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἤ, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἐκκόστον (Philem. ver. 14).

And again in Matth. Comm. series, § 72, p. 889:

"Sicut Paulus ad Philemonem dicit: Gaudium eum magnum habuimus et consolationem in caritate tua, quia viscera sanctorum requieverunt per te, frater." (Philem. ver. 7.)

And again in id. § 66, p. 884:

"A Paulo autem dictum est ad Philemonem: hune autem ut Paulus senex, &c." (ver. 9.)

(γ) Eusebius, H. E. iii. 25, reckons this Epistle among the ὀμολογογράμματα.

(δ) Jerome, proem. in Philem. vol. vii. pp. 743, 4, argues at some 111]
length against those who refuse to acknowledge this Epistle for St. Paul's
because it was simply on personal matters and contained nothing for
edification.

2. That neither Irenæus nor Clement of Alexandria cites our Epistle,
is easily accounted for, both by its shortness, and by the fact of its
containing nothing which could illustrate or affirm doctrinal positions.
Ignatius seems several times to allude to it:

Eph. c. ii., p. 645; ὑπάρχω ὑμῶν διὰ παντόσως, εὐάπτυος ἡ (Philem.
ver. 20).

Magnes. c. xii., p. 672; the same expression; which also occurs in
the Ep. to Polycarp, c. i., p. 720, and c. vi., p. 725.

3. The internal evidence of the Epistle itself is so decisive for its
Pauline origin,—the occasion and object of it (see below, § ii.) so simple,
and unassignable to any fraudulent intent, that one would imagine the
impugner of so many of the Epistles would at least have spared this one,
and that in modern times, as in ancient, according to Tertullian and Jerome,
"sua illam brevitas defendisset." But Baur has rejected it, or, which
with him is the same thing practically, has placed it in his second class,
of antilegomena, in common with the other Epistles of the imprisonment.

4. In doing so, he confesses ("Paulus, u.s.w." pp. 475 ff.) to a
feeling of subjecting himself to the imputation of hypercritical scepticism
as to authenticity: but maintains that the Epistle must stand or fall
with those others: and that its very insignificance, which is pleaded in
its defence, all the more involves it in their fate. Still, he professes to
argue the question on the ground of the Epistle itself.

5. He finds in its diction several things which strike him as un-
 pauline: several which establish a link between it and those other
Epistles. The latter position we should willingly grant him, and use
against him. But the former is here, as so often, taken up by him in the
merest disregard to common sense and probability. Such expres-
sions, occurring in a familiar letter, such as we do not elsewhere possess,
are no more than are perfectly natural, and only serve to enlarge for us
the Apostle's vocabulary, instead of inducing doubt, where all else is so
thoroughly characteristic of him.

6. The contents also of the Epistle seem to him objectionable. The
incident on which it is founded, he says, of itself raises suspicion. He
then takes to pieces the whole history of Onesimus's flight and con-
version, and the feeling shown to him by the Apostle, in a way which,
as I observed before (ch. iii. § i. 2) respecting his argument against

1 I subjoin Baur's list: συνστρατεύσης, ver. 2: ἄνηκος, ἐπιτάδεως, ver. 8: πρεσ-
βύτης, ver. 9: ἐχριστος and ἐφριστος, ver. 11: ἀπέκλω in the sense of 'receive back'
(but see note there), ver. 15: ἀποστέω, προσφέρεω, ver. 19: ὀμολογᾷ, ver. 20: ξενία,
ver. 22: the frequent recurrence (vv. 7, 12, 20) of the expression σπλάγχνα, not other-
wise un pauline.
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the Epistle to the Philippians, only finds a parallel in the pages of burlesque: so that, I am persuaded, if the section on the Epistle to Philemon had been first published separately and without the author's name, the world might well have supposed it written by some defender of the authenticity of the Epistle, as a caricature on Baur's general line of argument.

7. On both his grounds of objection—the close connexion of this with the other Epistles of the imprisonment, and its own internal evidence,—fortified as these are by the consensus of the ancient Church, we may venture to assume it as certain that this Epistle was written by St. Paul.

SECTION II.

THE PLACE, TIME, OCCASION, AND OBJECT OF WRITING.

1. The Epistle is connected by the closest links with that to the Colossians. It is borne by Onesimus, one of the persons mentioned as sent with that Epistle (Col. iv. 9). The persons sending salutation are the same, with the one exception of Jesus Justus. In Col. iv. 17, a message is sent to Archippus, who is one of those addressed in this Epistle. Both Epistles are sent from Paul and Timotheus; and in both the Apostle is a prisoner (Col. iv. 18; Philem. vv. 1, 9).

2. This being so, we are justified in assuming that it was written at the same place and time as the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, viz. at Rome, and in the year 61 or 62.

3. Its occasion and object are plainly indicated in the Epistle itself. Onesimus, a native of Colossæ, the slave of Philemon, had absconded, after having, as it appears, defrauded his master (ver. 18). He fled to Rome, and there was converted to Christianity by St. Paul. Being persuaded by him to return to his master, he was furnished with this letter to recommend him, now no longer merely a servant, but a brother also, to favourable reception by Philemon. This alone, and no didactic or general object, is discernible in the Epistle.

SECTION III.

TO WHAT PLACE ADDRESSED, &c.

1. From comparing Col. iv. 9, with ib. 17 and Philem. 2, we infer that Philemon was a resident at Colossæ. The impression on the
reader from Philem. 1, 2, is that Apphia was his wife, and Archippus (a minister of the church there, Col. iv. 17), their son, or some near relative dwelling with them under the same roof. A letter on a matter so strictly domestic would hardly include strangers to the family in its address.

2. An hypothesis has been advanced, recently by Wieseler, that our present Epistle is alluded to in Col. iv. 16, as ἡ ἐκ Λαοδίκειας, and that the message to Archippus in the next verse favours the view that he, and consequently Philemon, dwelt at Laodicea. And this is corroborated, by Archippus being called bishop of Laodicea in the Apostolic Constitutions (vii. 46, p. 1056, Migne).

3. The objection to this hypothesis is not so much from any evidently false assumption or inference in the chain of facts, all of which may have been as represented, but from the improbability, to my view, that by the latter limb of the parallelism—"this Epistle," "that from Laodicea,"—can be meant a private letter, even though it may have regarded a member of the Colossian church. We seem to want some Epistle corresponding in weight with that to the Colossians, for such an order, in such a form, to receive its natural interpretation.

4. Of Onesimus we know nothing for certain, except from the notices here and in Col. iv. 9. Tradition reports variously respecting him. In the Apostolical Canons (73) he is said to have been emancipated by his master, and in the Apostolical Constitutions (vii. 46, p. 1056) to have been ordained by St. Paul himself bishop of Beroëa in Macedonia, and to have suffered martyrdom in Rome, Niceph. H. E. iii. 11. In the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians, we read, cap. i., p. 615, ἐςεὶ οὖν τὴν πολυπληθίαν ἐμῶν ἐν ὀνόματι θεοῦ ἀπελήφθα ἐν Ὑονησίῳ, τῷ ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἁθηγήτῳ, ἐμῶν δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἐπισκόπῳ ὅν εἴχομαι κατὰ Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ὑμῶν ἁγαπῶν, καὶ πάντας ἐμῶς ἐν ὁμοιότητι εἶναι. ἐιλογητος γὰρ ὁ χαρισμένος ὑμῶν αὐξός οὐσί τοιότου ἐπισκόπου κεκτησθαί. It is just possible that this may be our Onesimus. The earliest date which can be assigned to the martyrdom of Ignatius is A.D. 107, i.e. thirty-five years after the date of this Epistle. Supposing Onesimus to have been thirty at this time, he would then have been only sixty-five. And even setting Ignatius's death at the latest date, A.D. 116, we should still be far within the limits of possibility. It is at least singular that in ch. ii., p. 645 immediately after naming Onesimus, Ignatius proceeds ὅναίμην ἐμῶν διὰ παντὸς (cf. Philem. ver. 20; and above, § i. 2).

3 In the Praejecto above referred to, Prolegg. to Eph., § i. 11, note, I had adopted Wieseler's hypothesis. Maturer consideration led me to abandon it, solely on the ground of the improbability stated in the text. We must regard the Epistle to the Laodiceans as one now lost to us (see Prolegg. to Vol. II. ch. iii. § iv. 3).

4 See also id. chapters ii., vi., pp. 645, 649.
SECTION IV.

CHARACTER AND STYLE.

1. This Epistle is a remarkable illustration of St. Paul's tenderness and delicacy of character. Dr. Davidson well remarks, "Dignity, generosity, prudence, friendship, affection, politeness, skilful address, purity, are apparent. Hence it has been termed with great propriety, the polite Epistle. The delicacy, fine address, consummate courtesy, nice strokes of rhetoric, render the letter an unique specimen of the epistolary style." Introd. vol. iii. p. 160.

2. Doddridge (Expositor, introd. to Philem.) compares it to an Epistle of Pliny to Sabinianus, ix. 21, written as an acknowledgment on a similar occasion of the reception of a libertus by his master: and justly gives the preference in delicacy and power to our Epistle. The comparison is an interesting one, for Pliny's letter is eminently beautiful, and in terseness, and completeness, not easy to surpass.

3. Luther's description of the Epistle is striking, and may well serve to close our notice of it, and this portion of our prolegomena to the Epistles.

"This Epistle sheweth a right noble lovely example of Christian love. Here we see how St. Paul layeth himself out for the poor Onesimus, and with all his means pleadeth his cause with his master; and so setteth himself, as if he were Onesimus, and had himself done wrong to Philemon. Yet all this doeth he not with power or force, as if he had right thereto; but he strippeth himself of his right, and thus enforceth Philemon to forego his right also. Even as Christ did for us with God the Father, thus also doth St. Paul for Onesimus with Philemon: for Christ also stripped Himself of His right, and by love and humility enforced the Father to lay aside His wrath and power, and to take us to His grace for the sake of Christ, who lovingly pleadeth our cause, and with all His heart layeth Himself out for us. For we are all His Onesimi, to my thinking."

5 The Epistle runs thus:

"C. Plinius Sabiniano suo S.

## LIST OF MSS. CONTAINING THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.

### Note.
It is intended to include in this Table the mention of those MSS. only which contain, and of those particulars which concern, the portion of the N. T. comprehended in this Volume.

### TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of Collator and other information</th>
<th>Gosp.</th>
<th>Cath.</th>
<th>Apoc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Alexanderinus.</td>
<td>V.</td>
<td>See Vol. I.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Vatican 1209.</td>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>See Vol. I.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Ephraemi.</td>
<td>V.</td>
<td>See Vol. I.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Charomontanus.</td>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>See Vol. II.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Sangermanensis.</td>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>A faulty transcript of D.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Augiensis.</td>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>See Vol. II.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Boerneriavus.</td>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>Cited only when it differs from F.</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Paris, Coisl. 202, a.</td>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Only fragments. See Vol. II.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Frag. Tischendorf.</td>
<td>V.</td>
<td>See Vol. I.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Moscow Synod, 98.</td>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>See Vol. II.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Passionei.</td>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>See Vol. II.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Sinatticus.</td>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>See Vol. I.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Lambeth 1182.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Scrivener.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Lambeth 1183.</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>Scrivener.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Formerly Lambeth 1184.</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Sanderson in Scrivener.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Lambeth 1185.</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Scrivener.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Lambeth 1186.</td>
<td>XL</td>
<td>Scrivener.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Theodori.</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>Scrivener.</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Wordworth.</td>
<td>XI1.</td>
<td>Scrivener.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b] See 104 below.</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>Cited as h in this edition.</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[k] Trin. Coll. Camb., B. x. 16.</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>Scrivener.</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] See 29 below.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Cited as l.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m] See 37 below.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Cited as in Acts Epp., 69 in the Gospels.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n] See 30 below.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Cited as m in this edition.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[o] See 61 below.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Cited as o in this edition.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Basle, K. iii. 3. (late B. vi. 27.)</td>
<td>X.</td>
<td>Tregelles and Roth in Gosp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Basle (late B. ix. ult.).</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Mill (B. 2). Belonged to Amerbach. Mutilated.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Vienna, Theol. 5(Kol.)</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Alter. Known as Corendencensis.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Basle (late B. x. 20).</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Mill’s B. 3. Wetstein, throughout Epp.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Paris 106.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Stephens’ 57. Scholz.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Paris 112.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Stephens’ e. [Def. Tit. ii. 1—Philem. 12.]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>— Stephens' χ'. <em>Identified by some with 132 below.</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Paris 102.</td>
<td>X. Stephens' τ'. No lacunae.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>Not identified.</td>
<td>— Stephens' α'.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Univ. Lib. Camb., MS. Kk. 6. 4</td>
<td>XI. Stephens' ρ'. [Def. 1 Tim. iv. 12 — 2 Tim. iv. 3.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Paris 237.</td>
<td>X. Stephens (α'). Wetstein, &quot;de integro.&quot; Scholia.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>Jacobi Fabri Daventriensis.</td>
<td>XVI. See note b.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Amandi.</td>
<td>XI. Wetstein. Variorum scholia. Inspected by Reiche. Belonged to J. Lascaris.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Paris 14. (Colb. 2844.)</td>
<td>XI. Wetstein.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Paris, Coisl. 199.</td>
<td>XI. Wetstein. Variorum comm.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Paris, Coisl. 27.</td>
<td>— Wetstein.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Paris, Coisl. 205.</td>
<td>XI. Wetstein.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Camb.Univ. Lib., MS. Dd. 11. 90.</td>
<td>XIII. [Def. 2 Tim. i. 1—ii. 4; Tit. i. 9—ii. 15. Ends Philém. ver. 2.]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Camb.Univ. Lib., MS. FF. 1. 30.</td>
<td>XI. The following portions were supplied in XIth century. Gal. i. 1—8; Eph. i. 1—13; Col. i. 1, 2; 2 Thess. iii. 16—end; 1 Tim. i. 1—4; Philem. 24, 25. Of these Gal. (or Eph. ?) i. 1—4; Col.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Jacobus Faber Stapulensis, i. e. Jacques le Fevre d'Etaples, a native of Etaples in Picardy, collated five Greek MSS. of St. Paul's Epistles which he sometimes appeals to in his Commentary (Paris, 1512). These citations, whenever it is necessary to refer to them, should not be quoted as if they came from some one MS. distinct from the others in the list, but as "var. read. in comm. Fab. Stap." or the like.

b. A ms. which once belonged to J. C. Wolf of Hamburg. It was procured by Wetstein from Wolf's library, and collated by him. It consists of two square paper volumes, containing the whole N. T. exc. Apoc., copied by Jas. Faber, of Daventer (a brother scholar of Erasmus), from a ms. written A.D. 1293 on Mt. Athos, by the scribe Theodore, who wrote also Gosp. 74, and Scrivener's Gosp. q Epp. f. The Epistle of St. Jude occurs twice, the 2nd copy is entered as Cath. 55.

c. "We know nothing more of it than that Amandus, who lived at Louvain, had it in his possession, that Zeger appealed to it," on Rom. i. 32 (as reading οὐ σοφιάναμ), "and that Erasmus supposed it to be a latinizing manuscript. How many books of the N. T. it contains, where it is at present preserved, whether it has been used in modern times under another name, are questions which I am unable to answer." (Michaelis.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 Bodleian, Baroc. 3.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Mill (Baroc.). Scholia.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Chr. Coll. Camb. F. i. 13.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Mill (Cant. 2). Scrivener (l, so cited in this ed.).</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Em. Coll. Camb. i. 4. 35.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Mill (Cant. 3). Scrivener (n, so cited in this ed.).</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Brit. Mus., Harl. 1057</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mill (Cov. 2).</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Brit. Mus., Harl. 5557.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Mill (Cov. 3).</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Brit. Mus., Harl. 5778.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Mill (Sim.). Very much mutilated.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Geneva 20.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Mill (Genet.).</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 The Leicester MS.</td>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>Scrivener. Cited as &quot;n&quot; in this vol., &quot;f&quot; in Apoc. 69 in the Gospels. See 69, Vol. I.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Bodleian, Laud. 31.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Mill (Laud. 2).</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Linc. Coll. Oxf. 82.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Mill (Linc. 2).</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Dublin, Montfort MS.</td>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>Barrett and Dobbin.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Magd. Coll. Oxf. 9.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Mill (Magd. 1).</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 New Coll. Oxf. 59.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Mill (N. 2).</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Vatican, Alex. 179.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Zacagni. Mill's Pet. 3. Birch. [Def. Tit. iii. 3 to end of Philem.].</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Bodleian, Roe 16.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Mill (Roe 2). Marginal scholia.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Frankfort on Oder, Seidel MS.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Middeldorpf.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Vienna, Theol. 300 (Nessel).</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Alter. Mill's Vien.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Situation unknown.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>A MS. brought from Rhodes, occasionally referred to by Stunica, one of the Complutensian editors.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 See note.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Hamburg.</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Bengel's Uffenbachianus.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 See M in Vol. II.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Munich 375.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Bengel (Augsburg, 6). Ec.-comm.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this list:

- The numbers bracketed are perfect because they may be entered in the list under other numbers.
- Under this number Wetstein and succeeding editors have entered "Codices Laur. Vallet." "Laurentius Valla, a learned Roman, who was born in 1417, and died in 1467, published in 1440, Annotationes in N. T., in which he collected the readings of three Greek and three Latin MSS., and took particular pains to amend the Latin version. The book was published at Paris in 1505, and gave occasion to the Complutensian Polyglott." (Michaelis' Introductory Lectures, 4to, London, 1761, p. 66.)
- Under this number Wetstein and succeeding editors have entered a Zürich MS., 118]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of Collator and other Information</th>
<th>Gosp.</th>
<th>Cath.</th>
<th>Apoc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57 Vienna, Theol. 23 (Nessel)</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Edited by Alter.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Vatican 165.</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Edited by Zacagni. Called Crypto-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ferratensis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Paris, Coisl. 204.</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Inspected. Catena.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Camb. Univ. Lib., MS. Mm. 6. 9.</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Mill’s Hal., identified by Scrivener</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with 221 below. Cited as “o”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from Scrivener’s Collation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Brit. Mus., Harl. 5588.</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Eph. collated by Griesbach.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Brit. Mus., Harl. 5613.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eph. collated by Griesbach.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[61] See M in Vol. II.</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Inspected by Griesbach.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Paris 60.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 Vienna, Theol. 302 (Nessel).</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Alter and Birch. The readings inserted by a corrector (672) are</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very valuable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Vienna, Theol. 313 (Nessel).</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Alter and Birch.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 Vienna, Theol. 303 (Nessel).</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Alter and Birch.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Vienna, Theol. 221 (Nessel).</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Alter and Birch.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Vienna, Theol. 10 (Kollar).</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Alter and Birch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Copenhagen 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hensler. Cited by Bengel and Birch.</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Upsala, Sparwenfeld, 42.</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Aurivilius. Catena. (Part of this MS. is XIIth cent.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 Wolfenbüttel xvi. 7.</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Knittel (collation given in Matthai).</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Vatican 360.</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Birch (cursory inspected).</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Vatican 363.</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Inspected by Birch and Scholz.</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 Vatican 366.</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Birch (cursory).</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Vatican 367.</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Birch “per omnia contuli.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Vatican 761.</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Inspected by Birch. (Ec.-comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Vatican 765.</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Inspected by Birch. Comm. on marg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Vatican 766.</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Ditto ditto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 Vatican 1136.</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Epp. inspected by Birch. [Def. from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Tim. vi. 5.] Apoc. bef. Epp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Vatican 1160.</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Inspected by Birch and Scholz.</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 Vatican 1210.</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1, 2 Thess.; 1, 2 Tim. Tit. Phil.</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“exacte contuli” Birch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Vatican, Palat. 171.</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Zacagni.</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which consists merely of the Epistles of St. Paul, transcribed for his own benefit by the reformer Zwingle from Erasmus’ 1st edition.

s Under this number Wetstein et al. “Codices Graeci, quorum fit mentio in Correctorio Bibliorum Latinorum seculo xiii. scripto.”

h Another transcript of Erasmus’ 1st edition, Harl. 5552 in the British Museum. Griesbach copied certain various readings found on the margin.

[119]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Date.</th>
<th>Name of Collator and other Information</th>
<th>Gosp</th>
<th>Cath.</th>
<th>Apoc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89 Vatican, Alex. 29.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Birch &quot;accurate exam.&quot; Contains Gal., Eph. i. 1—9 only of this vol.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Vatican, Urb. 3.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Birch.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 Vatican, Pio 50.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Birch &quot;per omn. diligenter h. coll.&quot;</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 Propaganda Lib. Rome 250.</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>Engelbreth in Birch (once Borg. 4.).</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Naples i B. 12.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>1 Tim. collated by Birch.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 Laur. Lib. Florence iv 1.</td>
<td>X.</td>
<td>Inspected by Birch. Mutilated at end. Marginal commentary.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 Laur. Lib. Florence iv 5.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Birch. Thl.'s comm.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 Laur. Lib. Florence iv 20.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Birch. Marg. comm.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 Laur. Lib. Florence iv 29.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Birch.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Laur. Lib. Florence iv 31.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Birch.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 Laur. Lib. Florence iv 32.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Birch.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 Brit. Mus. Addl. 11387</td>
<td>Scrivener. Cited as &quot;h.&quot; 1357</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 Bologna Can. Reg., 690</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 St. Mark's Venice, 5.</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Rinck.</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 St. Mark's Venice, 6.</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Rinck.</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 St. Mark's Venice, 10.</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Rinck.</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 St. Mark's Venice, 11.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Rinck. [Philem. wanting.]</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 St. Mark's Venice, 33.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Rinck. Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 St. Mark's Venice, 34.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Rinck. Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 St. Mark's Venice, 35.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Rinck. Comm. [Def. 1 Thess. iv. 13—2 Thess. ii. 14.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 (Moscow ?)</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Matthai (a). Belonged to Matthai himself.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 Moscow Synod, 5.</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>Matthai (c).</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 Moscow Synod, 334.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Matthai (d). Thl.'s comm.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 The MS. called &quot;K&quot; above.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Matthai (h).</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 Moscow Synod, 193.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Matthai (h).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Dresden, Cod. Matth.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Matthai (k).</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 Moscow Synod, 380.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Matthai (l).</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 Moscow Synod, 328.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Matthai (m).</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 Moscow Synod, 99.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Matthai (n). Scholia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 Munich 504.</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Philem. wanting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 Munich 435.</td>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Philem. wanting. Prob. copied from same M8. as preceding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 Munich 211.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Rinck uses this number for St. Mark's Venice 36.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129 Munich 35.</td>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Thl.'s comm. (So Hardit.)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Paris, Bibl. de l'Ar.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 Paris, Cois. 196.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 Paris 47.</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>Reich.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 Paris 56.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 Paris 57.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Reich.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Paris 58.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. [Def. 2 Tim. ii. to end, Tit.]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 Paris 59.</td>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 Paris 61.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Reich. [Def. Philem. 21—25.]</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 Paris 101.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Coll. 1 Tim.; 1 and 2 Thess. by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 Paris 102 A</td>
<td>X.</td>
<td>Reich.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 Paris 103.</td>
<td>X.</td>
<td>Reich. (in Epp. Paul). Marginal Schol.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 Paris 103 A.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. [Def. Phil. i. 5—end; Col. 1 Thess. i. 1 iv. 1, v. 26—end; 2 Thess. i. 1—11.]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 Paris 104.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 Paris 105.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Contains Gal. i. 1—10, ii. 4—end; Eph. i. 1—15; 1 Tim. i. 14—v. 5.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 Paris 106 A.</td>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 Paris 108.</td>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Contains Phil., Col., Thess., Tim.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148 Paris 111.</td>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Contains Tit., Philem.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149 Paris 124.</td>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Paris 125.</td>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 Paris 126.</td>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 Paris 216.</td>
<td>X.</td>
<td>Reich. Scholia.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 Paris 217.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz and Reich. Thdrt.'s Comm. on Epp. Paul.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 Paris 218.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Catena.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 Paris 220.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Comm., txt often omitted.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 Paris 222.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>&quot;Coll. magna codicis pars.&quot; Scholz. [Def. Col. i. 1—6.]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158 Paris 223.</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz and Reich. Catena.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159 Paris 224.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Catena.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 Paris 225.</td>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Fragments w. Thl.'s comm.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Paris 849.</td>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Thdrt.'s comm. w. txt on marg.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 Turin, C. I. 40.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Scholz &quot;accurate coll.&quot;</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 Turin, C. II. 17 (19).</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 Turin, C. II. 31 (1).</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 Turin, C. II. 5 (302).</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 Ambros. Lib. Milan 6.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172 Ambros. Lib. Milan 15.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Comm. after Chr.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173 Ambros. Lib. Milan 102.</td>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Continuous comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>&quot;Coll. cod. integer.&quot; Scholz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>&quot;Coll. cod. integer.&quot; Scholz under Paul.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[179]</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Scholz. Cited as Hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Thdrt.'s comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Comm. on Epp. Paul.</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Past. Epp. edited by Mai, as supplementary to B.</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Scholia.</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>X.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>XVII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Latin version.</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Latin version.</td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Thdrt.'s comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name of Collator and other information</td>
<td>Gosp.</td>
<td>Cath.</td>
<td>Apoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[211] Naples (no number).</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. <em>Apparently the same as 93 above.</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(173)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212 Naples 1 C. 26.</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213 Barberini Lib. Rome 29.</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. Scholia.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215 Venice 546.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>(Part Cent. XIII.) Inspected by Scholz. Comm.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216 Mon. of S. Bas. Messana 2.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Münter.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217 Palermo.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. [Def. 2 Tim. i. 8—ii. 14.]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 Syracuse.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Münter.</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 Leyden, Meerm. 116.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Dermout.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 Berlin, Diez. 10.</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>[Def. 1 Tim. iv. 1—endd.]</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of Collator and other information</th>
<th>Gosp.</th>
<th>Cath.</th>
<th>Apoc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[221] Camb. Univ. Lib., MS. Nn. 5. 27.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>A folio copy of the Greek Bible, printed &quot;Basilian per Joan. Hervagianum 1545.&quot; A few notes are written on the margin.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224 Bodleian, Clarke 9.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>On parchment. Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[225] The same MS. as 11 above.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[226] The same MS. as 27 above.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

k Scholz has run into great confusion with the manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library from not understanding the signs in his memoranda respecting them. The following explanation may be sufficient to clear up the matter. All the MSS. in the Library have since 1753 been denoted by a double-letter class mark, a number for the shelf, and a number for the volume. Nasmith, in writing out a list of the MSS. as thus arranged, added numbers on the margin to indicate merely the position which each MS. held in his catalogue. Nasmith’s classified index contains references to this catalogue by these marginal numbers, ψ being prefixed if the reference is to a printed book with MS. notes, an asterisk if to a Greek MS. Similar marginal numbers have been inserted in the printed catalogue now in course of publication; they are not the same as Nasmith’s, and it is as misleading to refer to MSS. by these numbers without stating what catalogue is meant, as to the pages of a book more than once edited, without stating the edition used. This may be seen in the following examples:

MS. Fr. 1. 30, is 1152 on Nasmith’s margin, and 1163 on that of the new Printed Catalogue.

MS. Kk. 6. 4, is 2068 on Nasmith’s margin, and 2084 on that of the new Printed Catalogue.

MS. Mm. 6. 9, is 2423 on Nasmith’s margin, and 2468 on that of the new Printed Catalogue.

MS. Nn. 3. 20, is ψ 2537 in Nasmith’s index.

MS. Nn. 5. 27, is ψ 2622 in Nasmith’s index.

It is right to prefix MS. to the double letter to indicate that the volumes meant belong to the Cases so marked in the Library, and to prevent any confusion with the classes of Printed Books alone known by the same letters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of Collator and other information</th>
<th>Gosp.</th>
<th>Cath.</th>
<th>Apoc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>227 Bodleian, Clarke 4.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>On parchment. Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228 Escurial x. iv. 17.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Moldenauer. (See Birch, Gospels.)</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229 Escurial x. iv. 12.</td>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>Moldenauer. (See Birch, Gospels.)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 Riccardi Lib. Florence 84.</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz. (= lect. 37.)</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231 Gr. Mon. Jerusalem 8.</td>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerus. 1.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234 Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerus. 2.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235 Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerus. 10.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerus. 15.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerus. 20.</td>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 Strasburg, Molsheimensis.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Various readings of Gospels given by Arendt in the German Theol. quarterly for 1883. Those of Acts and Epp. communicated to Scholz.</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239 Laur. Lib. Florence vi. 27.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 Brit. Mus., Harl. 5796.</td>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241 Wolfenbüttel, Gud. 104.</td>
<td>XII. (Inspected by Scholz?)</td>
<td>Scholia.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 Middlehill Worcest. 1461.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>(Inspected by Scholz?) Once Meer- mann 118.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243 Two MSS. in a monastery in the Island of Patmos.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244 Ch. Ch. Oxf., Wake 34.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Inspected by Scholz.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 Ch. Ch. Oxf., Wake 38.</td>
<td>XI. (Inspected by Scholz?)</td>
<td>Catena.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 Ch. Ch. Oxf. Wake 37.</td>
<td>XI. (Inspected by Scholz?)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-pee St. Petersburgh xi. 1. 2. 230.</td>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Muralto.</td>
<td>S-pee</td>
<td>8-pee</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is a List of Lectionaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of Collator and other information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lect-1 Leyden 243. Sealigeri.</td>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Wetstein and Dermont. Contains Col. i. 12-23; 1 Thess. iv. 13—v. 10; 1 Tim. iv. 9—v. 10. [≡ ev-6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lect-3 Bodleian, Baroc. 202?</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>(Quoted by Mill. Heb. x. 22, 23 qu.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lect-4 Brit. Mus., Harl. 5731.</td>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>Griesbach. Contains the following fragments:—Gal. iii. 23—29; iv. 4—7; id. 22—27; v. 22—vi. 2; Phil. ii. 5—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation.</td>
<td>Date.</td>
<td>Name of Collator and other information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| lect-5 Bodleian, Cromwell, 11. [Olim 296.] A liturgy book, containing 5thly (pp. 149—290), ἐναγγελισμάτων τῶν μηγάλων ἔως τῶν. | 1225 | Griesbach, who says "Variante lectiones collegi e. . . . Gal. iv. 4—7; Phil. iv. 4—9; Col. ii. 8, 9 . . . ."
| lect-6 Göttingen (C. de Missy). | XV. | Matthaei (v). See his appendix to Thess. Contains a large number of the usual lections. |
| | | XV. Hunslov in Birch. [ev-44] |
| | | XI. Birch. [ev-37] |
| | | XII. Inspected by Scholz. [ev-84] |
| | | XII. Inspected by Scholz. [ev-85] |
| | | XII. Inspected by Scholz. [ev-85] |
| | | 1022 Scholz. An important MS. [ev-60] |
| | | X. Matthaei (b). |
| | | XII. Matthaei (o). |
| | | XV. Matthaei (l). [ev-52] |
| | | XV. Matthaei (n). [ev-53] |
| | | 1470 Matthaei (p). [ev-54] |
| | | XVII. Matthaei (w). [ev-55] |
| | | XVI. Matthaei (16). Contains 2 Tim. ii. 1—10. [ev-56] |
| | | XI. Inspected by Scholz. [ev-83] |
| | | XII. Inspected by Scholz. |
| | | XII. Inspected by Scholz. |
| | | XIII. Mostly O. T. lections; only a few from N. T. |
| | | XI. Inspected by Scholz. |
| | | XII. Inspected by Scholz. Mutilated. |
| | | XIII. Inspected by Scholz. Defective. |
| | | XV. Griesbach. [ev-26] |
| | | XII. Some lections from Gospp. and Epp. [ev-94] |
| | | XIII. Inspected by Scholz. [ev-82] |
| | | XIII. Entered in list of MSS. of Gospels as 321. [Lections i.] 1 and 2 Tim. collated by Scholz. |
| | | XIII. "Cursus coll. magna codicis pars." Scholz. |
| | | XV. Inspected by Scholz. |
| | | XIII. Inspected by Scholz. [ev-92] |
| | | XIV. Inspected by Scholz. [ev-93] |
| | | XV. See ms 230 above. |
| | | XV. [ev-133] |
| | | XIV. Some parts of Cent. X. |
| | | XI. The first 114 leaves are lost. |
| lect-33 Paris 382. | | |
| lect-34 Paris 383. | | |
| lect-35 Paris 324. | | |
| lect-36 Paris 326. | | |
| lect-37 Riccardi Lib. Florence 84. | | |
| lect-38 Vatican 1528. | | |
| lect-39 Vatican, Ottob. 416. | | |
| lect-40 Barberini Lib. Rome 18. | | |
| lect-41 Barberini Lib. Rome (no number). | | |
| lect-43 Riccardi Lib. Florence 2742. | | |
| lect-44 Glasgow (Missy 1B). | | |
| lect-45 Glasgow (Missy CC). | | |
For Versions and Fathers, see Vol. II.

SECTION II.

List, and Specification of Editions, of Books Quoted, Referred To, or Made Use Of in This Volume.

(Works mentioned in the lists given in the Proleggm. to Vols. I. and II. are not here again noticed.)

Baur, Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi, u.s.w., Stuttgart, 1845.

Ditto, Die sogenannte Pastoral-briefe u.s.w. (this latter work is quoted second hand.)

Bisping, Erklärung der Briefe an die Ephesier, Philippier, Colossier, u. des ersten Briefes an d. Thessalonicher, Münster 1855. (Rom. Catholic.)


Eadie, Prof., Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, Lond. and Glasgow 1854.

Ditto, Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians, Lond. and Glasgow 1856.

Ellicott, C. J. (now Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol), a Critical and Grammatical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, &c., London 1854. 2nd edition, 1859.


Ditto, on the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, London 1857.

Ditto, on the Epistles to the Thessalonians, London 1858 1.

1 I cannot forbear recording my very deep sense of the service rendered by Bishop Ellicott to students of the Greek Testament by these laborious, conscientious, and

126]
§ II.  

BOOKS QUOTED.  [PROLEGOMENA.]

Fritzsch, Pauli ad Romanos Epistola, 3 voll., Hal. Sax. 1836.
Fritzschiorum Opuscula Academica, Lipsia 1838.
Harless, Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Ephesier, Erlangen 1834.
Hefele, Patrum Apostolicorum Opera, ed. 3, Tübingen 1847.
Hoffmann, Der Schriftbeweis, 2 voll., Nördlingen 1855.
Jowett, Prof., the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans: with critical Notes and Illustrations, Lond. 1856.
Krüger, Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen, Berlin 1852.
Mack, Commentar über die Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus, Tübingen 1836. (Rom. Catholic.)
Stier, Dr. Rudolf, Die Gemeinde in Christo Jesu: Auslegung des Briefes an die Epheser, 2 voll., Berlin 1848.
Usteri, der Paulinische Lehrbegriff, Zurich 1851.
Windischmann, Erklärung des Briefes an die Galater, Mainz 1843. (Rom. Catholic.)
Winer, Pauli ad Galatae Epistolam latine vertit et perpetua annotatione illustravit Dr. G. B. Winer, ed. tertia, Lips. 1829.

scholarlike volumes. They have set the first example in this country of a thorough and fearless examination of the grammatical and philological requirements of every word in the sacred text. I do not know any thing superior to them, in their own particular line, in Germany: and they add what, alas, is so seldom found in that country, profound reverence for the matter and subjects on which the author is labouring. Nor is their value lessened by Bishop Ellicott having confined himself for the most part to one department of a Commentator’s work—the grammatical and philological. No student ought to be without these books, nor ought he to spare himself in making them his own by continual study.

2 This Lexicon (which has now all appeared) is as superior to all other editions of Passow, German and English, as Passow was to all that went before. A comparison of any important words will shew the difference at once. The immense labour requisite will, it is to be feared, deter our lexicographers from giving the English public a translation: but it would be a great boon to the scholarship of our country. [It is understood that a new edition of Liddell and Scott’s Lexicon, now long promised, will contain all the valuable improvements and additions from Rost and Palm. A translation was in progress, but was broken off by the lamented death of Dr. Donaldson in the spring of 1861.]

127]
ERRATA.

Page 9, text, last line, dele v before ἐπεφορ, and transfer the reference to next page.
— 88, reference o, for Rom. viii. 1, 4 read Rom. viii. 4.
— 111, reference o, for Rom. xi. 30 read Rom. xi. 33.
— 192, reference i, for iii. 14 read iii. 16.
— 215, reference r, dele (bis).
— 289, reference g, after 2 Cor. xii. 7 insert [bis],
— 292, reference u, for Rom. ii. 18 read Rom. i. 18.
— 295, reference k, for Matt. xvii. 43 read Matt. xxvii. 43.
Readings of the Codex Vaticanus (B) in the text of this volume, which have been ascertained by the Editor’s personal inspection of the MS. at Rome, February, 1861.

Gal. i. 4. τοῦ εὐεστῶτος, not εὐεστῶτος as Bentley.
   5. τῶν αἰωνῶν as in Mai ed. 1, not τῶν αἰ. as in ed. 2.
   15. αφωνίας is in codex.
ii. 4. καταδουλοουσιν is 1. m.
   14. Κηφᾶ is in codex.
   16. ερρηθησαν is 1. m.
   21. οὕτως ἐν νομῷ, not ἐν ν. οὕτως as Bentley.
iv. 4. ο θεὸς is in codex, not omitted as in Bentley.
   15. οὐν μακαρίσμος as in ed. 2, not οὐν ο μακ. as in ed. 1.
   17. χυμᾶς θελονσιν is in codex without correction, not ημᾶς.
   25. το δὲ αγαρ, not το αγαρ as Bentley.
   v. 11. ελικοὶς is in codex, all from 1. m.
Eph. i. 1. οὖσιν is at the end of a line, and ἐν εφεσῳ in margin, but it is very doubtful whether it is 2. m., and not rather 1. m., as some of its letters seem to have the double ink of 1. and 2. m.
   23. τοῦ τα παντα, not του παντα as Bentley and Birch.
   iv. 2. εν αγαγη, not αγαγη as Bentley.
   20. εμαθῆτε as Mai ed. 1, not εμαθήτε as ed. 2.
   23. δὲ is not omitted as in Bentley.
   32. ςμίν is not “added by another hand” as Bentley asserts, but in the codex, 1. m.
Phil. i. 22. αἰρησομαι as Bentley, not -σομαι as Mai.
   ii. 9. αὐτῷ το οὐμα is in codex.
   30. παρακολουσαμενος, not -βολ.-ο
Col. Title. κολασσαεις, both letters being 1. m.
   i. 2. κολοσσ- is 1. m.
   4. εἰς παντας, not της εἰς as Muralto.
   16. εν τοις, not τα εν τοις as Muralto.
   18. η αρχη, not αρχη as Muralto.
   20. ενι γης, not επι της γης as Muralto.
   27. ο εστιν, not ος εστιν as Muralto.
ii. 1 and 2. Vercellone’s marginal notes are right: cod. has εωρ-, and τον θεου θριστου. εορ- is 1 m. in ver. 18.
iii. 8. νυνει 1. m.
   end. κολασσας. is here plainly 1. m.
   1Thess. i. 2. 1st νυμων is not omitted as in Bentley.
   iii. 8. στηρετε as in Mai ed. 2, not -ητε as in ed. 1.
   iv. 1. λοιπον ἀδελφοι is 1. m.: το λ. ουν αδ. 2. m.
   [4. “εἰδενα ενδς a line, and is followed by ενα written by the 2da manus.” — Mr. Cure, April, 1862.]
   v. 13. ηγεισθε is in codex.
2 Thess. ii. 3. η αποστασ. is in codex.
   iii. 14. συναναγιγνονθαι as Bentley, not -σδε as Mai.
EPISTLES

TO

THE GALATIANS, EPHESIANS, PHILIPPIANS,
COLOSSIANS, THESSALONIANS,—TO TIMOTHEUS, TITUS,
AND PHILEMON.
ΠΡΟΣ ΓΑΛΑΤΑΣ.

I. 1 Παύλος ἀπόστολος ὑμῶν ἁγίου τοῦ Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ πατρὸς, ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ πατρὸς λήγεται.

Title. τος προς γαλατας επιστολὴ παυλου: εἰς παυλου του αποστολου η προς γαλατας επιστολη: του αγιου και πανευθυμου αποστολου παυλου επ. πρ. γαλ. I: πρ. γαλ. επ. τ. αγ. απ. παυλ. h: επ. πρ. γαλ. k: tekst ABKN mn o 17, and (prefixing αρχαιοται) DF.

Chap. I. 1—5] Address and Greeting. πολλοί τὸ προφήτων γέμει θυμοῦ κ. μεγάλοι φρονήματος οὐ τὸ προφήτων δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσα, αὐτοί, ἡ ἐπιστολή. Chrys. In the very opening sentence of the Epistle, we see the fervour of the Apostle's mind and the weightiness of his subject betraying themselves. The vindication of his own apostolic calling,—and the description of the work and purpose of Christ towards us, shew him to be writing to those who had disparaged that apostleship, and were falling from their Saviour. 1.] It is better not to join ἀπόστολος (here of course used in its strict and highest sense: see Ellicott, and an interesting note in Jowett) with Πσ', but to let it stand by itself, and take the two prepositions as indicating, ἐπί the remote originating cause, διὰ the nearer instrumental one. In St. Paul's case, neither of these was merely human; the Lord Jesus was both the original Sender, and Himself the Announcer of the mission. Perhaps however the prepositions must not be so strictly pressed,—see ref. 1 Cor., and observe that the following διὰ belongs to θεοῦ πατρὸς as well as to Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ.—ἀνθρώπου is perhaps (as Mey., De W., Ellic., al.) singular, for the sake of contrast to Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ following; but more probably for solemnity's sake, the singular making even a more marked exclusion of human agency than the plural. Luther's view of the sentence is: "The Judaizing teachers could shew their credentials as disciples of Apostles or messengers of churches and Hispised Paul as having none such. To this he answers that he had not indeed any commission from men, but derived his authority from a higher source." But (1) this was not the fact, for he had a regular mission from the church at Antioch: (2) the words do not express it.

κ. θεοῦ πατρὸς] If by Jesus Christ, then also by God the Father, in and by whose presence all the mediatorial acts of Christ in the Headship of His Church are done. The inferences of Chrys. al. as to the equality of the Father and the Son from this juxtaposition, appear far-fetched, and according to "the mind, not of the apostolic, but of the Nicene age," as Jowett; but we may say at least this, that the strongest possible contrast is here drawn between man, in the ordinary sense, on the one side, and Jesus Christ, and God the Father, on the other. Had not the Apostle regarded Jesus Christ as one with the Father in the Godhead, he never could have written thus. On the use of διὰ here where ἐπί might be expected, see Ellicott's note. He refers it to the brevity with which St. Paul ex-
presses himself: I should rather say that he states our Lord Jesus and God the Father to have been the cause medians, in bringing down divine agency even to the actual fact of his mission—and leaving it therefore to be inferred a fortiori that the cause principalis was the will of God.

It is important to remember that the mission of Paul to the actual work of the ministry was by the command of the Holy Spirit, Acts xii. 2.—proceeding from, and expressing the will of, the Father and the Son.

πατρὸς is better taken generally, as in ref., the Father, than supplied with ἡμῶν (as De W. al.) or αὐτοῦ (as Meyer al.).

tοῦ ἐγ. αὐτ. Why specified here? Not, I think, because (Meyer) Paul was called to be an Apostle by the risen Saviour,—nor merely (De W.) to identify the Father as the Originator of the Son’s work of Redemption (which is so in Rom. iv. 24,—but here would not immediately concern Paul’s calling to be an Apostle).—nor (Calvin, al.) to meet the objection that he had never seen Christ, and turn it into an advantage, in that (Ang. [but cf. his Retractions], Erasm., Beza, al.) he alone was commissioned by the already risen and ascended Jesus,—for in this case we should not find τοῦ ἐγερθέντος κ.τ.λ. stated as a predicate of the Father, but τοῦ ἐγερθέντος κ.τ.λ. as one of the Son, —nor as asserting the Resurrection against the Jews and Judaizing Galatians (Chrys., Luther), which is far-fetched, —nor again (Jowett) as expressing an attribute of the Father, without which He can hardly be thought of by the believer, —for this is too loose a relevancy for a sentence so pointed as the present: but because the Resurrection, including and implying the Ascension, was the Father’s bestowal on Christ of gifts for men, by virtue of which (ἐδώκεν τοὺς μὲν ἀπόστολους, κ.τ.λ. Eph. iv. 11) Paul’s Apostleship had been received. Cf. a similar sentiment in Rom. i. 4, 5. ἐκ νεκρῶν = ἐκ τῶν ν.,—see note on Rom. iv. 24. In Matt. xiv. 2; xxvii. 61; xxviii. 7; Eph. v. 14; Col. i. 18 (ii. 12 ?); 1 Thess. i. 10, the article is expressed: otherwise it is always omitted. 2. ἄδελφοι Who these were, may best be inferred by the Apostle’s usage in the addresses of other Epistles, where we have ἔως ὁ διὸ ἀδελφ. (1 Cor. i. 1), Τύμωθευ δ ἡλ. (2 Cor. i. 1. Col. i. 1. Phil. 1.). They were his colleagues in the work of the Gospel, his companions in travel, and the like (not all the members of the church where he was, as Erasm., Grot., Jowett, al., who would hardly be specified as being σὺν αὐτῷ—besides that such an address would be unprecedented): and their unanimity (πάντες) is here stated, as Chrys., Luther, al., to shew that he was not alone in his doctrine, but joined by all the brethren who were present. At the same time πάντες would seem to imply that just now he had many of these ἄδελφοι with him. But we cannot draw any inference from this as to the date of our Epistle: for we do not know who were his companions on many occasions. At Ephesus, where probably it was written, we hear only of Gains and Aristarchus (Acts xix. 29), but we cannot say that there were not others: in all likelihood, several more of those mentioned Acts xx. 4, were with him.

tοῖς ἐκκλ. παρακαθήκατο γὰρ ἐρήμων ἡ νόσος. Thirt. the principal cities of Galatia were Pessinus and Ancyra: but this plural seems to imply more than two such churches. See 1 Cor. xvi. 1, and Acts xvi. 6; xviii. 23. That we have here barely τοῖς ἐκκλ., without any honourable adjunct (as in 1 Cor., 2 Cor., 1 Thess., 2 Thess., &c.), must be explained as Chrys. al.: θέα δέ μοι καὶ ἐναυτά τι πολλὴν ἀγανάκτησιν. οὐ γὰρ εἶπε Ἰωάννης, οὐδὲ Θεός ἤγιοσμένος, ἀλλὰ Τ. ἐκκλ. τ. Γαλ. Meyer denies this, alleging (carelessly, which is not usual with him) 1 Thess. and 2 Thess. as addressed barely τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, whereas in both we have added ἐν θεῷ πατρί κ. κυρίῳ Ἰς. [κ. [ρ. 3. See introductory note on Rom. i. 1—7. 4.] He thus obiter reminds the Galatians, who wished to return to the bondage of the law, of the
great object of the Atonement, which they had forgotten. Ch. iii. 13 is but a re-statement, in more precise terms, of this.

δόντως εἰς] viz. as an offering, unto death: an expression only found (in N.T.) here and in the Pastoral Epistles. Several such will occur; see the inference, in Prolegomena to Past. Epistles, § 1.52, note.

περὶ, in this connexion, has much the same sense as ὠπέρ: see ref.,

and on Eph. vi. 19; also Ellic's note here.

ὑπερερχομαι] is the very word used by the Lord of St. Paul's own great deliverance, see ref.

τ. αἰώνος τ. ἐνεστ. πονηροῦ] the present

(not, as Mey., ‘coming.’ The word will not bear this meaning in 1 Cor. vii. 26, nor apparently [see note] in 2 Thess. ii. 2, much less in Rom. viii. 38) evil age (state of things; i.e. the course of this present evil world;—and, as understood, make us citizens and inheritors of a better αἰώνος, τοῦ μέλλοντος. So Luther: “vocat hunc totum mundum, qui fuit, est et erit, praesens seculum, ad differentiam futuri et aeterni seculi.” The allusion (Jowett) to the Jewish expressions, “the present age,” “the age to come,” as applying to the periods before and after the Messiah’s coming, is very faint,—indeed hardly traceable, in the change which the terms had undergone as used in a spiritual sense by Christians. See however the rest of his note, which is full of interest.

κατὰ τὸ θέλημα ...] And this, (1) not according to our own plan, in proportion to our legal obedience or any quality in us, but according to the Father’s sovereign will, the prime standard of all the process of redemption: and (2) not so that we may trifle with such rescuing purpose of Christ by mixing it with other schemes and fancies, seeing that it is according to a procedure prescribed by Him, who doth all things after the counsel of His own will. And this, not as the lord merely

of His works, but as πατρὸς ἡμῶν, bound to us in the ties of closest love—for our good, as well as to fulfill His own eternal purpose. On the question, whether the genitive ἡμῶν depends on both, or only on the latter of the two nouns θεοῦ κ. πατρὸς, I agree in Ellicott’s conclusion, that as πατρὸς is regularly anarthrous, and thus purely grammatical considerations are confounded,—as θεοῦ conveys one absolute idea, while πατρὸς might convey many relative ones, it is natural to believe that the Apostle may have added a defining genitive to πατρὸς, which he did not intend to be referred to ἔθσ. Render therefore, God and our Father, not ‘our God and Father.’

5. ὁ οὖν κύριος] So (ref.) on other occasions, when speaking of the wonderful things of God, St. Paul adds a doxology. “In politeia, quando regnum aut principatum nominum appellationis, id honesto quodam genere, nominatur, et genuinissime facere solens. Multo magis cum de Deo loquimur, genu cordis flectere debemus.” Luther. In ὁ δὲ- the glory κατ’ έξοχήν, or ‘the glory which is His’,—the article is probably inserted for solemnity.

“In this and similar forms of doxology,—excepting the angelic doxology, Luke xi. 14, and that of the multitude, Luke xix. 38,—δόξα regularly takes the article when used alone; see Rom. xi. 36; xvi. 27; Eph. iii. 21; Phil. iv. 20; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xii. 21; 2 Pet. iii. 18. When joined with one or more substantives, it appears sometimes with the article (1 Pet. iv. 11; Rev. i. 6; vii. 12): sometimes without it (Rom. ii. 10; 1 Tim. i. 17; Jude 25).” Ellicott.

τοὺς αἰών. τ. αἰών. See note on Eph. iii. 21. 6—10.] Announcement of the occasion of the Epistle, in his amazement at their speedy falling away from the Gospel. Assertion of that Gospel’s exclusive claim to their adhesion, as proclaimed by him, who served God in
CHRIST, and not POPULARITY among men. We have none of the usual expressions of thankfulness for their faith, &c.; but he hurries vehemently into his subject, and, as Chrys. says, σφοδρότερον τῷ μετὰ ταύτα κέχρισαι λόγῳ, καθάπερ πυροβολεῖ σφόδρας ὑπὸ τῆς ἐννοιάς τῶν εὐργείων τοῦ θεοῦ. 6. θαυμάζω in this sense (see reff.) is a word of mildness, inasmuch as it imports that better things were expected of them,—and of desecration, as letting down the writer to the level of his readers and even challenging explanation from them. Still, like many other such mild words, it carries to the guilty conscience even sharper rebuke than a harsher one would.

οὕτως ταχέως] either (1) 'so soon after your conversion' (Calv., Olsh., Meyer, &c.), or (2) 'so quickly,'—after so little persuasion,' when the false teachers once came among you (Chr., De W., &c.), or (3) 'so soon after my recent visit among you' (Bengel, &c.). Of these I prefer (1), as more suitable the dignity of the passage, and as the more general and comprehensive reason. But it does not exclude (2) and (3): 'so soon,' might be, and might be intended to be, variously supplied. See Prolegomena, on the time and place of writing this Epistle. μετατίθη.] are passing over, pres.: not as E. V. 'are removed,' which is doubtfully wrong, for μετ. is not passive but middle, in the common usage of the word, according to which the Galatians would understand it. So Plat. Theog. 122 c, σμικρὸν γάρ τι μετατίθησιν, 'I am beginning somewhat to change my opinion.' see also Gorg. 493 c : Demosth. 379. 10: 'Ἰσχυρῶς, ἵνα . . . ἐστι Παραβάσας μετατίθησιν, Appian, Hiss. c. 17; &c. See also examples in Wetst. Chrys. says well, οὐκ εἰπεν Μετατίθησιν, ἀλλὰ Μετατίθησιν: τουτέστιν, οὐδέποτε πιστεύσας, οὐδὲ ἤγοιμαι ἀπροσήφημην εἶναι τῷ ἀκάνθῳ δ καὶ αὐτό πάλιν ἐςτιν ἀνακατηγοροῦν. It is interesting to notice, in connexion with οὕτως ταχέως μετατίθησιν, the character given by Cæsar of the Gauls: "ut ad bella suscipienda Gallorum alacer ac promtus est animus: sic mollis ac nimine resistens ad calamitates mens ipsorum est." B. G. iii. 19: "Cæsar . . . infirmitatem Gallorum veritus, quod sinit in consilii capienda mobiles, et novis plerumque rebus student;" ib. iv. 5: see also ib. ii. 8;

iii. 10. τοῦ καλεσαντος ὑμᾶς. P in ἡ χάριτι ἡ χριστοῦ εἰς 'ἐπερον εὐαγγελίον.' ABDP

HKL a b c d e f gh k l

ins iō baf χι D al1 vss. om χριστοῦ F Tert. Cyri1 Lucif.
is: 'This ετέρον εὐαγγ. is only in so far another, that there are certain, who &c.' Notice that the stress is on οὐκ; so that Paul, though he had before said εἰς έτέρον εὐαγγ., yet guards the unity of the Gospel, and explains what he meant by έτέρον εὐαγγέλιον to be nothing but a corruption and perversion of the one Gospel of Christ. Others, as Chrys., Ec., Thirt., Luther, De Wette, &c., take δ' οὖν έστιν άλλο as all referring to εὐαγγέλιον, 'which is (admits of being) no other' (= μή οὖσιν άλλον): and then εἰ μή is merely adversative, 'but,' or 'only,' a meaning which it will hardly bear, but which, as De W. remarks, is not necessarily involved in his interpretation: 'except that,' answering for it quite as well. The objection to his view is (1) that the meaning assigned to δ' οὖν έστιν άλλο is very harsh, taking the relative from its application to the concrete (ετέρον εὐαγγ.), and enlarging it to the abstract (το εὐαγγ. in general) (2) that the juxtaposition of έτέρον and άλλο in one sentence seems to require, as in 1 Cor. xv. 40, 41, that the strict meaning of each should be observed. Others again (Winer, Olsh., &c.) refer the δ to the whole sentence from οτι &c. to εὐαγγέλιον — 'which (viz. your falling away) is nothing else but (has no other cause, but that) δε.' To this the objection (2) above applies, and it is besides very unlikely that St. Paul would thus have shifted all blame from the Galatians to their false teachers ('hanc culpam non tam vobis imputo quam perturbatoriobus illsi, &c. Luther), and, as it were, wiped out the effect of his rebuke just after uttering it. Lastly, Schött., and Cornel. a Lapide, take δ' οὖν έστιν άλλο as a parenthesis, and refer εἰ μή to θαυμάζει, which should thus have been εὐαμώναυ (N. V.). This would besides make the sentence a very harsh and unnatural one.

The nature of this 'different Gospel,' as gathered from the data in our Epistle, was (1), though recognizing Jesus as the Christ, it insisted on circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic ordinances as to times, &c.: (2) it professed to rest on the authority of some of the other Apostles: see Chrys. quoted below. oii yap. The article points out in a more marked manner the (notorious) occupation of these men, q. d. 'certain your disturbers, &c.' Add to ret., Herodot. ix. 70, την σκηνην το Μαραθώνοι ουτοι έσταν οι διαπρασατες. Xen. An. ii. 4. 5, δ’ ἡγομενοι ουδες έσται: and compare the common expression ειςιν αι λεγοντες.

7. om καi θελοντες Ν: ins Ν-corti ofl.

8. και Δ Βιαλ Χρι Θηλ. εὐαγγελίσηται Κ κ δ κ μ αλ θερτ-μας Εκ: εὐαγγελισηται ΑΚ αθ Ευς Αθ Κυρ-ιερ Κυρ Θηρτ, Προκλ, εὐαγγελισιωρίτι latt Τερτ, Κυρρ. μων έν ευαγγ. ΒΗ Χρι Αρχελ Άνγ: om μων ΠΝ1 Διαλ Ευς Δαμασκ Τερτα(ελω, om 2nd us.) Κυρρ Λουκ. for μων, μμας D1 Π Γ Κυρ-ιερ Χρον. εὐαγγελίσημεθα D(ed Tischdr) FH.
9. προειρήσθη N

10. rec aet in εἰς γὰρ (for connexion), with D2-KL red syr Chr Thdrth Thul (Ec: om καὶ ΑΒΔεΨ KN-corr 17 latt Damasc latt-sl)

11. rec (for γὰρ) δὲ, with AD2-KLN3 (in red) red syrr cort Chr Cyr, Thdrth Ambrost: om ath: txt BD-F N-corr 17 latt Damasc Jer Aug.

In it the reference back to vv. 6, 7) to you other than what (παρά [refl.] as in παρὰ δόξαν, παρὰ τῶν ὤρκων, παραβάλων, &c. not merely 'against,' nor merely 'besides,' but indicating 'beyond,' in the sense of overstepping the limit into a new region, i.e. it points out specific difference. The preposition is important here, as it has been pressed by Protestants in the sense of 'besides,' against Roman Catholic tradition, and in consequence maintained by the latter in the sense of 'against.' (In fact includes both) we preached (evangelized) to you, let him be accused (of God; no reference to ecclesiastical excommunication; for an angel is here included. See note, Rom. ix. 3, and compare ch. v. 10: also Ellies's and Bagge's notes here).

9. As we said before (referring, not to ver. 8 as most Commentators; for the word more naturally, as in 2 Cor. xiii. 2 [so προειρήσαμεν, 1 Thess. iv. 6], relates to something said on a former occasion—and the plural seems here to bind it to εὐγγελίζωμεν, but to what he had said during his presence with them: see a similar reference, ch. v. 3, 21). I also now say again,

—If any one is (no longer now a suppression, but an assumption of the fact: see Hermann, ut supra; and Ellie's note) evangelizing you (refl.) other (with another gospel) than that which ye received (from us), let him be accused (see above).

10. For (accounting for, and by so doing, softening, the seeming harshness of the last saying, by the fact which follows) am I now (ἅρπα takes up the ἀρπαζειν of the last verse, having here the principal emphasis on it,—q. d. 'in saying this,'—in what I have just said;) 'is this like an example of men-pleasing?' persuading (seeking to win over to me, ὡς ἐρωτάς nearly; see rell.) men (see 1 Cor. iv. 3; 2 Cor. v. 11: not, as Erasm. al. [not Luther], 'cum res humanaa supplac. in divinis?'—nor as Calvin, 'suedeone secundum hominem, secundum Deum?') or (am I conciliating) (παρακατίσταμαι losing its more proper meaning, as of course, when thus applied) God or am I seeking to please men (a somewhat wider expression than the other, embracing his whole course of procedure)? (Nam if I any longer (implying that such is the course of the work before conversion to Christ; not necessarily referring back to the time before his own conversion, any more than that is contained by implication in the words, but rather perhaps to the accumulated enormity of his being, after all he had gone through, a more pleaser) were pleasing men (either (1) impartial, = 'seeking to please' so that the fact of being well-pleasing to men does not come into question; or (2) as Mey., 'the fact of pleasing, result of seeking to please'—'if I were popular with men': the construction will bear both.) I were not (ἦμι is a late form, found however in Xen. Cyr. vi. 1. 9: see Ellie, here) the (or a, but better the) 'servant of Christ.' Some interpret χρ. δοῦ, οὐκ ἐν ἡμῖν as Chr, ἐν τῇ κυρίων ἡμῖν, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἡμῶν. But this would more naturally be expressed by οὐκ ἐν κυρίων, and, as Mey. remarks, would give a very flat and poor sense: it is better therefore to take δοῦς in its ethical, not its historical meaning.

11—CHAP. II, 21. First, or Apologetic Part of the Epistle; consisting in an historical defence of his own teaching, as not being from men, but revealed to him by the Lord,—nor influenced even by the chief Apostles, but of independent authority. 11, 12.] Enunciation of this subject. ἀν. γὰρ] The γάρ
12. for ouve, oude (mechanical repetition) ADIFN m Eus Chr Cyr; txt BDKL rel Ec. for δε, dia Α α'.
13. for εποθη, επολεμ. Ε, expugnabam lat-lat'-exe Aug. (here and in ver 23.)
15. rec aft ένδοκήσας ins o θεος, with ADKLN rel syr-w-ast copiq Orig, Chrr, Thdrts, Iren-lat, Aug; om BE vulg Syr Chr, Thdrts, Iren-lat, Orig-lat Fanst (in Aug) Ambfrt Jer. affwosias B (ita cod. see table at end of prolegg. to this vol) D¹ m n.

17. rec (for 1st απήλθων) απήλθων, with AKLN rel latt syr copiq Chr Thdrts: txt RDF said ἀνεστρέφομεν ποτε, he allows himself to write τὴν ἐμ. ἀναστρέφοντα ποτε."""" Mey. cites as a parallel construction, ἡ τῆς Τρολας ἄλωσι το δεύτερον, Plat. Legg. iii. 683 d. τ. ἐκκλ. τ. θεού[ for solemnity, to set himself in contrast to the Gospel, and shew how alien he then was from it (1 Cor. xv. 9). ἐπορθ.] τούτου, oibá to ἐπεφεύγει τ. κατακλήσας, κατασφάγης κ. καθελεύκ, ἀφανίσαι τοῦτο γὰρ πορφύτου ἔγραφ. Chrys. But more than the mere attempt is to be understood: he was verily destroying the Church of God, as far as in him lay. Nor do we think of merely laying waste: the verb applies to men, not only to cities and lands, cf. Acts ix. 21, —κεῖσον γὰρ ἔπεφεραν ἄνθρωπος, Soph. Aj. 1177, and ἄρα παρακαλά, μὴ ἡμῖν δ Πρωταγόρας τὸν Ἀσμονίδου ἐκέγραφ. Plat. Protag. p. 340. 14. συννυκτίζως; "The compound form (compare σωμάτειχος, Eph. iii. 6; v. 7: συγκοινωνία, 1 Cor. ix. 23 al.) is condemned by the Atticists: Attic writers using only the simple form." Ellicott. ἐν τ. γένει μ., in my nation, see reff. περίσσ. viz. than they. [ηλ. τ. π. μ. παρ.] a zealous assessor (or defender) of my ancestral traditions (i.e. those handed down in the sect of the Pharisees, Paul being Φαρίσαιος, οὐδέ Φαρίσαων, Acts xxiii. 6.—not, the law of Moses. This meaning is given by the μοῦ: without it the παράδοσες of the whole Jewish nation handed down from of πατέρες, might be meant: cf. Acts xxvi. 5). 15.—17.] After his conversion also, he did not take counsel with men. 15. It was God's act, determined at his very birth (cf. especially Acts xiii. 2), and effected by a special calling: viz., that on the road to Damascus, carried out by the instrumentality of Ananias. To understand καλέσας of an act in the divine Mind, as Rückert, is contrary to our Apostle's usage of the word, cf. ver. 6; Rom. viii. 30 al. This calling first took place, then the revelation, as here. 16.] ἀποκαλ. belongs to ενδοκήσας, not to καλ. (Erasm.), nor to ἀφορ. and καλ. (Est., al.),—to reveal his Son (viz. by that subsequent revelation, of which before, ver. 12: not by his conversion, which, as above, answers to καλ. in me (strictly: 'within me,' τῆς ἀποκαλύφθες καταλαμπότισσι αὐτοῦ τὴν ψυχήν, Chrys.: not 'through me' (Jer., Erasm., Grot., &c.), which follows in τα εὐαγγ. κτ.λ., nor in my case (Rückert, al.), as manifested by me as an example to myself or others, as in 1 John iv. 9: the context here requires that his own personal illumination should be the point brought out:—nor 'to me' (Calv., al.), which though nearly equivalent to 'in me,' weakens the sense, &c). Notice the present εὐαγγελίζων, the ministry being not a single act, but a lasting occupation. ἐν τ. ἐδω.] the main object of his Apostleship: see ch. ii. 7, 9. 'εὐθεῖα is really connected with ἀπῆλθω: but the Apostle, whose thoughts outrun his words, has interposed the negative clause, to anticipate his purpose in going away.' Jowett. προσανεβ. See reff. The classical sense is, 'to lay on an additional burden;' and in middle voice, 'on oneself;' cf. Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 8. The later sense, 'to impart to,' τῷ πατὶ, either, as here, with the view of getting, or as in ch. ii. 6, with that of conferring. The πρὸς in composition does not signify addition, but direction: see Acts xxvii. 7, note. οἰκῆ κ. αἰμ. i.e. with manu-
kind, "generally with the idea of weakness and frailty," Ellic, whose note see, and also reff. 17. ἀπῆλθον both times refers to his departure from Damascus: q. d. 'when I left Damascus, I did not go, . . . but when I left Damascus, I went.' The repetition of ἀπῆλθον is quite in the Apostles' manner; Meyer addsuce as examples Rom. viii. 15 [Heb. xii. 18, 22. We may add Heb. ii. 16]. εἰς Ἀραβ. On the place which this journey holds in the narrative of Acts ix., see notes on vv. 19, 22 there. Its object does not seem to have been (as Chrys., al., Meyer, al.) the preaching of the gospel,—nor are the words ὅπα εἰσαρχεῖ κ.π.λ. necessarily to be connected with it,—but preparation for the apostolic work; though of course we cannot say, that he did not preach during the time, as before and after it (Acts ix. 20, 22) in the synagogues at Damascus. Into what part of Arabia he went, we have no means of determining. The name was a very vague one, sometimes including Damascus ('Damascus Arabice retro deputabatur, antequam transcripta erat in Syrophenicem ex distinctione Syriarum.' Tert. adv. Marciun., iii. 13, vol. ii. p. 339: so also (verbatim) adv. Judaeos 9, p. 619. ιττι δὲ Δάμασκος τῆς Ἀραβίκης γῆς ἢν κ. ἐστιν, εἰ καὶ οὖν πρασονεμέναι τῆς Συριακῆς λειχογένετο, οὖδ' ἤμων τινος ἀρνησάμεθα δυνατά, Justin Mart. c. Trypho, 78, p. 176).—sometimes extending even to Lebanon and the borders of Cilicia (Pliny, Hist. Nat. vi. 82). It was however more usually restricted to that peninsula now thus called, between the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. Here we must apparently take it in the wider sense, and understand that part of the Arabian desert which nearly bordered on Damascus. (From C. and H. edn. 2, i. p. 117, f.) How long he remained there we are equally at a loss to say. Hardly for any considerable portion of the three years: Acts ix. 23 will scarcely admit of this: for those ἤμεραι ικανοὶ were manifestly passed at Damascus. The journey is mentioned here, to account for the time, and to shew that he did not spend it in contradicting with men, or with the other Apostles. καὶ πάλ. ὑποτρπ. cf. Acts ix. 22, 25. 18—24.] But after a very short visit to Peter at Jerusalem, he retired to Syria and Cilicia. 18. At first sight, it would appear as if the three years were to be reckoned from his return to Damascus: but on closer examination we see that μετὰ ἔτη τρ. stands in opposition to ἐδώκας above, and the ἀνῆλθον κ.π.λ. here answers to ἀπῆλθον κ.π.λ. there. So that we must reckon them from his conversion: δει καὶ οὖν ἰδώκας κ.π.λ. ruling the whole narrative. See also on ch. ii. 1. This is the journey of Acts ix. 26,—where see note. There is no real discrepancy between that account and this. The incident which led to his leaving Damascus (Acts ix. 25. 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33) has not necessarily any connexion with his purpose in going to Jerusalem: a purpose which may have been entertained before, or determined on after, that incident. To this visit must be referred the vision of Acts xxii. 17, 18. ἵστορ. Κηφ. to make the acquaintance of Cephas, is not to get information or instruction from him; see reff., and Ellic. here. Peter was at this early period the prominent person among the Apostles; see note on Matt. xvi. 18. ἰδίαρ. δικαστ. was mentioned to show how little of his institution as an Apostle he could have owed to Peter. Why no longer, see in Acts ix. 29; xxii. 17—21. 19.] This verse admits of two interpretations, between which other considerations must decide. (1) That
James, the Lord’s brother, was one of the Twelve, and the only one besides Peter whom Paul saw at this visit: (2) that he was one of the Apostles, but not necessarily of the Twelve. Of these, (1) apparently cannot be: for after the choosing of the Twelve (John vii. 70), the apostle of our Lord did not believe on him (John vii. 5): an expression (see note there) which will not admit of any of his brethren having then been his disciples. We must then adopt (2): which is beside in consonance with other notices respecting the term ἀπόστολος, and the person here mentioned. I reserve the subject for full discussion in the prolegomena to the Ep. of James. See also notes, Matt. x. 3; xiii. 55; John vii. 5. [20.] This asseveration (cf. 2 Cor. xi. 31) applies most naturally to the important fact just asserted—his short visit to Jerusalem, and his having seen only Peter and James, rather than to the whole subject of the chapter. If a report had been spread in Galatia that after his conversion he spent years at Jerusalem and received regular institution in Christianity at the hands of the Apostles, this last fact would naturally cause amazement, and need a strong confirmatory asseveration. As regards the construction, ἅ ... διὰ ... ἄμια stands alone, (with regard to) the things which I am writing to you,—and the word necessary to be supplied to carry on the sense from ἄμια ἐν τῇ . τῆς λεγνίτις ἄνθρωπος, 1 Tim. v. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 14; iv. 1,—παν-αγωγικός, 1 Tim. vi. 13. Meyer would supply γράφω, which seems harsh: others take διὰ as for, which is worse still (cf. 2 Cor. xi. 21, δὲ θέου οἶδα . . . διὰ οὗ φέβομαι), and this too, understanding διὰ τίνες after θέου (Bengel). [21.] The beginning only of this journey is related in Acts ix. 30, where see note. Mr. Howson suggests (cgm. 2, i. p. 129, f) that he may have gone at once from Cæsarea to Tarsus by sea, and Syria and Cilicia may afterwards have been the field of his activity, —these provinces being very generally mentioned together, from their geographical affinity, Cilicia being separated from Asia Minor by Mount Taurus. (See also note on Luke ii. 1, 2.) Winer, al. have understood by Syria here, Phœnicia: but as Meyer has shown, inconsistently with usage. In Acts xv. 23, 41, we find churches in Syria and Cilicia, which may have been founded by Paul on this journey. The supposition is confirmed by our ver. 23: see below. [22, 23.] ‘So far was I from being a disciple of the Apostles, or tarrying in their company, that the churches of Judea, where they principally laboured, did not even know me by sight.’ ὁ προσώπῳ, the referential, or adverbialative: Donaldson, Gramm. § 457. τῆς Ιουδαίας excludes Jerusalem, where he was known. Jowett doubts this; but it seems to be required by Acts ix. 26—29. Chrys. seems to mistake the Apostle’s purpose, when he says, ἦν μᾶς, ὄτι οὐκ ἔλεγεν ἡμῖν τὸν κυρίον αὐτοῖς περίτομον, ὄτι οὐθε ἀδελφοὶ γνώρισαν αὐτοῖς: and Olshausen, in supposing him to be reticent the idea that he had learned the Gospel from other Christians in Palestine. [23. άκ. ἡσαν] They (the members of the churches: cf. Eurip. Hec. 39, πᾶς στρατεύματες ἡλεμνικοῖς πρὸς οἴκον εὐθύνομεν ἐναλλάκτων πάθην) heard reports (not ‘had heard,’ as Luth.: the resolved imperfect gives the sense of duration: see reff. and passim) that (not the recitative ἦν, but the explicative, following ακ. ἡσαν). Mey. remarks that no example is found of the former use of ἦν by St. Paul, except in O. T. citations, as ch. iii. 8) our (better taken as a change of person into the oratio directa, than with Mey. to understand ἡσαν as ‘us Christians,’ the Apostle including himself as he writes) former persecutor (not, as Grot., for διώτας, but as ἐπιφάνος, taken as a
substantive: see reff.) is preacing the faith (objective, as in reff., and 1 Tim. i. 19 b; iii. 9; iv. 1, &c.; but not = the doctrine of the Gospel which he once was destroying (see on ver. 13). And they glorified God in me ('in my case;' i.e. my example was the cause of their glorifying God: — not, 'on account of me,' see reff., and cf. in återas γέγονε, Pind. Nem. iii. 56,—en σω πᾶς ἐγέρεις σώματι, Soph. Aj. 519. Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 210). By thus shewing the spirit with which the churches of Judaea were actuated towards him, he marks more strongly the contrast between him and the Galatian Jewsizers. Thdttr. says strikingly: μανάλοντες γὰρ τὴν θύραν μεταβολήν, ἃν ἐπὶ δ ἱκίον πὰ τοιούσιν ἐργάζεται, τής ἐς τὸν θεῶν ὑμνιῶδες τὰ κατ᾽ ἑκεῖ πρόβασιν ἐλάμβανον. 11. 1—10.] On his subsequent visit to Jerusalem, he maintained equal independence, was received by the Apostles as of co-ordinate authority with themselves, and was recognized as the Apostle of the uncircumcision. 1. dia deix. ἐτῶν] First, what does this dia imply? According to well-known usage, dia with a genitive of time or space signifies 'through and beyond:' thus, δὲ μὲν χρόνους δὴ διὰ χρόνου προβαίνει μοι, Soph. Philoct. 285,—διὰ δὲκ ἐπάλεως παρὰργο ἦν μεγάλο, Thuc. iii. 21, and then τῶν παρὰργων ὄντων δὲ ἄλλογον: see reff., and Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 235. Winer, Gramm. edn. 6, § 51. (The instrumental usage, dia διακρίνων, dìa νυκτός, &c. is derived from this, the instrument being regarded as the means, passed through before the end is attained: but obviously has no place here, where a definite time is mentioned.) See more in Ellie. dia deix. ἐτῶν then is after fourteen years, δεκατεσσάρων παρελθόντων ἐτῶν, Chrys. Next, what time are we to reckon? Certainly at first sight it would appear,—from the journey last mentioned. And Meyer maintains that we are bound to accept this first impression without examining any further. But why? Is the prima facie view of a construction always right? Did we, or did he, judge thus in ch. i. 18? Are we not bound, in all such cases, should any reason ab extra exist for doing so, to re-examine the passage, and ascertain whether our prima factae impression may not have arisen from some indication furnished by the context? That this is the case here, I am persuaded. The ways of speaking, in ch. i. 18, and here, are very similar. The ἐπίστη in both cases may be well taken as referring back to the same terminus a quo, dia being used in this verse as applying to the larger interval, or even perhaps to prevent the fourteen years being counted from the event last mentioned, as they would more naturally be, had a second meta been used. What would there be forced or unnatural in a statement of the following kind? "After my conversion (ὅτε δὲ, &c. ch. i. 15) my occasions of communicating with the other Apostles were these: (1) after three years I went up, &c. (2) after fourteen years had elapsed, I again went up, &c. ?" This view is much favoured, if not rendered decisive, by the change in position of ἐτῶν and the numerals, in this second instance. In ch. i. 18, it is μετὰ ἐτῶν τριά: ἐτῶν, in the first mention of the interval, having the emphatic place. But now, it is not δὲ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων, but δὲ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν—ἐτῶν now passing into the shade, and the numeral having the emphasis—a clear indication to me that the ἐτῶν have the same reference as before, viz. to the time of his conversion. A list, and ample discussion, of the opinions on both sides, will be found in Anger, de ratione temporum, ch. iv. This (cf. Chronol. Table in Proleg. Vol. II.) would bring the visit here related to the year 50: see below. παλίν ἄνεβην I again went up: but nothing is said, and there was no need to say any thing, of another visit during the interval. It was the object of the Apostle to specify, not all his visits to Jerusalem, but all his occasions of intercourse with the other Apostles: and it is mere trifling, when Meyer, in his love of creating discrepancies, maintains that in such a narration as this, St. Paul...
would be putting a weapon into the hands of his opponents by omitting his second journey. That journey was undertaken (Acts xi. 30) in pursuance of a mission from the church at Antioch, to convey alms to the elders of the suffering church at Jerusalem. It was at a period of persecution, when James the son of Zebedee and Peter were under the power of Herod, and in all probability the other Apostles were scattered. Probably Barnabas and Saul did not see any of them. They merely (Acts xii. 25) fulfilled their errand, and brought back John Mark. If in that visit he had no intercourse with the Apostles, as his business was not with them, the mention of it here would be irrelevant; and to attempt, as Mey., to prove the Acts inaccurate, because that journey is not mentioned here, is simply absurd. That the visit here described is in all probability the third related in the Acts (A.D. 50) on occasion of the council of the Apostles and elders (Acts xv.), I have shown in a note to the chronological table, Prolegomena on Acts, Vol. II. The various separate circumstances of the visit will be noticed as we proceed.

2. for anēbēn (comitii D-lat vulg[and lat col of F]), anēbalaornēn expressi F.

instance of such a double prompting; Peter was induced by a vision, and at the same time by the messengers of Cornelius, to go to Cesarea. Schrader would give a singular meaning to κατ' ἀποκάλυψιν, that his visit was for the purpose of making known the Gospel which he preached, &c. Hermann (de ep. ad Gal. trib. prim. capp., cited by Meyer) agrees; "explicationis causa, i.e. ut pateferet inter ipsos qua vera esset Jesu doctrina." But it is against this sense, that (1) the N. T. usage of ἀποκάλυψις always has respect to revelation from above, and (2) this very phrase, κατ' ἀποκάλυψιν, is found in ref. Eph. used absolutely as here, undoubtedly there signifying by revelation. Hermann's objection that for this meaning, κατά τινα ἁπόκωστον would be required, is nugatory: not the particular revelation (concrete) which occasioned the journey, but merely the fact that it was by (abstract) revelation, is specified.

anēbēn (refl.): so Aristoph. Nub. 1436, τινὰς ἀνάθεις ἀπαντά τάμα πράγματα. See more examples in Wetst. autoi to the Christians at Jerusalem, implied in Ιεροσόλ., above; see ref. This wide assertion is limited by the next clause, κατ' ἵνα, &c. Ec., Calv., Osh., al. take autoi to mean the Apostles: in which case, the stress by and by must be on κατ' ἵνα,—I communicated it (indeed,—μὴ would more naturally stand here on this interpretation) to them, but privately (i.e. more confidentially,—but how improbable, that St. Paul should have thus given an exoteric and esoteric exposition of his teaching) τοῖς δοκοῦντοι. Chrys. is quoted for this view by Mey., but not quite correctly; ἐπείδη γὰρ εἰς τοὺς Ἰεροσολύμοις πάντες ἔκκαθαλίζοντο, εἰ τις παραβιάζῃ τὸν νόμον, εἰ τις καλοῦσῃ χρήσασθαι τὴν περιπτώσιν, παρῆσαι μὲν παρελθὲν κ. τὸ κήρυγμα ἀποκάλυψι κ. τὸν αὐτὸν ὄνομ ἤνειχτο, κατ' ἵνα δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦντοι ἀνέβητο ἐπὶ Βαρκελλείας κ. τίτον, ὡς οὕτω μέτρυτοι ἀξιόπησον γένεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐγκαθεσθώς, διὶ οὐδὲ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐδοξεν ἐκάθως δὲ παρακαλεῖ νήματα τοῦ κήρυγμα τοῦ τουτοῦτον. Estius, characteristically enough, as a Romanist; publish ita contulit, ut ostenderet gentes non debere circumcisci et servare legem Mosis,—privato autem et secreto colloquio cum apostolis habito placuit ipsos quoque Ju-
3. om ó B.

does ab observantia Mosaicæ legis ... esse liberandos." κατ. ἵνα δὲ τοῖς ἰδοκοῦσιν, μὴ πως ἐκ κενοῦ τρέχων ἡ ἐφοραμον. ... οἱ δὲ Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοὶ Ἐλλην ἰν γνακάθηνα περιτυμῆναι ... εἰ δὲ τούς παρεῖσιν—
vv. 6, 9. Mark x. 42. n Rom. xi. 21 al. Paul (Acts xxvii. 29 rec.) only. " ... κατ. ἵνα δὲ τοῖς ἰδοκοῦσιν, μὴ πως ἐκ κενοῦ τρέχων ἡ ἐφοραμον. ... οἱ δὲ Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοὶ Ἐλλην ἰν γνακάθηνα περιτυμῆναι ... εἰ δὲ τούς παρεῖσιν—
vv. 6, 9. Mark x. 42. n Rom. xi. 21 al. Paul (Acts xxvii. 29 rec.) only. " ... κατ. ἵνα δὲ τοῖς ἰδοκοῦσιν, μὴ πως ἐκ κενοῦ τρέχων ἡ ἐφοραμον. ... οἱ δὲ Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοὶ Ἐλλην ἰν γνακάθηνα περιτυμῆναι ... εἰ δὲ τούς παρεῖσιν—

being tumultuously disowned by them, is surely but natural. On εἰς κενοῦ and τρέχω, see reff. (The grammatical difficulty is well discussed in Ellicott's note.)

3.] But (so far were they from regarding my course to have been in vain, that) neither (ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ introduces a climax, see reff.) was Titus, who was with me, being a Greek (i.e. though he was a Gentile, and therefore liable to the demand that he should be circumcised), compelled to be circumcised (i.e. we did not allow him to be thus compelled: the facts being, as here implied, that the church at Jerusalem [and the Apostles?] apparently not, from Acts xv. 5) demanded his circumcision, but on account of the reason following, the demand was not complied with, but resisted by Paul and Barnabas. So Meyer, with Piscator and Bengel, and I am persuaded, rightly, from what follows. But usually it is understood, that the circumcision of Titus was not even demanded, and that Paul alleged this as shewing his agreement with the other Apostles. So Chrys.: ἀνρόβοστον ὡς οὖν ἤναγκασαν περιτυμῆναι οἱ ἄποστολοι, ὡς ἀπὸ ἀποδεικνύει τὴν μη καταγείρουσιν τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου λεγομένων ἐπὶ πατρικόμενον: so also Thdrt., Thl., Ecc., &c., and Winer and De W. Had this been so, besides that the following could not have stood as it does, not the strong word ἤναγκασαν, but the weakest possible word would have been used—the circumcision of Titus was not even mentioned):

4.] but (i.e. 'and this': the construction of the sentence is [against Ellic.] precisely as ver. 2: this δὲ restricts and qualifies the broader assertion which went before. 'Titus was not compelled ... and that,' &c. To connect this with ver. 2, supposing ver. 3 to be parenthetical, as Mr. Bagge, seems harsh, and unnecessary. A second δὲ would hardly be found in the same sentence in this restrictive sense) on account of the false brethren who had been foisted in among us (the Judaizers in the church at Jerusalem, see Acts xv. 1. The word παρεῖσκωτος is not found elsewhere. It
4. aft ἦν ins μὴ F. (not F-lat.) rec καταδολοσωται, with K rel Chr(σουλω-
σωτρόν) Thdrτ, -σουτρ L αł: txt AB¹CD; ἢσους B²F 17 Damasc.

5. om οις οὐδὲ D¹ Iren-lat Tert (who attributes “nece” to Mareion) Ambstr (Greci e contra: “nee...”) Victorin Primus: om οὐδέ hal, lett mass mentioned by Jer and
dosel: ins ABCD¹FLK rel vulg syrr copth gr-mass-in Jer-Ambrst Orig Ephig Chr Thdrτ Meion-t Ambra Angy.

for διαμεθρεῖ, διαμεθρεῖ F. (C defective.)

occurs in the title of the “proclus inerti
aurctoria” to Sirach: πρόλογος παρεισ-
ακτος ἀδῆλου. It is found however in the
lexicons of Hesych., Photius, and
Sinaitas, and interpreted ἀλλότριος.
The verb παρεισάχω is common in Polybius,
without any idea of surreptitious in-
troduction: see Schweig’s Index: but
such an idea certainly seems here to be
attached to it, by the repetition of παρεισ-
ακτος, in παρεισάχω immediately after),
men who (οἶνες classifies) crept in to
spy out (in a hostile sense: so Chrys.,-
ὁρις πᾶς καὶ τῇ τῶν κατακότων προστηγο-
ρίᾳ ἐχθροῖς τῶν πόλεων ἑκείνους, - rew, and
Eur. Helen. 1607, ὅποι νοσοῦν ᾠδία-
χῶν κατασκοπῶν) our freedom (from the
ceremonial law: to see whether or how
far, we kept it) which we have in
Christ Jesus, with intent to enslave us
utterly the future after ἤν is found
John xvii. 2; Rev. iii. 0; viii. 3; xxii.
14. Hermann, on Ed. Col. 156, says—
“futuro non jungitur ἤν, ut.” The construc-
tion of the future with ἤν and ἤν is common enough in the clas-
ses. Winer remarks, Gr. edn. 6, § 41.
b. 1. b, that it denotes continuance,
wheras the aorist subjunctive is used of
something transitory: but qu? I
should rather say that it signifies the
certain sequence, in the view of the
agent, of that which follows, not mer-
ely that it is his intent,—and that it arises
from the mingling of two constructions,
begining as if ἤν with the subjunc-
tive were about to be used, and then
passing off to the direct indicative:—
to whom not even for one hour (rew). did
we (Barnabas, Titus, and myself) yield
with the subjection required of us (iative
of the manner: the article giving the sense,
‘with the subjection claimed.’ Fritzsche
takes it, ‘yield by complying with the wish
of the Apostles’: but this is manifestly
against the context: Hermann, and simi-
larly Bretschneider, ‘qui nus horae qui-
dem spatium Jesu obsequio sequior fui,’—
absurdly enough, against the whole drift
of the passage, and the Apostle’s usage of
ὑποταγη abstractedly), that the truth of
the Gospel (as contrasted with the per-
verted view which they would have intro-
duced: but not to be confounded with τῷ
ἀληθεύει εὐαγγελίων. Had they been
borne in this point, the verity of the Gos-
pel would have been endangered among
them,—i. e. that doctrine of justification,
which on the Gospel turns as the truth of
God) might abide (rew: and note on ch.
18) with you (‘you Galatians: not:
‘you Gentiles in general’: the fact was
so,—the Galatians, especially, not being in
his mind at the time: it is only one of
those cases where, especially if a rhetorical
purpose is to be served, we apply home to
the particular what, as matter of fact, it only
shares as included in the general).
The omission of ὧν ὄνει in this sentence
(var. read.), has been an attempt to
simplify the construction, and at the same
time to reconcile Paul’s conduct with
that in Acts xxvii. 3, where he circumcised
Timothy on account of the Jews: but
the circumstances were then widely dif-
cent: and the whole narrative in Acts
xxv. makes it extremely improbable that
the Apostle should have pursued such a
course on this occasion.

6.] He re-
turns to his sojourn in Jerusalem, and his
intercourse with the δοκοῦντες. The con-
struction is difficult, and has been very va-
riously given. It seems best (and so most
Commentators) to regard it as an anacol-
thon. The Apostle begins with ἀρχέ δὲ
τῶν δοκοῦντων καὶ τι, having it in his
mind to add οὖν διοσελαβήσων or the like: but then, going off into the parenthesis ὅποιος ποτε ήσαν &c., he entirely loses sight of the original construction, and proceeds with ἐμοὶ γὰρ &c., which follows on the parenthesis, the γὰρ rendering a reason [this is still my view, against Ellic.] whose note see] for the οὖν μοι διαφέρει &c. De Wette and others think that the parenthesis ends at λαμβάνει, and the construction is resumed from ἀπὸ δὲ &c. in an active instead of in a passive form: but it seems better, with Meyer, to regard the parenthesis as never formally closed, and the original construction not resumed. Other ways are: (1) most of the Greek Fathers (Chrys. hardly says enough for this to be inferred as his opinion), and others (e. g. Olsh., Rückert) take ἀπὸ as belonging to διαφέρει, as if it were περὶ: so Thl., οὐδεμια μοι φροντὶς περὶ τῶν δοκοῦντων, &c. The preposition seems capable, if not exactly of this interpretation, of one very nearly akin to it, as in βλέπειτε ἀπὸ and the like expressions: but the objection is, that it is unnatural to join διαφέρει with ἀπὸ which lies so far from it, when ὅποιος ποτε ήσαν. so completely fills up the construction.

(2) Homberg (Parerg. p. 275: Meyer) renders,—"ab illis vero, qui videntur esse aliquid, non differo." But as Meyer remarks, though διαφέρει ἀπὸ τινος may bear this meaning, certainly διαφέρει μοι ἀπὸ τινος cannot. (3) Hermann assumes an aposiopesis, and understands "what should I fear?" but an aposiopesis seems out of place in a passage which does not rise above the fervour of narrative. See other interpretations in Meyer and De Wette.

οἱ δοκοῦντες, εἰναι τι may be either subjective ('those who believe themselves to be something'), or objective ('those who have the estimation of being something'). The latter is obviously the meaning here. ποτε is understood by some to mean 'once,' οὖν: 'whatever they once were, when Christ was on earth.' so vulg. ('quales aliquando fuirint'), Pelag., Luth., Beza, al. But this is going out of the context, and unnecessary. The emphasis is on μοι, and is again taken up by the ἐμοὶ γὰρ below. Phrynichus (p. 384) condemns τίνι διαφέρει as not used by the best writers, but Lobek (note, ibid.) has produced examples of it, as well as of the more approved construction τί διαφέρει, from Xenophon, Plato, and Aristotle.


7. for ἰδοτες, eidotes C f 17 al Oe-txt, eidotes m n.

πεπίστ. (for construction see reff. Acts and 1 Cor. and other examples in Winer, Gram., § 39. a) has the emphasis: they saw that I was (lit. am) the state being one still abiding) entrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision, as Peter with that of the circumcision; therefore they had only to accede to the appointment of God.

τής ἀκροβ. ] i. e. belonging to, addressed to, the uncircumcised (οὐ τὰ πρόγνατα λέγων αὐτά, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἄπτων γνωριζόμενα ἑθν, Chrys.). Peter was not the Apostle of the circumcision only, for he had opened the door to the Gentiles (Acts x., to which he refers, ib. xv. 7), but in the ultimate assignment of the apostolic work, he walked less among the Gentiles and more among the Jews than Paul: see 1 Pet. 1, and note. But his own Epistles are sufficient testimonies that, in his hands at least, the Gospel of the circumcision did not differ in any essential point from that of the uncircumcision. Cf., as an interesting trait on the other side, Col. iv. 11.

8. Parallelistic explanation of πεπίστευμα κ.τ.λ. 

Πέτρος and ιωάννης with which the Lord accompanied His word spoken by them, and to the power with which they spoke that word. The agent in ἐνεργεῖ εἰς τὴν πεπίστευμα, is καί ἡ ὑπομνήμασα. — God,—the Father: see Cor. xii. 6; Phil. ii. 13; Rom. xv. 15, 16. 

cf. Acts i. 20. 11. ου τῶν πνευμάτων as if you were reading it naturally. His use of the object in the same sentence shows his meaning: the word, not the sense, is meant. He thus differentiates between the word and its power. The power of the word appears in the power of the intermediary in receiving it: the power of the grace is seen in the power of the Word: the power of the Word is the power to believe: the power to believe is the operation of the Holy Spirit.
11. rec (for κηφᾶς) πέτρος, with DFKL read demid goth Chr Thl Ec Tert: petrus
celphas fuld: txt ABCHN 17. 67̅2 vulg Syr syr-marg coptt Clem(in Ens) Chron Damasc Pelag Ambrost.

John xiii. 29, where remarkably enough it is the same word which precedes ἢν. . . .
toίς πτωχοῖς ἰνα τι δῆ. The construction is complete without supplying any participle (ἀπόστολος or παρακαλοῦντες), depending upon ἐδωκαν. ὃ καὶ ἔστ. ἀυτῷ τ. ποι.] which was the very thing that I also was anxious to do,—viz, then and always: it was my habit. So that ἐσπούδασα has not a pluperfect sense. He uses the singular, because the plural could not correctly be predicated of the whole time to which the verb refers: for he parted from Barnabas shortly after the council in Acts xv. Meyer understands ἐσπούδασα. of the time subsequent to the council only: but this does not seem necessary.
The proofs of this σπουδῆς on his part may be found, Rom. xv. 25—27; I Cor. xvi. 1—4; 2 Cor. viii. ix.; Acts xxiv. 17: which, though they probably happened after the date of our Epistle, yet shewed the bent of his habitual wishes on this point. ἀυτῷ τότε is not merely redundant, as in ἦς ἐλεν το θυγατρόν ἁνῆς πνεύμα ἀκάθαρτον, Mark vii. 25,—but is an emphatic repetition of that to which δ refers, as in the version above. So that ὃ εστ. ἄυτῳ τότε ποι. = καὶ ἔστ. πό τ. ἄυτῳ τότε ποι. Cf. Thuc. i. 10.—Αὐθινάιον δ ή τ. ἄυτῳ τότε παθήτων. Cf. Ellicot's note. [11—17.] He further proves his independence, by relating how he rebuked Peter for temporizing at Antioch. This proof goes further than any before: not only was he not taught originally by the Apostles,—not only did they impart nothing to him, rather tolerating his view and recognizing his mission,—but he on one occasion stood aloof from and reprimanded the chief of them for conduct unworthy the Gospel: thus setting his own Apostleship in opposition to Peter, for the time.

11. ὅτε δὲ ἥλθ. ] This visit of Peter to Antioch, not related in the Acts, will fall most naturally (for our narrative follows the order of time) in the period described, Acts xv. 35, seeing that (ver. 13) Barnabas also was there. See below. 

Κηφᾶς] ἡ ἴστορα παρὰ Κλήμεντι κατὰ τὴν ἐπί−
πτιν τῶν ὑποτάσσων, ἐν ἡ καὶ Κηφᾶ, 
περὶ αὐτούς δὲ Παύλου ὁ Τιτσίας ἢ Κ. 
εἰς Ἀντ. κατ. πρ. αὐτ. ἀντιτέστην, ἐνα 
φηλο ἅγιο ἤν ἐν θησαυρῷ καὶ ἐν 
ἵμωννον Πέτρω τούχαντα τέ 

ἀποστόλῳ. Eus. H. E. i. 12. This story was manifestly invented to save the credit of St. Peter. See below. 

κατὰ πρὸς−

ωπὸν] to the face,—see ref. : not 'before all,' which is asserted by and by, ver. 14. One of the most curious instances of ecle-

siastical ingenuity on record has been af-

forded in the interpretation of this passage by the fathers. They try to make it ap-

pear that the reproof was only an apparent one—that δ θεῖος Πέτρος was entirely in the right, and Paul withstood him, κατὰ πρὸς−

ωπὸν, 'in appearance merely,' be-

cause he had been blamed by others. So Chrys.: so Thudtr. also: and Jerome,— 

"Paulus . . . nova asus est arte pugnandi, 

ut dispensationem Petri, qua Judaeos sal-

vari cepisset, nova ipse contradictionis dispensatione corrigeret, et resisteret ci in 

facie, non arguens propositum, sed quasi 

in publico contradicere, ut ex eo quod 

Paulus cum arguens resistebat, hi qui cre-

diderant e gentibus servarentur." In Ep. 

ad Gal. ad loc. This view of his met with 

strong opposition from Augustine, who 

writes to him, nobly and worthily, Ep. 

40. 3, vol. II. p. 155, ed. Migne: "In ex-

positione quoque Ep. Pauli ad Gal., in-

venimus aliquid, quod nos multum mo-

veat. Si enim ad Spiritus sanctas ad-

missa fuerint velut officiosa mendacia, 

quid in eis remanebit auctoritas? Quæ 

tandem de Spirituris illis sententia pro-

feretur, cujus pondere contentiose falsi-

tatis obstatur improbitas? Statim enim 

ut profereris: si alter sapit qui contra 

nitor, dictet illo quod prolatum erit 

honesto aliquid officio scriptorum fuisse 

mentitum. Ubi enim hoc non poterit, si 

potuit in ea narratione, quam exorsus 

Apostolus ait, Qua autem scribo vobis, 

ecce coram Deo quia non mentior, credi 

affirmarumque mentitus, ex loco ubi dixit 

depetro et Barnaba, cum viderem, quia 

non recte ingrediatur ad veritatem Evan-

gelii? Si enim recte illi ingrediebantur, 

iste mentitus est: si autem ibi mentitus 

est, ubi verum dixit? Cur ibi verum dix-

isse videbatur, ubi hoc dixerit quod lector 

sapt; cum vero contra sensum lectoris 

aliquid occurrit, officioso mendacio de-

putabitur . . . . Quare arripit, obsecro te, 

ingenuam et vere Christianam cum cari-

tate scervatatem, ad illud opus corrigen-

dum et emendandum, et ψαλινθιαν, ut 

C
12 πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθὼν τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου μετὰ τῶν ἀδερφῶν ἑνών συνήσθεν ὅτε ἦλθον, ὡς ἡπείτε συνιέναι καὶ ἀφ' ὥσιν ἐκείνους, φοβοῦμεν τοὺς ἐκ περιτῶν, καὶ καὶ μνημείῳ.

13 οὐνισκοίρθωσαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποί Ἰουδαίοι, ὥστε καὶ

12. ηδένευ 31018 εν κ Ορίγ (ἐλθόντος ἰακώβου), venisset D-lat G-lat some ms of vulg: txt ACD2-HKl rel vs gr-lat-f, venissent am(with fuld F-lat), venirent vulg-ed (and demid).

13. om 2nd καὶ B 672 vulg(and F-lat) cop goth.


12. The times ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου have been softened by some Commentators into persons who merely gave themselves out as from James (Winer, &c. and even Ellisott, edn. 2), or who merely came from Jerusalem where James presided (Beza, Grot., Olsb., &c.). But the candid reader will I think at once recognize in the words a mission from James (so Thl., &c., Estius [doubtfully], Rückert, Meyer, De W.); and will find no difficulty in believing that it was that Apostle, even after the decision of the council regarding the Gentile converts, may have retained (characteristically, see his recommendation to St. Paul, in Acts xxii. 18 if?) his strict view of the duties of Jewish converts,—for that is perhaps all that the present passage requires. And this mission may have been for the very purpose of admonishing the Jewish converts of their obligations, from which the Gentiles were free. Thus we have no occasion to assume (with De W.) that James had in the council been over-persuaded by the earnestness and eloquence of Paul, and had afterwards undergone a reaction: for his course will be consistent throughout. And my view seems to me to be confirmed by his own words, Acts xv. 19, where the emphatic τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπιστρέφουσιν tacitly implies, that the Jews would be bound as before. 

υστάτες As he had done, Acts x., on the prompting of a heavenly vision; and himself defended it, Acts xi. See below.

ὑπάσταλεν as well as ἀφορίζειν, governs εὐθέσιν: withdrew himself. So Polyb. i. 16. 10, ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἱέρων, ὑποστελάς εὐθές ὑπὸ τὴν Ῥωμαίων σκέπα, and al. freq. The imperfects express that this was more cases than one where he did this—it was the course he took. 

φοβούμενος being afraid of Chrys., to bear out his interpretation of the whole incident, says, οὐ τότε φοβοῦμεν, μὴ κινδυνεύον δὲ γὰρ ἐν ἀρχῇ μὴ φοβεῖτε (witness his denial of his Lord). πολλὰ μᾶλλον τὸτε ἀλλὰ Μὴ ἀποστασάσθων. εἰπέ καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει Γαλάταις, φοβοῦμαι ὡμᾶς μὴ πως εἰκῆ κεκοπίακη κ.τ.λ. And so Piscean, Grot., Estius, al. The whole incident is remarkably characteristic of Peter—ever the first to recognize, and the first to draw back from, great principles and truths: see this very ably enlarged on in Jowett’s note on ver. 11.

13. συν- 

υπεκρ.] were guilty of like hypocrisy. The word is not (as De W.) too strong a one to describe their conduct. They were aware of the liberty in Christ which allowed them to eat with Gentiles, and had practised it: and now, being still aware of it, and not convinced to the contrary, from mere fear of man they adopted a contrary course. The case here
Baronius a synapthxh aiuton tij upokrissi. 14 al' q Rom. xii. 16. 3 Pet. iii. 17 only. Exod. xiv. 6 only. const. John iii. 16 only. see Winer.

'three words as above. But he who was of the circumcision, whose leader we should have naturally supposed him to have been. 2]

Also, as portraying the state of indecision in which all, except St. Paul, even including Barnabas, were in reference to the observance of the Jewish law." Jowett.

14. θροπατειν apparently not occurring elsewhere, its meaning must be got from cognate words. We have ἀπριμον θροπατειν, Anthol. ix. 11, θροπατειν, Arist. Eth. End. iii. 2, and θροματιον, θροπατημον, &c.: to walk straight is therefore undoubtedly its import, and metaphorically (cf. περιπατειν, στοιχειον frequently in Paul), to behave uprightly. προς It is best, with Meyer, to take ἄλληθα as in ver. 5, and render, connecting prois with θροπαταδωσιν, towards (with a view to) maintaining and propagating the truth (objectively, the unadulterated character) of the Gospel. Others (cf. ειτ. al.) render prois 'with reference to,' (according to, E.V.), and take τ. ἀληθ.'τ. ειτ. to mean 'the truth (fulness of character) required by the Gospel.' Mey. remarks, that St. Paul does not express ειτωs after verbs of motion by prois, but by κατα, cf. Rom. viii. 4; xiv. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 3. Ellie, however answers, that in all these instances, περιπατειν, St. Paul's favourite verb of moral motion, is used, and that θροπατησιω does not so plainly express motion as περιπατειν. Still, I prefer the former meaning, as better suiting the expression ἀληθες τ. εισγγ.: cf. ver. 5. ειμη πατερ: 'before the church assembled.' The words require this, and the reproof would otherwise have fallen short of its desired effect on the Jewish converts. The speech which follows and which I believe to extend to the end of the chapter, must be regarded as a compendium of what was said, and a free report of it, as we find in the narratives by St. Paul himself of his conversion. See below. If thou, being (by birth, originally, cf. Acts xvi. 20 and note) a Jew, livest (as thy usual habit. As Neander [Phil. u. Lett. p. 114] remarks, these words show that Peter had long been himself convinced of the truth on this matter, and lived according to it: see further on ver. 18 as a Gentile (how, is shown by μετα των ιθνων σωφρινειν
above) and not as a Jew, how (is it that
[refl.]) thou art compelling the Gentiles
(i.e. virtually and ultimately) for the
high authority of Peter and Barnabas
would make the Gentile converts view
their course as necessary to all Christians.
There is no need, with De W. and Wie-
seler, to suppose that the tivtes dvo 'lak.
actually compelled the Gentile converts
to Judaize, as necessary to salvation, and
Peter uphold them: nor is there any
difficulty in the expression: the present
may mean, as it often does, 'art com-
peiling to the best of thy power,' 'doing
thy part to compel,'—for such certainly
would be the ultimate result, if Jews and
Gentiles might not company together in
social life—"his principle logically
involved this, or his influence and example
would be likely to effect it." Jowett) to
Judaize (observe the ceremonial law)?

15. Some (Calv., Beza, Grot., Her-
man, al.) think that the speech ends with
ver. 14: Calv., al., with ver. 15: Luther,
al., with ver. 16: Flatt, Neander,
al., with ver. 18: Jowett: that the
conversation gradually passes off into
the general subject of the Epistle.
"Ver.
11," he says, "is the answer of St. Paul
to St. Peter: what follows, is more like
the Apostle musing or arguing with him-
self, with an indirect reference to the
Galatians." But it seems very unnatural
to place any break before the end of the
chapter. The Apostle recurs to the Gal-
taians again with ἀνύστοι Γαλαταῖς, ch.
iii. 1: and it is harsh in the extreme to
suppose him to pass from his speech to
Peter into an address to them with so
little indication of the transition. I there-
fore regard the speech (which doubtless
is freely reported, and gives the bear-
ing of what was said, or the words them-
selves, as in Acts xxii. and xxvi.) as
continuing to the end of the chapter, as do
Chr., Thrd., Jer., Est., Beng., Rosenm.,
Winer, Rückert, Usteri, Olsh., B.-Cru.,
Meyer, Do W. We (thou and I) by
nature (birth) Jews and not sinners from
among the Gentiles (he is speaking to
Peter from the common ground of their
Judaism, and using [ironically?] Judaistic
language, in which the Gentiles were
θεοί, ἄνωμοι, ἄδικοι, ἀμαρτωλοὶ [refl.]
The putting a comma after ἀθέων, and
taking ἀμαρτωλοί with τῆς φύσ. οὐδ.
[Prim. in Est., Elsner, Er.-Schmid, al.],
'We, by birth Jews, and, though not
from the Gentiles, yet sinners,' is ab-
surd, knowing nevertheless (this seems,
against Ellie. ed. 2, the proper force of ἰς
here, and is the same in sense as his
"but as we know," but clearer) that a
man is not justified by (as the ground
of justification: see Ellie.” note on the
sense of ἐν) the works of the law (not,
'by works of law,' or 'on the score of
duly done' [Peile]: this, though follow-
ing as an inference, and a generalization
of the axiom, was not in question here.
The works of the law,' just as 'the faith
of Jesus Christ; the genitives in both
cases being objective—the works which
have the law [ceremonial and moral] for
their object,—which are wrought to ful-
fill their object,—which is to be realized
in Jesus Christ for its object,—which is re-
posed in or on Him. On δικαιος, see
note, Rom. i. 17),—(supply, nor is any
man justified, and see refl.) except by
(as the medium of justification. Ellie.
oberves that two constructions seem to be
mixed—οὐ δικ. ἄνωθ. ζῇ ἔργ. ν., and οὐ
dik. ἄνωθ. εἰς μ. διὰ τ. Χ. εἰς μ. ἐν
this elliptical construction is not else-
where found: but εἰ μ. repeatedly [refl.].
The εἰν seems to remove further off.
hypothesis, which arises in the mind of the two being united) the faith of (see above) Jesus Christ,—we also (as well as the Gentile sinners, q. d., casting aside our legal trust) believed (reft.) on Christ Jesus (notice 'Iσσρ. χρ. above, χρ. Ισσρ. here. This is not arbitrary. In the general proposition above, 'Iσσρ. χρ., as the name of Him on whom faith is to be exercised; here, when Jews receive Him as their Messiah, χρ. Ισσρ., as bringing that Messiahship into prominence. Perhaps, however, such considerations are but precarious. For example, in this case, the readings are in some confusion. It may be remarked, that the Codex Sinaiticus agrees throughout with our text) that we might be justified by (this time, faith is the ground) the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: because (it is an axiom in our theology that) by the works of the law shall all flesh find no justification (Angl.: 'shall no flesh be justified?' our language not admitting of the logical form of the Greek; but by this transposition of the negative, the sense is not accurately rendered). There is a difference between Commentators in the arrangement of the foregoing sentence. Meyer follows Lachmann in placing a period after χριστόν, and understanding ἐγέμνην at Ισσρ. or ἀμαρτωλόν. Boza, Hermann, Rückert, Usteri, Eilicott, al., begin a new sentence at εἰδότες δὲ, also understanding ἐγέμνην. But it seems much better, as above (with De W., al.), to carry on the sentence throughout. Meyer's objection, that thus it would not represent the matter of fact, for Peter and Paul were not converted as εἰδότες κ.τ.λ., would apply equally to his own arrangement, for they were not converted ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν κ.τ.λ. [17.] Continues the argument. But if, seeking (put first for emphasis—in the course of our earnest endeavour) to be justified in Christ (as the element—the Body, comprehending us the members. This is last sight of by rendering 'through Christ'), we ourselves also (you and I, addressed to Peter) were found to be sinners (as we should be, if we regarded the keeping of the law as necessary; for we should be just in the situation of those Gentiles who in the Judaistic view are ἀμαρτωλοί, faith having failed in obtaining righteousness for us, and we having cast aside the law which we were bound to keep), is therefore Christ the minister of sin (i.e. are we to admit the consequence which would in that case be inevitable, that Christ, having failed to obtain for his own the righteousness which is by faith, has left them sinners, and so has done all His work only to minister to a state of sin)? Whether we read ἀρα or ἃρα matters little; either will express the meaning, but the latter more pungently than the former. The clause must be interrogative, as μή γένοιτο always follows a question in St. Paul; see reft. Those who would take ἃρα for ἃρα ὑδ [μα. can it ever be so taken, in spite of Matthiow (Gr. Gr., § 64), Winer (comm. h. l., but not in Gr. ed. 6, § 57. 2, where he allows the translation given above), Monk (on Eur. Alcest. 535), and Porson (pref. to Hee. p. x)?] seem to me to miss altogether the fine irony of the question, which, as it stands, presupposes the ἃρα ὑδ question already asked, the inevitable answer given, and now puts the result, 'Can we believe, are we to hold henceforth, such a consequence?' The same might be said of all the passages alleged by the above scholars in support of their view. Theoloret expresses well the argument: εἰ δὲ ὅτι τῶν νόμων καταπληκτές τῷ χριστῷ προσελθόμενοι, διὰ τῆς ἐπιλογεῖς αὐτῶν πίστεως τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἀπολύσασθαι προσδιορισθῆς, παραδίδοσιν τὸν νομοματισμόν, εἰς αὐτῶν ἡ αἰτία χωρίες τῶν δεσποτῶν χριστῶν αὐτῶς γὰρ ἢν τὴν
properly appre¬
chised by me, was my
saidogwos to Christ: and in Christ, who
filleth the law, I died to the law: i. e.
satisfied the law’s requirements, and
passed out of its pale: the dative, as Ellic.
marks, is a sort of dativus commodi, as
also in "in teo) that I should live to God
(the end of Christ’s work, life unto God.
£usow is I aer. subj. in subordina-
to the aer. preceding: not fut., as stated in
former edd. See Ellic.). Many of the Fathers
(some as an alternative), Luther, Bengel,
al., take the first vTos here to mean the
Gospel (the vTos of the pneumatos of tis
notated of Rom. viii. 2): but it will be manifest
to any who follow the argument, that this
cannot be so. This dia vTou tov avpeda¬
yn has in fact a compendium of his ex¬
anded experience in Rom. vii.: and also,
his argument in ch. iii. iv. below. 20.
I am (and have been; perf.) crucified
with Christ (specification of the foregoing
avpedanov: the way in which I died to the
law was, by being united to, and involved
in the death of, that Body of Christ
which was crucified): but it is no longer
I that live, but (it is) Christ that liveth
in me (the punctuation—xrp. avpedanw¬
mai, to dei oikieti avv, to dei ev avr. xrp.,
as in E. V., &c. is altogether wrong, and
would require άλλα before oikieti. The
construction is one not without example,
where the emphatic word is repeated in
two parallel clauses, each time with δε.
Thus Ew. Inf. Taur. 1307, phileis δε κα
ου τον καιρόντον, θεά philein δε καί
tovs δημιουργος δόκει: Xen. Cyr. vii. 2.
22, ένα πολὺς μοι οίνος, πολλα δε σύκα,
pol òl έλαυν, βάλακτα δε προκλάνειν.
So that our second δε is not fendi¬
— not I, but;—but abr, as the first—q. d. but
the life is not mine, but the life is
Christ’s within me.” Notice, not δέ εν
φωλ χρp.: Christ is the vine, we the
branches: He lives, He, the same Christ,
through and in every one of His believing
people)—but (taken up again, parallel with καὶ... ὥστε... γὰρ... τό... ταῖστοι... ὡστε... δευτέρων... ἀπὸ... τοῦ... θεοῦ... εἰ... γὰρ... διὰ... νόμου... ἐκκαθίσμου... ἀρὰ... χριστοῦ)... (from ch. v.), with CD3KL rel vulg syr goth ath arm Ath Cyr, Thdtr, Damaso: on AD1F 17.1, 67.2 fuld Syrr coppt Orig (in Jer) Chr, Cyr, Thdtr, lat-ff. ree a προεγγραφή ins ev wmos, with DFKL rel vulg syr goth Ath Chr 'Thdtr' Damaso lat-ff: on ABCN 17.1 am (with tol F-lat) Syr coppt ath arm Cyr, Thdtr, Eus-int Archel Aug.

CHAP. III. 1. rec aft ἐβάσκανεν add τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πειθεθα (from ch v., 7), with CD3KL rel vulg syr goth ath arm Ath Cyr, Thdtr, Damaso: on AD1F 17.1, 67.2 fuld Syrr coppt Orig (in Jer) Chr, Cyr, Thdtr, lat-ff. ree a προεγγραφή ins ev wmos, with DFKL rel vulg syr goth Ath Chr 'Thdtr' Damaso lat-ff: on ABCN 17.1 am (with tol F-lat) Syr coppt ath arm Cyr, Thdtr, Eus-int Archel Aug.

CHAP. III. 1.—V. 12.] second, or polemical part of the epistle. 1. The Apostle exclaims indignantly, moved by the fervour and truth of his rebuke of Peter, against the folly of the Galatians, for suffering themselves to be bewitched out of their former vivid apprehension of Christ's work and Person. — ἀνύτοτα must not, with Jer., be taken as an allusion to any supposed national stupidity of the Galatians (Wetst. on ch. i. 6, cites from Theopistus a very different description: οἱ ἄνδρες... ἡμεῖς κ. ἄνθρωποι. κ. ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ; it merely springs out of the occasion; see ref. Luke. ὡς has the emphasis—'you, to whom,' &c. ἐβάσκανεν] Not with Chr. al., 'enrived,' in which sense the verb usually takes a dative: so Thom. Mag., basakian, οὐ μόνον ἀντὶ τοῦ φθονοῦ, ὅτε πρὸς δοκιμὴν συνάττεσται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ μέμφρου κ. διάβαλλον παρὰ τὸν παίλιον ἑτορίᾳ, κ. συνάττεσται πρὸς αἰτιακὴν (not always, cf. Sir. xiv. 6); but, as E. V. bewitched,—fascinated; so Aristot. Probl. xx. 34, διὰ τὸ τὸ πάγανον βασακίαν φανή φαρμακον εἶναι; δὴ διὸς βασικάνθαι δοκιμὴς λάβομεν ἐστινοτό... ἐπειξάγον γοῦν, ὅταν τῆς αὐτῆς τραπέζης τῇ ἑδυ τῇ προσφέροντες, μεταβέβαιοντες, ὡς μὴ βασακίας μὲν.' κατ' ἀθὰτ.) openly.—before your eyes: so τινά σοι κατ' ὑμάς, Aristoph. Ran. 625; κατ' ἑμάς, Eur. Androm. 1010, κριντὸς καταστάς, ὡς ἐν ἑμῖν ἔλθων μάχης; προεγγράφη was described before, as in ref. It has been variously explained, (1) 'depicted before you.' So (Ecc., Thl. (Chrys.?), Erasm., Luth., Calv., Winer, Rückert, Jowett, &c. But προεξόφληθαν cannot be shown to have any such meaning; nor [see below] is it required [as Jow.] by the context. (2) 'cum scripserit est.' so Estins, Emsler, Beugel, al. But this, although an allowable meaning (τῆς δικής προέγραψεν αὐτῆς, διὰ πένθου...
2. "μαθεῖν" before "θηλων" D13 F.

οἰκοβείειν, Plut. Camill. 11), would not suit εν υμιν (see below). (3) "proscriptus est?" So Vulg., Amb., Aug., Lyra. (προσγραφεῖν αὐτοὺς φυγάδας, Polyb. xxxii. 21. 12; οἱ προσγραφαμένοι, ib. 22. 1) But this is quite irrelevant to the context. It is best therefore to keep to St. Paul's own meaning of προσγραφεῖν, and understand it to refer to the time when he preached Christ among them, which he represents as a previous description in writing of Christ, in their hearts and before their eyes. Jerome, Hermann, al., understand it as above, "οἷν scripturis est," interpreting it, however, of the prophecies of the O. T. But not to mention that no prophecy sets Him forth as ἐσταυρωμένος, the whole passage (cf. vv. 2—5) evidently refers to the time when the Apostle preached among them. (See more in De W. and Meyer, from whom the above is mainly taken.) [The εν υμιν of the rec. could hardly belong to ἐσταυρωμένος; for if so, it would more naturally be ἐσταυρ. εν υμιν, the emphasis, as it now stands, being on εν υμιν: but it must belong to προσγραφή, as above, and as in 2 Cor. iii. 2,—"in animis vestris." So Mey. Among the various meanings proposed,—"among you" (E. V., &c., De W., Rück.), "on account of you" (Kopp, but wrongly, see ch. i. 24, note)—Luther's is the most remarkable: "iam non solum abjecistis gratiam Dei, non solum Christus frustra vos mortuos est, sed turpinisse in vobis crucifixus est. Ad cum modum loquitor et Epistola ad Ebr. vi. 6: denuo crucifigentes sibimetipsi filium Dei, &c." This again is condemned by the context, and indeed by the οὐρ. προσγραφήν.] ἐσταυρωμένος, as expressing the whole mystery of redemption by grace, and of freedom from legal obligation. 'It has an echo of συνεσταυρωμα in ch. ii. 20.' Jowett. 2. τ. μοῦν,—not to mention all the other grounds on which I might rest my argument, 'this only,' &c. διὰ συντόμων λόγου κ. ταχτής ἁπάθειας ομάς πεινα ἑαυτούμας. Chr. μαθεῖν, be informed; not to be pressed, as Luther, al. ("Agite nunc, respondete nihil discipulo vestro, tam subito enim facti estis docti, ut ne jam sitis praecessores et doctores"), but taken in its ordinary sense, see ref. Did ye from (as its ground, see ch. ii. 16) the works of the Law (not a Law) receive the Spirit (evidently here to be taken as including all His gifts, spiritual and external: not as Chr., Thl., Jer., χάρισματα only: for the two are distinguished in ver. 5), or from the hearing of faith (meaning either, 'that preaching which proclaimed faith,' or 'that hearing, which received (the) faith.') The first is preferable, because (1) where their first receiving the Gospel is in question, the preaching of it would probably be hinted at, as it is indeed taken up by the ouv below, ver. 5: (2) where the question is concerning the power of faith as contrasted with the works of the law, faith would most likely be subjective. But certainly we must not understand it 'obedience [στατικ. Rom. i. 5; xvi. 26. See 1 Kings xv. 22] to the faith,' as Wahl, al., which would spoil the contrast here? 3.] Are ye so (to such an extent, emph.) foolish (as viz. the following fact would prove)? Having begun (see Phil. i. 6, where the same two verbs occur together, and 2 Cor. viii. 6, where προσενέργατο is followed by ἐπιτελέσθη. Understand, 'the Christian life') in the Spirit (dative of the manner in which, reff. The Spirit, i.e. the Holy Spirit, guiding and ruling the spiritual life, as the 'essence and active principle' [Ellie.] of Christianity,—contrasted with the flesh,—the element in which the law worked), are ye now being completed (passive here, not mid., cf. Phil. i. 6, where the active is used: and for the passive, Luke xiii. 32. The middle does not appear to occur in the N. T., though it does in classical Greek, e. g. Polyb. ii. 58. 10, μηθὲν ἄσβεσ ἐπιτελεσθομένοι. Diod. Sic. xii. 54, μεγάλας πράξεις ἐπιτελεσθομένοι in (dative, as above) the flesh? 4.] Did ye suffer (not, 'have ye suffered,' as almost all Commentators, E. V., &c.,—i. e. πένωνθατε, Heb. ii. 18; Luke xiii. 2) so many things in vain? There is much controversy about the meaning. (1) Chrys., Aug., and the ancients, Grot., Wolf, Rück, Olsh., &c., understand it of the sufferings
5. aft vnom ins (see ver 2) to pneuma elabete L.

6. kaiwos yeraptaai Epistesuves akr. F.

which the Galatians underwent at the time of their reception of the Gospel. And, I believe, rightly. For (a) παθών occurs (see reff.) seven times in St. Paul, and always in the strict sense of 'suffering,' by persecution, or hardship (similarly in Heb., 1 Pet., &c.): (b) the historic aorist here marks the reference to be to some definite time. Now the time referred to by the context is that of their conversion to the Gospel, cf. το πν. ἐλαβετε, εἰρήφθησον πνευματι above. Therefore the meaning is, Did ye undergo all those sufferings (not specially mentioned in this Epistle, but which every convert to Christ must have undergone as a matter of course) in vain (Schomer first, and after him many, and Winer, B.-Crus., De Wette, understand παθών here in a good sense, in reference to divine grace bestowed on them. But παθών seems never to be thus used in Greek without an indication in the context of such a meaning, e.g. εἰ παθών, or as in Jos. Antt. iii. 15. 1, ἄρα παθόντες ἐξ αὐτοῦ κ. πτηκών ἐνεργησιών μεταλαβόντες, where the added clause defines the παθόντες; and never in N. T., LXX nor Apocrypha at all. (3) Bengel refers it to their patience with Paul [πατητισισμενεις περιληπισιστικε ρε]; but this, as Meyer remarks, would be expressed by ἀνέχειν, hardly by παθοῦν. (4) Meyer, to the troubles of their bondage introduced by the false and Judaizing teachers. But not to dwell on other objections, it is decisive against this, (a) that it would thus be present, παθέτη βε [see ch. iv. 10], not past at all, and (b) that even if it might be past, it must be the perfect and not the aorist. I therefore hold to (1); οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τοῦ νόμου ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ χριστοῦ τὰ πάθημα, Thurt. : πάντα γὰρ ἐκείνα, φησιν, ἅπερ ἐμείναιν, ζημιώσωμεν ὑμᾶς οὖν θελούντα, κ. τὸν στεφανὸν ὑμῶν ἀρπάζαι. Chrys. [So Ellie. ed. 2.] When Meyer says that this meaning is γαν ἐντίθητι ψεν Κατεύθυντα, he is surely speaking at random: see above. [Ellie. ed. 1 took ἑπάθητε in a neutral sense, as applied to both persecutions and blessings, and nearly so Jowett: 'Had ye all these experiences in vain?' objecting to (1) that it is unlike the whole spirit of the Apostle. But we find surely a trace of the same spirit in Phil. i. 29, 30; as there suffering is repre-

sented as a special grace from Christ, so here it might well be said, 'let not such grace have been received in vain!') 5) if it be really in vain (on εἰ γὰρ πν., see note on 2 Cor. v. 3: the construction is, 'if, as it must be, what I have said, εἰρήνη, is really the fact.' The Commentators all take it as a supposition,—some, as Chr., &c., E. V., 'in vain, or imperfect, still spoken of the time when he was with them? Chrys., Thurt., &c., and Bengel, al, maintain the latter: Luth., Calv., Rück., Meyer, De W., &c., the former. It seems to me, that this question must be settled by first determining who is the agent here spoken of. Is it the Apostle? or is it not rather God, and is not this indicated by the reference to Abraham's faith in the next verse, and the taking up the passive ἐλασθήβα by δικαιο ὁ Θεός (ἐπικ.) in ver. 8? 'If it be so, then the particulars here must be taken as present, but indefinite, in a substantive sense (Winer), as ὁ διάκονος ἡμᾶς ποτε, ch. i. 23. And certainly God alone can be said (and so in ref. 2 Cor.) εἰρήνη ἐπεμενεῖκ το πνεύμα, and ἐνεργείας (ch. ii. 5) δυνάμεις ὑμῖν (see below). ἐπικ.) The ἐπί does not imply addition, but as so often with prepositions of motion in construction, the direction of the supply: see notes on Acts xxvii. 7; Rom. viii. 16. δυνάμεις here, not merely miracles or χαράγματα, though those are included: nor is εἰρήνη, 'among you,' but δυν. are the wonders wrought by divine Power in you (cf. θεός ὁ ἐνεργός τὰ πάντα ἐν πνεύμα, 1 Cor. xii. 6. θεός γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐνεργός ὑμῖν τὸ θέλειν κ.τ.λ. Phil. ii. 13. Eph. ii. 2; also Matt. xiv. 2), viz. at your conversion and since. Ξ ἐργ. (supply does He it) in consequence of ("as the originating or moving cause," Ellie.) the works of the law, or in consequence of the hearing (see above, ver. 2) of faith! 6—9. Abraham's faith was his entrance into righteou-


ness before God: and Scripture, in recording this, records also God’s promise to him, by virtue of which all the faithful inherit his blessing. 6. The reply to the foregoing question is understood: it is εἰς άκοής πίστεως. And then enters the thought of God’s energies as following upon Abraham’s faith. The fact of justification being now introduced, whereas before the επιχορηγεῖν τὸ πνεύμα was the matter enquired of, is no real departure from the subject, for both these belong to the εἰρήματα of ver. 3,—are concomitant, and inseparable. On the verse, see note, Rom. iv. 3. 7. γινώσκει is better taken indicatively, with Jer., Ambr., Beza, Rück., al., than imperatively, with most Commentators (and Mey., De W., Olsh., Ellic.). It is no objection to the indicative that such knowledge could not well be predicated of the Galatians: it is not so predicated, but is here set before them as a thing which they ought to be acquainted with—from this then you know (q. d., ‘omnibus patet.’) The imperative seems to me to lose the fine edge of the Apostle’s argumentative irony: besides the usage of that mood with ἐπα is not frequent: indeed apparently not to be found in Homer; cf. ii. κ. 219; o. 522. See on the other side, Ellicott’s note here).

οἱ ἐκ πίστεως] see Rom. ii. 8; iii. 26, and notes, those who are of faith, as the origin and the καρφωθην of their spiritual life. οὕτωι emphatic; these, and these only (see Rom. viii. 14), not οἱ εἰς ἐργον. Chrys. says οὐκ οἱ τὴν φυσικὴν ἔχοντες πρὸς αὐτὸν συγγενεῖαν: but this point is not here raised: besides, they might be, as well as others, if they were ἐκ πίστεως, see Rom. iv. 16.

vīoι Αβρά.] see Rom. iv. 11—17, and notes. 8.] But (transitional [see Ellicott’s note]) the Scripture (as we say, Nature: meaning, the Author of the Scripture; see ref!) foreseeing (Schöttgen, Hor. Hebr. i. 732, gives examples of ‘quid vidiit Scriptura?’ and the like, as common sayings among the Jews) that of faith (emphatic,—‘and not of works’) God justifieth (present, not merely as Mey., De W., al., because the time foreseen was regarded as present, nor ‘respectu Pauli scribentis,’ as Bengel,—but because it was God’s one way of justification—He never justified in any other way—so that it is the normal present, q. d. ‘is a God that justifieth’) the Gentiles (observe, there is no stress here on τὰ ἑθνῶν,—it is not ἐκ πίστεως καὶ τὰ ἑθνῶν δικαίον ὑμᾶς: so that, as is remarked above, no question is raised between the carnal and spiritual seed of Abraham,—nor, as Bengel, ‘δὲ υμων τας ἑγερίας την ἴνα αὐτὸν καταμαθήνεις’; the question is between those who were ἐκ πίστεως, and those who wanted to return to the ἔργα νόμου, whether Jews or Gentiles. So that in fact τὰ ἑθνῶν must be here taken in its widest sense, as in the Abrahamic promise soon to be quoted) announced the good news beforehand (the word is found only in Philo, and in this sense: ἔσπερα τε καὶ προκει, ὡς ἡ μὲν προεγγελίζεται μέλικον ἦν ἵππον ἵππον, de Mundi Opif. § 9, vol. i. p. 7, and de mut. nom. § 29, p. 602, δς (viz. δ νεωτός) τοὺς ταρσοὺς διάσηκε φιλεῖ, τὴν ἐλπίδα τοῦ πέπτεσα διψόμεναι προεγγελίζεσθαι) to Abraham: (ὅτι: recitative) In thee (not, ‘in thy seed,’ which is a point not here raised; but strictly in thee, as followers of thy faith, it having first shown the way to justification before God. That the words will bear that other reference, does not show that it must be introduced here) shall all the Gentiles (see above; not to be restricted with Meyer, al., to its narrower sense, but expressing, from Gen. xviii. 18; xxii. 18, in a form suitting better the Apostle’s present argument, the πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς of Gen. xii. 3) be blessed. 9.] Consequence of ἐνευλογηθῆσονται above, substantiated
10. rec om ατι, with Kl. relvgl syrr Chr Thdrt: ins ABCDFN 17 arm Cyr Damascus. enγεγραμμένοις Β.

11. om τω bef θεω DIF.

12. αλλα DIX. rec aft αντα ins ανθρωπος, with DIF Kl rel: om Λ(apply) BCDIFN 17. 672 latv syrvt αθεν arm Meion-c Chr Cyr Damascus Ambrest Aug Jer. eν αντω Π. (not F-lat.)

by ver. 10 below. A share in Abraham’s blessing must be the accomplishment of his faith, not of works of the law.

πίστεως has the emphasis. συν, to show their community with him in the blessing: τό πιστεία, to show wherein the community consists, viz. FAITH.

[10.] substantiation of ver. 9: they ζε εργον νόμων cannot be sharers in the blessing, for they are accursed; it being understood that they do not and cannot εμιμενεν εν πασιν δε.; see this expanded in Rom. iii. 9—20. The citation is freely from the LXX. On τον ποιησα, not a Hebraism, but a construction common in later Greek, see Ellic.’s note.

[11, 12.] ‘contain a perfect syllogism, so that δό δικαίος εκ πιστεύς ζησεται is the major proposition, ver. 12 the minor, and εν νόμων δικαιοσυνα. δικαιοσυνα της θεος the consequence.’ Meyer. It is inserted to strengthen the inference of the former verse, by showing that not even a man keep the law, would he be justified—the condition of justification, as revealed in Scripture, being that by faith. But (= moreover) that in (not merely the elemental in, but the conditional as well: εν in and by: not ‘through’) the law no man is justified (the normal present: is, in God’s order of things) with God (not emphatic as Bengel, ‘quicquid sit apud homines;’ this would require δικαιοσυνα παρά του θεου δικαιοσυνα: but δικαιοσυνα παρά του θεου is simply predicated of δικαιοσυνα) is evident, for (it is written, that) the just by faith shall live (not ‘the just shall live by his faith,’ as Winer, De W., al. The order of the words would indeed suggest this rendering, seeing that δό εκ π. δ. θεος would properly represent the other: but we must regard St. Paul’s logical use of the citation: and I think, with Meyer, that he has abstained from altering the order of the words as being well known. He is not seeking to show by what the righteous shall live, but the ground itself of that righteousness which shall issue in life; and the contrast is between δό δικαιοσυνα εκ πιστεως and δό δικαιοσυνα αντων. [It is right to say that Ellic. (both edd.) prefers the other rendering, and supports it by the fact that the original Hebrew will not bear this one, and that St. Paul adopts the words of the LXX as they stand; and by the contrast between ζησεται εκ πιστεως, and ζησεται εν αντων.] Jowett doubts whether ζησεται could be used absolutely: but see Heb. xii. 9. I still however prefer rendering as above. The construction desired by Bp. Middleton to suit our rendering,—δό δικαιοσυνα εκ π.,—would stultify the sentence, by bringing into view other δικαιοσυναι, who were not εκ πιστεως: but (logical, introducing the minor of the syllogism: see above) the law (not ‘law, as such,’ Pelle: no such consideration appears here, nor any where, except in so far as the law of Moses is treated of as possessing the qualities of law in general) is not of (does not spring from nor belong to: ‘non agit fidei partes,’ Beng.) faith: but (i.e. KJR (its nature is such that) he who has done them (viz. πιστευσα τα προστάγματα μον κ. π.‘)
13. see (for στι γεγρ. γεγρ. γαρ, with D'KLN έλτσς) co-ordinate Iren.-gr Did Chr Cyr Tholdt: text ABCDF 17 lat. Eus. Damase Irex-int Jer Ambrst Hil Aug.

14. ἑπαγγέλλων D'F k Tert Ambrst Vig. (not F-lat.)

τὰ κρίματα τούτου μον. of Levit. xviii. 5, shall live in (conditional element) them (see Rom. x. 5). 13.] But this curse has been removed by the redemption of Christ. The joyful contrast is introduced abruptly, without any connecting particle: see an asyndeton in a similar case in Col. iii. 4. The ήμας is emphatic, and applies solely to the Jews. They only were under the curse of ver. 10,—and they being by Christ redeemed from that curse, the blessing of Abraham (justification by faith), which was always destined by God to flow through the Jews to the Gentiles, was set at liberty thus to flow out to the Gentiles. This, which is Meyer's view, is certainly the only one which suits the context. To make ήμας refer to Jews and Gentiles, and refer ἡ κατ. τού τοῦ, to the law of conscience, is to break up the context altogether. ἐγγύον. See, besides ref., 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23; 2 Pet. ii. 1; Rev. v. 9. Elliptic remarks, 'the ελ. need not be very strongly pressed, see Polyb. iii. 42. 2. εὐχάριστος ὑπὸ τοῦ δοκίμου θεοῦ, abstract, to express that he became not only accursed, but the curse, coextensive with the disability which afflicted us) for us (the Jews again. Not, as many older Commentators, and Rück., Oehler, Pelcz, &c., 'instead of us,' but 'on our behalf.' It was in our stead; but that circumstance is not expressed by ἐν αὐτῷ of Christ's death for us—see ref. and Eli'c.'s note; and Usteri, Paulin, Lehrbegriff, p. 115 if). ὅτι γέγραπται. is a parenthesis, justifying the formal expression γέγραπται. The implication omits the words οὐδὲ θεός of the LXX. They were not to the point here, being understood as matter of course, the law being God's law. The article ὅ does not in the LXX. The words are spoken of hanging after death by stoning; and are given in I. c. as a reason why the body should not remain on the tree all night, because one hanging on a tree is accursed of God. Such formal curse then extended to Christ, who died by hanging on a tree.

14.] In order that (the intent of γέγραπται) the blessing of Abraham (promised to Abraham: i.e. justification by faith; ver. 9) might be (come) upon the Gentiles (not, all nations, but strictly the Gentiles; see above on ver. 13) in (and by, conditional element) Jesus the Christ, that (ἵνα, parallel with, not dependent on and included in, the former ἵνα: for this clause has no longer to do with τα γεγραμμένα, see below. We have a second ἵνα co-ordinate with a first in Rom. viii. 13; 2 Cor. ix. 3; Eph. vi. 19, 20 we (not emphatic, nor is ἥνεκ) expressed: no longer the Jews, as Beza and Bengel, but all Christians; see Jowett's note, which perhaps is too finely drawn) might receive (in full, as fulfilled, nor) through the (or, but not so usually, our) faith (as the subjective medium: but rendered objective by the article, as so often by St. Paul: no stress on διά τ. π.) the promise of the Spirit (viz. that made Joel ii. 28. See Acts ii. 17, 33; Luke xxiv. 49—the promise of the new covenant). The genitive τοῦ πνεύματος, is objective, —the Spirit being the thing promised. But let us guard tiros against the old absurdity, "ἐπαγγέλλομαι τοῦ πνεύματος πρὸ τοῦ πνεύμα τοῦ ἐπιγγελμένου," which would destroy, here and every where else, the logical form of the sentence. This 'receiving the promise of the Spirit' distinctly refers back to ver. 2, where he asked them whether they received the
Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? "Here is a pause, at which the indignant feeling of the Apostle softens, and he begins the new train of thought which follows with words of milder character, and proceeds more quietly with his argument."—Windschmann. 

15—16. But what if the law, coming after the Abrahamic promise, abrogated that promise? These verses contain the refutation of such an objection: the promise was not abrogated by the law.

15. ti esti kat' andro. legous; e' e' androph'ounov paradoigmaton. Chr. But (see 1 Cor. xvi. 32) the expression refers not only to the character of the example chosen, but to the temporary standing-point of him who speaks: I put myself for the time on a level with ordinary men in the world. e*ai is out of its logical place, which would be after oeddels; see on ref. 1 Cor. To make it "even" and take it with androph'oun, is contrary to its usage. A (mere) man's covenant (not 'testament,' as Oshl., after Aug., al.; for there is here no introduction of that idea: the promise spoken to Abraham was strictly a covenant, and designated diathke in the passages which were now in the Apostle's mind, see Gen. xv. 18; xvii. 7. On the general meaning, see Mr. Bagge's note) when ratified (def.), no one notwithstanding (that it is merely a human covenant) sets aside or supplements (with new conditions, Jos. Antid. xvi. 9. 4 describes Arche
dus as δ εν ταίς ἐπιθυμήσεισ ὅποι τοῦ πατρὸς ἔγγεγραμένοις βασιλεῖς,—in his father's subsequent testament: and again says of Antipas, B. J. ii. 2. 3, ἀλών τῆς ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν διαθήκην εἶναι κυριωτέραν, ἐν δ' ἐνωσεν αὐτός ἐγέρσατο. Nothing is implied as to the nature of the additions, whether consistent or inconsistent with the original covenant: the simple fact that no additions are made, is enounced.

16. This verse is not, as commonly supposed, the minor proposition of the syllogism, applying to Abraham's case the general truth enounced in ver. 15: for had it been so, (1) we should certainly find ὅποι θεός contrasted with the ἀνθρώπου before, and (2) the parenthesis ὅποι λέγει... χριστὸς would be a mere irrelevant digression. This minor proposition does not follow till ver. 17. What is now said, in a parenthetical and subsidiary manner, is this: The covenant was not merely nor principally made with Abraham, but with Abraham and his seed, and that seed referred, not to the Jewish people, but to Christ. The covenant then was not fulfilled, but awaiting its fulfilment, and He to whom it was made was yet to appear, when the law was given. 

See 17 Cor. Thdrt. Damasc.) α'τ|ς σπέρματι ἵνα σου δ' αλλὰ Β.
\[\text{πον λέγω} \] to this distinction especially, and thinks that the Apostle used it as adapted to the calibre of those to whom he was writing: “Galatis, quos paulo ante stultos dixerat, factus est stultus.” The Roman-Catholic Windischmann, one of the ablest and most sensible of modern expositors, says, “Our recent masters of theology have taken up the objection, which is as old as Jerome, and forgetting that Paul knew Hebrew better than themselves, have severely blamed him for urging the singular \(\sigma\pi\rho\partial\alpha\mu\) here, and thus justifying the application to Christ, seeing that the word \(\gamma\gamma\) which occurs here in the Hebrew text, has no plural (Wind. is not accurate here: the plur. \(\gamma\gamma\) is found 1 Sam. viii. 15, in the sense of ‘grains of wheat’), and so could not be used. Yet they are good enough to assume, that Paul had no fraudulent intent, and only followed the arbitrary excesses of the Jews of his time (Rückert). The argument of the Apostle does not depend on the grammatical form, by which Paul here only puts forth his meaning in Greek,—but on this, that the Spirit of God in the promise to Abraham and the passage of Scripture relating that promise, has chosen a word which implies a collective unity, and that the promise was not given to Abraham and his children. Against the prejudice of the carnal Jews, who held that the promise applied to the plurality of them, the individual descend- ants of the Patriarch, as such,—the Apostle maintains the truth, that only the Unity, Christ, with those who are incorpored in Him, has part in the inheritance.” On these remarks I would observe, (1) that the Apostle’s argument is independent of his philology: (2) that his philological distinction must not be pressed to mean more than he himself intended by it: (3) that the collective and individual meanings of \(\sigma\pi\rho\partial\alpha\mu\) are both undoubted, and must have been evident to the Apostle himself, from what follows, ver. 29. We are now in a position to interpret the words \(\delta\varepsilon\ \iota\sigma\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\oslash\). Meyer says ‘\(\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\oslash\) is the personal Christ Jesus, not, as has been held (after Aug.), Christ and His Church.’ This remark is true, and untruc. \(\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\oslash\) certainly does not mean ‘Christ and His Church;’ but if it imports only the personal Christ Jesus, why is it not so expressed, \(\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\oslash \iota\sigma\nu\sigma\acute{\circ}\iota\sigma\acute{\circ}\sigma\acute{\circ}\) ? For the word does not here occur in pass-
the entire interval between the covenant with Abraham and the law, must be added the sojourning of the patriarchs in Canaan,—i.e. to the birth of Isaac, 25 years (Gen. xii. 4; xxii. 5), to that of Jacob, 60 more (Gen. xxvi. 28), to his going down into Egypt, 130 more (Gen. xlvi. 9); in all=215 years. So that the time really was 415 years, not 430. But in the LXX (and Samaritan Pentateuch) we read, Exod. xii. 40, ἡ δὲ κατοικίας (παροικίας, F.) τῶν ἵδε Ἰσραήλ, ἥν πασχάναις (πασχάναις, F.) ἦν τῷ Αχαῦντα καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἱσραήλ (F. adding, from the Cod. Alex., αὐτοί καὶ οἱ πάτερες αὐτῶν) ἡ ἑτέρρακτοι πρισκὰ — and this reckoning St. Paul has followed. We have instances of a similar adoption of the LXX text, in the apology of Stephen: see Acts vii. 14, and note. After all, however, the difficulty lies in the 100 years of Gen. xv. 13 and Acts vii. 6. For we may ascertain thus the period of the sojourn in Egypt: Joseph was 39 years old when Jacob came into Egypt (Gen. xlii. 47; xliii. 6): therefore he was born when Jacob was 91 (91+39=130: see gen. xliii. 9). But he was born 6 years before Jacob left Laban (compare ib. xxx. 25 with xxi. 41), having been with him 20 years (ib. xxxi. 88, 41), and served him 14 of them for his two daughters (xxxi. 41). Hence, seeing that his marriage with Rachel took place when he was 78 [91-20-7]; the marriages with Leah and Rachel being contemporaneous, and the second seven years of service occurring after, not, as I assumed in the first edition, before, the marriage with Rachel; Levi, the third son of Leah, whose first son was born after Rachel's marriage [xxix. 30-32], must have been born not earlier than Jacob's 81st year,—and consequently was about 49 [130-81] when he went down into Egypt. Now (Exod. vi. 16) Levi lived in all 137 years: i.e., about 88 [137-49] years in Egypt. But (Exod. vi. 16, 18, 20) Amram, father of Moses and Aaron, married his father Kohath's sister, Jochebed, who was therefore, as expressly stated Num. xxvi. 59, 'the daughter of Levi, whom her mother bare to Levi in Egypt.' Therefore Jochebed must have been born within 88 years after the going down into Egypt. And seeing that Moses was 80 years old at the Exodus (Exod. vii. 7),—if we call x his mother's age when he was born, we have 88+50+x as a maximum for the sojourn in Egypt, which clearly therefore cannot be 430 years, or even 400; as in the former case x would =262,—in the latter 232. If we take x =c. 47 (to which might be added in the hypothesis any time which 88 and x might have had in common) we shall have the sojourn in Egypt =215 years, which added to the previous 215, will make the required 430. Thus it will appear that the LXX, Samaritan Pent., and St. Paul, have the right chronology,—and as stated above, the difficulty lies in Gen. xv. 13 and Acts vii. 6,—and in the Hebrew text of Exod. xii. 16. 18.] See Rom. iv. 14. For if the inheritance (the general term for all the blessings promised to Abraham, as summed up in his Seed who was to inherit the land,—in other words, for the Kingdom of Christ: see 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10) is of the law (i.e. by virtue of the law, having as its ground the covenant of the law) it is no more (οὐκ ἐστὶ, as νῦν in argumentative passages, not of time, but logical—the οὐκ follows on the hypothesis) of (by virtue of) promise: but (the 'but' of a demonstration, appealing to a well-known fact) to Abraham by promise hath God granted [it] (and therefore it is not of the Law). 19-24.] The use and nature of the Law. What (ref.) then [is] the Law ('ubi audimus Legem nihil valere ad conferendum justitiam, statim obreput
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Schottgen gives numerous exainples from the Rabbinical books, in which


the name Mediator is given to Moses.—But most of the Fathers (not Thdrtr.), Bede, Lyra, Calvin, Calov., al., understand Christ to be meant: Schmieder and Schneckenburger, the Angel of the Covenant,—the Metatron. Neither of these interpretations however will hold against the above evidence. Why does the Apostle add this last clause? I am inclined to think with Meyer that it is,—not to disparage the Law in comparison with the Gospel (as Luth., Eisel., Flatt, Rück., Jowett, &c. &c.) or with the promise (Estius, Schneckenb., De Wette), but to enhance the solemnity of the giving of the law as a preparation for Christ, in answer to the somewhat disparaging question τί οὖν οἱ νόμις; If the δι’ ἀγγέλων had been here disparaging, as in Heb. ii. 2, διὰ τοῦ κυρίου or the like must have been expressed, as there, on the other side. And en χειρὶ μεσιτὸν is certainly no disparagement of the old covenant in comparison with the new, for this it has in common with the other. The fact is (see below on ver. 20), that no such comparison is in question here. 20. "The explanations of this verse, so obscure from its brevity, are so numerous (Winer counted 250: Jowett mentions 430) that they require a bibliography of their own." De Wette. I believe we shall best disentangle the sense as follows. (1) Clearly, δ μεσιτὴς and δ θεὸς are opposed. (2) As clearly, ένδο οὐκ ἐστὶν and εἰς ἐστὶν are opposed. (3) From this contrast arises an apparent opposition between the law and the promises of God, which (not alone, but as the conclusion of the whole τί οὖν to εἰς ἐστὶν) gives occasion to the question of ver. 21. Taking up therefore again (1),—δ μεσιτῆς, by whose hand the law was enacted, stands opposed to δ θεὸς, the giver of the promises. And that, in this respect (2);—(a) δ μεσιτῆς is not ένδος, but (b) δ θεὸς is εἰς. And herein lies the knot of the verse; that is, in (b),—for the meaning of (a) is pretty clear on all hands; viz. that δ μεσιτῆς (generic, so ref. Job; "quae multa sunt eunctis in unum colligendis," Hermann ad Iph. in Aul. p. 15, pref. cited by Meyer) does not belong to one party (masculine) (but to two, as going between one party and another). Then to guide us to the meaning of (b), we must remember, that the numerical contrast is the primary idea: δ μεσιτῆς belongs not to one, but δ θεός is one. Shall we then say, that all reference of εἰς (as applied to δ θεός) beyond this numerical one is to be repudiated? I cannot think so. The proposition δ θεὸς εἰς ἐστὶν would carry to the mind of every reader much more than the mere numerical unity of God—viz. His Unity as an essential attribute, extending through the whole divine Character. And thus, though the proposition δ μεσιτῆς ένδο οὐκ ἐστὶν would not, by itself, convey any meaning but that a mediator belongs to more than one, it would, when combined with δ θεὸς εἰς ἐστὶν, receive a shade of meaning which it did not bear before,—of a state of things involved in the fact of a μεσιτῆς being employed, which was not according to the ἐστὶς of God, or, so to speak, in the main track of His unchanging purpose. And thus (3), the law, administered by the μεσιτῆς, belonging to a state of εἰς εἰς, two at variance, is apparently opposed to the ἐπαγγελία, belonging entirely to δ εἰς, the one (faithful) God. And observe, that the above explanation is deduced entirely from the form of the sentence itself, and from the idea which the expression δ θεὸς εἰς ἐστὶν must necessarily raise in the mind of its reader, accustomed to the proposition as the foundation of the faith;—not from any preconceived view, to suit which the words, or emphatic arrangement, must be forced. Notice by the way, that the objection, that the Gospel too is en χειρὶ μεσιτῶν, does not apply here: for (a) there is no question here of the Gospel, but only of the promises, as direct from God: (b) the μεσιτῆς of the Gospel is altogether different, and His work different: He has absolutely reconciled the parties at variance, and made them one in Himself. Remember St. Paul's habit of insulating the matter in hand, and dealing with it irrespective of all such possible objections. To give even an analysis of the various opinions on this verse would far exceed the limits of this commentary: I will only take advantage of Meyer's long note, and of other sources, to indicate the main branches of the exegesis. (1) The Fathers, for the most part, pass lightly over it, as easy in itself,—and do not notice its pragmatic difficulty. Most of them understand by the μεσιτῆς, Christ, the mediator between God and man. In interpreting εἰς οὐκ ἐστὶν and εἰς ἐστὶν, they go in omnia alia. It may suffice to quote one or two samples. Chrys. says, τί εὖ ἐσταδάς εἰς τοιοῦ ἄρεσκες; εἰ γὰρ τὸ "μόνος ἄλη-
Deus eis estin. 21 o ovm nvmos kath tov epaggleiow

MEDIUS TERMINUS EST IN SYLLABISMO, cujus major propositio et minor expiriment, conclusio subauditur. Unus non utilius mediator illo: atqui Deus est unus. Ergo Deus non prins sine meditatore, deinde per mediatorem egit. Ergo is cujus est mediator non est unus, sed diversa a Dei, nemphe n vemos, Lec. ergo mediator Sainatics non est Dei sed legis: Dei autem, promissi, Locke (so also Michaelis); "God is but one of the parties concerned in the promise: the Gentiles and Israelites together made up the other, ver. 14. But Moses, at the giving of the law, was a mediator only between the Israelites and God: and therefore could not transact anything to the disannulling the promise, which was between God and the Israelites and Gentiles together, because God was but one of the parties to that covenant; the other, which was the Gentiles as well as Israelites, Moses appeared or transacted not for."

The older of the modern Commentators are generally quite nemo fault. I give a few of them: Grotius says, 'Etsi Christus mediator Legem Judaeos tulerit, ut ad aignitionem transgressionum adduceret, coeq ad splendit gratiae praepararet, non tamen est gentis Judaeae mediator, sed omni hominum: quemadmodum Deus unus est omnium.' Luther (1519), 'Ex nomine mediatoris concludit, nos adeo esse peccatores, ut legis opera salis esse nequenat. Si, inquit, lege justi estis, jam mediator non egretis, sed neque Deus, cum sit ipse unus, secun opiniue conveniens. Inter duos ergo quantur mediator, inter Deum et hominem: ac si dicit, impissima est ingratitudine, si mediatorem rejicisset, et Deo, qui unum est, remittitissimum, &c. Erasmus, in his paraphrase: 'Atqui conciliator, qui intercedit, inter plures intercedat oportet, non enim secun ipse disidet. Deus autem unus est, quocum dissidium erat humano generi. Princo tertio quiprim quam opus, qui natura utrinque partecaps ur quam inter sese reconciliaret, &c. Calvin, as the preferable view, 'diversitate he notari arbitor inter Judaeos et Gentiles. Non unum ergo mediator est Christus, quia diversa est conditio eorum quibussemen Deus, ipsius auspiciis, pacificat, quod ad externum persommam. Verum Paulus inde aestimandum Dei firdus negat, quasi secum pugnat, ut varium sit pro hominem diversitate.' (11) The later moderns begin to approach nearer to the philosophical and contextual requirements of the passage, but still with considerable errors and divergences. Bengel, on the first clause, 'Medius terminus est in syllabismo, cujus major propositio et minor expiriment, conclusio subauditur. Unus non utilius mediatore illo: atqui Deus est unus. Ergo Deus non prins sine mediatore, deinde per mediatorem egit. Ergo is cujus est mediator non est unus, sed diversa a Dei, nemphe n vemos, Lec. ergo mediator Sainatics non est Dei sed legis: Dei autem, promissi, Locke (so also Michaelis): "God is but one of the parties concerned in the promise: the Gentiles and Israelites together made up the other, ver. 14. But Moses, at the giving of the law, was a mediator only between the Israelites and God: and therefore could not transact anything to the disannulling the promise, which was between God and the Israelites and Gentiles together, because God was but one of the parties to that covenant; the other, which was the Gentiles as well as Israelites, Moses appeared or transacted not for."

(IV) Of the recent Commentators, Keil (Opusc. 1809—12) says: 'Mediatorem quidem non unus sed duorum certe partium esse, Deum autem qui Abrahami benefici aliquid promiserit, unum modouisse: hincique aposto leum id a lectoribus sui colligi volluste, in lege ista Mosalea pactum mutum Deum inter atque populum Israelitico mediatoris opera intercedente initium fuisse, contra vero in promissione rem ab unius tantum (Dei sc. qui solus eam dedidit) voluntate pendentem transactam, hincique legi isti nihil plane eum hac rei fuisse, adeoque nec potuisse ea novam illius promissionis implendae conditionem constitui, eoque ipso promissionem omnino tolli. And similarly Schleiermacher (in Usteri's Lehrbegriff, p. 186 ff.), but giving to ευς the sense of freedom and independence— and Meyer, only repudiating the second part of Keil's explanation from 'hincique,' as not belonging to an abstract sentence like this, but being historical, as if it had been ης, and besides contrary to the Apostle's meaning, who deduces from our verse a consequence the contrary to this ('hincique, . . . . . . . fuisse'), and obviates it by the question in ver. 21. For the numerous other recent interpretations and their refutations I must refer the reader to Meyer's note (as also to Ellicott's (in his ed. 1: see his present view in his ed. 2), who preferred Windischmann's interpretation of ευς, 'One, because He was both giver and receiver united: giver, as the Fathet;
The apparent contrariety in this way of the following explanation in the preceding context is not the ground of the whole paragraph preceding the one under consideration. The whole context, as we have seen, is the nature of the contrariety between the two verses, as if there were an insufficiency in the case, and the two verses make it clear that there is not a sufficient reason for its being so.

21. The Law is a glass of the original form of the Law, and so is the Scripture (not the Law as such, but as interpreted by the Author). The contrast here is that the Law gives an absolute standard of truth, whereas the Scripture is the expression of the mind of God. The imposing of the one against the other is not possible without a change in the very nature of the case.

22. But the contrast is that the Law gives an absolute standard of truth, whereas the Scripture is the expression of the mind of God. The imposing of the one against the other is not possible without a change in the very nature of the case.

The nature of the contrariety between the two verses is that the Law gives an absolute standard of truth, whereas the Scripture is the expression of the mind of God. The imposing of the one against the other is not possible without a change in the very nature of the case.
23. see συγκλείμενοι, with CD^{3}KL ref Clem, Cyr, Thdbt Thl Ec: txt ABD^F*EK
17 Clem, Chr, Cyr.

συγκλ. merely a declaratory sense, as Bull, Examen Censure xix. 6, 'conclusus involuntos declaravit,' al. all (neuter, as indicating the entirety of mankind and man's world: 'humana omnia,' as Jowett: cf. ref. I think against Ellie, ed. 2) that we must hold fast this under sin, in order that (the intention of God, as in Rom. xi. 32: not the mere result, here or any where else. Beware of such an assertion as Barton's quoted also by Peile: 'there here implies, not the case, but the consequence, as in many places.' This never implies any thing of the sort; nor does any one of the examples he gives bear him out) the promise (i.e. the things promised—the καταγωγα, cf. vv. 16, 18) (which is) by (depends upon, is conditioned by) faith of (which has for its object and its Giver—is a matter altogether belonging to) Jesus Christ (q.d. ἡ ἐπαγγ. ἤ κ. π.); but the article in such sentences is frequently omitted, especially where no distinction is intended between the subject and another of the kind: cf. τῆς πίστεως ἐν χρ. Ἰσχ. below, ver. 26,—τοῖς κύριοις κατά σῆμα, Eph. vi. 5, &c. The words εκ πίστ. cannot well be taken with δοθῆ without harshness, especially as ἵσθος χριστου intervenes, and τοῖς πιστεύουσι is already expressed. Besides, in this case they would most naturally come first, — ἵσθος εκ πίστεως τ. χρ. ἤ ἐπαγγ. δοθῆ τ. π. might be given (be a free gift—δοθῆ has the emphasis) to them that believe (δοθῆ having the emphasis, τοῖς πιστ. does no more than take up εκ πίστ. above; q.d. 'to those who fulfil that condition').

28. But (δὲ) carries us on to a further account of the rationale and office of the law. "When the noun, to which the particle is attached, is preceded by a preposition, and perhaps the article as well, δὲ may stand the third or fourth word in the sentence. So εἰ τοῖς πρώτοι δὲ Ἀρπάγαν, Thuc. i. 6; οὐχ ὢν ἐπαγγ. δὲ, Plat. Phadr. 227 d, &c." Hartung, Partikell. i. 190) before (this) faith (not, the faith, in the sense of the objects of faith, but the faith just mentioned, viz. πίστις ἵσθος χρ., which did not exist until Christ) came (was found, or was possible, in men: cf. ref, where however it is more entirely subjective), we (properly, we Jewish believers—but not here to be pressed, because he is speaking of the divine dealings with men generally—the Law was for τὰ πάντα, the only revelation) were kept in ward (not simply 'kept' as E. V., but as Chrys., ἤπειρον εἰς τειχῶν τινι,—though not as he proceeds, τὸ φόβῳ κατεχόμενοι—for, as above, our objective state is here treated of: see Rom. vii. 6. But we must not yet, with Chrys., al. introduce the παθητικός, or understand ἀφρωδόν, as conveying the idea of 'safely kept' [οὕτω ἐπερ. δηλουτός ἑστιν, ἦ τιν ἐκ τῶν ἐντολῶν τοῦ νόμου οὐκ οὐκ ἀνθρώπων τῶν οὐκ ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρώπων: συγκλείμενοι is quite against this, and the pedagogic figure does not enter till the next verse, springing out of the preparation implicit in εἰς, joined to the fact of our sonship, see below. Our present verse answers to ch. iv. 2, where we find ἤπειρον καὶ οἰκονωμόν, not the παθητικός. See Jowett's beautiful illustration), shut up under the law, in order to (εἰς of the preparatory design, not merely of the result, or the arrival of the time: and it may belong either to συγκλείμα. [not to συγκλείμενον, if that be read, as that would beok the act completed when the Law was given,) or to the imperfect ἄφουρομενή the faith (as in ver. 22) about to be revealed (on the order of the words see on ref. Rom. "As long as there was no such thing as faith in Christ, this faith was not yet revealed, was as yet an element of life hidden in the counsel of God," Meyer). 24. So that (taking up the condition in which the last verse left us, and adding to it the fact that we are the sons of God, cf. γαρ, ver. 20) the Law has become (has turned out to be) our tutor (pedagogue, see below) unto (ethically; for) Christ (the παθητικός was a faithful slave, entrusted with the care of the boy from his tender years till puberty, to keep him from evil physical and moral, and accompany him to his amusements and studies. See Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antt. sub voce. The E. V. 'schoolmaster' does not express the mean-
ing fully; but it disturbs the sense less than those have done, who have selected one portion only of the pedagogue's duty, and understood by it, 'the slave who leads a child to the house of the schoolmaster' [ον υπ' αυτοις δειδακασθαι προσφερει το διδασκοντος χριστων, Thdt.]: so also Th.: see Suicer, σχολ. 2], thus making Christ the schoolmaster, which is inconsistent with the imagery. On the contrary, the whole schoolmaster's work is included in the παιδαγωγος, and Christ represents the ἀλεθερία of the grown-up son, in which he is no longer guarded or shut up, but justified by faith, the act of a free man; and to Christ as a Teacher there is here no allusion, in order that by faith we might be justified (which could only be done when Christ had come): but (adversative) now that the faith (see above) has come, we are no longer under a tutor (pedagogue). 26. Reason of the negation in last verse. For ye all (Jews and Gentiles alike) are sons (no longer παιδες, requiring a παιδαγωγος) of God by means of the (or, but not so well, your) faith in Christ Jesus (some [Usteri, Windisch., al.] would join ἐν χρ. 'ινης. with υπι αυτοις δειδακασθαι, but most unnaturally,—and unnecessarily, for the idea of ἐν χρ. 'ινης. in that case has been already given by δι' της πιστεως. The omission of της before ἐν will stagger no one: see Col. 1. 4, where the same expression occurs). 27. For (substantiates and explains the assertion of ver. 26; see below) as many of you as were baptized into (see Rom. vi. 3 and notes) Christ, put on Christ (at that time, compare the aorists in Acts xix. 2: not "have been baptized," and "have put on," as E. V., which leaves the two actions only concomitant: the aorists make them identical: as many as were baptized into Christ, did, in that very act, put on, cloth yourselves with, Christ: see Ellicot's note). The force of the argument is well given by Chrys.: τινος ἐκεῖν ὁ δικαιος, ὁσιος γὰρ εἰς χριστων εἰμαι πίστεως, ἔνα ἐκ πίστεως δι' εἰς καὶ ἐκ τῆς πιστεως ὑποκάτωσαν. 25 εἰς πιστιν υποκάτωσαν. 26 πάντες γὰρ ὑποκάτωσαν καὶ ἐκ τῆς πιστεως εἰς χριστων Ἰουδαίων καὶ ἐκ ναύαρσάν εἰς ἐλληνικα ὁ δικαιος. 14. Eph. iv. 24. Col. iii. 10. Ps. cxix. 9. Luke xi. 4. m and see Rom. i. 16. 24. For γεγονεν, εγερετο B Clem., F-lat. Ambrst. 26. aet ισαιν ης Ντ: but marked for erasure by Ντ or Ν-corr. 28. For 2nd and τον, δι' και λεγετ, (not D-lat.) aft χρ. ins ισονοι D1 (and lat) F fulld (and
IV. 1 "\(\text{α}e\) \(\text{λ}d\) \(\text{γ}\), \(\text{ε}\) \(\text{π}\) \(\text{δ}\) \(\text{ε}\), \(\text{α}\) \(\text{π}\) \(\text{δ}\) \(\text{ε}\) \(\text{ν}\) \(\text{ο}\) \(\text{δ}\).
\(\text{kληρονύμος}\).

\(\text{κληρονύμος}\)
2 ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ ἀποτρόπους ἐστῖν καὶ οἰκονομοὺς ἀχοὶ τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός. 3 οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ὤτε ἡμεῖς νῦν ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἔδοξολοι· 4 οὕτε ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαποτελεί θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενομένον ἐκ γυναίκος.

3. for ἡμεῖς, mea Dem. 17. 4. for 1st γενομ., γενομένων κ.: γενομένων K al.: γενομένων a de f g (26 others and correctors of 4 more in Reiche) aeth Clem-ms Eus Ath., Thr drt., Damascus, uim, (with demid tol harl) Iren-lat, Cyr. rxt ABCDILKN rel syrr copth goth Clem Orig. Eus Ath., Ps-Ath Method Cyr-Jer Chr Cyr., Thdr., fectum latt Iren-lat3, Test Victorin Hil.

IV. 1—4. ΠΡΟΣ ΓΑΛΑΤΑΣ.

2 ἀποτρόπους ἐστῖν καὶ οἰκονομοὺς ἀχοὶ τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός. 3 οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ὤτε ἡμεῖς νῦν ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἔδοξολοι· 4 οὕτε ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαποτελεί θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενομένον ἐκ γυναίκος.

2. ἐπιτρόπους, overseers of the person; guardians: οἰκονομοῦσα, overseers of the property, stewards. See Ell-cott's and Bagge's notes. προθεσμία, the time (previously) appointed. The word (an adjective used substantively: σιλ. ημέρα or ὥρα. See for the classical meaning, 'the time allowed to elapse before bringing an action,' Smith's Dict. of Antt. sub voce) is a common one: Wetst. gives many examples. The following clearly explain it: δρίσια προθεσμία, ἐν ἡλικίᾳ κυρίες βασιλέων, Polyæn., p. 597.—ὲκ δὲ τῆς ὁμοίως τῶν ἀνθώπων χρόνος εἰκοσατέτηθη ἡ . . . τὴν δὲ τῶν ὑ. ἐτῶν προθεσμίαν ἐκπληρῶσαν, Plut. ad Apollon. ii. 113 e. It is no objection to the view that the father is dead, that the time was fixed by law (Hebrew as well as Greek and Roman): nor on the other hand any proof of it, that προθεσμία will hardly apply to a living man's arrangement: see on the whole, above.

3. ἡμεῖς—are Jews only here included, or Jews and Gentiles? Clearly, both: for ἡμείς τ. νόμος, ἀπολαμβάνων is spoken of all believers in Christ. He regards the Jews as, for this purpose, including all mankind (see note on ch. iii. 23), God's only positive dealings by revelation being with them—and the Gentiles as partakers both in their infant-discipline, and in their emancipation in Christ. ὅτε ἡμεῖς νῆσον refers, not to any immaturity of capacity in us, but to the lifetime of the church, as regarded in the προθεσμία τοῦ πατρός: see below on ver. 4. τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου] Aug. interprets this physically, of the worship of the elements of nature by the Gentiles: Chrys., Thdrt., al., of the Jewish new moons and sabbaths: Neander (Pil. n. Leit, p. 370), of a religion of sense as opposed to that of the spirit. But it is more natural to take στοιχεία in its simpler meaning, that of letters or symbols of the alphabet, and τοῦ κόσμου not in its worst sense, but as in Heb. ix. 1, ἄγων κοσμίων,—belonging to the unspiritual outer world. Thus (as in ref. Col.) the words will mean, the elementary lessons of outward things (as Conybeare has rendered it in his note: 'outward ordinances,' in his text, is not so good). Of this kind were all the enactments peculiar to the Law; some of which are expressly named, ver. 10. See στοιχεία well discussed in Ellicott's note; and some useful remarks in Jowett, in loc.

Meyer prefers taking ἡμεῖς and διευλαμβανόμενοι separate: 'we were under the elements of the world, enslaved,' as answering better to ἐν ἀποτρόπους ἐστιν above.

4. τὸ πλήρωμα τ. χρόνου (that whereby the time was filled up): see note on Eph. i. 23,—Fritzsche's note on Rom. xi. 12, and Stier's, Eph. i. p. 199 ff. for a discussion of the meanings of πλήρωμα answers to the προθεσμία τ. πατρός, ver. 2: see ref. The Apostle uses this term with regard not only to the absolute will of God, but to the preparations which were made for the Redeemer on this earth: partly as Thr., ὅτε πάν ἐνοῦς κακίας διεξειλέσθη ἡ φωνή ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη ἐδεικτόθη ἑδύτω θεαπαία, partly as Bengel, "σας εἰτινν εἰείλεισ εἰτετάκε." The manifestation of man's guilt was complete,—and the way of the Lord was prepared, by various courses of action which He had brought about by men as his instruments. ἐξαποτελ. cannot,—however little, for the purposes of the present argument, the divine side of our Lord's mission is to be pressed,—mean any thing less than sent forth from Himself (ref.): γενομένοι, ἐκ γενομένων, will not bear being pressed, as Calv., Grot., Estius, al., have done ("discernere Christum a reliquis voluit hominibus; quia ex semine matris creatus sit, non viri et mulieris coitu,"
6. aft wov add του θεου

Dauf (with [besides F-lat] demiud hal tol) goth lat-flf (not Aug).

Calv.) it is Christ's HUMANITY which is the point insisted on, not His being born of a virgin. On the other hand, the words cannot for an instant be adduced as inconsistently with such birth: they state generically, what all Christians are, able, from the Gospel record, to fill up specifically.

'γενώμενον υπὸ νόμου' 'born of a woman,' identified Him with all mankind: born under (the idea of motion conveyed by the accusative after εν is accounted for by the transition implied in 'γενώμενον) the law, introduces another condition, in virtue of which He became the Redeemer of those who were under a special revelation and covenant. A Gentile could not (humanly speaking, as far as God has conditioned His own proceedings) have saved the world: for the Jews were the representative nation, to which the representative man must belong. 'γενώμενον is both times emphatic, and therefore not to be here rendered 'legi subjectum,' as Luther, 'untr das Θεος getan.'

5. See above. Christ, being born under the law, a Jewish child, subject to its ordinances, by His perfect fulfilment of it, and by enduring, as the Head and in the interest of our nature, its curse on the tree, bought off (from its curse and power, but see on ch. iii. 13) those who were under the law: and if them, then the rest of mankind, whose nature He had upon Him. Thus in buying off τουν υπὸ νόμου, He is affected that ἐγένετο, all men. τὴν νοθεσίαν ἀπόλαβον—should receive (not 'recover,' as Aug., al. and Jowett ['receive back']): there is no allusion to the innocence which we lost in Adam, nor was redemption by Christ in any sense a recovery of the state before the fall, but a far more glorious thing, the bestowal of an adoption which Adam never had. Nor is it, as Chrys., καλὸς εἶπεν, ἀπόλαβον, δεινὸς ὤφει λιμῷν: it is true, it was the subject of promise, but it is the mere act of reception, not how or why it was received, which is here put forward. Nor again, with Rückert and Schott, must we render ἀπὸ—'therefrom,' as a fruit of the redemption. This again it is, but it is not expressed in the word the adoption (the place, and privileges) of sons. The word νοθεσία occurs only in the N. T. In Herod. vi. 57 we have θετων παιδα παι.
the foregoing, he has changed from the first person to the second in the foregoing verse, so now from the second: both times from the fervour of his heart, wavering between logical accuracy and generous largeness of sympathy, crying (in Rom. vii. 15, it is εὐ and κραξεῖν. Here the Spirit being the main subject, is regarded as the agent, and the believer merely as His organ) Abba Father. ὁ πατὴρ is not a mere Greek explanation of Ἄββα, but an address by His name of relation, of Him to whom the term Ἄββα was used more as a token of affection than as conveying its real meaning of "my father!" see notes on Mark xiv. 36, Rom. viii. 15. Aug. gives a fanciful reason for the repetition: "Eléganter antem intelligitur non frustra diversum linguaram verba posissent ideam significantiam propter universum populum, qui de Judaeis et de Gentilibus in unitatem fidei vocatus est: ut Hebreorum verbum ad Judaeos, Graecum ad gentes, utrisque tamen verbi eadem significatio ad ejusdem fidei spiritusque unitatem pertinent." And so Luther, Calvin, and Bengel. 7.] Statement of the conclusion from the foregoing, and corroboration, from it, of ch. iii. 29. The second person singular individualizes and points home the inference. Meyer remarks that this individualization has been gradually proceeding from ver. 5—ἀπολέσθων. 8. ἕστε. 9. ἐπὶ θεοῦ. The rec. θεοῦ ἐπὶ χριστοῦ seems to have been an adaptation to the similar passage, Rom. viii. 17. On the text, Windischmann remarks, "ἐπὶ θεοῦ combines, on behalf of our race, the whole before-mentioned agency of the Blessed Trinity: the Father has sent the Son and the Spirit, the Son has freed us from the law, the Spirit has completed our sonship; and thus the redeemed are heirs through the triune God Himself, not through the law, nor through fleshly descent." 8—11. ] Appeal to them, as the result of the conclusion just arrived at, why, having passed out of slavery into freedom, they were now going back again. 8.] τότε refers back for its time, not to ver. 3, as Windischmann, but to ὠδητί εἰς δούλους, ver. 7. In τοῖς εἰς ἄν. θ. there is no inconsistency with Rom. i. 21: there it is the knowledge which the Gentile world might have had: here, the matter of fact is alleged, that they had it not. τοῖς φύσει μὴ ὄνυν θ.] to gods, which by nature exist not: see 1 Cor. viii. 4; x. 19, 20 and note. The rec. would be, "to those which are not by nature gods," i.e. only made into gods by human fancy: but this is not the Apostle's way of conceiving of the heathen deities. Meyer compares 2 Chron. xxii. 9, ἐγένετο εἰς λεπά τῷ μὴ ὄντι θεῷ. Notice μη—giving the Apostle's judgment of their non-existence—and see 2 Cor. v. 21 note, where however I cannot hold with Ellie, that μη γνώται expresses 'God's judgment' (?). 9.] "The distinction which Olsh. attempts to set up between εἰδήσει as the mere outward, and γνώσει as the inner knowledge, is mere arbitrary fiction: see John vii. 26, 27; viii. 55; 2 Cor. v. 16." Meyer. μᾶλλον διὰ γν. ὑπ. θ. ] See note on 1 Cor. viii. 3. Here the propriety
of the expression is even more strikingly manifest than there: the Galatians did not so much acquire the knowledge of God, as they were taken into knowledge, recognized, by Him,—προσληψθήσετε ὑπὸ θεοῦ, Thl.: οὖν γὰρ ὡς κακοὶ περετέε τῶν θεῶν... αὐτός δὲ ὡς ἐπεστάσατο, Chrys. And this made their fall from Him the more matter of indignant appeal, as being a resistance of His will respecting them. No change of the meaning of γνωσθ. must be resorted to, as 'approved,' 'loved' (Grot., al.: see others in De W. and Mey.): cf. Matt. xxv. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 19. Cf. also Phil. iii. 12. πῶς; how is it that...? see ref. ἄνθρ. so the πρὸςγουσα ἐντολή is called in Heb. viii. 18, ἀνθρεῖς κ. ἀνωφέλεσ. Want of power to justify is that to which the word points here. πτωχ. in contrast with the riches which are in Christ. Or both words may perhaps refer back to the state of childhood hinted at in ver. 6, during which the heir is ἀνθενίς, as immature, and πτωχός, as not yet in possession. But this would not strictly apply to the elements as the Gentiles were concerned with them: see below. On στοιχία, see note, ver. 3.

πάλιν] These Galatians had never been Jews before; but they had been before under the στοιχία τοῦ κόσμου, under which generic term both Jewish and Gentile cultus was comprised: so that they were turning back again to these elements. ἄνωθεν] from the beginning,—afresh; not a repetition of πάλιν: Mey. quotes πάλιν ἐξ ἄρχως, Barnab. Ep. 16, p. 773 Migne: and Weitzstein gives, from Plautus, Cas. Proel. 33, 'rursum denso.' θέλετα, as in E. V., ye desire: but if thus expressed here by our translators, why not also in John v. 10, where it is still more emphatic?

10.] The affirmative form seems best, as (see Ellic.) supplying a verification of the charge just brought against them interrogatively: explaining τίς τῶν δόξας τῶν ὑπόθεν, Thdt. Wishing to show to them in its most contemptible light the unworthiness of their decadence, he puts the observation of days in the fore-
12 Γίνεσθε ώς ἐγώ, ὦτε κἀγὼ ὃς ὑμεῖς, ἀδελφοί, δέομαι ὑμῶν. οὖδὲν με ἡδικήσατε. 13 οἴδατε ὦτι ὦτι ἰσθένειαν

law shewed, by the fact of their periodical repetition, the imperfection of the dispensation to which they belonged: typical of each feature of Christ's work, which, as one great and perfect whole, has been performed once for all and for ever,—and were material representations of those spiritual truths which the spiritual Israel learn in union with Christ as a risen Lord. To observe periods then, now in the fulness of time, is to deny the perfection of the Christian dispensation, the complete and finished nature of Christ's work: to forsake Him as the great spiritual teacher of His brethren, and to return to carnal pedagogues: to throw aside sonship in all its fulness, and the spirit of adoption: and to return to childhood and the rule of tutors and governors." Bagge: who however elsewhere maintains the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath. 11.] There is no attraction in the construction (φοβ. ὑμᾶς, μὴ ποιῶ ...) as Winer (comm. in loc.) holds: in that case ὑμεῖς must be the subject of the next clause (so in Diod. Sic. iv. 40 [Meyer], τὸν ἀδελφὸν εὐλαβεῖσθαι, μὴ ποτὲ ... ἐπιθύμησι τῇ βασιλείᾳ): but φοβ. ὑμᾶς stands alone, and the following clause explains it. So Soph. Ξελ. Τύρ. 760, διδοῖς ἐμαντὼν ... μὴ πόλλ᾽ ἔχαν εἰρήμεν ἡ μοί. The indicative assumes the fact which μὴ ποιῶ deprecates:—see ref. 12—16.] Appeal to them to imitate him, on the ground of their former love and renovation for him. 12.] This has been variously understood. But the only rendering which seems to answer the requirements of the construction and the context, is that which understands εἰμί or γέγονα after ἐγώ, and refers it to the Apostle having in his own practice cast off Jewish habits and become as the Galatians: i.e. a Gentile: see 1 Cor. ix. 20, 21. And so Winer, Neander, Fritz., De W., Meyer, Jowett (alt.), &c. (2) Chrys., Thdrt., Thl., Erasm.-par., &c., regard it as said to Jewish believers, and explain,—ποιῶν ἐγὼν πάλαι τῶν ἔκλον σφόδρα τῶν νόμων ἐπέθυναν ἀλλ᾽ ὀρατό πῶς μεταβεβλημαι. ταῦτην τοιοῦτι καὶ ὑμεῖς ξηλώσατε τῆς μεταβολῆς (Thdrt.). But this to Meyer rightly objects, that ἤμι, which would in this case have to be supplied, must have been expressed, as being emphatic, and cites from Justin ad Graecos, c. 2, where however I cannot find it, γίνεσθαι ὡς ἔγω, ὦτε κἀγὼ ἦμιν ὡς ὑμεῖς. (3) Jerome, Erasm.-not., Corn.-a-lap., Estius, Michaelis, Rücker, Olsh., ... as also I have accommodated myself to you.' But thus the second member of the sentence will not answer to the first. (4) Luther, Beza, Calvin, Grot., Bengel, Morus, Peile, al., would understand it, 'love me, as I love you' ("acipicte hane mean objurgationem co animo quo vos oljargavī: sit in nobis is affectus erga me, qui est in me erga vos," Luth.). But nothing has been said of a want of love: and certainly had this been meant, it would have been more plainly expressed. The words ἀδελφοί, δέομαι ὑμῖν are by Chrys., Thdrt., al., Luther, Koppe, al., joined to the following: but wrongly, for there is no διέγραψιν in what follows. οὖδὲν με ἡδικήσατε] The key to rightly understanding these words is, their apposition with εξουθενήσατε, ... εξετάσατε ... εὐθανασία below. To that period they refer: viz. to the time when he first preached the Gospel among them, and the first introduction of this period seems to be in the words, ὦτι κἀγὼ ὡς ὑμεῖς. Then I became as you: and at that time you did me no wrong, but on the contrary showed me all sympathy and reverence. Then comes in the inference, put in the form of a question, at ver. 16,—I must then have since become your enemy by telling you the truth. The other explanations seem all more or less beside the purpose: διὰ λοιπὸν ὅτι οὐ μισοῦσ, οὔτε ἔχασα ἢν τὰ εἰρήμενα ... Chrys., and similarly Thl., Aug., Pel., Luth., Calv. (‘non exandescendo mea causâ, nec quod vobis sim infensus’), Estius, Winer, al., which would be irreverent, and indeed preposterous without some introduction after the affection of the foregoing words: ‘ye have done me no wrong,’ i.e. ‘ex animo omnia condonabat si resipiscerentur,’ Beza: so Bengel, Rückert, al.,—which is refuted by the aorist ἡδικήσατε, of some definite time. The same is true of ‘ye have wronged not me but yourselves’ (Ambr., Corn.-a-lap., Schött.), ‘... not me, but God, or Christ’ (Grot. al.). 13.] δι’ ἀνθέναι τῆς σαρκός can surely bear but one rendering,—on account of bodily weakness: all others (e.g. ‘in weakness,’ as E. V., μετὰ ἀνθέναις, as Ec., Thl., ‘per infirmitatem,’ as vulg., Luth., Beza, Grot., Estius, Jowett [comparing Phil. i. 15, where see note], ‘during a period of sickness,’ as Mr. Bagge) are ungrammatical, or irrelevant, as ‘on account of the infirmity of (your) flesh’ (Jer., Estius, Hig., Rettig), which would require some qualifying adverb such as οὕτως with εἰρήμενα, and would be-
13. om δὲ DIF goth Damascus Aug. om της F α.
14. rec (for μετά) του, with DKL rel syr Ch Thdrτ Damascus οἰκ. τοι N 3 m Syr goth arm Ιασ Τθδ: txt ABDFE 17. G7(Bch) latt copt Τυρ κατ f, μον τον Τ C2, (C3 illegible.) om ευκ N 1: ins Ν- cor1 obl. [αλλά, so B F ]
15. rec (for τοι) τις, with DKL rel syr goth ανατ-ρησ Θοδ-μος Thdr Τ οἰκ, Augus, Ambriœ: txt ABCFR 17. 67ξ vulg Syr syr-marg copt arm Damascus Jer Pelag Bade, ("το τις αντι Του ποι τεθεικ") Chr Thdrτ rec aft ουν ins νερ, with DK vss Chr: το F: futi aut est G-lat; εστιν αι, vulg Jer Sechnl; νυν αι: om ABCCLN m o 17. 67ξ

side by side wholly out of place in an Epistle in which he is recalling them to the substance of his first preaching. The meaning then will be, that it was on account of an illness that he first preached in Galatia: i.e. that he was for that reason detained there, and preached, which otherwise he would not have done. On this, see Prologeneumena, § ii. 3: the fact itself, I cannot help thinking, is plainly asserted here. Beware of conjectural emendation, such as δι' ἀσθένειας of Peirce, for which there is neither warrant nor need.

το πρότερον may mean 'former,' but is more probably the first time,' with reference to that second visit hinted at before, ver. 16, and ch. v. 21. See Prologeneumena, § v. 3. 14.] I had in some former editions retained the rec., feeling persuaded that out of it the other readings have arisen. The whole tenor of the passage seeming to shew that the Apostle's weakness was spoken of as a trial to the Galatians, μον appeared to have been altered to μον, — or to have been omitted by some who could not see its relevance, or its needfulness. But the principles of sounder criticism have taught me how unsafe is such ground of arguing, and have compelled me to adopt the text of the most ancient MSS. The temptation seems to have been the 'thorn in the flesh' of 2 Cor. xii. 1 ff, whatever that was: perhaps something connected with his sight, or some severe inquniness: see below, and notes on Acts xiii. 9; xxi. 1. ἐγείρεσατε [expresses figuratively and in a climax the sense of ζεύγος. Cf. the Latin despere, respere. In other Greek writers we have only καταπτόνειν τινός, ἀποπτοῦν 

τινά (Eur. Troad. 608; Icc. 1205. Hes. Εργ. 724), and ἐπίτευχν τινά in this metaphorical sense, — and ἐκπτόνειν always in its literal sense (Hom. Od. c. 322), as also ἐκπτόνειν τινί. Even in the passage cited by Kypke from Plat., Alex. i. p. 328, it is in its literal sense, as ὀς κρατοῦν, a climax: besides the freedom of angels from fleshly weakness, there is doubtless an allusion to their office as messengers — and to His saying, who is above the angels, Luke x. 16. No inference can be drawn from these expressions being used of the Galatians' reception of him, that they were already Christians when he first visited them: the words are evidently not to be pressed as accurate in point of chronology, but involve an ὀς κρατοῦν πρότερον: not, 'as you would have received,' &c., but 'as you would (now) receive.' 15. Where then (i. e. where in estimation, holding what place) (was) your congratulation (of yourselves) i. e. considering your fickle behaviour since. "Qua causa fuit gratulationis, si nos nume postem mei?" Bengel. Various explanations have been given: 'qua (reading τίς) erat beatitudi vestra,' neglecting the οὐ, and making μακαρισμός into beatitudine, which it will not bear: so οἰκ., Luth., Beza, &c. All making the words into an exclamation (even if τίς be read) is inconsistent with the context, and with the logical precision of οὐ, and ὡστε below. "Where is then the blessedness ye spake of?" (E. V.) is perhaps as good a rendering as the words will bear. μακαρισμός γὰρ . . . . a proof to what lengths this μακαρισμός, and consequently their high value for St. Paul ran, at his first visit. In seeking for a reference to this expression, τ. δφθ. οὐν
éop. éow. μοι, the right course will be, not at once to adopt the conclusion, that they point to ocular weakness on the part of the Apostle, nor because they form a trite proverb in many languages, therefore to set down (as Meyer, De W., Windischmann, al., have done) at once that no such allusion can have been intended, but to judge from the words themselves and our information from other sources whether such an allusion is likely. And in doing so, I may observe that a proverbial expression so harsh in its nature, and so little prepared by the context, would perhaps hardly have been introduced without some particle of clinax. Would not the Apostle have more naturally written, ὡς εἰ ὑπάκουε; καὶ τῶν ὀφθ. ὑμ. . . . ? Had the καὶ been inserted, it would have deprived the words of all reference to a matter of fact, and made them purely proverbial. At the same time it is fair to say that the order τῶν ὀφθ. ὑμ. rather favours the purely proverbial reference. Had the Apostle's eyes been affected, and had he wished to express "You would, if possible, have pulled out your own eyes, and have given them to me," he would certainly have written ὑμῶν τῶν ὀφθ. not τῶν—ὁφθ. ὑμ. In other words, the more emphatic τῶν ὀφθαλμῶς is, the more likely is the expression to be proverbial merely; the less emphatic τ. ὀφθ. is, the more likely to refer to some fact, in which the eyes were as matter of notoriety concerned. The inference then of any ocular disease from these words themselves seems to me premonitory. Certainly Acts xxiii. 1 ff. receives light from such a supposition; but with our very small knowledge on the subject, many conjectures may be hazarded with some show of support from Scripture, while none of them has enough foundation to make it probable on the whole. The proverb is abundantly illustrated by Wetst. ἐφόρυσ-σω is the regular classic word: cf. Herod. viii. 116: this however is doubted by Ellic. See on the whole passage, Jowett's most interesting "fragment on the character of St. Paul," Epp. &c. vol. i. pp. 290—303.

16.] So that (as things now stand) an inference derived from the contrast between their former love and their present dislike of him. See Klotz, Devar. ii. 776) have I become your enemy (‘blated by you’),—ἐχρ, in passive sense: or perhaps it may be active, as Ellic.), by speaking the truth (see Eph. iv. 15 note) to you? When did he thus incur their enmity by speaking the truth? Not at his first visit, from the whole tenor of this passage: nor in this letter, as some think (Tcr., Luther, al.), which they had not yet read; but at his second visit, see Acts xviii. 23, when he probably found the mischief beginning, and spoke plainly against it. Cf. similar expressions in Wetst.: especially 'obscurum amicos, veritas odium parit,' Ter. Andr. i. 1. 40: ὁργίζοντας ἀπατεῖς τοὺς μετὰ παρθένια τῇ ἀληθείᾳ λέγοντας, Lucian, Abdic. 7.

17.] My telling you the truth may have made me seem your enemy: but I warn you that these men who court you so zealously (see ref. 2 Cor., and cf. Plat. vii. 762, cited by Fritz. ὁποῖος τὸν πρῶτον Ἐκπόνει κ. ἡμῖν, ὥστε ὑμᾶς ἀλήθειας ταῦτα ἐπιστημόνως, have no honourable purpose in so doing: it is only in order to get you away from the community as a separate clique, that you may court them.' Thus the verse seems to fit best into the context. As regards particular words, ἐκκλησία must bear the meaning of exclusion from a larger and attraction to a smaller, viz. their own, party. (Our very word 'exclusive' conveys the same idea.) I have therefore not adopted Mey.'s rendering: 'from all other teachers,'—nor that of Luther (1538), Calv., Grot., Beng., Rich., Osi., Winer, al., 'from me and my communion,'—nor that of Chrys., Ec., Thl., τῆς τῆλειας γνώσεως ἐπιστημόνως, nor that of Erasmus, Corn.-u-lap., 'from Christian freedom.'

The mood of ἐκκλησία has been disputed: and it must remain uncertain here, as in 1 Cor. iv. 6, where see note. Here as
there Meyer would give \( \text{θα} \) the meaning of "in which case:" but it is surely far better where the sentence so plainly requires \( \text{θα} \) of the purpose, to suppose some peculiar usage or solecism in formation of the subjunctive on the part of the Apostle.

18.] Two meanings are open to us: (1) as E. V. (apparently: but perhaps 'zealously affected' may be meant for the passive—for 'earnestly courted') and many Commentators taking \( \text{ξηλουθαι} \) as middle—or passive with a signification nearly the same, 'it is good to be zealously affected in a good cause, and not only during my presence with you:' in which case the sense must be referred back to ver. 13—15, and the allusion must be to their zeal while he was with them. But, considering that this context is broken at ver. 17,—that the words \( \text{ξηλουθαι} \) \( \text{εν καλῷρ} \) are an evident reference to \( \text{ξηλουθαι} \) \( \text{βυ} \) \( \text{οῦ καλῶν} \), and that the wider context of the whole passage addsuces a contrast between their conduct when he was with them and now, I think it much better (2) to explain thus: 'I do not mean to blame them in the abstract for \( \text{ξηλουθαι} \) \( \text{καλῷ} \): any teacher who did this \( \text{καλῷ} \), preaching Christ, would be a cause of joy to me' (Phil. i. 15—18): and it is an honourable thing (for you) to be the objects of this zeal ('ambirii') \( \text{εν καλῷ} \), in a good cause (I still cannot see how this rendering of \( \text{εν καλῷ} \) 'alters the meaning of the verb' ['Ellic.']: it rather seems to me that the non-use of \( \text{καλῶν} \), while the paronomasia is retained, leads to this meaning), at all times and by every body, not only when I am (or was) present with you;' q. d. 'I have no wish, in thus writing, to set up an exclusive claim to \( \text{ξηλουθαι βυ} \)—whoever will really teach you good, at any time, let him do it and welcome.' Then the next verse follows naturally also, in which he narrows the relation between himself and them, from the wide one of a mere \( \text{ξηλωθῆς} \), to the closer one of their parent in Christ, much as in 1 Cor. iv. 14 f,—\( \text{ως τέκνα μου} \) \( \text{ἀγαπητά γενοῦν} \) 'even \( \text{γαρ} \) \( \text{μωρίους παιδ}-\text{αγωνοῦν ἐξήκει ἐν χριστῷ} \), \( \text{ἀλλός οὐ} \) \( \text{πάλιν παιτέρας} \) ἐν \( \text{γαρ} \) \( \text{χρ}. \) \( \text{τῆς} \) \( \text{τινς} \) \( \text{εἰς χριστίου} \). On other interpretations, I may remark, (a) that after \( \text{ξηλουθαι} \), the passive meaning is the only suitable one for \( \text{ξηλουθαι} \), as it is indeed the only one justified by usage: (b) that \( \text{ξηλωθαι} \) must keep its meaning throughout, which will exclude all such renderings as 'invidioso tractarii' here (Koppe: (g) that all applications of the sentence to the Apostle himself as its object (ἐν καλῷ, in the matter of a good teacher, as Estius, Corn.-a-lap., al.) are beside the purpose.

19.] belongs to what follows, not to the preceding. Lachmann, (I suppose on account of the \( \text{δὲ} \) following, but see below,) with that want of feeling for the characteristic style of St. Paul which he so constantly shews in punctuating, has attached this as a flat and irrelevant appendage to the last verse (so also Bengel, Knapp, Rückert, al.): and has besides toned down \( \text{τεκνὰ} \) into \( \text{τεκνὰ} \), thus falling into the trap laid by some worthless corrector. My little children (the diminutive occurs only here in St. Paul, but is manifestly purposely, and most suitably chosen for the propriety of the metaphor. It is found [see reff.] often in St. John, while our Apostle has \( \text{τεκνῶν} \), 1 Tim. i. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 1), whom (the change of gender is common enough. Meyer quotes an apposite example from Eur. Suppl. 12, \( \text{θαυμάζων ἑταὶ γενναῖοι} \) \( \text{τεκνῶν} \) . . . \( \text{οὺς} \) \( \text{ποτ} \) . . . \( \text{ἡγαγε} \) I again (a second time; the former was \( \text{ἐν τῷ} \) \( \text{παρειβαῖ} \) \( \text{με}, \) ver. 18) travel with (bear, as a mother, with pain and anxiety, till the time of birth) until Christ shall have been fully formed within you (for Christ dwelling in a man is the secret and principle of his new life, see ch. ii. 20),
20. ye, I could wish (see note on Rom. ix. 3. There is a contrast in the δε between his present anxiety in absence from them and his former παρείσαν ver. 18: similar constructions with δε are frequent, especially after vocatives, when some particular is adduced more or less inconsistent with the address which has preceded: thus Hom. II. o. 244, "Εκτορ, νεί Πρα-μοίο, τί δε σοί νόσιν απ’ ἄλλων ἢ ᾧ ὀλγητελέων; Εὐρ. Ηεκ. 372, μὴτε, σοὶ δ’ ἡμῖν μηθὲν ἐμποδών γένη ... al. freq.) to be present with you now, and to change my voice (from what, to what?) Some say, from mildness to severity. But surely such a change would be altogether beside the tone of this deeply affectionate address. I should rather hold, with Meyer,—from my former severity, when I became your enemy by ἀληθευόν ὡς, to the softness and mildness of a mother, still ἀληθευόν, but in another tone. The great majority of Commentators understand ἀλλάζει as Corn.-alap. [Mey.]: 'ut scilicet quasi mater uncta blanderis, nunc gemerem, nunc obscearem, nunc objurgar- eros vos.' But so much can hardly be contained in the mere word ἀλλάζει without some addition, such as πρὸς τὸν και-ρόν, πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον [1 Cor. xii. 7], or the like: for I am perplexed about you (not 'I am suspected among you,' but ἐν ὡς as in 2 Cor. vii. 16, θαρρῶ ἐν ὡς,—the element in which: the other is irrelevant, and inconsistent with the N. T. usage of ἀπορούμαι: see reff. The verb is passive: Meyer quotes Demosth. p. 830. 2, τάλλα τοιῶν ἀπορηθεῖσι περὶ τούτων

χριστός ἐν ὑμῖν, 20 ὦθελον δὲ καὶ παρεῖναι δοθέντι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀλλάζει τῷ φωτῷ μου, ὅτι κ΄ ἀποροούμαι ἐν ὑμῖν. 21 Δέγετε μοι οἷον ὑπὸ νόμον θλεῦτες εἰσίν, τὸν νόμον οὗκ ἀκούετε; 22 γέγραπται γὰρ ὁ Αβραὰμ δύο υἱῶν ἐσχέν, ἕνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἕνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθερας. 23 ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ οὐράνια γεγένεται, ὦτ τίς ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθερας ἀναφέρεις. 24 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἀληθευομένα αὕτη γάρ μείνα ὑιόν. 25 —καθ᾽ ἐκαστὸν ἐξελεγχόμενος, καὶ Sir. xvii. 7, ὅταν παρόνται, τότε ἀπορρέσε- 

21. for ακούετε, αναγνωστείτε DF latt coptt arm Orig, Cyr Jer, Ambr, Ambritt, Bede. 23. om mev B vulg Tert Hil. 24. for αὐταί, αὕτη F. rec ins ai bef διο, with N1 67: om ABCDFKL³ rel.
The lesson to be drawn from this whole passage, as regards the Christian use of the O. T., is of an importance which can scarcely be overrated. Of course no one, who reads, marks, learns, and inwardly digests the Scriptures, can subscribe to the shallow and indolent dictum of Macknight, ‘This is to be laid down as a fixed rule, that no ancient history is to be considered as allegorical, but that which inspired persons have interpreted allegorically: but at the same time, in allegorizing Scripture, he will take care to follow the analogy of the faith, and proceed soberly, and in dependence on that Holy Spirit, who alone can put us in possession of His own mind in His word.’ Calvin’s remarks here are good: “Quemadmodum Abraham domus tune fuit vera Ecclesia: ita minime dubium est quin praecipui et pra allis memorabiles eventus qui in ea contigerunt, nobis totidem sint typi. Sicut ergo in circumcisione, in sacrificiis, in toto sacerdotio legis allegoria fuit: sicuti hostis in nostris sacramentis, ita etiam in dono Abrahamus fuisse dico. Sed id non facta ut in literali sensu receatur. Summa perinde est ac si diceret Paulus, figuram duorum testamentorum in duabus Abrahamae uxoris, et duplicitas populi in duobus filiis, velut in tabula, nobis depictam.” As to the objection of Luther, repeated by De Wette, that this allegory shews misapprehension of the history (die Allegorie von Sara und Hagar, welche ... zum Etich zu schwach ist, denn sie weicht ab vom historischen Verfass. Luth., cited by De W.), because Ishmael had nothing to do with the law of Moses, the misapprehension is entirely on the side of the objectors. Not the bare literal historical fact is in question here, but the inner character of God’s dealings with men, of which type, and prophecy, and the historical fact itself, are only so many exemplifications. The difference between the children of the bond and the free, of the law and the promise, has been shown out to the world by, and since the covenant of the law. See an excellent note of Windischmann’s ad loc., exposing the shallow modern critical school. See also Jowett’s note, on the other side: and while reading it, and tracing the consequences which will follow from adopting his view, bear in mind that the question between him and us is not affected by any thing there said on the similarity between St. Paul and the Alexandrians as interpreters of Scripture,—
25. *δέ ABD m copt Cyṛ: γαρ CFKL vulg syyr aeth arm Epiph Chr Cyr Thdrt Damasc Orig-lat Jer.—om γαρ CFN vulg aeth arm Epiph Cyr,sie Damasc Orig-int Jer.—om τo γαρ γαρ 17. (The variation appears to have sprung from the juxtaposition of γαρ γαρ: hence one or other was omad, and δε insd for connexion.)

26. but remains as it was before,—was the O. T. dispensation a system of typical events and ordinances, or is all such typical reference fanciful and delusive? For these [women [αυστην], not as Jowett, Ishmael and Isaac, which would confuse the whole: the mothers are the covenantants;—the sons, the children of the covenantants] are (import in the allegory, see reff.) two covenantants (not 'revelations,' but literally covenants between God and men): one (covenant) indeed from Mount Sina (taking its origin from,—or having Mount Sina as its centre, as δ εκ Πελοποννησου πολεμου) gendering (bringing forth children: De W. compares νυν . . . της διαδοχης, Acts lxi. 25) unto (with a view to) bondage, which one is (identical in the allegory with) Agar.

25.] (No parenthesis: συστοιχεις δε begins a new clause.) For the word Agar (when the neuter article precedes a noun of another gender, not the import of that noun, but the noun itself, is designated,—so Demosth. p. 255. 4, το δε αυτος ετων ειτω, την παλαι λεγω. Kühner ii. 174.) is (imports) Mount Sina, in Arabia (i.e. among the Arabs). This rendering, which is Chrysostom's,—το δε Σινα θρος ουστα μεθερμηνευεται τη επικοψα των γλαττης [σοι also Thl. Luther], is I conceive necessitated by the arrangement of the sentence, as well as by το "Agar. Had the Apostle intended merely to localize Σινα θρος by the words εν τη 'Arp, he could hardly but have written το εν τη 'Arp, or have placed εν τ 'Arp before εστιν. Had he again, adopting the reading το γαρ Σινα θρος εστιν εν τη 'Arb;ia, intended to say [as Windischmann], 'for Mount Sina is in Arabia, where Hagar's descendants likewise are,' the sentence would more naturally have stood το γαρ Σινα δε εν τη 'Arp. εστιν, or και γαρ Σινα δε εστιν εν τ 'Arp. εστιν. As it is, the law of emphasis would require it to be rendered, 'For Sina is a mountain in Arabia,' information which the judaizing Galatians would hardly require. As to the fact itself, Meyer states, "ذَلِكَ in Arabic, is a stone: and though we have no further testimony that Mount Sina was thus named kat' θυργον by the Arabsians, we have that of Chrysostom; and Büsching, Erdbeschreibung, v. p. 535, adds that of the traveller Haraut, that they to this day call Sinai, Πτέρυξ. Certainly we have Hagar as a geographical proper name in Arabia Petraea: the Chaldee paraphrast always calls the wilderness of Shur, אַשּׁהן." So that Jowett certainly speaks too strongly when he says, "the old explanations, that Hagar is the Arabic word for a rock or the Arabic noun for Mount Sinai, are destitute of foundation." As to the improbability at which he hints, of St. Paul quoting Arabic words in writing to the Galatians, I cannot see how it is greater than that of his making the covert allusion contained in his own interpretation. We may well suppose St. Paul to have become familiarized, during his sojourn there, with this name for the granite peaks of Sinai), but (δε marks the latent contrast that the addition of a new fact brings with it: so Elich.) corresponds (viz. Agar, which is the subject, not Mount Sinai, see below. "συστοιχειν is to stand in the same rank: hence 'to belong to the same category,' 'to be homogeneous with:' see Polyb. xiii. 8. 1, ὅθω κ. συστοιχα.) Mey., Chrys., all, and the Vulg. [conjectus est], take it literally, and understand it, γενεται, 'is joined, by a continuous range of mountain-tops,' understanding Sina as the subject) with the present Jerusalem (i.e. Jerusalem under the law, the Jerusalem of the Jews, as contrasted with the Jerusalem of the Messiah's Kingdom), for she (ου νυν 'ιεριων, not 'Agar) is in slavery with her children. 26. But (opposes to the last sentence, not to μὴ μειν, ver. 23), which, as Meyer observes, is left without an apodosis, the reader supplying that the other covenant is Sara, &c.) the Jerusalem above (i.e.
the one husband (Abraham) who was common to Sara and Agar, which might do in this passage, but would not in
Isaiah: whereas ἐκ τοῦ ἄνδρα means, "her (of the two) who has (the husband)," the other having none: a fineness of meaning which we cannot give in English.

28.] But (transitional: or rather perhaps adversative to the children of her who had an husband, which were last mentioned. With ἡμεῖς, it would be re-
sumptive of ver. 26) ye (see read, add), brethren, like (the expression in full, κατὰ τ. ὀνόματι Μελαγεθέκ, occurs Heb. vii. 15. Wetst. quotes from Galen, ὁ ἄνθρω-
πος οὗ κατὰ λευντὰ ἐστὶν τὴν βάρμην, and from Arrian, Hist. Gr. ii., τιμώμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ δόμου κατὰ τοῦ πατέρα Ἀγνώνα: see also reff.) Isaac, are children of pro-
mise (ἐπαγγ. emphatic: are children, not κατὰ σάρκα, but διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, see ver. 23, and below, ver. 29).

29.] οἳ κατ. σάρ. γεν., see ver. 23. It has been thought that there is nothing in the Hebrew text to justify so strong a word as ἐδικοκες. It runs, 'and Sarah saw the son of Hagar' ... παῖς' (παίοντα μετὰ Ἰσαάκ τοῦ νιῶν αὐτῆς, LXX) ... and some deny that παῖς ever means 'he mocked.' But certainly it does: see Gen. xix. 14. And this would be quite ground enough for the ἐδικοκες, for the spirit of persecution was begun. So that we need not refer to tradition, as many have done (even Ellie, whom see; Jowett, as unfortunately usual with him when impugning the ac-
curacy of St. Paul, asserts rashly and confidently, that the sense in which the Apostle takes the Hebrew is inadmissible), to account for St. Paul's expression. τοῦ κατὰ πνεῦμα, sc. γεννηθέντα, him that was born after the Spirit, i.e. in virtue of the promise, which was given by the Spirit. Or, 'by virtue of the Spirit's agency;' but the other is better. οὕτως καὶ νῦν] 'nec quicquam est quod tam graviter animos nostros vulnerare debeat, quam Dei contemptus, et adversus ejus gratiam ludibria: nec ullum magis exitiale est persecutionis genus, quam quum impeditur animae salus." Calv.

30.] ἀλλά, as in E. V., 'neverth-
less;' notwithstanding the fact of the persecution, just mentioned. The quo-
tation is adapted from the LXX, where μοῦ Ἰσαάκ stands for τῆς ἐλευθερᾶς. We need hardly have recourse (with Ellie,) to the fact that God confirmed Sarah's words, in order to prove this to be Scriptu-
re: the Apostle is allegorizing the whole history, and thus every part of it assumes a significance in the allegory.

κλη-
ρονομήσῃ] See Judg. xi. 2 (LXX), κ. ἐξέβαλον τὸν Ἰερεθα, κ. εἰπὼν αὐτῷ, οὐ κληρονομήσῃς ἐν τῇ οἶκῳ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ὅτι νῦν γυναικὸς ἔταρας σὺ. "The distinction drawn by Hermann on ὑμ. Col. 553, between ὦ μυ with future indicative (duration or futurity) and with aorist subjective (speedy occurrence), is not applicable to the N. T. on account of (1) various readings (as here:) (2) the decided violations of the rule where the MSS. are unanimous, as 1 Thess. iv. 15: and (3) the obvious prevalence of the use of the subjunctive over the future, both in the N. T. and 'fatiscens Graecitas:' see Lobeck, Phryn. p. 722." Ellicot.

31.] I am inclined to think, against Meyer, De W., Ellie, &c., that this verse is, as commonly taken, the conclusion from what has gone before: and that the διὸ is bound on to the κληρονομήσῃ preceding. For that we are κληρονόμοι, is an acknowled-
ged fact, established before, ch. iii. 29; ver. 7. And if we are, we are not the children of the handmaid, of whom it was said οὐ μὴ κληρονομωμένος, of the free-
woman, of whose son the same words asserted that he should inherit. Observe in the first clause πατιδότης is snarrous: most likely because emphatically prefixed
...
the nPoS the n 1 qapplies e|e7re(reTe tKdtyoiuOci, justified be mouth not iravrl serious (Uterally 'seeking clement Christ, when you began your course of "έν νόμῳ δικαιοσύνη", ye who are being justified ('endeavouring to be justified,' seeking justification: such is the force of the subjective present. So Thl. ὡς ὑπολαμβάνεται in (not 'by;' it is the element in which, as in the expression ἐν κυρίῳ the law,—ye fell from (reff.: see 1 Cor. xiii. 8, note. Wets. quotes from Phut., Agis and Cleom. p. 796, τῶν πλείστων ἐξέστην ἡ Σάρτρα καλῶν: Gracch. p. 834, ἐκπεσέων κ. στερέσθαι τῆς πρὸς τῶν δήμων εὐνοίας. 'So Plato, Rep. vi. 496, ἐκπέσεων φιλόσοφας: Polycl. xii. 14. 7, ἐκπέσεων τοῦ καθήκοντος,' Ellic.) grace. 5.] Proof (hence γάρ) of εξέπ. τ. χάρ., by statement e contrario of the condition and hope of Christians. Emphasis (1) on ἡμείς, as opposed to οὕτως ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοσύνη,—(2) on πνεύματι (not 'mente' [Fritz.], nor 'spiritually,' Middleton, al., but by the [Holy] Spirit, reff.), as opposed to σαρκί, the fleshly state of those under the law, see ch. iv. 29,—(3) on ἐκ πίστεως, as opposed to ἐν νόμῳ, which involves ἔργαν. ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης Is this genitive objective, the hope of righteousness, i.e. the hope whose object is perfect righteousness, -or subjective, the hope of righteousness, i.e. the hope which the righteous entertain—viz. that of eternal life? Certainly I think the former: for this reason, that ἐλπίδα has the emphasis, and ἐλπίδα δικ. ἐκπεσέως. answers to δικαιοσύνη above—Ye think ye have your righteousness in the law: we, on the contrary, anxiously wait for the hope of righteousness (full and perfect). The phrase ἐπεκδεξέσθαι ἐλπίδα may be paralleled, Acts xxiv. 15; Tit. ii. 13; Eur. Alcest. 130, τίνι ἐτί βλοῦ ἐλπίδα προδέξωμαι; Polyl. viii. 21. 7, ταῖς προδεξώμεναι ἐλπίσων. 6.] Confirmation of the words ἐκ πίστεως, ver. 5. ἐν χριστῷ, in Christ, as an element, in union with Christ,ἴν the state of a Christian: notice ἥρα, not 'ὁσος. χρ.: in Christ, and that Christ, Jesus of Nazareth. ἐνεργομένη, not passive, but middle, as always in N. T. See reff. and notes on those places: also Fritzsche’s note on Rom. vii. 5. "ἐνεργεῖν, εἰμι εξερχέομαι de personis, ἐνεργεῖσθαι, εἰς se (aut suam) εἰμι εξερχέομαι de rebus collocavit, Gal. v. 6; Col. i. 29; 1 Thess.
7. rec aνεκοφε, with none of our ms: txt ABCDFKLN8 rel. om τη ABR1: ins CDFKLN8 rel. at end add μη πειθάσθαι F lat-mss-in-Jer vulg-sixth(with dem. hil) Victorinus Lucif Ambrost-comm Pelag Bede. (Gloss to account for τη πεισμονEfoll.)
8. om oυκ D1 al lat-mss in Jer(who says "abstulenter non") in Sedul(who says male) Orig, Lucif. καλοντας(sic) N.
9. for ξυμοι, δολα D1 vulg(and F-lat) lat-mss(‘male’) in Jer and Sedul Mcion-e Constt Bas-mss Lucif Ambrost Pelag: corrumpit fermental G-lat.
10. aft ειγω ins δε CFl demid syr arm Damase Eq-comm. om εν κυριο Β Χr

ii. 13 al., ut b. 1. Passivo (cf. ενεργειαται πλεωμον Polyb. i. 13; 5; Jos. Antt. xv. 5. 3) nunquam Paulus usus est." The older Romanist Commentators (Bellarm., Est.) insisted on the passive sense as favouring the dogma of fides formata, for which it is cited by the Council of Trent, sess. vi. cap. 7, de justitie. And the modern Romanist Commentators, though abandoning the passive sense, still claim the passage on their side (c. g. Windischmann); but without reason; love is the modus operandi of faith, that which justifies, however, is not love, but faith; nor can a passage be produced, where St. Paul says we are justified by ‘faith working by love,’ but it is ever by faith only. One is astonished at the baldness of such a generally calm and fair writer as Windischmann, in claiming the passage for the Tridentine doctrine, even when the passive interpretation, which was all it had to lay hold on, is given up. As parallels to our passage, see Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Cor. vii. 19.

7-12.] He laments their deflexion from their once promising course, and denounced severely their perverters. Ye were running well (‘hoc est, omnia apud vos erat in felici statu et successu, vivesbatis optimae, contutudinibus recta ad vitam aeternam quam vos polibecibatur verbam,’ &c. Luther): who (see ch. iii. 1, the question expresses astonishment) hindered you (Polyb. xxiv. l. 12, uses ογκος-τες with a dative, δια των Φιλιππων ογκος-τες τη δικαιοσυνη: Elle. quotes, in connexion with the view of the primary notion being that of hindering by breaking up a road,—Greg. Naz. Or. xvi. p. 290, ἥ κακας ογκοποιημενη δυσπαθεια των πονηρων, ἢ δρετης δυσποιημενη ευκαλυθεια των βελτιων) that ye should not (μη before πειθάσθαι is not pleonastic, but the construction, so often occurring, of a negative after verbs of hindering, is in fact a pregnant one, μη πειθάσθαι being the result of the hindrance: q. d. δις μη της ov και εντοιχοις μη τη. See Bernhardy, Syntax, ix. 6 b, who quotes one example very apposite to this,—ειποδον ιμην γενηται την θεον μη ξελεδοναι, Aristoph. Pac. 315) obey the truth (i. e. submit yourselves to the true Gospel of Christ. These words, which Chrys. omits here, have been transferred hence to ch. iii. 1. See var. read. there. On that account they are certainly genuine here?)

8.] The persuasion (to which you are yielding—active; not your persuasion, passive. πεισμονη may mean either. Ellic. says: "As the similar form πλησμονη means both saticites (the state) and also expelto (the act), Col. ii. 23; Plato, Symposium 186 c. πλα κατανωσι—so πεισμονη may mean the state of being persuaded, i. e. conviction, or the act of persuading; ‘persuadendi sollarion’ (Schott.): cf. Chrys. on 1 Thess. i. 3, ov πεισμονη άνθρωπινη...νην η πειθοσα. But here, η πειθα, being connected with δια καλων διασ, and answering to the act of ενγος-τεω in the last verse, is better taken actively) is not from (does not come from, is not originated by) Him who calleth you (i. e. God: see ch. i. 6 and note).
9.] ξυμοι may allude either to men (Jer., Augz., Grot., Est., Beng., De W., al.), or to doctrine. In the parallel place in 1 Cor. v. 6, it is moral influence; so also where our Lord uses the same figure, Matt. xvi. 12, where ξυμων = διασχιε. Nor can there be any objection to taking it as abstract, and φωσμα concrete;—a little false doctrine corrupts the whole mass (of Christians). So Chrys. (ουτω και ομιαν ἱσχυε το μικρον τοιτο κακον, μη διαθυνθην, κακς τετελειν λιουδαιων διασχουν), Thl., Luth., Calv., al. 10.] "After the warning of vv. 8, 9, Paul assures his readers that he has confidence in them,
but that their perverters shall not escape punishment. *Diede et impera!* Meyer.  

*εὖς*, emphatic, I, for my part; 'quod ad me attiniet, 

... *eis, with regard to*, see ref., and Bernhardy, p. 220.  

On *ἐν κυρίῳ*, see 2 Thess. iii. 4:—it is the element or sphere in which his confidence is conditioned.  

οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρον. See εὐθρ. Phil. iii. 15: of which this ἄλλο is a kind of softening. We take the meaning here to be, *ye will be of no other mind than this*, viz. which I enjoin on you,—not in vv. 8, 9 only, but in this Epistle, and in his preaching generally.  

οὗ ταράσσων need not be interpreted as referring necessarily to any one ἐπισημοῖο among the Judaizers (as Olsh., al.), but simply as individualizing the warning, and carrying home the denunciation to each one’s heart among the perverters. Cf. οὗ ἀναστατούστε below, and ch. i. 7; iv. 17.  

τὸ κρίμα, the sentence, understood to be unfavourable, is a burden laid on the judged person, which he ἀναστάτει, bears. The ὅστις εἰν ἂν generalizes the declaration to the fullest extent: see ch. i. 8, 9.  

11.] The connexion appears to be this: the Apostle had apparently been charged with being a favourer of circumcision in other churches; as shewn e. g. by his having circumcised Timothy. After the preceding sharp denunciation of ὅ ταράσσων ὡμᾶς, and ὅστις εἰν ἂν, it is open to the adversaries to say, that Paul himself was one of their ταράσσοντες, by his inconsistency. In the abruptness then of his fervid thoughts he breaks out in this self-defence. *εὖς*, emphatic as before.  

περιτομήν has the chief emphasis, as the new element in the sentence, and not κηρύσσω, as Chrys. (οὐ γὰρ εἴης ὅτι περιτομὴν οὐκ ἐργάζομαι, ἀλλὰ, οὐ κηρύσσω, τοῦτοτε, οὐχ οὕτω κελεύω πιστεύειν), al.,—its position not allowing this. The first ἐτι is best understood, as referring, not to any change in his preaching as an Apostle (for he appears always to have been of the same mind, and certainly was from the first persecuted by the Jews), but to the change since his conversion, before which he was a strenuous fator of Judaism. Olsh. objects to this, that κηρύσσω could not be used of that period. But this (even if it be necessary to press κηρύσσω, so far into matter of fact) cannot be said with any certainty:—the course of Saul as a zealous may have often led him even to preach, if not circumcision in its present debated position, yet that strict Judaism of which it formed a part.  

τὶ ἐτι *σιῶν.* ἐτι is logical, as in ref. (De W.): i. e., *what further excuse is there for my being (as I am) persecuted (by the Jews) for,* if this is so, if I still preach circumcision, ἢρα, then is brought to nought, is done away, the offence (ref. stumbling-block, σκάνδ. has the emphasis) of the cross—because, if circumcision, and not faith in Christ crucified, is the condition of salvation, then the Cross has lost its offensive character to the Jew: οὐδὲ γὰρ οὕτω ὃ σταυρός ἦν ὁ σκανδαλιῶν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὃ τὸ μὴ δειν πείθεσθαι τοῖς πατρίδοις νόμοις. καὶ γὰρ τῶν Στέφανος προσέφεγκτοι, οὐκ εἰπόν ὅτι οὐνόμα τῶν ἐπισκοποῦσιν προκειμένοι, ἀλλ’ ὅτι κατὰ τὸ νόμον κ. τ. τόπων λέγει τοῦ ἀγίου. Chrys.  

12.] The καί introduces a climax—I would (ref.) that they who are unsettling you would even ... *As to ἀποκορούται,* (1) it cannot be passive, as E. V., *were even cut off,* (2) It can hardly mean *would cut themselves off from your communion,* as the καί is against so mild a wish, besides that this sense of the word is unparalleled.  

(3) There is certainly an allusion to *ἐνεκοφεν* in ver. 7, so that in reading aloud
the Greek, the stress would be, ἐφελ. κ. ἀποκρύψωναι οἱ ἀν. ἤσ. But (4) this allusion is one only of sound, and on account of the καὶ, all the more likely to be to some well-known and harsh meaning of the word, even as far as to which the Apostle’s wish extends. And (5) such a meaning of the word is that in which (agreeably to its primitive classical sense, of hewing off limbs, see Lidd. and Scott) it is used by the LXX, ref. Deut., by Arrian, Epict. ii. 20, by Hesych., δὸ ἀπόκρυ- 

νον μὲν τῷ εὐθείᾳ εἰς ἑστηκεν τῷ σαρκί, ἀλλὰ ὅπος ἡ γὰρ ἀλλήλους ἀποκρύψωναι οἱ ἀν. ἤσ. — a special, it seems, of the editions, IVoni. 6, Ph. 17, xellips, eh. 3, xlv, Matt., 6, Matt. v. 56, y Rom. viii, a. ii. 2 Cor. v. 12. xi. 12 Fin. 1 Tim. v. 14 only. P. Exe. v. 7 only. 22. 1 Cor. ix. 19. A border, Acts xix. 5, xxvii. 17. e Rom. xiii. 8. 15. Acts xiii. 25. xiv. 26 al. Ps. xx. 4. c Matt. xix. 18. d – Matt. iii. 7. — LEVIT. xix. 18.


14. for νομος, λογος KL. ins eν μαν bef eν eνι λογο (to refer the sentence to the Galatians) DTF Ambst.: μαν Μειν-ε: in pauci syr.(but txt in margv. rec παρουσια (coren, in ignorance of true sense of perfect), with DFKL rel Chr Thlrt Damasc.Jer: txt ABCX m 17 Meion-ε Damasc. Aug. om eν τω DF

13—Ch. VI. 5.] The third of the portiaion portion of the Epistle, not however separated from the former, but united to it by the current of thought: — and, 13—15.] Though free, be one another’s servants in love. γὰρ gives the reason why the Apostle was so fervent in his denunciation of these disturbers; because they were striking at the very root of their Christian calling, which was for (on condition of; hardly, for the purpose of; see refl.) freedom. Only (make not) (so μὴ with the verb omitted and an accusative in μὴ μανεῖς μῶθες, Aristoph. Vesp. 1179; μὴ τριβᾶς ἐτι, Soph. Antig. 577; μὴ μοι μαριοῦς μὴ δισμυρῆς ἄνεμοι, Diodost. Phil. i. § 10). See modern examples in Hartung, ii. 159) your liberty into (or, use it not for) an occasion (opportunity) for the flesh (for giving way to carnal passions), but by means of (your) love, be in bondage (opposition to ἑλευθερία) to one another. Chrys. remarks, ἀλλὰ ἐν ταύτη τινὶ ἀληθείᾳ, ὀφείλεται ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλευθερίαν, ὃς ἐν ἑκείνῳ τοις αἱρετ. καὶ τῆς φιλαρχίας εἰτίν ἐπιθυμία. 14.] See Rom. xiii. 8, 9.

The rec. reading παρουσια would mean merely ‘is in course of being fulfilled,’” whereas now it is, “is fulfilled: not ‘comprehended’” (Luth., Calv., Olsh., Winer, al.). “The question, how the Apostle can rightly say of the whole law, that it is fulfilled by loving one’s neighbour, must not be answered by understanding νόμος of the Christian law (Koppe), or of the moral law only (Estius, al.), or of the second table of the decalogue (Beza, al),
13—17. ΠΡΩΣ ΓΑΛΑΤΑΣ.

τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. 15 εἰ ἐξ ἀλλήλους ἐσάκτυτε καὶ ἐκατεσθίτε, ἵνα βλέπετε μὴ ὑπὸ ἀλλήλων ἰʿ ἀναλωθίτε.

16 Λέγω δὲ, πνεύματι 1 περιπατήτες, καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς ὑπὲρ μὴν τελέσητε. 17 ἢ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τὸν πνεύματος, ὡς δὲ πνεύμα 2 κατὰ τὸν τύχῃ σαρκὸς ταῦτα

κ ἐν. 1. Ῥωμ. xv. 8. 14) ἔπειτα, Acts (ix. 31) xxi. 21. 2 Cor. xii. 18. o advers, James iv. 2. 2 Kings xxiii. 15.

latt arm Meion—Ambrst Jer Pelag (not Aug.5). rec (for σεαυτόν) εαυτον, with FL rel Chr Thl Oe: txt ABCDKS b e g h u o 17 Meion—Thrd Damascus. (Simly Rom xiii. 9.)

15. ἀλλήλους has both times the emphasis. The form of the sentence is very like Matt. xxvi. 52,—πάντες οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν, ἐν μαχαίρα ἀπολοῦσαν, except that there labvones, as having the stress, precedes. Chrys. says, ταῖς λείσσεις ὕμων ἐκρήγησεν, οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ διάκονον, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατεσθίτης, ὥσπερ ἐστὶν ἐμενώντος τῷ ποιήματι. οὔ μὴν γὰρ διάκονον, ἐγγὺς ἐπιθύμως πάθος; ὅ δὲ κατεσθίων, θρησκίας ἐσχάτης παράσχει ἀποδείξην, δήματα δὲ κ. βρωσίας οὐ τὰς σωματικὰς φθάνη, ἀλλὰ τὰς πολλὰ χαλεπότερα. οὐ γὰρ οὕτως ἄνθρωπος ἀπεγεννησόμενος σαρκὸς βλαψεν, ὅτι τὸ δήματα εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν παράγεται, ἡν ψυχὴ τιμωτέρα σῶματος, τοιοῦτος χαλεπότερα ἢ ταύτης βλαψέν.

ἀναλωθή] The literal sense must be kept, —consumed (by one another), — your spiritual life altogether annihilated: ἡ γὰρ διάστασις κ. η μαχαίρα φθοροῦσον κ. ἀναλωτικόν καὶ τὸν δειμώνων αὐτὴν κ. τῶν εἰσαιγόντων, καὶ σημὸν μᾶλλον ἡπείρα ἀνατρέχῃ. Chrys. 16—26. Exhortation to a spiritual life, and warning against the works of the flesh. 16. Λέγω δὲ refers to ver. 13—repeating, and explaining it,—q. d., 'What I mean, is this, πνεύματι, the normal dative, of the rule, or manner, after or in which:

Meyer quotes Hom. II. o. 194, ὅστις Δῖος βέβαμα φρεσίν—by the Spirit. But πν. is not man's spiritual part, as Beza, Rück., De W., al. nor is πνεύματι, after a spiritual manner, Pelle,—nor will ἥνωκούσα χάρις give the force of πνεύμα (Thdrt.): it is (as in ver. 5) the Holy Spirit of God: this will be clear on comparing with our vv. 16—18, the more expanded parallel passage, Rom. vii. 22—viii. 11. The history of the verbal usage is, that πνεύμα, as χριστός and θέος, came to be used as a proper name: so that the supposed distinction between τὸ πν. as the objective (the Holy Ghost), and πν. as the subjective (man's spirit), does not hold.

σαρκός the natural man:—that whole state of being in the flesh, out of which spring the practices and thoughts of ver. 19. οὐ μὴν τελεσθῇ] Is this (1) merely future in meaning, and a sequence on πνεύματι περιπτ., 'and ye shall not fulfill,' or is it (2) imperative, 'and fulfill not'? Ellic. in his note has shewn that this latter meaning is allowable, it being doubtful even in classical Greek whether there are not some instances of οὐ μὴ with the second person subjunctive imperatively used, and the tendency of later Greek being rather to use the subjunctive aorist for the future. And Meyer defends it on exegetical grounds. But surely (1) is much to be preferred on these same grounds. For the next and following verses go to shew just what this verse will then assert, viz., that the Spirit and the flesh exclude one another. 17. Substantiation of the preceding,—that if ye walk by the Spirit, ye shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh. The second γαρ (see var. read.) gives a reason for the continual ἐπιθυμεῖν of these two against one another: viz., that they are opposites. [iv] not 'so that'—this is the
17. rec for (2nd) yap, de (prob to avoid recurrence of yap which introduced the former clause: the recurrence of de would not be simly felf), with ACDBKLX ab rel Chr Thurt Damasc: txt BD^TFN 17 latt cohort lat-

result: but more is expressed by ἵνα. Winer gives the meaning well: "Atque

theleov there applies only to one side, the

better will, striving after good: whereas

here it must be taken 'sensu communi,' for 'will' in general, to whichever way in-

clined. So that our verse requires exp-

ansion, both in the direction of Rom. vii. 15—20, and in the other direction, ὑπὸ

τὸν πνεῦμα (after the natural man) ποιῶ

τὸν πνεῦμα, (from the flesh) τὸν πνεῦμα,

—to make it logically complete. 18.]

By this verse, the locus respecting the flesh and the Spirit is interwoven into the general argument, thus (cf. ver. 23): the law is made for the flesh, and the works of the flesh: the Spirit and flesh ἀντίκεινται: if (de bringing out the contrast between the treatment of both in ver. 17, and the

selection of one side in this verse) then

ye are led by (see Rom. ref., δοῦνα... πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἀγωνία, οὕτως νοεῖν ἐστὶν θεοῦ) the Spirit, ye are not under the law. This he proceeds to substantiate, by specifying the works of the flesh, and of the Spirit. This interpretation is better than the merely practical one of Chrys., al., ὑπὸ τὸν πνεῦμα ἔχων ὡς χρής, σέβεται διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντά 

ὅ τοῦτον ἀπωλέσεις ὡς διά τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα 

ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου θυσίας, ψυχὸς τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ἐκείνου παραγεγέννημον, ἐνώ γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἐπίθυμη διὰ τοῦ νόμου θυσίας ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ π

19—23.] substantiates (see above) ver. 18. 19.] φανερά (emphatic), plain to all, not needing, like the more hidden fruits of the Spirit, to be educed and specified: and therefore more clearly amenable to law, which takes cognizance of τὰ φανερὰ. ἀνακαλεῖ ἐστὶν] almost ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθυμίας ἀπαντάσα, ὡς διὰ τοῦ π

Trench, New Test. Synonyms, p. 64. The
21. om. φωνι (prob from homostel, but see Rom. i. 29) BN 17 demid F-lat! Clem Melion-e Iren-int Cypr Jor.(and esew expressly) Ambrst Aug: ins ACDFKL rel Chr om 2nd και ΒΦΝ 672 vulg sath Chr Tert Thdrt Damasc Iren-int Jer. for προειπτ., επον Ν1: προειπηκαν

22. rec ραπασθη, with DFKL rel: txt ΑΒCN 17 Cyp-jor. aft εγκρατ. ins ΔΤΕΙA DTF latt(not am harl) Bas Pallad Iren-int Cypr Ambrst Pelag Sedul (not Jer Aug).

...best word for it seems to be wantonness, 'proterevila.' 20] ἐδολω., in its proper meaning of idolatry: not, as Olsh., 'sins of lust,' because of the unclean orgies of idolatry. φαρμ., either 'pollutions,' or 'sorceries.' The latter is preferable, as more frequently its sense in the LXX and N. T. (refl.), and because (Mey.) Asia was particularly addicted to sorceries (Acts xix. 19).

... θυμοί] passionate outbrea. θυμός μὲν ἑστὶ πρόσκαιρος, ὡρίζεν ἐπὶ πολυχρόνοις μνημειαίας, Ammonius. διαφέρει δὲ θυμος ὡρίζει, τὸ θυμόν μὲν εἰναὶ ὡρίων ἀναθυμωμένον κ. έτι ἐκκακωμένην, ὡρίζεν δὲ ἐρεβακατυπαχροσθε. Orig. sel. in Ps. ii., vol. ii. 541: both cited by Trench, Syn. p. 146. ζῆνος, jealousy (in bad sense)—reft. ἐπιθεία] not 'strife,' as E. V. and commonly, in error: see note on Rom. ii. 8,—but cabals, unworthy compassings of selfish ends. 21.] Wetst. N. T. ii. p. 147, traces in a note the later meanings of αἰρέσεις. Here διχοτοσ.., divisions, seems to lead to αἰρέσεις, parties, composed of those who have chosen their self-willed line and adhere to it. Trench quotes Aug. (cont. Crescon. ii. 7 (9), vol. ix. p. 471): "Schisma est recens congregationes ex aliqüa sententiarum diversitate discessio: hæresis autem schisma inveteratum." But we must not think of an ecclesiastical meaning only, or chiefly here. θρόνος. (φόνο.) see Rom. i. 29, where we have the same alliteration. α. προκ. The construction of α is exactly as John viii. 54, ὅν υἱός λέγετε ὃς θεός ὑμῶν ἐστιν:—it is governed, but only as matter of reference, by προέλεγα.—not to be joined by attraction with πράσσοντες, as Olsh., al. προκ. κ. προειπτ.] I forewarn you (now), and did forewarn you (when I was with you): the προ- in both cases pointing on to the great day of retribution. τα τοιαύτα] The article generalizes τοιαύτα, the things of this kind, i. e. all such things. See Ellie's note. βασ. θ. ου κλ.] See ref. 22.] καρπός, not ἔργα, τοι τοινύμιντος. The works of the flesh are no καρπός, see Rom. vi. 21. These are the only real fruit of men: see John xv. 1—8: compare also John iii. 20, note. They are, or are manifested in, ἔργα: but they are much more: whereas those others are nothing more, as to any abiding result for good. ἀγάπη] at the head, as chief—1 Cor. xiii. See Rom. xii. 9. χαρά, better merely joy, than as Winer, al., 'voluptas ex aliorum commodis percepita,' as opposed to φθονος. We must not seek for a detailed logical position in the two lists, which would be quite alien from the fervid style of St. Paul. χραστότης, ἀγάπωσ.] Jerome, comm. in loc., says, "Benignitas sive suavitas, quia apud Graecos χραστότις utrunque sonat, virtus est lenis, bland, tranquilla, et omnium honorum apta consortio: invitans ad familiaritatem sui, dulcis alloquio, moribus temperata. Non multum bonitas (ἀγάπωσ) a benignitate diversa est, quia et ipsa ad benefaciendum videtur exposita. Sed in co differt; quia potest bonitas esse tristior, et fronte severis moribus irrigata bene qui dem facere et praestare quod positis: non
24. ins κυριων bef χριστου Ν' (but erased). rec om ἵσων, with DFLK rel latt syr Chr Thdrt Ps-Ath Cypr Jor: ins ABCN 17 coppt with Chr perspaxe Bas Procop Damase Aug. aft σαρκα ins αυτων F vulg Cypr. 25. πνευματι bef ζω. DF latt (not am demid al) Aug: ζ. ὡν εν πν. κ. πν. στοιχ. syr Chr. om και F Ambrest-ed. 26. αλληλους ΗΓ¹ c d k l Chr Thdrt, ins (Ec: αλληλους(ec) a: txt ACDFKLN rel Clerm, Thdrt) Damase.

taman suavis esse consortio, et sua cunctos invitare duculcendae. Plato, def. 412 e, defines χρηστοτης, ἕσως ἀπλαστα μετ' ἐλογιστικ. ἀγάθως. is a Hellenistic word, see reff. Perhaps kindness and goodness would best represent the two words. πιτις, in the widest sense: faith, towards God and man: of love it is said, 1 Cor. xiii. 7, πάντα πιστεύει. 23.] πραξις seems to be well represented by meekness,—again, towards God and man: and ἐγκρ. by temperance, —the holding in of the lusts and desires. τῶν τοιοῦτων answers to τά τοιαῦτα above, and should therefore be taken as neuter, not masculine, as Chrys., al. This verse (see above on ver. 18) substantiates ὥστε ἦνω νόμων—for if you are led by the Spirit, these are its fruits in you, and against these the law has nothing to say: see 1 Tim. i. 9, 10. 24.] Further confirmation of this last result, and transition to the exhortations of ver. 25, 26. But (contrast, the one universal choice of Christians, in distinction from the two catalogues) they who are Christ's crucified (when they became Christ's,—at their baptism, see Rom. vi. 2: not so well, 'have crucified,' as E. V.) the flesh, with its passions and its desires,—and therefore are entirely severed from and dead to the law, which is for the fleshly, and those passions and desires,—on which last he founds,— 25.] If (no connecting particle—giving more vividness to the inference) we live (emphatic—if, as we saw, having slain the flesh, our life depends on the Spirit) in (said to be a species of instrumental dative; but such usage is of very rare occurrence, and hardly ever undoubted. Here the dative is probably employed more as corresponding to the dative in the other member, than with strict accuracy. But it may be justified thus: our inner life, which is hid with Christ in God, Col. iii. 3, is lived πνευματι [normal dative, the Spirit being its generator and upholder] the Spirit,—in the Spirit (emphatic) let us also walk (in our conduct in life: let our practical walk, which is led κατά προαθέσεως of our own, be in harmony with that higher life in which we live before God by faith, and in the Spirit). 26.] connected with στοιχείων above, by the first person,—and with ch. vi. 1, by the sense; and so forming a transition to the admonitions which follow. μὴ γινώσκω, let us not become—εὐφαίλειτο, vulg., Erasmus,—a mild, and at the same time a solemn method of warning. For while it seems to concede that they were not this as yet, it assumes that the process was going on which would speedily make them so. 'Let us not be,' of the E. V., misses this. κενοδοξοί would include, as De W. observes, all worldly honour, as not an object for the Christian to seek, 1 Cor. i. 31; 2 Cor. x. 17. ἀλληλ. προκαλ. eis φιλονεικες κ. ἐρεις, Chrys. So eis δικα προκαλημένων των 'Αδηναίων, Thuc. vii. 18: eis μάχην προκαλείτο, Xen. (Wetst.) "φονείν is the correlative act on the part of the weak, to the προκαλείθαι on the part of the strong. The strong vauntingly challenged their weaker brethren: they could only reply with enev. Ellicot. These words are addressed to all the Galatians:—the danger was common to both parties, the obedient and disobedient, the orthodox and the Judaizers. VI. 1—5.] Exhortation to forbearance and humility. Brethren (bespeaks their attention by a friendly address; marking also the opening of a new subject, con-
connected however with the foregoing: see above), if a man be even surprised (προλημφθη) has the emphasis, on account of the καί. This makes it necessary to assign a meaning to it which shall justify its emphatic position. And such meaning is clearly not found in the ordinary renderings. E.g. Chrysostom,—ἐν παραπτωμᾷ—so E.V. 'overtaken,' and De Wette, al., which could not be emphatic, but would be periphrastic: Grudius,—si quis anea [h. e. antequam hae ep. ad vos venit] deprehensus fuerit! Winer,—ελλειπον si [si vel] quis anea deprehensus fuerit in peccato, earn tarnen [iterum peccantem] corrigit? Olsh., who regards the προ- almost as expletive, betokening merely that the λαυβάνθος comes in time before the καταρτίζειν. The only meaning which satisfies the emphasis is that of being caught in the fact, 'flagrante delicto,' before he can escape: which, though unusual, seems justified by ref. Wisd.: and so Meyer, Ellic, al.) in any transgression (with the meaning 'over- taken' for προλημφθη, falls also that of 'inadvertence' for παραπτωμα. The stronger meaning of 'sin,' is far commoner in St. Paul: see ref. Rom. and ib. v. 15, 16, 20; 2 Cor. v. 19; Eph. i. 7, ii. 1, 5; Col. ii. 13 bis), do ye, the spiritual ones (said not in irony, but bond fide: referring not to the clergy only, but to every believer), restore (Beza, Hammond, Bengel, al., have imagined an allusion to a dislocated limb being reduced into place: but the simple ethical sense is abundantly justified by examples: see Herodot., cited on 1 Cor. i. 10; Stob. i. 85, καταρτίζειν φιλοις διαφερομένου [Ellis.] such a person (see especially 1 Cor. v. 5, 11) in the spirit of meekness (beware of the silly hendiadys: Chrys. gives the right allusion, —οὐς εἰσερχόμεθα ἐν παραπτώματι, ἄλλα ἐν παραπτώματι παραπτώματι) δηλούν ὑπὸ καὶ τῷ παραπτώματι σαντίμα δοκεῖ, καὶ τὸ δύνασθαι μετ' ἑπιμελείας διωρύσθων τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας, χαρισματός ἐστι νομισματικοῦ: and Ellic, "πν. here seems immediately to refer to the state of the inward Spirit as wrought upon by the Holy Spirit, and ultimately to the Holy Spirit, as the in- working power. Cf. Rom. i. 4, viii. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 13; Eph. i. 17: in all of which cases πν. seems to indicate the Holy Spirit, and the abstract genitive the specific χάριμα "),—looking to thyself (we have the same singling out of individuals from a multitude previously addressed in Tuncyd. i. 42, ἐν εὐθυμίαις, καὶ νεοτέρον τὸν παρά πρεσβύτερον μαθᾶν, ἀμαθῶς ... ἡμᾶς ἀμφισβητᾶ. See more examples in Bernardy, p. 421), lest thou also be tempted (on a similar occasion: notice the aorist). 2.] ἀλλήλων, prefixed and emphatic, has not been enough attended to. You want to become disciples of that Law which imposes heavy burdens on men: if you will bear burdens, bear one another's burdens, and thus fulfill (see var. read.): notice aorist: by this act fulfill the law of Christ,—a far higher and better law, whose only burden is love. The position of ἀλλήλων I conceive fixes this meaning, by throwing τὰ βάρη into the shade, as a term common to the two laws. As to the βάρη, the more general the meaning we give to it, the better it will accord with the sense of the command. The matter men-
tioned in the last verse led on to this: but this grasps far wider, extending to all the burdens which we can, by help and sympathy, bear for one another. There are some which we cannot: see below.

ἀνάπληρα, thoroughly full: Ellic. quotes Plat. Populicol. ii., ἀνεπλήρωσα τήν βουλήν ἀληθευόσαν, 'filled up the Senate.'

3.] The chief hindrance to sympathy with the burdens of others is self-conceit: that must be got rid of. εἶναι τι, see ref.

μὴ δὲν ἢν] there is (perhaps: but this must not be over-pressed, see Ellic.) a fine irony in the subjective μὴ δὲν — being, if he would come to himself, and look on the real fact, nothing: —whereas ὡς ἢν expresses more the objective fact,—his real absolute worthlessness. See examples of both expressions in Wetst. h. i.

φρεναπατά] not found elsewhere: see ref. and James i. 26. The word seems to mean just as ἀπάτων καρδιᾶν αὐτὸν there: I should hardly hold Ellic.'s distinction: both are subjective deceits, and only to be got rid of by testing them with plain matter of fact.

4.] The test applied: emphasis on τὸ ἔργον, which (as Muy.) is the complex, the whole, the practical result of his life, see ref. ὅσο.] put to the trial (refl.): not 'render δικαίων,' which the word will not bear.

κ. τότε] And then (after he has done this) he will have his matter of boasting (the article makes it subjective: the καφαχμα, that whereof to boast, not without a slight irony,—whatever matter of boasting he finds, after such a testing, will be) in reference to himself alone (εἰς ἑαυτὸν, μόνον: emphatic—corresponds to εἰς τὸν ἑαυτὸν, and not (as matter of fact: not μή) in reference to the other, (or, his neighbour— the man with whom he was comparing himself: general in its meaning, but particular in each case of comparison).

5.] And this is the more advisable, because in the nature of things, each man's own load (of infirmities and imperfections and sins: not of 'responsibility,' which is alien from the context) will (in ordinary life: not 'at the last day,' which is here irrelevant, and would surely have been otherwise expressed: the βαστάζει must correspond with the βαστάζετε above, and be a taking up and carrying, not an ultimate bearing the consequences of) come upon himself to bear, φορτίον here, hardly with any allusion to Εσοπ's well-known fable (C. and H. ii. 182, edn. 2),—but, as distinguished from βάρος, in which there is an idea of grievance conveyed,—the load imposed on each by his own fault. The future, in this sense of that which must be in the nature of things, is discussed by Bernhardy, pp. 377-8.

6—10.] Exhortation (in pursuance of the command in ver. 2, see below), to liberality towards their teachers, and to beneficence in general.

6.] κοινωνεῖται most likely intransitive, as there does not appear to be an instance of its transitive use in the N. T. (certainly not Rom. xii. 13). But the two senses come nearly to the same: he who shares in the necessities of the saints, can only do so by making that necessity partly his own, i. e., by depriving himself to that extent, and communicating to them. On καθαρωμαι, and καθάρων, see Soiey, Thes. sub voce. This meaning, of 'giving oral instruction,' is confined to later Greek: see Lidd. and Scott. δὲ, as bringing out a contrast to the individuality of the last verse.

τὸν λόγον, in its very usual sense of the Gospel.—the word of life. It is the ascensive of reference or of second government, after καθαρωμαι, as in Acts xviii. 25. εἰν πάρ.] in all good things: the things of this life mainly, as the context shows. Nor does this meaning produce an abrupt break between vv. 5 and 6, and 6 and 7, as Meyer (who understands ἀγαθά of moral
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10. ἐχόμεν B' Β'γ. ἐργαζόμεθα ἌΒ 'Β' ἐτὸς m goth ΕΕ : txt B'CDFN rel vs Clem., σουμέθα K al., μὴ ἐγκ. [10.] ἀρὰ σοῦ, so then: 'the meaning of ἐρα, 'rebus ita comparatis,' is here distinctly apparent: its weaker ratiocinative force being supported by the collective power of σοῦ.' Ellic. ὅσο not 'while' (Olsh., al), nor, 'according as,' i.e. 'quotiescessisseque,' nor, 'since,' causal (De W., Winer, al.)—but as, i.e. in proportion as: let our beneficence be in proportion to our καρπός—let the seed-time have its καρπὸς ζησεως, as well as the harvest, ver. 9. Thus καρπός is a common term between the two verses. ὁ ἄγιον: the good thing: as we say, 'he did the right thing,' as that which is (in each case) good. τ. οἶκεύως τ. πιστ. [11.] those who belong to the faith: there does not seem to be any allusion to a household, as in E. V. In Isa. lviii. 7 'thy fellow-men' are called οἱ οἶκευόντων σου: so also in the examples from the later classics in Wett., οἶκευόντων φιλοσφόρων, — γεωργίας, — ἐλεγχόμενος, τρυπανισπάς, etc. — end. | Postscript and Benediction. [11.] See in how large letters (in what great and apparently insightfully characters: see note on next verse. Πηλίκου will not bear the rendering (1) 'how many,' πολλοίς, — or (2) 'what sort,' ποιας: — but only (3) how great [reff.]. Nor can (3) be made to mean (1) by taking γράμματα for 'Epistle,' a sense unknown to St. Paul. I wrote (not strictly the epistolary sericelbëmon, nor referring to the following verses only: but the aorist spoken as at the time when they would receive the Epistle, and referring I believe to the whole of it, see also below) with my own hand. I do not see how it is possible to avoid the inference that these words apply to the whole Epistle. If they had reference only to the passage in which they occur, would not γράφω have been used, as in 2 Thess. iii. 17? Again, there is no break in style here, indicating the end of the dictated portion, and the beginning of the written, as in Rom. xvi. 25; 2 Thess. iii. 17 al. I should rather believe, that on account of the peculiar character of this Epistle, St. Paul wrote it all with his own hand, —as he did the pastoral Epistles: and I find confirmation of this, in the partial resemblance of its style to those Epistles. (See Prolomomena, as above on ver. 9.) And he wrote it, whether from weakness of his eyes, or from choice, in large characters. [12.] As my Epistle, so my practice: I have no desire to make a fair show outwardly: my γράμματα are not εὑρόσωμα (is there a further allusion to the same point in ὅσο τῷ καλῷ οὖντος σαυχάρης, and even in στίγματα, below?) and I have no sympathy with these θέλεστε εὑρόσωμα ἐν σαρκί. The word εὑρόσωμα occurs only here: but we have φανοροσωματικός, Cic. Atti. vii. 21; xiv. 21: σεμνοροσωματικός, Aristoph. Nub. 363. ἐν σαρκί, not merely 'in the flesh,' but in outward things, which belong to man's natural state: see ch. v. 19. οὖν, it is these who: see ver. 7. ἀναγκάζων] are compelling: — go about to compel. τῷ σταυρῷ dative of the cause, see reff. Winer would understand should be persecuted with the Cross (i. e. with sufferings like the Cross of Christ.' But apart from other objections (which I do not feel, however, so strongly as Ellie.), surely this would have been otherwise expressed — by
13. peristemmenoi BL rel 672 copt goth lat-v: txt ACDFKN d h l 17 syrr Meion- e Chr Thdr Thdr Damasc Bede. for belouvis, bouvouia AC: peristemmenoi B: kaukhisontai DGI e d.

14. kaukhisontai AD1. ins o bef kosmos F (Clem Bas,) Thl. rec ins tw bef kosmo, with (CDE)KL rel Clem Orig Ath, Mac Bas, Epiph Chr Cyr Thdr Damasc: om ABCDFKN 17 Orig3 Ath1.

15. rec (for ostr yap) en yap k. etp. ouste (from ch v. 6), with ACDEKLN rel latt syr-w-ast (ev to etp.) copt ath-pl Thdr Damasc Victorin Ambrost: txt B 17 Syr syr(altern), sah goth ath arm (ed 1963) Cyr Syne Jer Aug.

16. stoichoumen (corru to pres, as more usual and simpler. No reason can be given why the fut should have been substituted, and it belongs to the nervous style of this conclusion) AC1DF syrr copt (appxy) goth arm Chr Cyr Victorin Jer Aug, Ambrost Rulf:

τοὺς παθήμασιν or the like. 13. For (proof that they wish only as escape persecution) not even they who are being circumcised (who are the adopters and instigators of circumcision, cf. ἀκούσας above) themselves keep the law (νόμον emphatic: the words contain a matter of fact, not known to us otherwise.—that these preachers of legal conformity extended it not to the whole law, but selected from it at their own caprice), but wish you (emphatic) to be circumcised, that in your (emphatic) flesh they may make their boast (γίνεται ἐν τῷ κατακόπτει τὴν ὑμετέραν σάρκα καυκόσαντας ἢ διδάσασαι ὑμᾶς, i. e., μαθητάς ὑμῖν ἔχοντες, Thl. In this way they escaped the scandal of the Cross at the hands of the Jews, by making in fact their Christian converts into Jewish proselytes). 14. But to me let it not happen to boast (on the construction, see ref.) Meyer quotes Xen. Cyr. vi. 3. 11,— ὥσπερ μέγιστο, λαβένς μοι γένοιτο αὐτῶν), except in the Cross (the atoning death, as my means of reconciliation with God) of our Lord Jesus Christ (the full name for solemnity, and ημῶν to involve his readers in the duty of the same abjuration), by means of whom (not so well, of 'which' τοῦ σταυροῦ) as many Commentators; the greater antecedent, τοῦ κυρ. ἱ. 1. χ., coming after the σταυρῷ, Vol. III.

has thrown it into the shade. Besides, it could hardly be said of the Cross, ζα, νῦν the world (the whole system of unspiritual and unchristian men and things. Notice the absorption of the article in a word which had become almost a proper name: so with ζηλος, γῆ, πᾶλιν, &c.) has been (and is) crucified (not merely 'dead') he chooses, in relation to σταυῤῥοῦ above, this stronger word, which at once brings in his union with the death of Christ, besides his relation to the world) to me (ἐμοί, native of ethical relation: so μάνιν Μαυρίκιον καθ- εῖδω, Plut. Erat. p. 760 ά: see other examples in Bernhardy, p. 85), and I to the world. Ellic, quotes from Schöttg, 'alter pro mortuo habet alterum.' 15. See ch. v. 6. Confirmation of last verse: so far are such things from me as a ground of boasting, that they are nothing: the new birth by the Spirit is all in all. κτίσεις (see note on 2 Cor. v. 17), creation: and therefore the result, as regards an individual, is, that he is a new creature: so that the word comes to be used in both significations. 16. And as many (reference to the ζυγοῖ of ver. 12: and in κατα κατὰ to the εὐφρωσυνήν, and πηλεῖον γράμματα: see above) as shall walk by this rule (of ver. 15. κατά is a straight rule, to detect crookedness: hence a norma vivendi. The dative is normal), peace be (not 'is': it is the apostolic blessing, F.
so common in the beginnings of his Epistles: see also Eph. vi. 23) upon them (come on them from God; refl., and Luke ii. 25, 40 al. freq.) and (and indeed, 'and more,' the καί explicative, as it is called: see ref.) upon the Israel of God (the subject of the whole Epistle seems to have given rise to this expression. Not the Israel after the flesh, among whom those teachers wish to enrol you, are blessed: but the Israel of God, described ch. iii. ult., ἐὰν δὲ ὑμεῖς χριστοῦ, ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ στέρμα ἑστε. Jowett compares, though not exactly parallel, yet for a similar apparent though not actual distinction, 1 Cor. x. 32).

17.] τοῦ λαοῦ, as E. V., henceforth: see, χρᾶνον. So Herod. iii. 15, ἐγὼ τοῦ λαοῦ διαστάτου: see numerous other examples in Wetstein. "τὸ λαότων continuum et perpetuum tempus significant,—ut apud Xen. Cyr. viii. 5, 24; τοῦ λαοῦ autem repetitionem ejusdem facti relicuo tempore indicat, ut apud Aristoph. in Pace, v. 1681 [1650 Bekk.]." Hermann ad Viger., p. 706. But the above example from Herod, hardly seems to bear this out. Rather is a thing happening in time regarded as belonging to the period including it, and the genitive is one of possession. Against this Ellic., viewing the gen. as simply partitive, refers to Donalds. Gram. § 451: who however defines its meaning by saying "partitive, or, what is the same thing, possessive." This indeed must be the clear and only account of a partitive genitive.

κότι. παραξ. How? Thdrt. (hardly Chrys.), al., understand it of the trouble of writing more epistles —οἰκίτι, φράσι, γράφας τι πάλιν ἀνίκητας ἅντι δὲ γραμματῶν τῶν μᾶλλον δείκνυμι, κ. τ.ν. αἰκίσμοιν τὰ σημεῖα. But it seems much more natural to take it of giving him trouble by rebellious conduct and denying his apostolic authority, seeing that it was stamped with so powerful a seal as he proceeds to state. ἵς γάρ] for it is I (not the Judaizing teachers) who carry (perhaps as in ver. 5, and ch. v. 10,—bear, as a burden: but Chrys.'s idea seems more adapted to the 'free' character of the sentence: ὅπως εἶτε, ἐκώ, ἄλα, ἡμάς ἄπτε τε ἔτι τροποῖοι μέγα φρονῶν ποίημα σημεῖον διδάσκεις: see ref. [2]) in (on) my body the marks of Jesus, τὰ στίγματα,—the marks branded on slaves to indicate their owners. So Herod. viii. 233, τοὺς πλείωνας αὐτῶν, κελεύσαντος Ξερέως, ἔτοιχοι στίγματα βασιλείας: and in another place (ii. 113) is a passage singularly in point: ὅπως ἄνθρωπον ἐπιβάλλεται στίγματα ἵππα, ἐκὼ ποῦ τοῦ τὸν θεὸν ἔξεστι τούτου δόξασθαί. See many more examples in Wetst. These marks, in St. Paul's case, were of course the scars of his wounds received in the service of his Master—cf. 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff. 'Ἰησοῦ is the genitive of possession,—answering to the possessive βασιλεία in the extract.
above. There is no allusion whatever to any similarity between himself and our Lord, 'the marks which Jesus bore;' such an allusion would be quite irrelevant: and with its irrelevancy falls a whole fabric of Romanist superstition which has been raised on this verse, and which the fair and learned Windischman, giving as he does the honest interpretation here, yet attempts to defend in a supplemental note. Neither can we naturally suppose any comparison intended between these his στίγματα as Christ's servant, and circumcision: for he is not now on that subject, but on his authority as sealed by Christ: and such a comparison is alien from the majesty of the sentence. 18. ] The Apostolic blessing. No special intention need be suspected in πνεύματος (ἀπάγων αὐτοῦς τῶν σαρκικῶν, Chrys.), as the same expression occurs at the end of other Epistles (refl.). I should rather regard it as a deep expression of his Christian love, which is further carried on by ἀδελφοί, the last word,—parting from them, after an Epistle of such rebuke and warning, in the fulness of brotherhood in Christ.
ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ.

I. 1 Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῖς ἑτέροις ἐν Εφέσῳ καὶ τοῖς συναντούσις ἐν εὐπρεπίς, πρὸς ἑαυτόν τινα ἔγραψεν Παῦλος τοῖς εὐτυχεῖσιν ἐν εὐπρεπίς.
Christ Jesus. This, in its highest sense, "qui fideem præstant," not mere truth, or faithfulness, is imported: see reft. The ἀγιοίς and πατήσιος denote their spiritual life from its two sides,—that of God who calls and sanctifies,—that of themselves who believe. So Bengel, ‘Dei est, sanctificare nos et sibi asserere; nostrum, ex Dei m Good, ereedere.' Stier remarks that by πατής, ἐν χρί, '—ἀγιός gets its only full and N. T. meaning. He also notices in these expressions already a trace of the two great divisions of the Epistle—God's grace towards us, and our faith towards Him.

2.] After χαρίς ὑπ. κ. εἰρ. supply rather εἰρ. than ἑστι: see 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Pet. i. 2; Jude 2. On the form of greeting, cf. Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2; Gal. i. 3, &c. The Socinian perversion of the words, ‘from God, who is the Father of us and of our Lord Jesus Christ;' is decisively refuted by Tit. i. 4, not to mention that nothing but the grossest ignorance of St. Paul's spirit could ever allow such a meaning to be thought of. We must not fall into the error of refining too much, as Stier, on χαρίς and εἰρ., as referring respectively to ἀγιοίς and πατήσιος: see || above, where these last epithets do not occur.

3—III. 21.] FIRST PORTION OF THE EPISTLE: THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. And herein, I. 3—23.] GROUND AND ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH, IN THE FATHER'S COUNSEL, AND HIS ACT IN CHRIST, BY THE SPIRIT. And herein again, (A) the preliminary idea of the Church, set forth in the form of an ascription of praise vv. 3—14:—thus arranged:—vv. 3—6] The Father, in His eternal Love, has chosen us to holiness (ver. 4),—ordained us to sonship (ver. 5),—bestowed grace on us in the Beloved (ver. 6):—vv. 7—12] In the Son, we have,—redemption according to the riches of His grace (ver. 7), knowledge of the mystery of His will (vv. 8, 9),—inheritance under Him the one Head (vv. 10—12):—vv. 13, 14] through the Spirit we are sealed,—by hearing the word of salvation (ver. 13),—by receiving the earnest of our inheritance (ver. 14),—to the redemption of the purchased possession (ib.).

3.] Blessed (see note on Rom. ix. 5. Understand εἰγ (Job i. 21; Ps. exi. 2; or ἐστιν, 2 Chron. ix. 8. Ellicot)—'Be He praised.' See a similar doxology, 2 Cor. i. 3. Almost all St. Paul's Epistles begin with some ascription of praise. That to Titus is the only exception [not Gal.: cf. Gal. i. 5]. See also 1 Pet. i. 3) be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. (cf. Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 3; xi. 31; Col. i. 3)—also 1 Cor. xv. 21. Such is the simplest and most forcible sense of the words—as Thl., ἰδον κ. θεός κ. πατήρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κ. ἑνὸς χριστοῦ θεός μεν, ἣς σαρκωθέντος 'πατήρ δὲ, ἃς θεός λόγου. See John xx. 17, from which saying of our Lord it is not improbable that the expression took its rise. Meyer maintains, 'God who is also the Father of...: on the ground that only πατήρ, not θεός, requires a genitive supplied. But we may fairly reply that, if we come to strictness of construction, his meaning would require ὁ θεός, ὁ καὶ πατήρ. Harless's objection, that on our rendering it must be ὁ θεός ὁ καὶ πατήρ, is well answered by Meyer from 1 Pet. ii. 25, τὸν ποιμήνα κ. ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν. Ellicot prefers Meyer's view, but pronounces the other both grammatically and doctrinally tenable, who blessed (aor. not hath blessed: the historical fact in the counsels of the Father being thought of throughout the sentence, εὐλογηθεὶς —εὐλογήσας — εὐλογία—such was the ground-tone of the new covenant. As in creation God blessed them, saying, 'Be fruitful and multiply,'—so in redemption,—at the introduction of the covenant, "all families of the earth shall be blessed,"—at its completion,—"Come ye blessed of my Father." But God's blessing is in facts—ours in words only) us (whom? not the Apostle only: nor Paul and his fellow-Apostles:—but, all Christians—all the members of Christ. The καὶ μακ. of ver. 13 perfectly agrees with this; see here: but the κάγω of ver. 15 does not agree with the other views) in (instrumental or modal: the element in
which, and means by which, the blessing is imparted} all (i.e. all possible—all, exhaustive, in all richness and fulness of blessing; cf. ver. 23 note) blessing of the Spirit (not merely, 'spiritual [inward] blessing' πνευματικός in the N.T. always implies the working of the Holy Spirit, never bearing merely our modern inaccurate sense of spiritual as opposed to bodily. See 1 Cor. ix. 11, which has been thus misunderstood) in the heavenly places (so the expression, which occurs five times in this Epistle [see ref.], and nowhere else, can only mean: cf. ver. 20. It is not probable that St. Paul should have chosen an unusual expression for the purposes of this Epistle, and then used it in several different senses. Besides, as Harless remarks, the preposition εἰς in composition with adjectives gives usually a local sense: e.g. in εἰς τίγειον, εἰς εὐθύνον, εἰς ἑωρακίον, as compared with γίνειον, χίον, ούρανος. Chrys., al., would understand it 'heavenly blessings,' in which case the Apostle would hardly have failed to add χαρίσματος, or ἄγαθος, or the like.

But, with the above rendering, what is the sense? Our country, πολιτεία, is in heaven, Phil. iii. 20: there our High Priest stands, blessing us. There are our treasures, Matt. vi. 20, 21, and our affections to be, Col. iii. 1 f.: there our hope is laid up, Col. i. 5: our inheritance is reserved for us, 1 Pet. i. 4. And there, in that place, and belonging to that state, is the εὐδοκία, the gift of the Spirit, Heb. vi. 4, poured out on those who τὰ ἐνω φρονοῦσιν. Materially, we are yet in the body: but in the Spirit, we are in heaven—only waiting for the redemption of the body to be entirely and literally there.

I may once for all premise, that it will be impossible, in the limits of these notes, to give even a synopsis of the various opinions on the rich fulness of doctrinal expressions in this Epistle. I must state in each case that which appears to me best to suit the context, and those variations which must necessarily be mentioned, referring to such copious commentaries as Harless or Stier (for further statement) in Christ (‘the threefold εὖν after εὐλογήσας, has a meaning ever deeper and more precise: and should therefore be kept in translating. The blessing with which God has blessed us, consists and expands itself in all blessing of the Spirit—then brings in Heaven, the heavenly state in us, and us in it—then finally, Christ, personally, He Himself, that is, in exalted from Heaven, by the Spirit down into us, so that He is in us and we in Him of a truth, and thereby, and in so far, we are with Him in heaven.” Stier). 4. According as (καθὼς explains and expands the foregoing—shewing wherein the εὐδοκία consists as regards us, and God’s working towards us. Notice, that whereas ver. 3 has summarily included in the work of blessing the Three Persons, the Father bestowing the Spirit in Christ,—now the threefold word, so to speak, is unwrapped, and the part of each divine Person separately described: cf. argument above) He selected us (refl. I render selected, in preference to elected, as better giving the middle sense,—‘chose for himself,’—and the εὖ, that it is a choosing out of the world. The word [ref. Deut.] is an O. T. word, and refers to the spiritual Israel, as it did to God’s elect Israel of old. But there is no contrast between their election and ours: it has been but one election throughout—an election in Christ, and to holiness on God’s side—and involving accession to God’s people [cf. πιστεύσαντες, ver. 13, and εἷς εὐπρεπετε τῷ πίστει, Col. i. 23] on ours. See Eichhott’s note on the word, and some excellent remarks in Stier, p. 62, on the divine and human sides of the doctrine of election as put forward in this Epistle) in Him (i.e. in Christ, as the second Adam [1 Cor. xv. 22]), the righteous Head of our race. In Him, in one wide sense, were all mankind elected, inasmuch as He took their flesh and blood, and redeemed them, and represents them before the Father: but in the proper and final sense, this can be said only of His faithful ones, His Church, who are incorporated in Him by the Spirit. But in any sense, all God’s election is in Him only) before the foundation of the world (πρὸ κατ. k. only here in St. Paul: we have ἀπὸ κατ. k. in Heb. iv. 3; his expressions elsewhere are πρὸ
Commentators, are to take the passage, after Him, as indicating that He was and is the embodiment of the positive and negative sides of the Christian character, Æóuos, of the general positive category, Æóos, of the non-existence of any exception to it. So Plut. Periciol., p. 173 [Mey.], Æias kathodo k. Æólitas. This holiness and unblameableness must not be understood of that justification by faith by which the sinner stands accepted before God: it is distinctly put forth here [see also ch. v. 27] as an ultimate result as regards us, and refers to that sanctification which follows on justification by faith, and which is the will of God respecting us, 1 Thess. iv. 7. See Stier’s remarks against Harless, p. 71) before Him (i.e. in the deepest verity of our being—throughly penetrated by the Spirit of holiness, bearing His searching eye, ch. v. 27; but at the same time implying an especial nearness to His presence and dearness to Him—and bearing a foretaste of the time when the elect shall be Æóous to tiv Æóon toiv theoi, Rev. vii. 15. Cf. Col. i. 22, note) in love. There is considerable dispute as to the position and reference of these words. Three different ways are taken. (1) Gecum., &c., join them with Æéleústeo. I do not see, with most Commentators, the extreme improbability of the qualifying clause following the verb after so long an interval, when we take into account the studied solemnity of the passage, and remember that Æv Æóísth in the last verse was separated nearly as far from its verb Æélogíssas. My objection to this view is of a deeper kind: see below. (2) The Syy., Chrys., Thidrt., Thl., Bengel, Lachm., Harless, Olsh., Mey., De W., Stier, Elle., all, join them with Æprosías in the following verse. To this, in spite of all that has been so well said in its behalf, there is an objection which seems to me insuperable. It is, that in the whole construction of this long sentence, the verbs and participles, as natural in a solemn emphatic enumeration of God’s dealings with His people, precede their qualifying clauses: e.g. Æélogíssas ver. 3, Æéleústeo ver. 4, Æéaríowven ver. 6, Æéprosías ver. 8, Æélogíssas ver. 9, Æóloé theo., Æóloélaüsivver. 10. In no one case, except the necessary one of a relative qualification (Æv ver. 6, and again ver. 8), does the verb follow its qualifying clause: and for this reason, that the verbs themselves are emphatic, and not the conditions under which they subsist. “Blessed be God who did all this, &c.” He may have fore-ordained, and did fore-ordain, in love: and this is implied in what follows, from kata t. evó &c., to Æéleústeo: but the point brought out, as that for which we are to bless Him, not that in love He fore-ordained us, but the fact of that fore-ordination itself: not His attribute, but His act. It is evidently no answer to this, to bring forward sentences elsewhere in which Æv Æóloé stands first, such as ch. iii. 18, where the spirit of the passage is different. (3) The vulg., Anbrst., Erasm., Luth., Castal., Beza, Calvin, Grot., all, join them, as in the text, with Ævali . . . Æómos Æval Æáov. This has been strongly impugned by the last-mentioned set of Commentators: mainly on the ground that the addition of Æv Æóloé to Æv. k. Æómos, Æval Æáov, is ungrammatical,—is flat and superfluous,—and that in neither ch. v. 27, nor Col. i. 22, have these adjectives any such qualification. But in answer, I would submit, that in the first place, as against the construction of Æv Æv. with Æómos, the objection is quite futile, for our arrangement does not thus construct it, but adds it as a qualifying clause to the whole Ævali . . . Æáov. Next, I hold the qualification to be in the highest degree solemn and appropriate. Æáov, that which man lost at the Fall, but which God is, and to which God restores man by redemption, is the great element in which, as in their abode and breathing-place, all Christian graces subsist, and in which, emphatically, all perfection before God must be found. And so, when the Apostle, ch. iv. 16, is describing the glorious building up of the body, the Church,
he speaks of its increasing εἰς οἰκεδαυμένῳ ἐκατόν ἐν ἀγάπῃ. And it his practice, in this and the parallel Ephes, to add ἐν ἀγάπῃ as the completion of the idea of Christian holiness—cf. ch. iii. 18; Col. ii. 2, also ch. iv. 2; v. 2. With regard to the last objection,—in both the places cited, the adjectives are connected with the verb παραστῆσαι, expressed therefore in the abstract as the ultimate result of sanctification in the sight of the Father, not, as here, referring to the state of sanctification, as consisting and subsisting in love.

5. Having predestined us (subordinate to the θελετέσσαρ: see Rom. viii. 29, 30, where the steps are thus laid down in succession):—οὗ προέρχεται οὗ προέρχεται, τούτων καὶ ἱκάλητων. Now the ἐκλογή must answer in this to the προέρχεται, and precede the προέρχεσθαι. Stier remarks well, "In God, indeed, all is one; but for our anthropomorphic way of speaking and treating, which is necessary to us, there follows on His first decree to adopt and to sanctify, the nearer decision, how and by what this shall be brought about, because it could only thus be brought about." προ,—as Pelagius [in Harless.]—"ad eos refertur qui anteac non fuerunt, et priusquam fierent, de hoc cognitatum est et postea substanturum") unto adoption (so that we should become His sons, in the blessed sense of being reconciled to Him and having a place in His spiritual family,—should have the remission of our sins, the pledge of the Spirit, the assurance of the inheritance) through Jesus Christ (the Son of God, in and by whom, elementally and instrumentally, our adoption consists, cf. Rom. viii. 29, προέρχεσθαι συμφόρων τῆς εἰκόνος τ. ν. ν. αὐτῶν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν προτότουκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἄδελφοις) to Him (the Father: see Col. i. 20, δι' αὐτοῦ [Christ] ἀποκαταλαλάζει τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτῶν [the Father]. So Thirt., all., Harl., Osh., Meyer, Stier: and rightly, for the Son could not be in this sentence the δειμματικοὶ [the whole reference being to the work and purpose of the Father]; and had this been intended, as Harl. remarks, we must have had καὶ εἰς αὐτῶν. De W., who, after Anselm, Tho.-Aq., castal., all., refers it to the Son, fails to answer this objection of Harl.'s. But now arise two questions: (1) the meaning.

Does it merely represent ἔστω, a dativus commodi? So Grot., al., but it cannot be, after the insertion of the special διὰ τ. χ., that the sentence should again return to the general purpose. It seems much better, to join it with διὰ τ. χ., as in Col. i. 20, above: and so Harl., but too indefinitely, taking it only as a phrase common with the Apostle and not giving its full import. As in Col. i. 20, the εἰς αὐτῶν, though thus intimately connected with διὰ αὐτῶν, depends on ἀποκαταλαλάζει, so here it must depend on ἡμοθεσία, and its import must be 'to [into] Himself.'—i. e. so that we should be partakers of the divine nature: cf. 2 Pet. i. 4. (2) Should we read αὐτῶν or αὐτῶν? It will depend on whether we refer this clause, from διὰ to κατά, to the Father as its subject, or consider it as a continuation of the Apostle's thanksgiving. And the latter is much the most likely; for had the former been the case, we should probably have had, instead of διὰ θεσιν. χρίστον, διὰ τοῦ ν. αὐτῶν. i. e., so that reference to the Father might still be kept up. I decide therefore for αὐτῶν, as Thirt. certainly read, or his remark, τὸ δὲ εἰς αὐτῶν, τὸν πατέρα λέγει, would have been needless. And so Erasm., Wetsl., Laehm., Harl., Osh., Meyer. Then αὐτῶν in ver. 6 naturally takes it up again) according to (in pursuance of) the good pleasure (it is disputed whether εὐδοκία has here merely this general meaning of benevolentiam, or that of benevolentia. Harl. [see also Ellicott] examines thoroughly the use of the word by the LXX, and decides in favour of the latter, alleging especially, that a mere assertion of doctrine would be out of place in an ascription of thanksgiving. But surely this is a most unfortunate position. The facts on which doctrines rest are here the very subjects of the Apostle's thanksgiving: and the strict parallels of Matt. xi. 26, Luke x. 21, should have kept him from adding it. Granting, as we must, both sensus to εὐδοκία and εὐδοκία, the context must in each case determine which is meant. And its testimony here is clear. It is, as De W. remarks, not in προφθαρμένου, but in προφθαραπέσας, that the object, to which εὐδοκία refers, is to be sought: and the subsequent recurrences to the same idea in ver. 9 and ver. 11 point out that it is not the Father's
benevolentia, but His beneplacitum, which is in the Apostles' mind. And so Meyer, De W., Stier, and Elice. This beneplacitum was benevolentia, ver. 6; but that does not affect the question. See, besides Harl., a long note in Fritz, on Romans ii. p. 369 of His will, 6. to (with a view to, as the purpose of the predestina-
tion) the praise (by men and angels—all that can praise) of the glory of His grace (beware of the miserable hendiadys, 'His glorious grace,' by which all the richness and depth of meaning are lost. The end, God's end, in our predestination to adoption, is, that is the glory, glorious nature, brightness and majesty, and kindliness and beauty—of His grace might be an object of men and angels' praise: both as it is in Him, ineffable and infinite—and exemplified in us, its objects; see below, ver. 12. "Owing to the defining genitive, the article (before δακης) is not indispensable: see Winer, edn. 6, § 19. 2, b: compare Madvig, Synt. § 10. 2." Elice.) which (there is some difficulty in deciding between the readings, εν ης, and ης. The former would be the most naturally substi-
tuted for an attraction found difficult: and the existence of ης as a reading, seems to point this way. The latter, on the other hand, might perhaps be written by a transcript carelessly, χάρισος having just preceded. But I own this does not seem to me very probable. A relative follow-
ing a substantive, is as often in a differ-
cent case, as in the same: and there could be no temptation to a transcript to write ης here, which could hardly occur at all unless by attraction, a construction to which transcribers certainly were not prone. I therefore, with Lachm., Mey., Rück, al., adopt ης. Considerations of the exigencies of the sense, alleged by Harl., al., do not come into play unless where external authorities are balanced [which is the case here] and probabilities of alteration also [which is not!]. He be-
stowed upon us (the meaning of χαριτωσ is disputed. The double meaning of χάρις,—favour, grace bestowed, and that which ensures favour, viz. grace inherent, beauty, —has been supposed to give a double mean-
ing to the verb also,—to confer grace, and to render gracious, or beautiful, or accept-
able. And this latter sense is adopted, here and in Luke i. 28 [where see note], by many,—e. g. by Chrys., τουτεστι, υδι
μονον διαμαρτματων ανηλλαξεν, Αλλα και επερατωσ επιοιησ,—Erasm., Luth., all. But the meaning of χάρις, on which this is founded, does not seem to occur in the N. T., certainly not in St. Paul. And χαριτωσ, both here and in 1, e., according to the analogy of such verbs, will be 'to bestow grace.' Another reason for this sense is the indefinite norist, referring to an act of God once past in Christ, not to an abiding state which He has brought about in us. This, as usual, has been almost universally overlooked, and the perfect sense given. Another still, is the requirement of the context. Harl. well remarks, that, according to the sense 'bestowed grace,' ver. 7 is the natural answer to the question, 'How hath He bestowed grace?' whereas, on the other rendering, it has only a mediate connexion with this verse. Stier would unite both meanings; but surely this is impossible. The becoming χαριστει may be a conse-
quence of being κεκαιριωμεν, but must be quite independent of its verbal mean-
ing. Conyb. remarks that it may be liter-
ally rendered 'His favour, wherewith He favoured us:' but 'favour' would not reach deep enough for the sense) in (see above on εν χρισταφ, ver. 3. Christ is our Head and including Representative) the Beloved (i.e. Christ: = ιηδος ης έγανθης αυτω, Col. i. 13. He is God's ἡγησιμαι-
νος κατ' εξωθη,—cf. Matt. iii. 17; John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 9—11). 7. Now the Apostle passes, with εν ης, to the consideration of the ground of the church in the SON (7—12): see the synopsis above. But the Father still continues the great subject of the whole;—only the re-
ference is now to the Son. In whom (see on εν χρ. ver. 3—cf. Rom. iii. 21) we have (objective—there is for us.) But
not without a subjective implied import, as spoken of those who truly have it—have laid hold of it: "are ever needing and ever having it," Eadie the Redemption (from God's wrath—or rather from that which brought us under God's wrath, the guilt and power of sin, Matt. i. 21. The article expresses notoriety—'of which we all know,'—'of which the law testified, and the prophets spoke') through (as the instrument: a further fixing of the εγερσεως) His blood (which was the price paid for that redemption, Acts xx. 28; 1 Cor. vi. 20; both the ultimate climax of His obedience for us, Phil. ii. 8, and, which is most in view here, the propitiation, in our nature, for the sin of the world, Rom. iii. 25; Col. i. 20. It is a noteworthy observation of Harless here, that the choice of the word, the Blood of Christ, is of itself a testimony to the idea of expiation having been in the writer's mind. Not the death of the victim, but its blood, was the typical instrument of expiation. And I may notice that in Phil. ii. 8, where Christ's obedience, not His atonement, is spoken of, there is no mention of His shedding His Blood, only of the act of His Death), the remission (not "overlooking" [παρέσεως; see note on Rom. iii. 25]) of (our) transgressions (explanation of τις απολύτρωσις: not to be limited, but extending to all vileness from the practice and consequences of our transgressions: at least equivalent with ἀπολύτρωσις)—so Thirl., δι' εκείνου γὰρ τὰς τῶν ἀμαρτιών ἀπολύτρωσιν κηλίδας, κ. τῆς τοῦ τυραννίας δουλείας ἀπαλλαγέντες, τοὺς τῆς ἐκκκνοι τῆς θλίας ἀπελάθουσεν χαρακτήρια. This again is Harless, according to the riches (Elich compares Plato, Enulrhyph. 12 A, τραβάς ἐν τῃ πλου- τῳ τῆς σοφίας) of His grace (this alone would prevent &πέρις as implying to merely the forgiveness of sins. As Passavant [in Stier], "We have in this grace not only redemption from misery and wrath, not only forgiveness,—but we find in it the liberty, the glory, the inheritance of the children of God,—the crown of eternal life: cf. 2 Cor. viii. 9 ")

8. which he shed abundantly ('caused to abound') ἄφθονος εἴξεξε, Thl. Thirl. has the same idea, ἀναβλύζει γὰρ τῶν ἐκλεον πυγάς. κ. τούτων ἡμᾶς ἐπεκλυζεί τῶν βέβαιως. The E. V. is wrong, 'wherein He hath abounded,' no such construction of attraction of a dative being found in the N. T. Calvin and Beza would take ἵναι not as an attraction, but as the genitive after ἐπεράθη, as in Luke xv. 17, 'of which He was full,' &c. But this does not agree well with the γνωρίσας, &c. below. As little can the 'quae superabundavit' of the Vulg. [and Syr.] stand: the attraction of the nominative being scarcely possible, and this being still more inconsistent with γνωρίσας forth to us in all (possible) wisdom and prudence (with E. V., De Wette, &c., I would refer these words to God. On the other hand, Harless [whose words are Olsh., Stier, Elich, al.] maintains, that neither πᾶσα νοήματι φρονήσει will allow this. "πᾶς," he says, "never = summus,—never betokens the intension, but only the extension, never the power, but the frequency,—and answers to our 'every,' i. e. all possible,—so that, when joined to abstracts, it presents them to us as concrete: πᾶσα δύναμις, 'every power that we know of,' 'that exists;'—πάσα ὑπομονή, every kind of endurance that we know of;—πᾶσα εὐσέβεια, &c. Now it is allowable enough, to put together all excellences of one species, and allege them as the motive of a human act, because we can conceive of men as wanting in any or all of them: but not so with God, of whom the Apostle, and all of us, conceive as the Essence of all perfection. We may say of God, 'in Him is all wisdom,' but not, 'He did this or that in all wisdom.' "Again," he continues, "φρονί- σις cannot be ascribed to God." And this he maintains,—not by adopting the view of Wolf, al., that it is practical knowledge, which snits neither the context nor usage,—nor that of Anselm, Bengel, al., that σοφία is 'de presentibus, φρον., 'de futuris,'—but by understanding σοφία of the normal collective state of the spirit, with reference especially to the intelligence, which last is expressed accord-
9. γνωρίσας F lat. goth Hil lat.-fl (not Jer). on 2nd aor. DF goth copt Tert Hil Victorin.

His manifold wisdom and prudence, manifested in all ways possible for us, that He poured out His grace upon us: and this wisdom and prudence was especially exemplified in that which follows, the notification to us of His hidden will, &c. In Col. i. 9, the reference is clearly different: see note there), having made known (γνωρίσας is explicative of επερεύσεσθαι, just as προφήτης is of εξελέξατο above: in that He made known.' This 'making known' is not merely the information of the understanding, but the revelation, in its fulness, to the heart) to us (not, the Apostles, but Christians in general, as throughout the passage) the mystery (refh. and Rom. xvi. 25). St. Paul ever represents the redemptive counsel of God as a mystery, i.e. a design hidden in His counsels, until revealed to mankind in and by Christ. So that his use of μυστήριον has nothing in common, except the facts of concealment and revelation, with the mysteries of the heathen world, nor with any secret tradition over and above the gospel as revealed in the Scriptures. All who vitally know that, i.e. all the Christian church are the initiated: and all who have the word, read or preached, may vitally know it. Only the world without, the unbelieving, are the unintitulated) of (objective genitive, 'the material of which mystery was, &c.') His will (that which He purposed), according to His good pleasure (belongs to γνωρίσας, and specifies it: not to διαθήκη. [τοἰ κατα τ. ε. αὐ.] i.e. so that the revelation took place in a time and manner consonant to God's eternal pleasure—viz. εἰς αἰώνας. &c. On εἰδόθη, see above ver. 5) which He purposed (reff.) in Himself (ἐν αἰώνι) is read, and referred (1) to Christ, by Chrys. and the fl. Anselm, Bengel, Luther, all. But this is impossible, because ἐν τῷ κρίστῃ is introduced with the proper name below, which certainly would not occur on the second mention after ἐν αἰὼνι, in the same reference: (2) to the Father, by Harless. But this is equally impossible. For αἰών to refer to the subject of the sentence, we must have the mind of the reader removed one step from that subject by an
intermediate idea supervening, as in κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ. Had this been κατὰ τ. προθέσιον αὐτοῦ, the reference would have been legitimate. But when, as here, no such idea intervenes,—ἡ προθέσιον ἐν αὐτῷ—the subject is directly before the mind, and αὐτός, not being reflexive but demonstrative, must point to some other person: who in this case can only be Christ. Our only resource then is to read αὐτῷ in order to (belongs to προθέσιον, not to γνωρίσας. Very many ancient Commentators and the Vulg. and E. V., take εἰς wrongly as = ἐν, by which the whole sense is confused. Hardly less confusing is the rendering of Erasm., Calv., Est., al, usque ad tempus dispensationis, thereby introducing into προθέσιον the complex idea of decreed and laid up, instead of the simple one which the context requires) the economy of the fulfilment of the seasons (after long and careful search, I am unable to find a word which will express the full meaning of οἰκονομία. The difficulty of doing so will be better seen below, after τὸ πλῆρ. τῶν καρπ. has been dealt with. This expression is by no means = τὸ πλ. τοῦ χρόνου in Gal. iv. 4, nor to be equalized with it, as Harl. attempts to do, by saying that many καρποὶ make up a χρόνος. The mistake which has misled almost all the Commentators here, and which as far as I know Stier has been the only one to expose, has been that of taking τ. πλ. τῶν καρπῶν as a fixed terminus a quo, = the coming of Christ, as Gal. iv. 4,—whereas usage, and the sense, determine it to mean, the whole duration of the Gospel times; cf. especially ch. ii. 7, ἐν τοῖς αἰῶνις τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις: 1 Cor. x. 11, τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων, and Luke xxi. 24, καρποὶ ἑορτῶν, Acts i. 7; iii. 19, 21; 1 Tim. ii. 6. Thus τ. πλ. τ. καρπῶν will mean, the filling up, completing, fulfilment, of the appointed seasons, carrying on during the Gospel dispensation. Now, belonging to, carried on during this fulfilling of the periods or seasons, is the οἰκονομία here spoken of. And, having regard to the derivation and usage of the word, it will mean, the giving forth of the Gospel under God's providential arrangements. First and greatest of all, HE is the οἰκονομός: then, above all others, His divine Son: and as proceeding from the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit—and then in subordinate degrees, every one who
rec (for 1st epistle) καὶ τὰ ἑτέρα καὶ τὸ ἐπί τῆς γῆς; 11 ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐν ὦ καὶ ἐκληρωθῆνεν προοοιμαθέντες κατὰ προθεσίν του τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντο κατὰ τὴν θελὴμα—

only. u v = Phil. ii. 5 ref.
vi. 17. v = Rom. viii. 28, iv. 11. ch. iii. 11. vii. 7. ref. w = Gal. ii. 5 ref.
x = Acts h. 25, iv. 26. xii. 36. Heb.

to find in Ellicott a defence of the rec. ἐν, grounded on the fact that "ἐν is never joined in the N. T. with ὁρανός or ὁράω, and that ἐν ὁρανός and ἐν ὄνος are invariably found in antithesis." Such an argument would sweep away all ἡπαξ λεγόμενα of construction, and break down the significance of all exceptional usage) and the things on the earth (general, as before τὰ πάντα. All creation is summed up in Christ: it was all the result of the Love of the Father for the Son [see my Doctrine of Divine Love, Serm. i.], and in the Son it is all regarded by the Father. The vastly different relation to Christ of the different parts of creation, is no objection to this union in Him: it affects, as Beng. on Rom. viii. 19, "pro suo quodque genus captu." The Church, of which the Apostle here mainly treats, is subordinated to Him in the highest degree of conscious and joyful union: those who are not His spiritually, in mere subjugation, yet consciously; the inferior tribes of creation, unconsciously: but objectively, all are summed up in Him); 11.] in Him (emphatic repetition, to connect more closely with Him the following relative clause), in whom we (Christians, all, both Jews and Gentiles; who are resolved below into ἢμεις and ἡμεῖς: see on ver. 12) were also (besides having, by His purpose, the revelation of His will, ver. 9. Not 'we also,' καὶ ἢμεῖς, as vulg. "in quo etiam nos . . ." nor as E. V. 'in whom also') taken for His inheritance (κληρονόμος, in its ordinary meaning, 'to appoint by lot,'—then 'to appoint generally: κληρονομεῖν, mid. 'to get, or possess any thing by such appointment.' The aorist passive, if ever taken in a middle sense, cannot be thus understood here, on account of εἰς τὸ εἶλαι following. Confining ourselves therefore to the strict passive sense, we have three meanings apparently open to us: (1) 'we were appointed by lot.' So Chrys., Thl., vulg. [sorte vocati sumus]. Erasm. [sorte electi sumus]. Chrys. supposes this apparently fortuitous choice to be corrected by proop. κ.τ.λ. following: 'we were allotted, yet not by chance:' others justify it, as Estius, 'quia in ipsis electis nulla est causa cur eligantur praec alii.' But to this Meyer properly opposes the fact, that we are never by St. Paul said to be chosen by any such θέλημα τῆς, but only by the gracious purpose of God: cf. Plato, Legg. vi. p. 759 c: κληρον τὸν τῆς θεός τῆς ἀποδοθέντα. (2) 'we were made partakers of the inheritance; i. e. of the Kingdom of God, as Israel of Canaan,—Acts xxvi. 18: Col. i. 12. This is adopted by Harl., and Mey., and many others. But it seems without authority from usage: the instance which Mey. quotes from Pind., Ol. viii. 19, κληρον τῶι, not bearing this rendering. And besides, the context is against it: ἐκληρωθένει being followed, as Stier observes, not by εἰς τὸ έκαλεν ἡμι, but by εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμι, and thus pointing at something which 'we are to become, not to possess. Another reason, see below. (3) 'we were made an (God's) inheritance.' This (Grot., Beng., Olsh., De W., Stier, Ellic., al.) seems to me the only rendering by which philology and the context are alike satisfied. We thus take the ordinary meaning of κληρονομος, to assign as a κληρον: and the prevalent idea of Israel in the O. T. is as a people whom the Lord chose for His inheritance; cf. Deut. iv. 20, ήμιαι έλαβεν δ ἥθος . . . εἶλαι αὐτῷ λαον ἐγκληρον: ib. ix. 29; xxii. 9; 3 Kings viii. 51, al. Platt cites from Philo (qu. ref.), ἐπισκεκαθαρίσκη τί, διοὶ των συμπατος ἀνθρώπων γίνεσ τῆς ἀπενεκμίη όλα τις ἄπαρχη τη τοιητη κ. πατρι. Olsh. calls this 'the realization in time of the κληρον ἐν χρυσῳ spoken of before,' viz. by God taking to Himself a people out of all nations for an inheritance — first in type and germ in the O. T., then fully and spiritually in the N. T. This interpretation will be further substantiated by the note on ver. 12 below), having been predestined (why mention this again? Harl. maintains that it here applies to the
Jews only, and refers to their selection [according to him] to possess the inheritance by God: but this cannot be, because as remarked above, ήμας, which first brings up the difference, does not occur yet. The true answer to the question lies in this—that here first the Apostle comes to the idea of the universal Church, the whole Israel of God, and therefore here brings forward again that fore-ordination which he had indeed hinted at generally in ver. 5, but which properly belonged to Israel, and is accordingly predicated of the Israel of the Church) according to (in pursuance of) the purpose (repeated again [see above] from ver. 9: cf. also ch. iii. 11) of Him who works (energies; but especially in and among material previously given, as here, in His material creation, and in the spirits of all flesh, also His creation) all things (not to be restricted, as Grot., to the matter here in hand, but universally predicated) according to the counsel of His will (the δοκία ver. 5.—the definite shape which the will assumes when decided to action—implying in this case the union of sovereign will with infinite wisdom), 12. in order that we (here first expressed, as distinguished from οἱ ζητοῦντες, ver. 13: see below) should be to the praise of His glory (see on ver. 6 and ver. 14 below), namely, we who have before hoped in the Christ (we Jewish-Christians, who, before the Christ came, looked forward to His coming, waiting for the consolation of Israel: cf. especially Acts xxviii. 20, ἐνίκηκε γὰρ τῇ ἐκπίθου τοῦ Ἰσραήλ τὴν ἀλώνιν ταύτην περίκειμαι—and xxvi. 6, 7. The objection, that so few thus looked, is fully met by the largeness of St. Paul’s own expression in this last passage. But this whole interpretation requires defending against opponents. First, the verse is variously punctuated. Harl., and Olsh. even more decidedly, read it εἰς τὸ εἶναι ήμας, εἰς ἐπανον δόξ. αὐ., τοὺς προηγ. ἐν τ. χρ. But to this it may be objected, (1) that εἰς ἐπ. δόξας αὐ., occurring as it does again at the end of the whole passage as the final aim of all, cannot with any probability be here merely parenthetical: (2) that above, ver. 6, and below, ver. 14, it, as well as the predes- tination, has reference to the fulness of the Gospel, not to incomplete prefatory hope in Christ [this would be no objection to De W. ’s view: see below]; (3) that thus we should require some demonstrative expression preceding, to mark out these ήμας, such as εἰς φι καὶ ἐκληρωθέντοι ήμείς οἱ προσωρισθέντες. The objections which Harl. brings against the ordinary construction are implicitly answered in this exposition. They rest mainly on the mistake of referring ἐκληρωθότες to the Jewish Christians: see above. De W. denies all reference to Jews and Gentiles.—(1) from the analogy of words compounded with προ- [προ-ακούειν Col. i. 5, προλέγειν Gal. v. 21; 1 Thess. iii. 4, προγράφειν Rom. xv. 4, προσεπαγγέλλεσαι Rom. i. 2], which he says indicate always priority as to the thing spoken of [in his idea here merely, ‘hope previous to the fulfilment of that hope,’ i.e. προ- has no meaning, for all hope must be this], not in comparison with other persons: but (a) this is not true—cf. προσεθέτοι Acts xx. 13, προεξέ- σθαι, προσγείωσθαι, προτιθέναι, προάγειν, προσφέρεσθαι,—and (b) if it were, it does not touch our interpretation—hoped before [Christ’s coming]:—(2) from ver. 13 saying nothing peculiar to Gentile Christians [but see there]: (3) from καὶ οἱ ζητῶν, in ch. ii. 1, and Col. i. 21, not meaning Gentile Christians, but being merely addressed to the readers generally. But in both these places it is so, merely because other things or persons have just been treated of: whereas here he would understand this ήμας as including the οἱ ζητῶν, thus depriving it of the force which it has there). 13. What is the construction? Have we but one sentence, εἰς φι . . . εὐφραγειοθητε, the two participial clauses being parallel, and both belonging to the verb τοῦ: so the f, Beng., De W., Ellie., [by whom the view is well defended and explained], &c. But this seems to me impossible, from the arrangement. It would require the omission of the second εἰς φι, or the placing of the καὶ οἱ ζητῶν after ἐπανοντες. As the sentence now stands, the second εἰς φι καὶ must begin a new sentence, and surely cannot be the mere rhetorical repetition of the first. This being so, we must un-
derstand some verb to complete εν δ καλ ὑμεῖς. Nothing can be more usual or more simple than to supply εστὶ: nothing commoner than εν χριστῷ ειναι: nothing better suited to the context than, after putting forward the Jewish believers, to turn to the Gentiles. Ye also have your part in Christ—our prominence does not exclude you.' Some supply ἐλεῖατε (Erasm.-ver., Calv., Est., al.), some ἐλεύθερητε (Erasm.-par., Harl., Olsh., al.); but the other is far simpler; and I cannot see how it deserves the charge which Ellicott brings against it, of being "a statement singularly rigid and out of harmony with the linked and ever-rising character of the context." It is quite accounted for as above, as forming a link in the context, whose character is well thus described. In whom ye are also (ye Gentile believers) since ye heard (from the time when ...) Their hearing was the termīnus a quo the word of the truth (the word whose character and contents are the truth of God: "quasi extra ipsum nulla esset proprius veritas," Calv.; see ref). This word is the instrument of the new birth, James i. 18. See Col. i. 3, and, above all, John xvii. 17, (viz.) the Gospel of your salvation (the Gospel whose contents, whose good tidings are your salvation: not a genitive of apposition, as Harl.,—cf. the expressions εικῶν τις χριστὸς τ. θεοῦ, Acts xx. 24,—τ. εἰλημ. χριστοῦ, ch. vi. 15,—τ. θάνατος, Matt. ix. 35,—Ἰσθοῦ χριστοῦ, Mark i. 1); in whom (belongs to Christ, as the former εν φίλοις —not to λόγον nor to εὐαγγελίον,—nor is εν φίλοις to be taken with πιστεύουσιν, see below: but with εσφαγαγίσθη— in whom ye not only are, but were sealed. The εν δ καλ. ... εσφαγαγίσθη answers exactly to εν ὑμῖν καλ. εκελαμφάνειν above: πιστεύουσιν not being by this construction rendered superfluous [Mey.]; see below) also (belongs to πιστεύουσιν εσφαγαγίσθη, not to either word alone) on your believing (termīnus a quo, as δικαυ- σαντες above. Not to be taken with εν φίλοις [as = εἰς δέν, an usage unknown to St. Paul], for see Acts xix. 2, εἰ πεινάμα δ'γ. ΄έλαστε πιστεύουσιν; —εἰ δὲ ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed? —and Rom. xiii. 11, νῦν ... ἔγγυτερον ἡμῶν ἑαυτῷ τῆς εὐαγγελίας ... εὐπρεπῶς τηρήσατε: see also 1 Cor. iii. 5; xv. 2, 11; Heb. iv. 3. This use of the aorist marks the time when the act of belief first took place—and it must naturally therefore stand absolutely) ye were sealed (the fact followed on baptism, which was administered on belief in Christ. See the key-passage, Acts xix. 1—6. πιστεύουσιν is, and is not, contemporaneous with εσφαγαγίσθη: it is not, inasmuch as in strict accuracy, faith preceded baptism, and baptism preceded the gift of the Spirit: but it is, inasmuch as on looking back over a man’s course, the period of the commencement of his faith includes all its accidents and accompaniments. See Erill’s note. The figure of sealing is so simple and obvious, that it is perhaps mere antiquarian pedantry, with Schöttgen, Grot., and Wetst., to seek for an explanation of it in Gentile practices of branding with the names of their deities, or even in circumcision itself. The sealing was objective, making manifest to others [ἐστιν δὲ αὐτῶν, ὅτι τικ ἐπετεύκας τ. καθόρος, Θλ.; so Chr., al.]: see John iii. 33; Rev. vii. 3—but also subjective, an approval and substantiation of their faith [τὴν βεβαιώσεων ὑπεξάκου, Theod. Mops.], see Rom. viii. 16; 2 Cor. i. 22; 1 John iii. 24 b) by the spirit of the promise (i. e. who was ἡ ἐπαγγελία του πατρός, Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4; Gal. iii. 14, 22; and I therefore insert the article. This, and not the other alternative, that the Spirit confirms God’s promises to us, is the true rendering: He was the promise of the O. T. as well as of the N. T.: as Chr.: δοῦ ἐκείνην ἐπαγγελία, μια μὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, ἔτερα δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ νεότ. To unite together both alternatives as Stier does, weakens the force of the reference of ἐπαγγελία back to God, so necessary to the context. The fact, that the Spirit is to us the Spirit of promise, is abundantly expressed in the following cause), the Holy One (I have preferred giving the ἑγω separately, feeling with Meyer that there is an emphatic pathos in it which
should not be lost in the usual prefix, 'the Holy Spirit.' The Spirit with whom He sealed you is even His own Holy Spirit—what grace, and mercy, and love, is here! which (if the δ of the rec. be retained, it is not for a moment to be referred to Christ,—nor to be insisted on as agreeing with the understood gender of the personal πνεύμα,—but as so very often, a relative agreeing in gender with the subject [ἀποστασών] of the relative clause: see ch. iii. 18 ref. and many examples in Brüder) is the (not an) earnest ("the word signifies the first installment paid as a pledge that the rest will follow. It is used by the Greek orators, and by the earlier Latin writers, especially Plautus and Terence. A. Gellius [xvii. 2] speaks of it as a word considered in his time [A.D. 120—50] to be vulgar, and superseded by 'arria,' which is the substitute for it in later Latinity. It is remarkable that the same word ἵνα is used in the same sense in Hebrew, Gen. xxxviii. 17, 18, from ἵνα, to mix or exchange, and thence to pledge, as Jer. xxx. 21; Neh. v. 3. It was therefore probably derived by the Greeks from the language of Phenician traders, as tariff, cargo, are derived, in the English and other modern languages, from Spanish traders." Stanley, on 2 Cor. i. 22. And so here—the Spirit is the ἀποστασία, Rom. viii. 23,—the μέρος τοῦ πνεύματος, as Chrys., or πρόδωμος, as Hesych.: the pledge and assurer to us of τοῦ ἐντός τοῦ θεοῦ καθορισμένος ἡμῖν, 1 Cor. ii. 12, which eye hath not seen, &c.) of our inheritance (here the first person comes in again, and not without reason. The inheritance [see above on ἐκκλησιάμμενον, which involved the converse idea] belongs to both Jew and Gentile—to all who are the children of Abraham by faith, (Gal. iii. 28, 29), for ('in order to,'—not 'until,' as E. V.; nor in ch. iv. 30; nor does this belong to ἄλλοις ...), but to ἀφανείαν. These two final clauses express (the great purpose of—not any mere intermediate matter—nor can the Holy Spirit be said to be any such intermediate gift) the full redemption (ἀπόλυτρωσις) often used by the Apostle in this sense, e.g. ch. iv. 30; Rom. viii. 23, of the full and exhaustive accomplishment of that which the word imports) of His purchased possession (the sense of περιποιηθέντως has been on last τῆς Ν.

much disputed, and many ungrammatical and illogical renderings of the words given. A full discussion may be seen in Harless's note. The senses to be avoided are, (1) the nonsensical antiposisis, that ἄπολυτρωσις τῆς περιποίησις, eis ἑτεραν τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. (2) the equally absurd hendiadys, taking τ. περιποίησις for τ. περιποιηθέντως, which fits neither the true sense of eis, nor the context: (3) the taking περιποίησις as active in meaning, by taking περιποίησις qua contingat certa vita possesso; Bucer. But this it could not convey to the Apostle's readers, unless constructed with some substantive to indicate such a meaning, as in 1 Thess. v. 9, where see note. A variety of this is proposed by Grot.—'rescueing,' i.e. salvation—and defended by Heb. x. 39, where περιποίησις ψυχής is opposed to ἀπάθεια. But besides that there the genitive ψυχής fixes the meaning,—the article τῆς here, in my view, is an insuperable objection. (4) the taking περιτησις in a passive sense, as res acquisitio—making it therefore = κληρονομία, and giving to ἀπολύτρωσις the sense of entire bestowment, which it cannot have. It remains then, that we seek some technical meaning of περιποίησις, since the obvious etymological ones fail. And such a meaning is found by considering its uses in the O.T. It, and its cognate word περίειμα, are found applied to the people of God, in the sense of a people whom He preserves for Himself as His possession. So Exod. xix. 5, ἐσταθή μοι λαὸς περιποίησις ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν έθνών, Dent. vii. 6; xiv. 2; xxvi. 18; Ps. cxlvii. 4, τὸν Ιακώβ ἐξελίξατο δό κόριος, Ἰσραήλ εἰς περισκοιμούσαν εὐαγγ.,—Isa. xliii. 21, λαός μου ὑπὸ περιτοιχίαμαν τὰς ἀρετὰς μου διηγείται.—Mal. iii. 17, ἐστοντά μοι, λέει κύριος παντικρ., εἰς ἴμαραν, ἄν εὐχά, εἰς περιποίησιν, κ. ἀρεταὶ αὐτοῦ ... κ.τ.λ. In ref. 2 Chron. we have the wider meaning of a remnant generally. The above sense as applied to the people of the Lord, was adopted by the N. T. writers: e.g. St. Paul, Acts xx. 28, τῷ ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἦν περιποιηθέντα διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τ. Ιδων,—St. Peter, 1 Pet. ii. 9, ὑμεῖς ... λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν. And such seems to be the meaning here: though no other construction can be alleged in which the word stands so absolutely. We must suppose, that it would explain itself to the
15 Atò τούτο κάγω, ἀκούσας τὴν ἑκατέρου ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐπὶ τῶν κυρίων ἱδον καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἀγίους, 16 ὑπὲρ πάντων ἐνυχριστῶν ὑπὸ ὑμῶν, μειάνει τι παραμένει ὑπὸ τῶν προσευχῶν μου, 17 ἵνα

m Gal. iii. 26. Col. i. 4. 1 Tim. iii. 13. 2 Tim. iii. 16. P. n Rom. v. 8. Col. i. 4. 1 Pet. iv. 8. p Acts vi. 13. xii. 10. 31. Col. i. 9. 1sa. xxxviii. 20. q = John xii. 41. Rom. i. 8. 1 Cor. i. 4. al. r = Judith viii. 25. Wied. xvii. 2. 2 Macc. i. 11 only. s Rom. i. 9. 1 Thess. i. 2. Philem. 4. only. Job xiv. 13. t = Phil. i. 3. 3 Thess. iii. 9. 2 Tim. i. 3 (Rom. xii. 12 v. r.) only. P. u = Rom. i. 10. 1 Thess. i. 2. Philem. 4 only.

16. πανοραματ. D Victorin. rec (abst μειάνει) ins υμὼν, with D'KL rel vulg syrr copt Chr Thdrt Damasc Aurbst Aug: αφ' η. t. p. αγαπην την τοπο τινων (possibly from homoeoteλ?) ABMN 17 Cyr Jer Augaiie: om των D'F: ins KLN3 rel latt syrr copt goth Chr Cyr, Thdrt Damasc Aurbst Aug: —κ. t. η. π. αγαπην την αχιους η: κ. t. e. π. t. αγ. αγαπην m 80.

Ledge of the hope of His calling, of the riches of His promise, and the power which He exercises on His saints as first wrought by Him in Christ, whom He has made Head over all to the Church.

15, 16.] INTRODUCTION TO THE PRAYER. Wherefore (i.e., on account of what has gone before since ver. 3, but especially of what has been said since ver. 13, where καὶ ὑμεῖς first came in—because ye are in Christ, and in Him were sealed, &c.) I also (καὶ γὰρ, either as resuming the first person after the second, going back to the ἁληρώθησέν ver. 12,—or as corresponding to καὶ ὑμεῖς above:—not, as Mey. al., because he is sensible that in thus praying for them he is helping their prayers for themselves) having heard of (on the indication supposed to be furnished by this respecting the readers, see Proleg. § ii. 12) the faith among you in the Lord Jesus (καθ' ὑμᾶς is not = ὑμεῖς ἤρξασθαί, as ordinarily rendered [even by Meyer], either here or any where else: cf. the example which Mey. quotes from Thuc. vi. 16, το κατ' αὐτούς ἔδωσε, 'the life which prevails among them'; Ellic. compares, for the distinction, το νῦν το ὑπόκερως); addressed to Pharsees, John viii. 17, with νῦν τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς, said with reference to Jews in Achais, Acts xviii. 15: nor is 'among you' merely local [chez vous], but is permissive, implying the possibility of some not having this faith, and thus intensifying the prayer which follows) and your love which is towards all the saints (on the reading, see digest. Taking the bracketed words as genuine, την specifies την ἄγ. which might be general: καὶ ὑμῖν wants no such specification, all our faith being in τ. κυρ. ἵστατο, grounded in Him. Chrys. remarks: πανταχοῦ συνώπετε κ. θυγκαλλής τ. πιστῶν κ. τ. ἄγαθήν

readers, from their familiarity with O. T. expressions, or with the Apostle's own use of it. This view is taken by the Syr., EcErasm., Calv., Grot., and most Commentators, also by De Wette, Harless, Ols., Meyer, Stier, Ellic. Stier endeavours, as so often, to unite the meanings regarding God, and ourselves,—for that we in being God's possession, reserved for survivorship to others, do, in the root of the word, thus survive, are thus saved: and undoubtedly this is so, but is not the leading idea) for the praise of His glory (as before, ver. 6: but as Stier well remarks, χάρις does not appear here, grace having done its work. αὐτός is the Father: cf. ver. 17, δ ἀπαθή τῆς δόξης. This, the thorough and final redemption of the Church which He hath acquired to Himself, is the greatest triumph of His glory: as Grot. well says, *Plus aliquanto est in voce πεπιστευόμενος quam in voce καθάρον quam antea habumnus. καθάρος, sors, ius proprium perpetuumque signifcat: πεπιστευόμενος, acquisito, et hoc, et modum acquirendi gratem et laboriosum. Solum autem plurimae facie quae magno nobis constant.*). See the typico-historical connexion of this wonderful passage with the patriarchal, legal, and prophetic periods, unfolded in Stier, i. pp. 129—136. I would not be understood to subscribe to all there advanced: but though his parallelism sometimes borders on the fanciful, the connexion is too striking to be altogether set aside by the real student of Scripture.

(B vv. 15—23.] THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH carried forward, in the form of a prayer for the Ephesians, in which the fulfilment of the Father's counsel through the Son and by the Spirit, in His people, is set forth, as consisting in the know—Vol. III.
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θεματάτην τινα ξυαρφίδα cease not giving thanks for you, making mention \\
of them,—viz. your faith and love) in (see reff. 'In εὐθύς with a genitive, the 
apparent temporal reference partakes somewhat of the local reference of juxtaposition.' 
Bernhardy, p. 216) my (ordinary, see Rom. i. 9 note) prayers. 17.] 
purpose (including also the purport, see 
not on 1 Cor. xiv. 13, and Ellicott's note here) of the prayer:—that (depends 
on the sense of μεν τινι ποι. επ. τον προσευχών, 
implying that a prayer for them took place) the God of our Lord Jesus Christ 
(see on ver. 3. The appellation is here solemnly and most appropriately given, as 
leading on to what is about to be said in vv. 20 ff. of God's exaltation of Christ 
and to be Head over all things to His Church. 
To His God, Christ also in the days of His 
 Flesh prayed, πατέρ, δόξασον σου τον 
νιόν: and even more markedly in that 
last cry, θεύ μου, θεί μου, the Father of 
glory (not merely the acutor, fonts, of 
glory, Grot., Olsh.), still less = πατήρ 
ένδοξος: nor with Chrys. to be explained 
δ' μεγάλα ἡμῖν δεδεκομένων γάθα: ἀπὸ τῶν 
ἐπικεφαλίων ἡμῶν καλεῖ, ὡς 
ὅταν λέγη δ' πατήρ τῶν ὀστικρόμων: nor 
δόξας to be understood of the divine 
nature of Christ, as Thdttr.: θεον μὲν ὡς 
ἀνθρώπων, πατέρα δὲ ὡς θεοῦ, δόξα 
γὰρ τὴν θείαν φύσιν ἄφωνος: for this 
would require τ. δόξας αὐτοῦ: but God is the 
Father,—by being the God and Father 
of our Lord Jesus Christ,—of that glory, 
the true and all-including glory, and only 
glory, of the Godhead, which shines forth in 
the manhood of the only-begotten Son 
of [John i. 14],—the true Shechinah, which 
His saints beheld in the face of Christ, 
2 Cor. iv. 4, 6, and into which they are 
changed by the Lord the Spirit, ib. iii. 
18. In fact, 2 Cor. iii. 7—iv. 6, is the key 
to this sublime expression, would give (the 
group of the optative after ἵνα, when a 
present [παρεβαίνω] has preceded, is very 
simple. It is used when the purpose is not 
that of the writer as he is writing, but 
is described as that of himself or some one 
et al ather time. Thus Herod. ii. 93, 
καταπλάσωι εἰς θάλασσαν, κ. ἀναπλάσω-
outes ὁπισώ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀντίχειοτητος, 
. . . . η addiction of the last, as transformed 
by the law of poetry, to mean that we are 
understanding also the words of our Lord 
our Father: 'In very truth, I say unto you, 
what soever ye shall ask in my name, that 
will I do.' 
And so, though there is no such passage 
in the Bible as the one the Minister 
is alluding to (for, fr. Gal. iv. 26, 'Nero 
πρὸς τὸν θάνατον τὸν θάνατον τοῦ 
πολεμιστοῦ τους τοὺς περισσοτέρους 
νο ἐκθέτειν,' see Col. i. 23), this 
example is used for the purpose of 
illustrating the power of prayer as 
being 'effectual, that ye may obtain 
that which ye ask of the Lord.' 
This passage, however, is only 
considered as an instance, and 
not as a reference to the text 
(§ 15. 15). 
The Greek word ἐπιθυμήσει is 
ordinarily used with the Greek 
language, and in this 
context, to mean 'as the object 
being to exalt the gifts of the Spirit, 
ἐν ἐπιθυμήσει αὐτοῦ would hardly 
come first in the sentence, and thus mono-
polize the emphasis. See also on a similar 
proposal, ver. 4, end. 
aυτοῦ [not αὐτοῦ] refers to the Father,—not 
to Christ, as Beza, Calv., al.; cf. αὐτοῦ four 
times in vv. 18, 19: Christ first becomes 
thus designated in ver. 20), 
having the 
eyes of your heart enlightened (the 
construction is as in Soph. Electr. 479, ὑποτε 
μοι ἔδειξές μοι θαρσοῦν κλέονας ὀρτίς 
οντίστων—Esch. Choep. 336, πεπαλα-
tαι δ' αὐτί μοι φιλον κέρας τόδε κλέονας 
ἀντίον: see also Acts xxvi. 3,—Kühner ii. p. 381: so that περστιομένον belongs 
to νῦν, and τὸν ὀφθαλμόν is the accu-
sative of reference. So Beza, Beng., 
Korpe, Meyer, Eiller. and such is the 
simpler and more forcible construction. 
But Grot., Rück, Harl., Olsh., De W.,
Stier, all, take ἐπερ. τ. ὑφ. together, and govern it by ὑφ. to which the article before ὑφ. is no objection [as Bong., but the logic of the passage is. The enlightening as regards [or of] the eyes of the heart, is a condition, subordinate to the ἀνελάμβανος σοφ. κ. ἀπόκ., not another gift, correlative with it. Besides which, the sentence, even after all the grammatical indications of Harl., al.,—ὑφ. ὑμῖν... περισταμένους τοὺς ὑφ. τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν, is clumsy and unpalatable in the last degree. On περισταμένους, cf. Matt. iv. 16: ch. iii. 9 [v. 14]: Harl. gives an elaborate analysis, as usual, of the meaning, and remarks well that ὑφ. is the double meaning of 'βεβηρὸν ὑμῖν'... ἐνλαμβανόμενον, εἰ γὰρ σκότος ἡ ἁγία κ. ἡ ἁμαρτία, φῶς ἂν εἰπ. ἡ γνώσις κ. ὁ βίος ὁ ἐνθέος. The expression τ. ὑφ. τῆς καρδίας is somewhat unusual. The καρδία of Scripture is, as Harl., the ὑπόθεσιν ὑπόθεσιν, the very core and centre of life, where the intelligence has its post of observation, where the stores of experience are laid up, and the thoughts have their fountain. Similarly the Homeric κραδίαν, see Damm. Lex.: the Latin 'cor'—cf. Cic. Tusc. i. 9.—'aliss cor ipsum animus videtur, ex quo excordes, vocordes, concordesque dicuntur.' Thus the ὑφ. τῆς καρδίας was to be pointed at in Matt. vii. 22, 23.—That inner eye of the heart, through which light is poured in on its own purposes and motives, and it looks out on, and perceives, and judges things spiritual: the eye, as in nature, being both receptive and contemplative of the light, that you may know (purpose of the περισταμένους, not of the ὑμῖν. σοφ. κ. ἀπόκ.) This, which is now to be described, to the end of the chapter, is involved in the πν. σοφ. κ. ἀπόκ., not its object: but it is the object of the enlightening, which will endue us with the knowledge) what (the dispute among the Commentators, whether τίς implies quality or quantity, seems hardly worth entering into. The fulness of the simple meaning, 'what,' embraces all categories under which the things mentioned can be contemplated. In the passage to which both sides appeal, ch. iii. 18, τί τὸ πλάτος κ.τ.λ. of course implies, 'how great is the breadth, &c.' but it implies this by the simple meaning 'what is the breadth, &c.' not by making τί = quantum, quantity being already involved in the substantives) is the hope (again, it is mere trifling to enquire whether ἐλπίς is the hope [subjective] or the thing hoped for [objective], in this case. For the τίς involves in itself both these. If I know what the hope is, I know both its essence and its accidents. Undoubtedly such an objective sense of ἐλπίς does occur,—see on Col. i. 5; but certainly the meaning here is far wider than in that passage. As well might the subjective sense of Col. i. 23, be alleged on that side (of belonging to, see on ch. iv. 4) His calling (i.e. the calling wherewith He called us. All the matters mentioned, καίνης, κληρονομία, δόνας, are ἀπότομοι. Πρ.—but not all in the same sense; see below. On καίνης, see notes, Rom. viii. 28—30), what the riches of the glory of His inheritance ("what a rich, sublune cumulation, setting forth in like terms the weightiness of the matters described;—and not to be weakened [ἐρμαίτιστ] by any resolution of the genitives into adjectives." Mey. See Col. i. 27) in (in the case of, as exemplified in; not so weak as 'among',—nor merely 'in,' so as to refer to its subjective realization in them) the saints (much dispute has arisen on the construction of ἐν τ. ὑπ. Koppe and Winer [Gram. §19.2.b, edn. 3: not appy in edn. 6], with whom Meyer and De Wette agree, connect it with ἐστιν understood, so as to mean 'what the richness of, &c. is among the saints.' To mention no other objection to this awkward construction, the context and sense are decisive against it. As Stier well says, 'Paul does not pray for their eyes to be enlightened, to see what great and rich things are already among Christians.' No: nor is it easy to conceive how any
intelligent reader of the Epistle could ever maintain such a rendering. The other construction is, to take έν τ. ἁγ. as belonging either to πλοῦτος, or to δόξα, or to κληρονομιας, as if it had been δ (or της) έν τοις ἁγ. And this is the only one allowed by the context: cf. vv. 19, 20, where εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἐν χριστῷ, form objects of reference precisely similar. Again there is manifestly a distinction between οἱ ἁγίοι here, and ημεῖς οἱ πιστευόντες in the next verse: the former being the perfected, the latter the militant saints. And this decides for the joining έν τ. ἁγ. to κληρονομιας αὐτοῦ, — His inheritance in us, whose example and fulness, and embodying is in the saints! The objection to this is supposed to be the want of the article before έν, which is urged by Meyer [see also Ellicot's note here], because αὐτοῦ has intervened, thereby preventing κληρ. έν τ. ἁγ. being considered as one idea. But surely this is not so. If, before αὐτοῦ was inserted, ἡ κληρ. έν τ. ἁγίοις was sufficiently one to prevent the necessity of a specification of the genus κληρονομια that it was the κληρ. which was έν τ. ἁγ. [for such is the force of the inserted article], how can this logical fact be altered by the insertion of Him, whose κληρ. it is,—who originated and bestowed it,—and who is therefore necessarily prior to the κληρονομια, not intervening between it and its example? I therefore join it to κληρ., and so Rock, Harless, Olsh., Stier, al. This latter, as usual, combines the senses of κληρ. αὐτοῦ, including the inheritance which God has in His people, and that which they have in Him. His whole note is well worth attention), 19.) and what the surpassing (a word only paulline in N. T., see ref.) greatness of His power to usward who believe (construction as before, ver. 18, τῆς δυναμ. αὐτ. εἰς ἡμ., not τι το ὑπ. . . . [τότε] εἰς ἡμ. Not His future power in the actual resurrection only is spoken of, but the whole of His energizing to usward from first to last, principally however His present spiritual work, cf. πιστεύωντας, not, as in 2 Thess. i. 10, πιστεύωνας: see also Col. ii. 12, and 1 Pet. i. 3—5. This power is exalted to usward, which expression of the E. V. I retain as giving better the prominence to us in the fact of its direction, than the more usual but tamer 'toward us.' But it is not, as Matth., Platt, the power which works faith in us, except in so far indeed as faith is a portion of its whole work: here, the πιστεύωντες are the material on which the power works), according to (in proportion to,—as might be expected from: but more than this—His power to usward is a part of, a continuation of, or rather included as a consequence in, the other. All the shallower interpretations must be avoided here: Grot., 'rei similitudinem significat': Van Ess., 'gleich der Erfüllung: nor must we join, as Erasm. al., κατά τ. ἐν with πιστεύουντας, which is beside the Apostle's purpose: nor, with Mey., understand it as a qualification of εἰς το εἰδέναι [Εἴδεταινησίνδρε το μετηρησίαις Μονετέτατο:] nor, with Harless, refer it to all three, εἷς, πλοῦτος, μέγεθος: but with Chrysts., Calv., Est., Grot., De W., Elic., take it as an amplification, or explanation, or grounding of,—το ὑπέρθεν . . . to πιστεύουντας the working (putting forth in action, in an object) of the strength of His might (κράτος) the actual measure of λογιας. His might. The latter is the attribute, subjectively considered: the former the weight of that attribute, objectively esteemed: the ενέργεια, the operation, in matter of fact, of the strength of that might. Calvin's distinction, though not quite accurate, is worth noting: "Inter tria nomina quae hic positui, hoc interest: quod robor est quasi radix, potentia, anima, arbor (quae vice versi!?): efficacia, fructus, est eium extensio divini brachii, quae in actum emergit ": which (viz. ενέργεια: cf. ver. 6, note) He hath wrought in Christ (our αὐρατῆς, as (Ec.): nor only this, but our Head, in virtue of God's ενέργεια in whom, His power to usward is made possible and actual. No shallower view, such as that of Grot. that 'Deus oleifus humanis quantum possit, in Christo, capite et duce nostro, ostendit,' must be for a moment admitted) in that He raised
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(as γνωρίσασ above, ver. 9) Him from the dead (the resurrection of Christ was not a mere bodily act, an earnest of our bodily resurrection, but was a spiritual act, the raising of His humanity [which is ours], consisting of body and soul, from infirmity to glory, from the curse to the final triumph. In that He died, He died unto self once; but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God. And so ἡ αὐτή τοις εἰσόντων, knit to Him, have died unto self and live unto God. It is necessary to the understanding of the following, thoroughly to appreciate this — or we shall be in danger of regarding, with the shallower expositors, Christ’s resurrection as merely a pledge of our bodily resurrection, or as a mere figure representing our spiritual resurrection, — not as involving the resurrection of the Church in both senses; or, and setting Him at His right hand (see especially Mark xvi. 19) in the heavenly places (see on ver. 3; and Matt. vi. 9, note). But the fact of the universal idea, of God’s dwelling being in heaven, being only a symbolism common to all men, must not for a moment induce us to let go the verity of Christ’s bodily existence, or to explain away the glories of His resurrection into mere spiritualities. As Stephen saw Him, so He vitally is: in human form, locally existent) over above (not, as in my former editions, ‘far above.’) Ellicott says, ‘The intensive force which Chrys. and Thal. find in this word, ἴνα τὸ ἀκρότατον ὄψις ἡθλώς, and which has recently been adopted by Stier and Eadie, is very doubtful: as is also the assertion [Eadie] that this prevailed in the majority of passages in the LXX: cf. Ezek. i. 26; vii. 2; x. 19; xi. 22; xiii. 15; and even Dent. xxvi. 19; xxviii. 1. Such distinct instances as Ezek. xiii. 15, and in the N. T., Heb. ix. 5, the simi-
μέλλουτα of Rom. viii. 38—not only *time* present and to come, but the present [earthly] condition of things, and the future [heavenly] one. And forasmuch as that heavenly state which is for us *future*, is now, to those in it, present, it is by the easiest transition deduced by the μέλλουσα αὐτῶν cf. Luke xx. 35, and especially Heb. ii. 5. *the osiōσιν* τῆς μέλλουσας. So that the meanings seem combined,—*every name now named in earth and heaven*; and, *every name which we name,—not only now, but hereafter.* And in this last view Thdrt.: *prostšekeν, ὅπει ἐν ταὐτά τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, μετὰ τὰ δεῖ τάσσεται γνωσόμεθα εἰς τὸ μέλλον.* Bp. Chrys.: ὅπει ἐντεύκησαν τοῖς νόμοις ἡμῶν ἡσύχα κ. οὐ γνωριζόμενα. Grot., *quae nomecum in altero sacculo,* Beng., *quamvis non omnes nominare possumus.* Wesley, beautifully expanding Bengel (Stier, p. 183): 'We know that the king is above all, though we cannot name all the officers of his court. So we know that Christ is above all, though we are not able to name all His subjects'*. 22. and subjected all things under His feet (from the Messianic Ps. viii.; not without an allusion also in καθήσασα, &c. above to Ps. cx. 1: not merely cited, as Thdrt., καὶ προφητικὴν ἐπίστασε μαρτυρίαν, but interwoven into the context, πάντα being a summing up of all mentioned before), and gave (presented; keep the literal sense: not appointed; see below) ἥμι (emphatic, from its position: ἥμι, thus exalted, thus glorified, the Father not only raised to this supereminence, but gave Him to His re-deemed as their Head, &c.) as Head over all things to the Church (not as Chrys.,—in either of his alternatives: ἢ τοῦ ὑπό τοῦ πάντα τὰ δρώμενα κ. τὰ νοσομένα χριστῶν [which would be τέλος, of τὸν ὑπό πάντα], ἢ ὑπέρ πάντα τὰ ἅγαθα τούτω πεποιήκε, τὸ τὸν ὕπόν ὑδαίνα κεφαλήν,—which is beside the context, in which no comparison is made between the gift of Christ and other blessings: nor as Beng., *Eccelesia, super omnim, super imperia, &c., quorum caput (?)* Christus est, potest dicere, Christus est caput meum; ego sum corpus ejus,—for this sense cannot possibly be extracted out of the words themselves ὑπέρ πάντα: nor as Baumgarten, ὑπέρ πάντα = μάκαρα πάντων, praeclara, potius quam ceteris,—for, not to mention other objections, πάντα must surely be the same in meaning as πάντα before: nor can πάντα be masculine, as Jer., Anselm, al., and Wahl: nor, as Calv., *quia simul plena rerum omnium potestas et administratio illi sit commissa:* nor, with Harl., does πάντα find its limitation within the Church, so as not to apply to other things without it: nor is ὑπέρ πάντα to be taken with κεφ., summum caput, as Oslh., al.: nor as Meyer, Stier, and Elliot [cdn. 1: in cdn. 2, he interprets nearly as below], is another κεφαλή to be supplied before τῇ ἐκκλ.: *gave Him, as Head over all things, as Head to the Church:* nor is the dative a dat. commodi, as De W.: but the meaning is thus to be gained, from what follows: Christ is Head over all things: the Church is the Body of Christ, and as such is the fulness of Him who fills all with all: the Head of such a Body, is Head over all things; therefore when God gives Christ as Head to the Church, He gives Him as Head over all things to the church, from the necessity of the case. Thus what follows is epexegetical of this), which same (Church, *quae quiem*—hardly *at quem,* "in virtue of her being," as Meyer) is His body (not in a figure merely: it is veritably His Body: not that which in our glorified humanity He personally bears, but that which in which He, as the Christ of God, is manifested and glorified by spiritual organization. He is its Head; from Him comes its life; in Him, it is exalted: in it, He is lived forth and witnessed to; He possesses nothing for Himself,—neither His communion with the Father, nor His fulness of the Spirit, nor His glorified humanity,—but all for His Church, which is in the innermost reality, Himself; His flesh and His bones—and therefore the fulness (πλήρωσεις in apposition with τὸ σῶμα αὐτῷ);
II. 1 Καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας 1 νεκροὺς τοῖς 2 παραπτώμασιν 1 2
Rev. iii. 1. m here only. παρ., Gal. vi. 1 ref.

and is a fresh description of ἡ ἐκκλησία. It would pass my limits, even to notice summarily what has been written on πάληρωμα. I will endeavour to give an account of the word itself. Like other derivatives in -μα from the perfect passive, it would appear primarily to designate either (1) concrete, that thing on which the action denoted by the verb has passed: e. g. πολύμα, the thing made, πράγμα, the thing done, στέρμα, the thing sown, πλή-
ρωμα, the thing filled: or (2) abstract, that occurrence whereby the action denoted has been exemplified: e. g. τρόμα, the effect of ἀτρόφοικεν, not the thing wounded, but the wound inflicted: so θλόμα, ἄθλομα, and the like; πλήρωμα, the fullness. From this latter, the transition is very easy to the meaning the thing whereby the effect is produced, as where πλήρωμα is used for the crew of a ship [see also Matt. ix. 16 ||; Mark vi. 43; 1 Cor. x. 26; Gal. iv. 4; ver. 10], ζεύγμα for a bridge or yoke, &c. Hence arises the so-called active sense of such nouns, which is not in fact an active sense at all, but a logical transference from the effect to that which exemplifies the effect. Here, the simple and primary meaning is by far the best.— the thing filled,'—'the filled up receptacle' [cf. κατοικοτήριον, ch. ii. 22], as Eadie expresses it [see also Ellicott], the meaning being, that the church, being the Body of Christ, is dwelt in and filled by God: it is His πλήρωμα in an especial manner—His fulness abides in it, and is exemplified by it. The nearest approach to any one word in English which may express it, is made by fulness, though it, as well as πλ., requires explaining, as importing not the inherent plenitude of God Himself, but that communicated plenitude of gifts and graces wherein He infuses Himself into His Church. I would refer those who wish to enter more fully into this matter, to the long and laboured notes of Harless, and Stier: and to Fritzsche on Rom. vol. ii. pp. 469 ff.) of Him who filleteth (it is doubted whether πληρο-
μένοι is passive, or middle in an active sense. Those who take πλήρωμα above, actively, "the filling up," generally [Har-
less is an exception] defend the passive sense here, "of Him who is [being] filled, &c." So Chrys.: πληρώμα, φησίν ὑών κεφαλῆ πληροῦται παρά τοῦ σώματος . . . διὰ πάνων ὑών πληροῦται τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ. τότε πληροῦται ἡ κεφαλῆ, τότε τέλειον σώμα γίνεται, διὰν ὃμοι πάντες ἀνεν εὐθυμίων κ. συγκεκολλημένων. Jer.: "Sicut adimplerunt imperator, si quotidie ejus angueart exercitus, et tant novo provincie, et populorum multiindo succressat, ita et Christus, in eo, quod sibi credunt omnia, ipse adimplerunt in omnibus," and Estius: "Qui secundum omnia, sive quoad omnia in omnibus sui corporis membri adimplerunt. Nisi enim essent hic quidem pes ejus, ille vero manus, alias autem aliud membrum . . . . non periperetetur Christus secundum rationem capitis." But to this it is difficult to assign any satisfactory sense, especially on account of τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσι. It cer-
tainly cannot be said that Christ awaits His completion, in any such meaning as this, by the completion of his Church. And it is not probable that if such had been the meaning, τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν would have thus barely and emphatically preceded the participle which itself con-
veyed so new and startling an idea. We should have had some such arrangement as this—τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα [κ. ἐν πᾶσι πληρομένου. If now we take πληρομένου in an active reflective sense, both meaning and ar-
rangement will be satisfactory— the ful-
ness [receptacle, filled and possessed] of Him who filleteth τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι. But are we justified in thus taking it? It seems so, from Xen. Hell. vi. 2. 14, ὁ στρατηγὸς μάλα ὀδέω τάς ναῦς ἕπη-
ρυναὶ κ. τ. τριπλάρχοι πνεύματε. See likewise Plato, Gorg, § 106; Xen. Hell. v. 4. 56; vi. 2. 35 : Demosth. p. 1208. 14 : Plut. Ael. 35: Pollux i. 99: in all of which the 1 aor. middle is thus used. Having then this authority as far as gram-
matical usage is concerned, we are further inclined to this rendering by ch. iv. 10, where it is said of Christ, ὁ ἀναβάς ὑπερ-
ἀνω πάνων τῶν ὀφρακάρων, ἐν πληρομῇ τὰ πάντα, and the Apostle proceeds to enumerate the various gifts bestowed by Him on His Church. See further in note there all things (the whole universe: not to be restricted in meaning. The Church is the special receptacle and abiding-place—the πλήρωμα κατ’ ἐξοχὴν, of Him who fills all things) with all things (i. e. who is the bestower of all, wherever found, ἐν πᾶσι has been rendered 'every where' [B.-Crus.]; 'in every way' [De W.]; 'in every case' [Harl.] and al.: but the Apostle's own usage is our best guide,—πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι, ch. v. 18, and other reff., and directs us to the in-
II. 1. for ἀμαρτίας, εἰσφθήμασις. B. Damase Thl Ec; ins BDFN m 17. 672 vss Thdt Lucif Victorion, εὐαυτοῦ Α.

The power of the Father in quickening us, both Gentiles and Jews, in and with Christ (1—6);—His purpose in manifesting this power (7);—inference respecting the method of our salvation (8—10).

1. 2. Actual state of the Gentiles—dead in trespasses and sins, living under the power of the devil.

You also (καὶ is much more than merely copulative. It selects and puts into prominence ὅμως, from among the recipients of God’s grace implied in vv. 19—23 of the former chapter. See below), who were (“ἐντὸς clearly marks the state in which they were at the time when God quickened them: this in ver. 5 is brought prominently forward by the καὶ: here however καὶ is joined with and gives prominence to ὅμως. A simple indication, then, of their state, without any temporal or causal adjunct, ‘when,’ ‘whereas,’ &c., seems in the present case most satisfactory, as less calling away the attention from the more emphatic ὅμως.” Ellicott, edn. 1) dead (certainly not, as Meyer, ‘we object to [physical] death.’ the whole of the subsequent mercy of God in His quickening them is spiritual, and therefore of necessity the death also. That it involves physical death, is most true; but as I have often had occasion to remark [see e.g. on John xi. 25, 26], this latter is so subordinate to spiritual death, as often hardly to come into account in Scripture) in (not exactly as in Col. ii. 13, μεταύριστας ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμασιν, where the element is more in view, whereas here it is the causal dative—we might render, were the expression good in serious writing, ‘dead of your trespasses,’ as we say ‘he lies dead of cholera.’ I use ‘in’ as giving nearly the same causal sense: we say, indiscriminately, ‘sick of a fever,’ and ‘sick in a fever’) your trespasses and sins (it seems difficult to establish universally any distinction such as has been attempted, e.g. by Fittin, Synon. p. 47,—“unct resit nat satis vera Hieronymi distinctio video: ut, quæ parapòmona primum ad peccatum lapsum esse dicit, ἁμαρτία, quum ad ipsam facinus preterum est; tamen in v. parapòmona proprio templo notio peccati quod temere commissum est, i.e. a nolente facere injuriam; sed in ἁμαρτία et ἁμαρτήμα cagitatur facinus quod, qui fert, facere voluit, sive imprudens erraverit, recte se facere existimans, sive impetui animi et libidini obreptus fecerit. . . . Levios est parapòmona quam ἁμαρτία, si ἁμαρτία de singulo peccato dicitur.” Where however, as here, the two occur together, it may be accepted as correct. If we take merely that of Ellicott, al., that “parapòmma are the particular, special acts of sin,—ἁμαρτία the more general and abstract, viz. all forms, phases, and movements of sin, whether entertained in thought or consummated in act,” we shall not provide for the whole case: for ἁμαρτία: are unquestionably used for special acts (= ἁμαρτήματα); and we want a distinction which shall embrace
this case. Another question concerns the construction of this accusative clause. Some [Beng., Lachm., Harl.] consider it as a continuation of ch. ii. 23, and place a comma only at πληρομένον. But [see our division of the sense] the sentence evidently finishes with πληρομένον, and a new subject is here taken up. The simplest view seems to be the usual one, that the Apostle began with the accusative, intending to govern it by συνειςωπίσαν τῷ χριστῷ, but was led away by the relative clauses, ἐν αἷς ποτε . . . . . , ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς . . . . . . , and himself takes up the dropped thread of the construction by δὲ θέδω . . . . . , ver. 4. So Erasm.: "hyperbatia longioris ambitum ipse corruerit Apostolus dicens 'Deus autem qui dives est' . . . . ." At all events, the clause should be left, in translation, pendent, as it stands, and not filled in conjecturally, 2.) in which (ἀμφατη, the last substantive, but applying in fact to both) ye once walked (we hardly need, as Eadie, al., go back every time to the figure in περιπατεῖν—the word has become with the Apostle so common in its figurative sense. See Fritzsche's note, Rom. vol. iii. p. 140) according to (after the leading of, conformably to) the course (so E. V.: the very best word, as so often. The meaning of αἰών here is compounded of its temporal and its ethical sense: it is not exactly 'lifetime,' 'duration,' nor again 'fashion,' 'spirit,' but some common term which will admit of being both temporally and ethically characterized,—'career' or 'course.' Beware 1) of taking αἰών and κόσμον as synonymous, and the expression as a pleonasm ["utrumque nominat, seculum et mundum, cum sufficiente alterum dixisse," Estiús], 2) of imagining, as Michaelis and Baur, that the expression is a gnostic one, the ζόν the devi: for, as Meyer remarks, the ordinary sense of αἰών gives a good meaning, and one characteristic of St. Paul. See Gal. i. 4, for a use of αἰών—somewhat similar, but more confined to the temporal meaning) of this world (St. Paul generally uses δ. κόσμος, but has δ. κ. οὐτος in 1 Cor. iii. 19; v. 10; vii. 31. It designates the present system of things, as alien from God, and lying in the evil one), according to the ruler of the power of the air (the devil—the θέος τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, 2 Cor. iv. 4, is clearly meant: but it is difficult exactly to dissect the phrase, and give each word its proper meaning. ἐξουσία appears to be used here as δημιουργία in Homer, ἡλίκια, ἑταίρια, δούλεια, ὁπροφορία, συμμαχία, and the like, to represent the aggregate of those in power: as we say, 'the government.' So that all such renderings as 'princeps potentissimus' are to be at once dismissed. So also is every explanation which would ascribe to the Apostle a polemical, or distantly allusive tendency, in an expression which he manifestly uses as one of passage merely, and carrying its own familiar sense to his readers. This against Michaelis, and all who have imagined an allusion to the gnostic ideas—and Wetst., who says, "Paulus ita loquitur ex principiis philosophiae Pythagoreae, quibus illi ad quos scribit imbuti erant." Not much better are those who refer the expression to Rabbinical ideas for its source. The different opinions and authorities [which would far exceed the limits of a general commentary] may be seen cited and treated in Harless, Stier, and Eadie. I am disposed to seek my interpretation from a much more obvious source: viz. the persuasion and common parlance of mankind, founded on analogy with well-known facts. [Eilic., edn. 2, disapproves this, but without sufficiently attending to my explanation which follows, which, as in so many cases where he imagines a difference between our interpretations, is practically the same as his own.] We are tempted by evil spirits, who have access to us, and suggest thoughts and desires to our minds. We are surrounded by the air, which is the vehicle of speech and of all suggestions to our senses. Tried continually as we are by these temptations, what so natural, as to assign to their ministers a dwelling in, and power over that element which is the vehicle of them to us? And thus our Lord, in the parable of the sower, when He would represent the devil coming and taking away the seed out of the heart, figures him by τὰ πετευτα τοῦ ὀβρανοῦ. The Apostle then, in using this expression, would be appealing to the common feeling of his readers, not to any recondite or questionablc system of demonology. That traces are found in such systems, of a belief agreeing with this, is merely a proof that they have embodied the same general feeling, and may be used
in illustration, not as the ground, of the Apostle's saying. All attempts to represent ἄγιος as meaning 'darkness,' or 'spirit,' are futile, and beside the purpose. The word occurs (see ref.) six more times in the N. T. and nowhere in any but its ordinary meaning, of the spirit (τῆς ζεύ-

νοσίας) being used as designating [see above] the personal aggregate of those evil ones who have this power, τοῦ πνεῦ-

ματος, in apposition with it, represents their aggregate character, as an influence on the human mind, a spirit of ungodli-

ness and disobedience,—the πνεῦμα τοῦ κάσιμου of 1 Cor. ii. 12,—the aggregate of the πνεῦματα πάντα of 1 Tim. iv. 1. So that [against Harless] the meaning of πνεῦματος, though properly and strictly objective, almost passes into the subjecti-

ve, when it is spoken of as ἐνεργοῦντος εἰς κ.τ.λ. And this will account for the otherwise harsh conjunction of ἄρχωνα τοῦ πνεῦματος. As he (the devil) is the ruler of τα πνεῦματα, whose aggregate τὸ πνεῦμα is,—so he is the ἄρχων of the thoughts and ways of the ungodly,—of that πνεῦμα which works in them. The genitive, πνεύματος, must not be taken, as by many Commentators and by Rückert, as in apposition with ἄρχωνα, by the Apostle's negligence of construction. No such assumption should ever be made without necessity; and there is surely none here) which is now (i. e. still') contrast to ποτέ,—to you, who have escaped from his government: no allusion need he thought of to the interval before the παρουσία being that of the hottest conflict between the principles [2 Thess. ii. 7. Rev. xii. 12], as De W.) working in the sons of (the expression is a II. brais, but is strictly reproduced in the fact: that of which they are sons, is the source and spring of their lives, not merely an accidentuality belonging to them) disobedience (the vulg. renders it differentia, but unfortunately, as also Luther Unglaub; for both here and in ch. v. 6, it is practical conduct which is spoken of. Doubtless unbelief is the root of disobedience: but it is not here expressed, only implied. In Dent. ix. 23, ἡ πεπηγήσατο τῷ βίᾳ ἐγερένθητε δι' ἄπειθειαν, we have the disobedience in its root—

here, in its fruits—cf. ver. 3, ποιοῦτες τὰ θελήματα κ.τ.λ.): 3.] among whom (the viol τ. ἄπειθειας: not merely local, but 'numbered among whom,'—ἀν καὶ ἄτολ ὄντες, as Rückert: not in ἦς ὃς, viz. παραπτάμασιν, as—SYR., Jer., Grot., Bengel, al., and Stier, who would divide off ἄμαρτια, allotting them to the Gentiles, and to ver. 2,—and παραπτῶματα, assigning them to the Jews, and to ver. 3. See further on this below: but meantime, besides its very clumsy treatment of the ἄμαρτια, and παραπτῶματα, which both belong to ἄμαρτια in ver. 1, it ascribes to the Apostle an unusual and unnatural precision in distinguishing the two words which he had used without any such note of distinction, such as τε—καί) we also all (νῦν). The usage of ἄμας πάντες by St. Paul must decide. It occurs Rom. iv. 16, ὅτι ἐστὶν παθή πάντων ἡμῶν, undeniably for Jews and Gentiles included [for the slight difference arising from πάντων being first, and therefore emphatic, need not be insisted on]: viii. 32, ὅπερ ἡμῶν πάντων παρίσωκεν αὐτόν, where the universal reference is as un-

doubtful: 1 Cor. xii. 13, where it is still more marked: ἄμας πάντες... ἐκτὸς οὐδαίοι εἰς ἐλλάπας, εἰς δούλους εἰς ἑλέοντέρας: 2 Cor. iii. 18, equally un-

doubted. It can hardly then be that here he should have departed from his universal usage, and placed an unmannerly πά-

ntes after ἄμας merely to signify, 'we Jews, every one of us.' I therefore infer that by ἄμας πάντες, he means, we all, Jews and Gentiles alike; all, who are now Christians) lived our life (refl. especially 2 Cor.) once, in (as in refl. 1 Pet., of the element, in which: in 2 Cor. i. 12, the same double use of ἐν, of the place, and the element, is found) the desires of our flesh (of our unrewound selves, under the dominion of the body and the carnal soul. See a contrast, Gal. v. 16), doing the wishes (the instances in which τὸ θέλημα manifested itself: see refl.) of our flesh and of our thoughts (the plural use is remarkable. There appears to be a reference to Num. xv. 39, οὐ διαστράφησον ὄπισθεν τῶν διανοιῶν ἡμῶν. In Isa. iv. 9, a distinction is made, ἀπέκει πὶ δια-

νομάτα ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς διανοίας μου, which is useful here, as pointing to διά-

νομαῖα as an improper use for διανοήματα,
3. om καὶ ημεις FL: for ημα, υμα, A (but nearly erased) D1 rec (for ημεα) ημειη, with ADKFL rel Clem Did Chr Thdrt Damascus: txt BN 17 Orig, φωσι beσν τεκνα ADKFL m latt arm Orig, Did Thdrt lat-ff: om φωσει 100 aeth Clem: txt BKN rel Orig3 Chr Thl Ec.

—the instrument for its results. Thus 'thoughts' will be our nearest word—those phases of mind which may or may not affect the will, but which then in our natural state we allowed to lead us by the desires they excited, and were (the change of construction has been remarked by the best Commentators as intentional, not of negligence,—‘to give emphasis to the weighty clause that follows, and to disconnect it from any possible relation to present time, ‘we were children of wrath by nature,—it was once our state and condition, it is now so no longer.’” Ellicot. And Eadie remarks: “Had he written καὶ θυτες, as following out the idea of ποιοντες, there might have been a plea against the view of innate depravity [see below]—‘fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and being,' or ‘so being, children of wrath.' But the Apostle says, καὶ ημεθα—‘and we were,' at a point of time prior to that indicated in ποιοντες”) children (not = viol, but implying closer relation. The effect of the expression is to set those of whom it is predicated, beneath, in subjection to, as it were, the products of, ὑγιη. So in the passages adduced by Harl.;—Deut. xxv. 2, Ἰηνα ὑγεια, ‘if he be the son of stripes,' i.e. not as LXX and E. V. ἤκιος πληγην, but actually beaten:—1 Sam. xx. 31, ἡ προσομοσ γει, 'he is the son of death,'—i.e. as we express it, 'he is a dead man,' anticipating the effect of that which seems to be certain) by nature (the meaning of φωσης is disputed. Some of the ancients [Cyr, ΕΕ, ΤΗ1], and Grot. took it as = ὑγειαι, ἀληθες, which meaning it never bears; see on Gal. iv. 8. Others [Holz- hend, Hoffm.] would join it with ὑγεια, —'anger, which arises from the ungodly natural life;' but as Mey. remarks, even granting this use of φωσης, this would require της της φωσης ὑγειας or της ἐκ της φωσης ὑγειας. It can then only mean, 'by nature,' And what does this imply? Harl., in loc., seems to have given the distinctive sense well: 'φωσης, in its fundamental idea, is that which has groen as distinguished from that which has been effecte

[θαι Γεματεδεν εις Γεματας = δυν Γεματετ] i.e. it is that which according to our judgment has the ground of its existence in individual development, not in accessory influence of another. Accordingly, φωσης, in its concrete idea, as the sum total of all growth, is 'rerum natura:' and in its abstract philosophical idea, φωσης is the contrast to θεςης. The φωσης of an individual thing denotes the peculiarity of its being, which is the result of its being, as opposed to every accessory quality: hence φωσης εἰλαοι or ποιεις τι means, 'συν σπουτε σεματε, esse aliquid' and 'natura esse aliquid;' to be and do any thing by virtue of a state [ἑναι] or an inclination [ποιεις], not acquired, but inherent: ζητη 

οις και φωσης ει μη πεφυκιτα σε ταυτα φωσης, μηθε τετησαθα καια, Soph. Philoct. 80. If this be correct, the expression will amount to an assertion on the part of the Apostle of the doctrine of original sin. There is from its secondary position [cf. Plutarch de terrat. am. p. 37, in Harl., ὁργην φωσης ποιωντων έτυπθεν] no emphasis on φωσης: but its doctrinal force as referring to a fundamental truth otherwise known, is not thereby lessened. And it is not for Meyer to argue against this by assuming original sin not to be a pauline doctrine. If the Apostle asserts it here, this place must stand on its own merits, not be wrested to suit an apparent preconceived meaning of other passages. But the truth is, he cites those other passages in a sense quite alien from their real one. It would be easy to shew that every one of them [Rom. i. 18; ii. 8, 9; v. 12; vii. 9; xi. 21. Gal. ii. 15] is consistent with the doctrine here implied. The student will do well to read the long notes in Harl., De W., Stier, and Eadie) of wrath (whose wrath, is evident: the meaning being, we were all concluded under and born in sin, and so actual objects of that wrath of God which is His mind against sin. ὑγεια must not be taken as τιμωρια, κόλασις, as Chrys., Thidrt., Basil, Thl., al.: this would in fact make the expression mean, actually punished: see above on τεκνα;—just as it now means, the
actual objects of God's wrath against sin, as also are (not, were) the rest (of mankind: not Gentiles, as those hold who take the ημείς πάντες of Jews,—see above: nor, as Stier, the rest of the Jews who disbelieved: but, all others, not like us, Christians). 4.] The construction is resumed, having been interrupted (see above on ver. 1) by the two relative sentences, ἐν αἰσ...ἐν οἷς. But (contrast to the preceding verse,—the ἔλεος and ἀγάθη, to the ὁρή just mentioned. δὲ is, however, often used after a parenthesis, where no such logical contrast is intended, the very resumption of the general subject being a contrast to its interruption by the particular clauses: see examples in Klotz, Devarius, ΙΙ. 376, 7) God, being rich (the participial clause states the general ground, and the following διὰ τ. πολλ. ἄγ., the special or peculiar motive, of οὐκ εὐσεβείᾳ, De W.) in compassion (for ἐν, see ref. ὅτι ἄπλος ἔλεημόν, ἀλλὰ πλοῦσις καθάπερ καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ [Ps. v. 7; lxviii. 13] φιλεῖν Ἐν τῷ πλῆθε τοῦ ἔλεους σου κ. π. [Ps. l. 1] Ἐλέησον με κατὰ τὸ κύριον σου, Chrys. ἔλεος, properly, as applying to our wretchedness before: cf. Ezek. xvi. 6),—on account of His great love wherewith (the construction may be attractive: but it would appear from ref. 2 Kings, to be rather a Hellenistic idiom) He loved us (the clause belongs, not to πλοῦσις δὲν ἐν ἔλ. as Calv., al., and E. v. necessarily, by 'hath quickened' following: but to the verb below. ημαὶς is all Christians; = ημεῖς πάντες in the last verse) even when we were dead (the καὶ belongs to, and intensifies, the state predicated by δύναται νεκροίς; and is therefore placed before the participle. It is not to be taken as a mere resumption of ver. 1 [Rücker, al.], nor as the copula only [Meyer]. His objection to the above rendering, that a quickening to life can happen only in and from a state of death, and therefore no emphasis on such a state is required, is entirely removed by noticing that the emphasis is not on the mere fact ἐφωσοποίησαν,—but on σωτ., τῷ χριστῷ, with all its glorious consequences) in our

(rous, the π. which we committed) trespasses (see on ver. 1), vivified (not 'hath vivified'—a definite act in time, not an abiding consequence is spoken of) us together with Christ (the reading in τ. χρ. [see var. readil.] seems to have arisen either from repetition of the -ἐν in συν- εὐσεβείᾳ, or from conformation to ver. 6. It is clearly not allowable to render χριστῷ, in Christ, as Boza,—without the proposition. It is governed by the συν--, and implies not exactly as Chrys., ἐξωταῖος κάκινον καὶ ημῖν,—but that Christ was the RESURRECTION and the Life, and we follow in and because of Him. The disputes about the meaning of ἐξωταῖος have arisen from not bearing in mind the relation in N. T. language between natural and spiritual death. We have often had occasion to observe that spiritual death in the N. T. includes in it and bears it with natural death as a consequence, to such an extent that this latter is often not thought of as worth mentioning: see especially John xi. 25, 26, which is the key-text for all passages regarding life in Christ. So here—God vivified us together with Christ: in the one act and fact of His resurrection He raised all His people—to spiritual life, and in that to victory over death, both spiritual, and therefore necessarily physical also. To dispute therefore whether such an expression as this is past [spiritual], or future [physical], is to forget that the whole includes its parts. Our spiritual life is the primary subject of the Apostle's thought: but this includes in itself our share in the resurrection and exaltation [ver. 6] of Christ. The three aorists, σωτηρίσθησαν, σωζόμενοι, συνεκκλησίαν, are all prophetic as regards the actuation in each man, but equally describe a past and accomplished act on God's part when He raised up Christ)—by grace ye are saved (this insertion in the midst of the mention of such great unmerited mercies to us sinners, is meant emphatically to call the reader's attention to so cogent a proof of that which the Apostle ever preached as the great foundation truth of the
Gospel. Notice the perf. 'are saved,' not σώζεται, 'are being saved,' because we have passed from death unto life: salvation is to the Christian not a future but a past thing, realized in the present by faith—and raised us together with Him (the Resurrection of Christ being the next event consequent on His vivification in the tomb) and seated us together with Him (the Ascension being the completion of the Resurrection. So that all these verbs refer strictly to the same work wrought on Christ, and in Christ on all His mystical Body, the Church) in the heavenly places (see on ch. i. 3, 20). "Obiter observa, non dixisse Apostolum: 'et consedere fecit ad dexteram suam,' sicut superiori capite de Christo dixerat: sedere enim ad dexteram Patris Christo proprium est; nec quicquam alteri communicatur: tamen in thorino Christi dicuntur sensuri qui vicerrir, Apoc. iii. in fine." Estius; and so Bengel) in Christ Jesus (as again specifying the element in which, as united and included in which, we have these blessings which have been enumerated—ἐν Χριστώ as in ch. i. 3, does not [Eadie] belong to τό ἐν Χριστῷ, but to the verb, as an additional qualification, and recalling to the fact of our union in Him as the medium of our resurrection and glorification. The disputes as to whether these are to be taken as present or future, actual or potential, literal or spiritual, will easily be disposed of by those who have apprehended the truth of the believer's union in and with Christ. All these we have, in fact and reality [see Phil. iii. 20], in their highest, and therefore in all lower senses, in Him: they were ours, when they were His: but for their fulness in possession we are waiting till He come, when we shall be like and with Him),

that He might shew forth (see Rom. ix. 23 : and for ἔδειξηται, reff. The middle voice gives the reference which the English sentence itself implies, that the exhibition is for His own purpose, for His own glory [see ch. i. 6, 12, 14]—see note on Col. ii. 15. This meaning of præ se ferre is illustrated by Liddell and Scott sub voce: or far better by Palm and Rost, Lex. Beware of the rendering 'might give a specimen of' ['Rückert, Eadie'], which the word will not bear either here or in reff.) in the ages which are hereafter to come (what are they? the future periods of the Church's earthly career,—or the ages of the glorified Church hereafter? The answer must be given by comparing this with the very similar expression in Col. i. 26, 27. . . . τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκρυπτουμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰῶνων κ. ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν, γινεῖ δὲ εἰρηνεία τοῖς ἄγιοις αὐτῶν, οἷς ἤθελεν καὶ ὁ θεὸς γενναίοις τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. Here it is manifest (1) that the αἰῶνες from which the mystery was hidden are the past ages of this world; (2) that those to whom, as here, God will make known the riches of His glory, are His saints, i. e. His church on earth. Therefore I conceive we are compelled to interpret analogously: viz. to understand the αἰῶνες ἐπερχόμενοι of the coming ages of the church, and the persons involved in them to be the future members of the church. Thus the meaning will be nearly as in ch. i. 12. The supposed reference to the future state of glory seems not to agree with αἰῶνες, nor with ἐπερχόμενοι:—nor with the fact that the second coming and future kingdom of Christ are hardly ever alluded to in this Epistle (the exceeding riches of His grace in) (of the material of which this display of His grace will consist, the department in which it will find its exercise) goodness (see especially Rom. ii. 4) towards us in (not 'through,' as E. V.)
Christ Jesus (again and again he repeats this "in Christ Jesus.") HE is the great centre of the Epistle, towards whom all the rays of thought converge, and from whom all blessings flow; and this the Apostle will have his readers never forget). 8.] For by grace (the article shows us the import of the sentence—to take up and expand the parenthetic clause χάριτι ἐστε σεαυτονθένων above: but not barely so: that clause itself was inserted on account of the matter in hand being a notable example of the fact, and this γάρ takes up also that of hand in hand—the ἐπερεθήκατο πλοῦτος κ.τ.λ.) are (perf.) saved, through [your] (or [the]), but the possessive article is preferable, see below: the 'the' would make both objective. The abstract, 'through faith,' must be the rendering if the article be omitted faith (the dative above expressed the objective instrumental condition of the fact, and this γάρ takes up also that matter in hand—the ἐπερεθήκατο πλοῦτος κ.τ.λ.) ye are (perf.) saved, through [your] (or [the]), but the possessive article is preferable, see below: the 'the' would make both objective. And this (not your faith, as Chrys. oυδὲ ἡ πίστις, φθειν, εἶς ὑμῶν: so Thdr., al., Corn. a. lap., Beza, Est., Grot., Beng., al.;—this is precluded [not by the gender of τοῦτο, but] by the manifestly parallel clauses oῦκ εἶς ὑμῶν and oὐκ εἶς ἔργον, of which the latter would be more serious as asserted of πίστις, and the reference of ver. 9 must therefore be changed:—but, as Calv., Calov., Rück, Harl., Olsh., Mey., De W., Stier, al., 'your salvation;' τὸ σεαυτονθέν νείν, as Ellisc.) not of yourselves, God's (emphatic) is the gift (not, as E. V. 'it is the gift of God'; τὸν δάφνων; τὸ δάφνων, viz. of your salvation:—so that the expression is pregnant—q. d., 'but it is a gift, and that gift is God's.' There is no occasion, as Lachm., Harl., and De W., to parenthesis these words: they form a contrast to oὐκ εἶς ὑμῶν, and a quasi-parallel clause to ταῦτα μὴ τα καυχησία: below: not of works (for εἶς ἔργον, see on Rom. iii. 18, and Gal. ii. 16), that no man should boast (on the proposition implied, see on Rom. iv. 2. Τα ἔχει in matter of fact its strictest teleic sense. With God, results are all purposed; it need not be understood, when we predicate of HIm a purpose in this manner, that it was His main or leading aim;—but it was one of those things included in His scheme, which ranked among His purposes). 10.] For (substantiates vv. 8, 9). The English reader is likely to imagine a contrast between 'not of works' and 'for we are His workmanship,' which can hardly have been in the mind of the Apostle) his handwork are we (ποιήμα, not, as Tert. and al., of our original creation: 'quod vivimus, quod spiramus, quod intelligimus, quod crede possumus, ipsius est, quia ipse conditor noster est,' Pelagius, in Harl.: this is clearly refuted by the defining clause below, κτισθ, κτ.λ., and the ποιήμα shewn to be the spiritual creation treated of in vv. 8, 9), created in Christ Jesus (see ver. 15, ἐγείρον δόθη κτισθ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἑαυτὸ καὶ ἀνθρωπον, and cf. Tit. iii. 5, where the beginning of this new life is called παλεγενεσία. See also 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15) for (see ref.: so Xen. Anab. vii. 6. 3, καὶ γείροντο ἐπὶ ἡμῖν. See Winer, edn. 6, § 18. c. e; Phrynichus, ed. Lobbeck, p. 175) good works (just as a tree may be said to be created for its fruit: see below), which (attraction for a: not for which, which would require ἡμᾶς after the verb) God before prepared ('ante paravit, quam conderet,' Fritz. in Ellisc. So Philo, de Opif. 25, vol. i. p. 18,
11 ὃς μηνουνεῖτε ὅτι ποτὲ μείζον τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκὶ, λεγομένοι ἀκροβασία ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χριστοποίητον, ὅτι τῷ τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ χορίς χριστοῦ πάτηλοριον τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ


11. ἐὰν τοῦτο μηνουνεῖτε μιᾷ, ὃι ποτὲ κ.τ.λ. F Dial., reε ωίεις bef ποτε (for εφύλη), with DΚΛ3 rel vss ff: τον ABDB'N1 in 17 vulg Dial, Cyril Did Ambr Jer. 12. rec ins ev bef τον καιρον (explanatory), with DΚΛ3 rel vulg copt goth Orig-cat Dial Tert: om ABDB'F8 17 tol(and F-lat) Chr-comm Epiph Cyr Victorin Jer Ang.

ὅθες τὰ ἐν κόσμῳ πάντα προτοίμασεν: Wisd. ix. 8, μιμημα σχήμα άγιας την προτοίμασας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. The sentiment is the same as that in John v. 36, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ εὐαγγέλιον μοί ὁ πατὴρ ἔνα τελείωσιν αὐτά. To recur to the similitude used above, we might say of the trees,—they were created for fruits which God before prepared that they should bear them: i.e. defined and assigned to each tree its own, in form, and flavour, and time of bearing. So in the course of God’s providence, our good works are marked out for and assigned to each one of us. See the doctrine of pre-existence in God explained in Delitzsch’s biblica Psychologie, p. 23 ff. Stier’s view, after Bengel, is that the verb προτείνειν, is neuter, having no accusative after it,—for which God made preparation, &c.: but this usage of the compound verb wants example: that we should walk in them. Thus the truth of the maxim “bona opera non procedunt justificandum, sed sequuntur justificatum” (see Harl.) is shewn. The sentiment is strictly pauline (against De W. and Baur),—in the spirit of Rom. xii. Gal. v. 22, 25. &c. B.II—22.] HORTATORY EXPANSION OF THE FOREGOING IN DETAIL: REMINDING THEM, WHAT THEY ONCE WERE (Vv. 11, 12); WHAT THEY WERE NOW IN CHRIST (Vv. 13—22). 11. WHEREFORE (since so many and great blessings are given by God to His people, among whom ye are) remember, that once ye, the (i.e. who belonged to the category of the) Gentiles in the flesh (i.e. in their corporeal condition of uncircumcision: ‘præphantium profani hominis indicium est,’ Calv,—construction see below), who were called (the) uncircumcision by that which is called (the) circumcision in the flesh wrought by hands (this last addition ἐν σαρκὶ χριστοῦ seems made by the Apostle, not to throw discredit on circumcision, but as a reserve, περιτομῆν having a higher and spiritual application: q. d.—‘but they have it only in the flesh, and not in the heart.’ As Ellie, well states the case—“The Gentiles were called, and were the ἀκροβασία: the Jews were called, but were not truly the περιτομή.” See Col. ii. 11), 12. that ye were (the ἐν τινι takes up again the ἐν τινι in ver. 11, after the relative clause,—and the τῷ κ. ἐκείνῳ takes up the ποτε there. It is not a broken construction, but only a repetition; ‘that, I say . . .’) at that time (when ye were,—not τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκὶ, which ye are now, and which is carefully divided from ποτε above by ωθεινεις—but that which is implied in ποτε—heathens, before your conversion to Christ. On the dative of time without the preposition ἐν, see Kühner, vol. ii. § 569), and remarks on its difference from the genitive and accusative) without Christ (separate from, having no part in, the promised Messiah. That this is the sense, is evident from ver. 13: see below. The words τὴν χριστού χριστοῦ are not a defining clause to ἡτί ἀπάλλατος, as Lachmann points them, and De W. and Eadie render: ‘that ye were, being without Christ, &c.’ The arrangement would thus be harsh and clumsy beyond all precedent) alienated from (οὐκ εἶπεν, κεκωσμωμένοι . . . . πολλῇ τῶν ἑμιστὰτον ἐκμαζοσ, πολὺν δεικνύου τῶν χρισμών. ἐνείκα ἤσε ἵσταται τῆς πολιτείας ἐὰν ἐκτός, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἂν ἀλλότριοι ἂλλ' ἃς ῥάθυμοι, κ. τ.δ. διαθηκῶν ἐξετέσον, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἂς ἐκεῖοι, ἀλλ' ἂς ἄνδεξιοι, Chr. Gentiles and Jews were once united in the hope of redemption—this was constituted, on the apostasy of the nations, into a definite polis. The Jews, from which and its blessings the Gentiles were alienated) the commonwealth (πολιτεία is both polity, state [objective],—tow τῆν τὸς πόλιν οἰκονομον τῶν τάξεων τίς, Aristot. Polit. iii. 1,—and right of citizenship, ref. Acts. The former appears best here, on account of
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13—15. ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ.  

ver. 11, and mark the repetitions, χριστοῦ —κρατήρ [τοῦ—τοῦ χριστοῦ, which this αυτὸς takes up] is our peace (not by metonymy for εἰρημοποιεῖ, but in the widest and most literal sense, our peace. He did not make our peace and then retire, leaving us to enjoy that peace,—but is Himself its medium and its substance; His making both one was no external reconciliation, but the taking both, their common nature, and on and into Himself,—see ver. 15. Bear in mind the multitude of prophetic passages which connect peace with Him, Isa. ix. 6; 11; lxxi. 5; lxxi. 19; Micah v. 5; Hag. ii. 9; Zech. ix. 10: also Luke ii. 14; John xiv. 27; xx. 19, 21, 26. And notice that already the complex idea of the whole verse, that of uniting both Jews and Gentiles in one reconciliation to God, begins to appear: for He is our Peace, not only as reconciling Jew to Gentile, not as bringing the far-off Gentile near to the Jew, but as reconciling both, united, to God; as bringing the far-off Gentile, and the near Jew, both into peace with God. For want of observing this the sense has been much obscured: see below) who made (specification, how He is our peace. Better made, than hath made: the latter is true, but it is the historic fact which is here brought out) both (Jews and Gentiles; not man and God,) as Stier: cf. vv. 15, 16. Neuter, as abstract,—both things, both elements) one, and (epexegetical—namely, in that he) threw down the middle wall of the fence (i. e. the middle wall which belonged to—was a necessary part of the carrying out of—the φραγμός. The primary allusion seems to be, to the rending of the veil at the crucifixion: not that that veil separated Jew and Gentile, but that it, the chief symbol of separation from God, included in its removal the admission to Him of that one body into which Christ made Jew and Gentile. This complex idea is before the Apostle throughout the sentence: and necessarily; for the reconciliation which Christ effected between Jew and Gentile was in fact only a subordinate step of the great reconciliation of both to God, which He effected by His sacrifice in the flesh,—and in speaking of one he speaks of the other also. The φραγμός, from what has been said above, is more general in sense than the μεσότοξον; is in fact the whole arrangement, of which that was but an instrument—the separation itself, consequent on a system of separation: it is therefore the whole legal system, ceremonial and moral, which made the whole separation,—of Jew from Gentile,—and in the background, of both from God), the enmity (not, of Jew and Gentile: so strong a term is not justified as applying to their separation, nor does such a reference satisfy ver. 16, as we see there;—but, the enmity in which both were involved against God, see Rom. viii. 7. τὴν ἐξ θεοῦ is in apposition to τό μεσότος. This enmity was the real cause of separation from God, and in being so, was the inclusive, mediate cause of the separation between Jew and Gentile. Christ, by abolishing the first, abolished the other also: see below) in His flesh (to be joined not with καταργήσας, as most Commentators, which is very harsh, breaking the parallelism, and making the instrumental predication precede the verb, which is not the character of this passage;—but with λύσας. Christ destroyed the μεσότος, i. e. the ἐξ θεοῦ, in, or by, His flesh; see on ver. 16, where the same idea is nearly repeated. It was in His crucified flesh, which was in διωκόματι σαρκός ἀμαρτίας, that He slew this enmity. The rendering, 'the enmity which was in His flesh,' would certainly in this case require the specifying article τὴν, besides being very questionable in sense),—having done away the law of secretory commandments (this law was the φραγμός,—the great exponent of the ἐξ θεοῦ). Its specific nature was that it consisted in commandments, decretorily or dogmatically expressed;—in ἐντολαὶ ἐν δύναμιν. So that we do not require τῶν ἐν δόγ., or τῶν ἐν δογ. This law, moral and ceremonial, its decalogue, its ordinances, its rites, was entirely done away in and by the death of Christ. See Col. ii. 13—15, notes. And the end of that καταργήσις was) that He might create the two (Jew and Gentile) in Him (it is somewhat difficult to decide
between έαυτώ and αυτώ. On the one hand, αυτώ is the harder reading: on the other, we have the constant confusion of αυτώ, αυτός, and έαυτώ, complicating the question. Whichever be read, the reference clearly must be to Christ, which, with αυτώ, is, to say the least, a harsh recurrence to the αυτός of ver. 14) into one new man (observe, not that He might reconcile the two to each other only, nor is the Apostle speaking merely of any such reconciliation: but that He might incorporate the two, reconciled in Him to God, into one new man,—the old man to which both belonged, the enemy of God, having been slain in His flesh on the Cross. Observe, too, one new man: we are all in God's sight but one in Christ, as we are but one in Adam), making peace (not, between Jew and Gentile: He is ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, of us all; see below on ver. 17), and (parallel with the former purpose) not 'second purpose' (Ellic., De W.), which yet must thus be the first. The καί is in fact just in ver. 14) might reconcile again, most likely this is implied in the από. We have it only in Col. 2. 20, 21, where the same sense, of reinstating in the divine favour, seems to be intended) both of us in one body (not His own human body, as Chrys. [who however seems to waver,—cf. τοις ἐν μινούσιν ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ,—between this and His mystical body], ult.—but the Church, cf. the same expression Col. iii. 13) to God (if this had not been here expressed, the whole reference of the sentence would have been thought to be to the uniting Jews and Gentiles. That it is expressed, now shews that throughout, that union has been thought of only as a subordinate step in a greater reconciliation) by means of the cross (the cross regarded as the symbol of that which was done cn and by it), having slain the

enmity (ἐξάρθα) has been taken here to mean the enmity between Jew and Gentile. But see on ver. 15: and let us ask here, was this the enmity which Christ slew at His death? Was this the ἐξάρθα, the slaying of which brought in the ἀποκατάλαξις, as this verse implies? Does such a meaning of ἐξάρθα at all satisfy the solemnity of the sentence, or of the next two verses? I cannot think so: and must maintain ἐξάρθα here [and if here, then in ver. 15 also] to be that between man and God, which Christ did slay on the cross, and which being brought to an end, the separation between Jew and Gentile, which was a result of it, was done away. Eliott, who maintained the above opinion in his 1st edn., now agrees with that here insisted on) on it (on the cross: compare Col. ii. 15, notes: not in His body; see above): and having come, He preached (how? when? Obviously after his death, because by that death the peace was wrought. We seek in vain for any such announcement made by Him in person after his resurrection. But we find a key to the expression in John xiv. 18, οὐκ ἀφήσας ὑμᾶς ἀφανίσως ἑξέρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς; see also ver. 28. And this coming was, by His Spirit poured out on the Church. There is an expression of St. Paul's, singularly parallel with this, and of itself strongly corroborative of the genuineness of our Epistle, in Acts xxvi. 23, εἰ παθήτω δ ἁρπατίων, εἰ πρῶτος εἰς ἀναστάσις νεκρῶν φῶς μελέτη καταγγέλλω τῷ τε λαῷ κ. τοῖς ἑρασίν. This coming therefore is by His Spirit [see on ver. 18, and ministers, and ordinances in the Church] peace to you who were far off, and peace to those (not "to us," for fear of still upholding the distinction where he wishes to merge it altogether) that were nigh (this διὴρήνη is plainly then not mere mutual reconciliation, but that
far greater peace which was effected by Christ’s death, peace with God, which necessitated the union of the far off and the near in one body in Him. This is shewn especially by the repetition of εἰρήνη. See Isa. lvii. 19. Then follows the empowering reason, why He should preach peace to us both: and it is this ver. 18 especially which I maintain cannot be satisfied on the ordinary hypothesis of mere reconciliation between Jew and Gentile being the subject in the former verses. Here clearly the union [not reconciliation, nor is enmity predicated of them] of Jew and Gentile is subordinated to the blessed fact of an access to God having been provided for both through Christ by the Spirit; for (not epexegetical of εἰρήνη, ‘viz. that . . . ,’ as Bamm.-Crus.) through Him we have our access (I prefer this intransitive meaning to that maintained by Ellie., al., ‘introduction,’—some [Mey.], say, by Christ [1 Pet. iii. 18] as our προσαγωγής [admissionalis, a word of Oriental courts],—not as differing much from it in meaning, but as better representing, both here and in Rom. v. 2, and ch. iii. 12, the repetition, the present liberty of approach, which ἔχωμεν implies, but which ‘introduction’ does not give), both of us, in (united in, 1 Cor. xii. 13) one Spirit (not ‘one frame of mind’ [Anselm, Koppe, al.]: the whole structure of the sentence, as compared with any similar one, such as 2 Cor. xiii. 13, will shew what spirit is meant, viz. the Holy Spirit of God, already alluded to in ver. 17; see above. As a parallel, cf. 1 Cor. xii. 13) to the Father. 19. So then (δέ ὥσπερ) is said by Hermann [Viger, art. 292] not to be classical Greek. It is frequent in St. Paul, but confined to him; see ref. Cf. on Gal. vi. 10) ye no longer are strangers and sojourners (see ref. Acts, where certainly this is the sense. “παροικος is here simply the same as the classic μέτοικος [a form which does not occur in the N. T., and only once, Jer. xx. 3, in the LXX.], and was probably its Alexandrian equivalent. It is used frequently in the LXX,—in eleven passages as a translation of εἰς, and in nine of ψευδος.” Ellicott. ‘Sojourners,’ as dwelling among the Jews, but not numbered with them. Bengel opposes ἐκλείπει to ‘gives’ and πᾰροικοζ to ‘domiciliac;’—and so Harless: but this seems too artificial), but are fellow-citizens with the saints (συμπολιτης is blamed by Phyrnihus [ed. Lob. p. 172: see Lobeck’s note] and the Atticists as a later word. But it occurs in Eur. Heraclid. 821, and the compound verb συμπολευσον is found in pure Attic writers: see Palm and Rost’s Lex. τολευται would not here express the meaning of comrades, co-citizens, of the saints. οἱ ἄγιοι are not angels, nor Jews, nor Christians then alive merely, but the saints of God in the widest sense,—all members of the mystical body of Christ,—the commonwealth of the spiritual Israel) and of the household (οἰκεῖον, not as Harl., ‘stones of which the house is built,’ which is an unnatural anticipation here, where all is a political figure, of the material figure in the next verse: but ‘members of God’s family,’ in the usual sense of the word) of God,—having been built (we cannot express the εἴ:—the ‘superedificati’ of the Vulg. gives it: we have the substantive ‘super-structure,’ but no verb corresponding. There is, though Harl. [see above] denies it, a transition from one image, a political and social, to another, a material) upon the foundation (dative as resting upon: in 1 Cor. iii. 12, where we have εἰς τὸν ἑποδόματε ἐς τον θεμέλιον . . . the idea of bringing and laying upon is prominent, and therefore the case of motion is used. Between the genitive and dative of rest with ἐς there is the distinction, that the genitive implies more partial overhanging, looser connexion,—the dative, a connexion of close fitting attach-
II.

20. aft akρογονιαίον ins λόγον DF Orig, Ens Chr-txt. for αὐτοῦ, τοῦ ἥν: om
Syri Orig, Almsg. Chr-comm: txt N-corr

The Apostles and Prophets (how is this genitive to be understood? Is it a genitive of apposition, so that the Apostles and Prophets themselves are the foundation? This has been supposed by numerous Commentators, from Chrys., to De Wette. But, not to mention the very many other objections which have been well and often urged against this view, this one is to my mind decisive—that it entirely destroys the imagery of the passage. The temple, into which these Gentiles were built, is the mystical body of the Son, in which the Father dwells by the Spirit, ver. 22. The Apostles and Prophets [see below], yea, Jesus Christ Himself, as the great inclusive Head Corner Stone [see again below], are also built into this temple. [That He includes likewise the foundation, and is the foundation, is true, and must be remembered, but is not prominent here.] Clearly then the Apostles and Prophets have laid the foundation, being here spoken of as parts of the building, together with these Gentiles, and with Jesus Christ Himself. But again, does the genitive mean, the foundation which the Apostles and Prophets have laid? So also very many, from Ambrost., to Rück., Harl., Mey., Stier, Ellic., both edd. As clearly,—not thus. To introduce them here as agents, is as inconsistent as the other. No agents are here spoken of, but merely the fact of the great building in its several parts being built up together. The only remaining interpretation then is, to regard the genitive as simply possessive: *the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets,* = 'the Apostles and Prophets' foundation'—that upon which they as well as yourselfs are built. This exegesis, which I find ascribed to Bucer only (in De W.), seems to me beyond question the right one. See more below. But (2) who are προφητάι? They have commonly been taken, without enquiry, as the O. T. Prophets. And certainly, the sense, with some little straining, would admit of this view. They may be said to be built upon Christ, as belonging to that widest acceptance of His mystical body, in which it includes all the saints. O. T. as well as N. T. But there are several objections: first, formal: the order of the words has been urged against this view, in that προφ. should have come first. I should not be inclined to lay much weight on this; the Apostles might naturally be spoken of first, as nearest, and the Prophets second—the Apostles, yea and of the Prophets also.' A more serious formal objection is, the omission of the article before προφ., thereby causing τῶν ἀποστόλων κ. προφητῶν together as belonging to the same class. But weightier objections are behind. In ch. iii. 5, we have οἱ ἑτέραι γενεῖς οῦκ ἐγγραφισθέντες τοῖς ναῖσι τῶν ἄνθρωπων, ἀλλὰ ἐπικαλθέντες τοῖς ἄγαλμα, ὑπὲρ ἀποστόλων ἀυτοῦ κ. προφήται ἐν πνεύματι, where unquestionably the προφήται are N. T. Prophets; and again ch. iv. 11, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐδωκέν τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας. And it is difficult to conceive that the Apostle should have used the two words conjoined here, in a different sense. Even stronger is the consideration arising from the whole sense of the passage. All here is strictly Christian,—post-Judaic,—consequent on Christ's death, and triumph, and His coming preaching peace by the Spirit to the united family of man. So that we must decide for προφ., being N. T. Prophets: those who ranked next to the Apostles in the government of the church; see Acts vi. 27, note. They were not in every case distinct from the Apostles: the apostleship probably always including the gift of prophecy: so that all the Apostles themselves might likewise have been προφηταί], Christ Jesus Himself (the αὐτός exalts the dignity of the temple, in that not only it has among its stones Apostles and prophets, but the Lord Himself is built into it. The attempt of Bengel, al., to render αὐτός, 'ils,' and refer it to θεμελιώ, will be seen, by what has been said, to be foreign to
the purpose. Besides, it would more naturally be δυτος αυτος αιρον. . . . .

Bengel's idea, that on our rendering, it must be αυτος του, is refuted by such passages as καλ αυτος δευς, Luke xx. (42) being the Head corner stone (see, besides refl. Ps. cxvii. 22; Jer. xxviii. (ii.) 26; Matt. xxxi. 42; Acts iv. 11. The reference here is clearly to that Headstone of the Corner, which is not only the most conspicuous but the most important in the building: "qui, in extremo angulo [fundamenti, but qu.] positus, duos parietes ex diverso vientes conjungit et continet," Est. Builders set up such a stone, or build such a pillar of brick, before getting up their walls, to rule and square them by. I must again repeat, that the fact of Jesus Christ being Himself the foundation, however it underlies the whole, is not to be brought in as interfering with this portion of the figure).

21. in whom (δ το πασα συνεχων εστιν δ θριστος, Chr.: not only so, but He is in reality the inclusive Head of the building: it all in αυτοι συνεστηκε, is squared and ruled by its unity to and in Him) all the building (more properly πασα η οικοδ: and to a classical Greek ear, any other rendering of οικοδ εικ. than 'every building,' seems preposterous enough. But 'every building' here is quite out of place, inasmuch as the Apostle is clearly speaking of but one vast building, the mystical Body of Christ: and πασα οικ. cannot have Meyer's sense 'every congregation thus built in;' nor would it be much better to take refuge in the proper sense of οικοδομη, and render 'all building,' i.e. 'every process of building,' for then we should be at a loss when we come to αυτει below. Are we then to render ungrammatically, and force words to that which they cannot mean? Certainly not; but we seem to have some light cast here by such an expression as πωροτοκος πανας κτισεως, Col. i. 15, which though it may be evaded by rendering 'of every creature,' yet is not denied by most Commentators to be intended to bear this sense 'of all creation;' cf. also ib. ver. 23, in πασα κτισει τη αιωνων. The account to be given of such later usages is, that gradually other words besides proper names became regarded as able to dispense with the article after πας, so that as they said first πασα ισεροσλομεα [Matt. ii. 3], and then πας οικος ισεραθ [Acts ii. 36], so they came at length to say πασα κτισια [as we ourselves 'all creation,' for 'all the creation'] and πασα οικοδομη, when speaking of one universal and notorious building, Ellic. adds to the examples, πασα γη, Thucyd. ii. 43, πασα εστιασα, Ignat. Eph. § 12, p. 656. οικοδομη itself is a late form, cen- sured by Phryn. [Lob. p. 421] and the Atticists, being framed exactly together (the verb = συναρμολωγος sufficiently explains itself, being only found in these two places [ref.].) Wetst. quotes ἀρμονισθησα ταφων from Anthol. iii. 32. 4, and Palm and Rost refer for ἀρμολογον to Philip of Thessalonica, Ep. 78 is growing (there seems no reason why the proper sense of the present should not be retained. Both participle and verb imply that the fitting together and the growing are still going on; and the only way which we in English have to mark this so as to avoid the chance of mistake, is by the auxiliary verb sub- stantive, and the participle. The bare present, 'growth,' is in danger of being mistaken for the abstract quality, and the temporal development is thus lost sight of: whereas the other, in giving pro- minence to that temporal development, also necessarily implies the 'normal, per- petual, unconditioned nature of the or- ganic increase' [Ellic.] to (so 'crescere in cumulum,' Claudian in Piscator) an holy temple in the Lord (i.e. according to apostolic usage, and the sense of the whole passage, 'in Christ.' The εν εν κυριω, —εν ει—like the frequent repetitions of the name θριστος in vv. 12, 13, are used by the Apostle to lay all stress on the fact that Christ is the inclusive Head of all the building, the element in which it has its being and its growth. I would join
III. 1 Τούτων χάριν έγώ Χαίλος ο ἀρεστός τοῦ Χριστοῦ, through those ministers who wrought in the Spirit: primarily, as regarded the Ephesians, through himself. Thus first, of his Office as Apostle of the Gentiles (1—13): secondly, under the form of a prayer for them, the aim and end of that office as respected the Church: its becoming strong in the power of the Spirit (14—19). Then (20, 21) doxology, concluding this first division of the Epistle. 1—13.] (See above.) On this account (in order to explain, something must be said on the construction. (a) Chrys. says:—elπ τούτων χριστου την κηδεμονία την πολλήν εκβάλει λοιπόν κ. ἐπί την ἑαυτοῦ, μεν μεν οὖσαν κ. σφόδρα οὐδὲν πρὸς ἐκείνην, ἰκανὴν δὲ καὶ ταύτην ἐκπαύσασθαι. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐγὼ δέδεμα, φρον. This supplying of εἴδων after ἀρεστός, and making the latter the predicate, is the rendering of Syr., and adopted by very many. It has against it, 1) that thus τούτων χάριν and ὑπὲρ ἰδιών become tautological: 2) that thus ver. 2 and the following are unconnected with the preceding, serving for no explanation of it ['legationis, non vicinorum rationem explicat', Castalio in Harl.]: 3) that the article ὅ with the predicate ἀρεστός gives it undue prominence, and exalts the Apostle in a way which would be very unnatural to him,—'sum captivus ille Christi,' as Glass, and inconsistent with εἴ γε ἤκοισα, &c. following. (b) Erasm.-Schmidt, Hammond, Michael., Winer [and so E.V.] regard the sentence, broken at εἴδων, as resumed at ch. iv. 1. Against this is the decisive consideration, that ch. iii. is no parenthesis, but an integral and complete portion of the Epistle, finished moreover with the doxology vv. 20, 21, and altogether distinct in subject and character from ch. iv. (c) Ec. says [and so Estius and Grot.]: ἀνταπόδοσις ἐστὶ τούτων χάριν, οὐν τούτου χ. ἐμοῦ τῷ ἔλ. π. ἀγ. εὐθ. κ.τ.λ. (ver. 8) σκοτεῖ δὲ ότι ἀρέστε- μεν τῆς περίδος κατά το ὅρθον σχήμα ἐν τῇ ἀπόδοσις ἐπιλαγχός, αἰχμαλώτικας τ. ἀνταπόδοσις πρὸς τόν περιβολάν τόπου. But as Harl. remarks, this deprives τούτων χάριν of meaning: for it was not because they were built in, &c., that this grace was given to him: and, besides, thus the leading thought of the antapodosis in ver. 8 is clumsily forestalled in vv. 6, 7. (d) The idea that ver. 13 resumes the sentence [Camerar., Cramer, al.] is refuted by the

ἐν κυρίω with ναῦν ἄγιαν, as more accordant with the Apostle's style than if it were joined with ανεί [ανεί ἐν κυρίω εἰς ναῦν ἄγιαν], or with ἄγιαν [εἰς ναῦν ἐν κυρίω ἄγιαν]. The increase spoken of will issue in its being a holy temple in Christ), 22.] in whom (not 'in which,' viz. the temple—it is characteristic [see above] of this part of the epistle to string together these relative expressions, all referring to the same) ye also (not, as Eadie, 'even you,' there is no depreciation here, but an exaltation, of the Gentiles, as living stones of the great building) are being built in together (with one another, or with those before mentioned. An imperative sense ['Ephesos hortatur ut crescant in fide Christi magis et magis postquam in ea semel fuerunt fundati,' Calv.] is not for a moment to be thought of: the whole passage is descriptive, not hortatory) for (Griesb. parenthesizes with two commas, ἐν δὲ ... συνουσιόμενοι, and takes this εἰς as parallel with the former εἰς. But this unnecessarily involves the sentence, which is simple enough as it stands) an habitation of God (the only true temple of God, in which He dwells, being the Body of Christ, in all the glorious accetpation of that term) in the Spirit (it is even now, in the state of imperfection, by the Spirit, dwelling in the hearts of believers, that God has His habitation in the Church: and then, when the growth and increase of that Church shall be completed, it will be still in and by the Holy Spirit fully penetrating and possessing the whole glorified Church, that the Father will dwell in it for ever. Thus we have the true temple of the Father, built in the Son, inhabited in the Spirit: the offices of the Three blessed Persons being distinctly pointed out: God, the Father, in all His fulness, dwells in, fills the Church: that Church is constituted an holy Temple to Him in the Son,—is inhabited by Him in the ever-present indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The attempt to soften away ἐν πνεύματι into πνευματικὸς [ναῦς πνευματικὸς, Chrys., and so Thl., Ec., al., and even Olsh.] is against the whole sense of the passage, in which not the present spiritual state of believers, but their ultimate glories completion [εἰς] is spoken of. See ref.).

III. 1—21.] Aim and End of the Church in the Spirit. And herein, the revelation to it of the mystery
insufficiency of such a secondary sentiment as that in ver. 13 to justify the long parenthesis full of such solemn matter, as that vv. 2—12; and by the improbability that the Apostle would resume τούτου χάριν by διό, with τούτου χάριν occurring again in the next verse, and not rather have expressed this latter in that case by καλ. (e) It remains that with Thdt. [on ver. 1, βαθύτατα μιν εἰπέν· ὅτι ταῦτα υμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν εἴδω κ.τ.λ. δέομαι κ. ἑκτενώ τὸν τῶν ἀληθῶν θεοῦ, βεβαιώσαι υμᾶς τὸ πλεῖον κ.τ.λ., then on ver. 14, ταῦτα πάντα ἐν μιᾷ τεθεικάς ἀναλογίαις τῶν περὶ προσευχῆς λόγων], Luth., Pisc., Corn.-a-lap., Schöttg., Beng., Rück., Harl., De W., Stier, Ellic., al., we consider ver. 14 as taking up the sense, with its repetition of τούτου χάριν, and the weighty prayer which it introduces, and which forms a worthy justification for so long and solemn a parenthesis. τούτου χάριν will then mean, 'seeing ye are so built in,'—stand in such a relation to God's purposes in the church—I Paul (he mentions himself here, as introducing to them the agent in the Spirit's work who was nearest to themselves, and setting forth that work as the carrying on of his enlightenment on their behalf, and the subject of his earnest prayer for them: see argument to this chapter above), the prisoner (but now without any prominence, or the very slightest: cf. Τιμόθεος ὁ ἄδελφος: it is rather generic, or demonstrative, than emphatic) of Christ [Jesus] (see ref.; χρ. first, because it is not so much personal possession, as the fact of the Messiahship of Jesus having been the cause and origin of his imprisonment, which is expressed by the genitive) on behalf of you Gentiles (see ver. 13, where this υπὲρ υμῶν is repeated. The matter of fact was so:—his preaching to Gentiles aroused the jealousy of the Jews, and led to his imprisonment. But he rather thinks of it as a result of his great office and himself as a sacrifice for those whom it was his intent to benefit,—if, that is (cf. γε, 'assuming that:' see note on 2 Cor. v. 3). The Ephesians had heard all this, and St. Paul was now delicately reminding them of it. So that to derive from εἰ γε ἡκούσατε an argument against the genuineness of the Epistle, as De Wette does, is mere inattention to philology, ye heard of (when I was among you: his whole course there, his converse [Acts xx. 18—21], and his preaching, were just the imparting to them his knowledge) the economy (see note on ch. i. 10. It is not the apostolic office,—but the dispensation—μνεάν διαπενσαντία, in which he was an οἰκονόμος, of that which follows) of the grace of God which was given me (the χάρις δοθήσα with benevolent δοθήσα in any of the so-called figures was the material with respect to which the dispensation was to be exercised: so that the genitive is objective as in ch. i. 10) towards you (to be dispensed in the direction of, to, you). 3.] that (exegesis of the fact implied in ἡκούσατε τὴν οἰκ. 'viz. of the fact that:' as we say, 'how that') by revelation (see ref.; the stress is on these words, from their position) was made known to me the mystery (viz. of the admission of the Gentiles [ver. 6]) to be fellow-heirs, &c. See ch. i. 9, directly referred to below) even as I before wrote (not, 'have before written,' though this perhaps better marks the reference. 'Before wrote,' viz. in ch. i. 9 ff.) briefly (διὰ βραχεῖας, Chrys.: 'Haec locutionem hanc Aristoteles rhet. iii. 2, p. 716, ubi de acumenibus orationis, quae ex unis aut plurium vocum similiun oppositione orintur, dict, ex tanto de-
5. rec ins ev bef etepais (on account of the double dative), with (none of our mss) syr copt: on ABCDFKLN rel latt Syr goth arm Clem Orig Cyr Jer Chr Cyri Jer. autov bef apostrapoiv DF copt Thil Hil. ins two bef pnevmati F Chr.

6. rec aft epaggelias ins autov, with D-3FKL rel syr Thdrt Damage Hil: on ABCD58 17 demid(with tol) D-lat Syr copt arm Orig3 Chr Jer Pelag Sedul. rec ins two bef xristo, with DFKL rel: on ABCD58 17 vulg syr-w-ast copt goth Amburh Pelag.

gantiora esse, 80v en elastov, quanto brevissimus proferantur, et id ideo dicit sic se habere, uti, 80v mae8hes, dian 80v en aistei8ia88a8 ma8lon, dian de en en oligmou bat8ton 8yn8ta, quoniam ea oppositionem ex magis, ob brevitatem vero eo ecellere copianturn. 80v Kypke, obsb. sacra, ii. p. 293).

4. 80v (or, ‘in accordance with’; perhaps) ‘is our word nearest corresponding. The use of πρός is as in πρός το διόκτον τεταρταγμόνων which (viz., that which I wrote: not the fact of my having written briefly, as Kypke) ye can, while reading (away, absolute), perceive (aorist, because the act is regarded as one of a series, each of which, when it occurs, is sudden and transitory) my understanding in (construction see reff, and compare sines en pid6n sophia, Dan. i. 17, also Dan. x. 1, LXX and Theod.) the mystery of Christ (by comparing Col. i. 27, it will clearly appear that this genitive is one of apposition: the mystery is Christ in all His fulness: not of the object, ‘relating to Christ’), 5) which in other generations (dative of time: so Luke xii. 20, s31. 77 τὴν νυκτὶ τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀπακοῦσθαι ἀπὸ σοῦ.—Matt. xvi. 21 al.: for the temporal meaning of γενέα, see reff.) was not made known to the sons of men (‘Iatissima appellatio, causam exprimens ignominiae, orum naturalium, cum oppressur Spiritus,’ Beng.; and to which, remarks Stier, ἀγίου and αὐτοῦ are further contrasted) as (ἐγνωρίσθη μὲν τοῖς πᾶλα προφήταις, ἀλλὰ οὕτω ἢ νῦν ὡς γὰρ τὰ πρᾶγματα εἶδον, ἀλλὰ τοῖς περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων προεργάζων λόγοις, Thirt.) it has been now revealed (we are com-
pelled in the presence of νῦν, to desert the aorist rendering: was revealed,’ which in our language cannot be used in reference to present time. The Greek admits of combining the two. We might do it by a paraphrastic extension of νῦν,—as in this present age it was revealed’) to His holy (see Stier’s remark above. Olschansen says, ‘It is certainly peculiar, that Paul here calls the Apostles, and consequently himself among them, ‘holy Apostles.’ It is going too far when De W. finds in this a sign of an unapostolic origin of the Epistle: but still the expression remains an unusual one. I account for it to myself thus,—that Paul here conceives of the Apostles and Prophets, as a corporation (cf. ch. iv. 11), and as such, in their official character, he gives them the predicate ἄγιος, as he names believers, conceived as a whole, ἄγιοι or ἡγιασμένοι, but never an individual’) Apostles and Prophets (as in ch. ii. 20, the N. T. Prophets—see note there) ir (as the conditional element; in and by) the Spirit (Chrys. remarks, ἐν ὁποσον γὰρ ὁ Πέτρος, εἰ μὴ παρὰ τοῦ πνευματος ἦσαν, οὐκ ἐν υἱῶθεν εἰς τὰ ἐθν. ἐν τν. must not be joined with προφ. as Koppe, al. [not Chrys., as the above citation shews]: for, as De W. remarks, the words would thus either be superfluous, or make an unnatural distinction between the Apostles and Prophets) —that (‘namely, that’—giving the pur-
port of the mystery) the Gentiles are (not, ‘should be’: a mystery is not a secret design, but a secret fact) fellow-
heirs (with the Jews) and fellow-members.
(of the same body) and fellow-partakers of the promise (in the widest sense; the promise of salvation)—the complex, including all other promises, even that chief promise of the Father, the promise of the Spirit itself in (not to be referred to the ηγαμία, which would be more naturally, though not necessarily, the ἐν— but to the three foregoing adjectives, in Christ Jesus, as the conditional element in which their participation consisted) Christ Jesus (see above on ch. ii. 13) through the Gospel (He Himself was the objective ground of their incorporation; the εὐαγγελίων, the joyful tidings of Him, the subjective medium by which they apprehended it); of which (Gospel) I became (a reference to the event by which. “The passive form, however, implies no corresponding difference of meaning [Rück., Eadie]: γίγνομαι in the Doric dialect was a deponent passive: εὐγενήσθαι was thus used for εὐγενῆ, and from thence occasionally crept into the language of later writers. See Buttm., Irregular Verbs, s. v. ΓΕΝ.—Lobeck, Phryn., pp. 108-9.” Ellic.) a minister (see the parallel, Col. i. 23: and the remarks in Mey., and Ellic. on Διάκονος and ὑπηρέτης) according to (in consequence of, and in analogy with) the gift of the grace (genitive of apposition, as clearly appears from the definition of the grace given in the next verse: the grace was the gift of God which was given to me (δόθη, not tautological, or merely pleonastic after δώρεαν, but to be joined with what follows) according to the working in me of his power: (because, and in so far as, His Almighty power wrought in me, was this gift of the χάρις, the ἀποστολή, the office of preaching among the Gentiles, &c., bestowed upon me). 8.] Instead of going straight onward with ἐν τοῖς ἔθεσιν κ.τ.λ., he calls to mind his own (not past, but present and inherent, see 1 Tim. i. 15) unworthiness of the high office, and resumes the context with an emphatic declaration of it. To me, who am less than the least (thus admirably rendered by E. V. Winer, edn. 6, § 11. 2. b, adduces ἐλαχιστάτασσος from Sext. Empir. ix. 406, and μειοντὶς from Apoll. Rhod. iii. 368—and Wettst. χρειάτερος from I. b. 218, and other examples [Ellic. remarks that Thuc. iv. 118 must be removed from Wettst.’s examples, as the true reading is κάλλιον] of all saints (οὓς εἴπε, τῶν ἀποστόλων, Chrys.: and herein this has been regarded as an expression of far greater depth of humility than that in 1 Cor. xv. 8: but each belongs to the subject in hand—each places him far below all others with whom he compared himself), was given this grace (viz.) to preach to the Gentiles (κ. ἐν, is emphatic, and points out his distinguishing office. There is no parenthesis of ἐπὶ αὐτῷ as Harl. has unnecessarily imagined) the unsearchable (refr.; “in its nature, extent, and application.” Ellic.) riches of Christ (i.e. the fulness of wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption—all centred and summed up in Him) 9.] and to enlighten (refr.; not merely externally to teach, referred to his work, —
but internally to enlighten the hearers, referred to their apprehension: as when the Apostles gave witness with great power of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, Acts iv. 33. On St. Paul's mission to enlighten, see especially Acts xxvi. 18 (all (no emphasis on πάντας, as Harl.— "not the Gentiles only, but all men,"— or as Mer. observes it would be πάντας [or τούς π.?] φωτίζω]) what (the dispensation [arrangement, regulation] of the mystery [the union of Jews and Gentiles in Christ, ver. 6]) was now to be humbly traced and acknowledged in the fact of its having secretly existed in the primal counsels of God, and now having been revealed to the heavenly powers by means of the Church. Ellicott (which has been hidden from (the beginning of) the ages (ἀπὸ τ. αἰῶνων) gives the temporal limit from which the concealment dated: so χρόνους αἰωνίου σχετικῶς, Rom. xvii. 25. The decree itself originated ἐκ πατριάθλησις κόσμου, ch. i. 4, πρὸ τῶν αἰῶνων 1 Cor. ii. 7: the αἰῶνες being the spaces or reaches of time necessary for the successive acts of created beings, either physical or spiritual) in (join with ἀποκαλύπτω.) hidden within,—humanly speaking, "in the bosom or the mind of") God who created all things ("rerum omnium creatio fundamentum est omnis relinquit economia, pro potestate Dei universalis liberire dispensatissima.") Beng. The stress is on τὰ πάντα—this concealment was nothing to be wondered at—for God of His own will and power created all things, a fact which involves His perfect right to adjust all things as He will. τὰ π. (in the widest sense, embracing physical and spiritual alike), 10.] that (general purpose of the whole: more properly to be referred perhaps to θέσθην by to any other one word in the last two verses. For this sublime cause the humble Paul was raised up,—to bring about,—he, the least worthy of the saints,—that to the heavenly powers themselves should be made known, by means of those whom He was empowered to enlighten, &c. Cf. Chrys.: καὶ τῶν δὲ χάρισμά την, τὸ τῶν μυστηρίων εὐγενείαν, τὸ γενεάθαι τῶν εὐαγγελισμῶν) there might be made known (emphatic, as opposed to ἀποκαλύπτω above—"no longer hidden, but..."") now (has the secondary emphasis: opposed to ἀπὸ τῶν αἰῶνων) to the governments and to the (Stier notices the repetition of the article. It perhaps here does not so much separate the two ἀρχαῖα and ξ., as different classes, as serve to elevate the fact for solemnity's sake) powers (see ch. i. 21 and note) in the heavenly places (see ch. i. 3 note. The ἀρχ. and ξ., are those of the holy angels in heaven; not, as has been vainly imagined, Jewish rulers [Locke, Schöttz.]: Christian rulers [Pel.]: good and bad angels [Beng., Olsh.]. These are excluded, not by ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπουρανίων, see ch. vi. 12, but by the general tenor of the passage, as Ellic., who adds well: "evil angels more naturally recognize the power, good angels the wisdom of God") by means of the Church (ὅτε ἡμεῖς ἐμάθημεν, τότε κακίων δι' ἡμῶν, Chrys. See also Luke xv. 10; 1 Pet. i. 12; and cf. Calvin's note here. "That the holy angels are capable of a specific increase of knowledge, and of a deepening insight into God's wisdom, seems from this passage clear and incontrovertible," Ellic. "Vide, quantus honos hominum, quod hae arcana consilia per ipso maxime per apostolos, Deus innotescere angelis voluit. Ideo angelis post hoc tempus nolunt ab apostolis eori tanquam in ministerio magno collocatis, Apoc. xix. 10, et merito." Grot. But as Stier well notices, it is not by the Apostles directly, nor by human preaching, that the Angels are instructed in God's wisdom, but by the Church—by the fact of the great spiritual body, constituted in Christ, which they contemplate, and which is to them the θεάταν τῆς δόξης του θεοῦ) the manifold (πολυπολίκοιος, so far from
being a word found only here [Harl., Stier], occurs in Eur., Iph. Taur. 1149, πολυτοικία φάρεια: in a fragment of Eubulus, Ath. xv. 7, p. 679, στέφανον πολυτοικίων ἄθεων, and twice in the Orphic hymns, in this figurative sense: πολυτοικίων τελετή, v. 11; π. λόγος, lx. 4.) wisdom of God (how is the wisdom of God πολυτοικίως? It is all one in sublime unity of truth and purpose: but cannot be apprehended by finite minds in this its unity, and therefore is by Him variously portioned out to each finite race and finite capacity of individuals—so that the Church is a mirror of God's wisdom, —chronic, so to speak, with the rainbow colours of that light which in itself is one and undivided. Perhaps there was in the Apostle's mind, when he chose this word, an allusion to the πέρονες περι- στερας περιηγηρομεναί καὶ τὰ μετάφερα αυτῆς ἐν χαλαρωτη χροσλον, the adornment of the ransomed church, in Ps. lxvii. 13. See Heb. i. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 10).  

11. according to (depends on γνωμοσθτι—this imparting of the knowledge of God's manifold wisdom was in accordance with, &c.) the (not, 'a:) after a preposition, especially when a limiting genitive, as here, follows, the omission of the article can hardly be regarded as affecting the sense) purpose of (the) ages (the genitive is apparently one of time, as when we say, 'it has been an opinion of years:' the duration all that time giving the aiωνες a kind of possession. If so, the sense is best given in English by 'eternal' as in E. V.), which (πρόθεσιν) He made (constituted, ordained). So Calv., Beza, Harl., Rück. On the other hand, Thirl., Grot., Koppe, Olah, Mey., De W., Stier, Ellic., would apply it to the carrying out, executing, in its historical realization. I can hardly think that so indefinite a word as ποιεω would have been used to express so very definite an idea, now introduced for the first time, but believe the Apostle would have used some word like ἐπτελεσθαι. Further, we should thus rather expect the perfect; whereas the aorist seems to refer back the act spoken of to the origination of the design. Both senses of ποιεω are abundantly justified: see, for our sense, Mark xv. 1; Isa. xxix. 15; for the other, ch. ii. 3; Matt. xxii. 31; John vi. 38; 1 Thess. v. 24 al.) in Jesus our Lord the Christ (or, 'in the Christ, [namely] Jesus our Lord.' The former is official, the latter personal. It was in his Christ that He made the purpose: and that Christ is Jesus our Lord. The words do not necessarily refer ερωτη- σεω to the carrying out of the design. They bind together God's eternal purpose and our present state of access to Him by redemption in Christ, and so close the train of thought of the last eleven verses, by bringing us again home to the sense of our own blessedness in Christ. That he says, εἰ τ. χριστων ἰδιος, does not, as Ols. and Stier, imply that the act spoken of must necessarily be subsequent to the Incarnation: see ch. i. 3, 4: it is the complex personal appellation of the Son of God, taken from, and familiar to us by His Incarnation, but applied to Him in His pre-existence also).  

12. whom (for the connexion, see note on last verse: in whom, as their element and condition) we have our boldness (not 'freedom of speech' merely, nor boldness in prayer: παρθενισθαι is used in a far wider sense than these, as will appear by the ref.: viz., that of the state of mind which gives liberality of speech, cheerful boldness, 'rémouμενικη' and our access (see note on ch. ii. 18: here the intransitive sense is even more necessary, from the union with παρθενισθαι. We may confidently say, that so important an objective truth as our introduction to God by Christ would never have been thus coupled to a mere subjective quality in ourselves. Both must be subjective if one is; the second less purely so than the first—but both referring to our own feelings and privileges) in confidence (τουτότιον, μετα τοι θαυμακ, Chr.) Meyer remarks what a noble example St. Paul himself has given of this παρθενισθαι in Rom. viii. 38 f. παρθενισθαι is a word of late Greek; see Lobeck's Phrynichus, p. 291) through the faith.
12. om 2nd the ABK* 17: ins CDFKLX3 rel Ath Ch Thrdt Danasc.

13. rec εκκακεῖν, with CDPFK rel: txt ABDB* in 17. (See note on Gal vi. 9.)

14. rec άτομα ins του κυριου ημων επιθ. χριστου (from ch i. 3, and similar passages: of θεον και above). It wd hardly have been erased, as De W., as coming between πατα & πατριαν, with DFKLX3 rel latt syrr goth Ps-Just Ch Thrdt Danasc. Phot Tert Victorin Lucif: on ABC*1 17. 672 demid copth ath Thdot Orig Did Method Synod-ancre-in-Epiph Cyr-jer. Cyr2 Danasc Elias-cret Thl-commapp JExeexp ("non, ut in latinis codd. additium ist est, 'ad Patrem Dom. nostri J. C.'—sed simpliciter 'ad Patrem' legendum") Aug1 Cassiod-comm Vg.

("εν χρ. points to the objective ground of the possessio, δια της πιστης, the subjective medium by which, and ἐν πεποιθησει, the subjective state in which, the object is apprehended." Ellie.) of (objective: = 'in': of which He is the object: see reff.) Hm.

13.) Wherefore ('que cum ina sitin," viz. the glorious things spoken of vv. 1—12: and especially his own personal part in them, ἐνω π., ἐμιν εδώθη, έγενεθη διακονος: since I am the appointed minister of so great a matter) I beseech you (not, beseech God,—which would awkwardly necessitate a new subject before υπεκαιειν: see below) not to be dispirited (not, 'that I may not be dispirited," as Syr, Thrdt, Beng., Rück, Harl., Oshl. Such a reference is quite refute by the reason rendered below, ἵτις ευ. δοξα ωμων, and by the insertion of μων after θεω, which in this case would be wholly superfluous: not to mention its inconsistency with all we know of the Apostle himself) in (of the element or sphere, in which the faint-heartedness would be shewn: 'in the midst of') my tribulations for you (the grammatical Commentators justify the absence of the article before υπερ by the construction θλησσωμαι υπερ tivos. This surely is not necessary, in the presence of such expressions as τοις κυριοις κατα σφηκα, ch. vi. 5. The strange view of Harl., that υπερ ωμων is to be joined with αιτουμαι, needs no refutation), seeing that they are (not 'which is:' ἵτις is not = ὁ, but γ' quippe qui,' utpote qui: see examples in Palm and Rost's Lex. δ, p. 547) your glory (πως ητη δοξα αυτων; δι ουτως αυτων υηατησεν ο θεος, ζυτε και τ. υπερ αυτων δοουαι, κ. των δοους κακων. έν γαρ αυτοι τηχασα τοσοουτων άγαθων, Παυλος έθεσεντοι, Chrys, Bengel compares ημεις ένδοξου, ημεις δη τημων, 1 Cor. iv. 10: and this certainly seems against Stier's notion that δοξα ωμων means 'your glorification,' 'the glory of God in you').

14.) On this account (resumes the τουτου χαρων of ver. 1 [see note there]:—viz. 'because ye are so built in, have such a standing in God's Church') I bend my knees (sell. in prayer: see reff.; and cf. 3 Kings xix. 18) towards (directing my prayer to Him: see Winer, § 49, h) the Father (on the words here interpolated, see var. read.); from whom (as the source of the name: so Hom. II. k. 68, πατροθεον η ενευς υμωναζων άδημος εκαστων:—Soph., (Ed. Tyr. 1036, δυναμας εν τυχες ταιτης, ής ει:— Xen. Men. iv. 5, 8, έφε δε και τ διαλεγεσα υμωνασθαι εκ του συνωστος κοινη βουλευεσα διαλεγοντας:—Cic. de Amicitia, 8, 'amor, ex quo amicitia nominata') every family (not 'the whole family' [πασα η πα. ή, or less strictly, πασα πατρι, §], as E. V. The sense, see below) in the heavens and on earth is named (it is difficult to convey in another language any trace of the deep
connexion of πατήρ and πατρία here expressed. Had the sentence been 'the Creator, after whom every creature in heaven and earth is named,' all would be plain to the English reader. But we must not thus render; for it is not in virtue of God's creative power that the Apostle here prays to Him, but in virtue of His adoptive love in Christ. It is best, therefore, to keep the simple sense of the words, and leave it to exegesis to convey the idea. πατρία is the family, or in a wider sense the genus, named so from its all having on πατήρ. Some [Est., Gr.], Wets., J. have supposed St. Paul to allude to the rabbinical expression, 'the family of earth and the family of heaven;' but as Harl. observes, in this case he would have said π. ἡ πατήρ, ἡ ἐν οὐρ. κ. ἡ ἐν θ. Others [Vulg., Jer., Thdrt.,—ός ἄλλοις ὑπάρχει πατήρ, ὅτι οὐ παρά ἄλλο τότε λαβὼν ἔχει, ἀλλ' αὐτός τοῖς ἄλλοις μεταβεβλήκε τοῦτο,—Corn.-alap.] have attempted to give πατρία the sense of paternitas, which it can certainly never have. But it is not so easy to say, to what the reference is, or why the idea is here introduced. The former of these will be found very fully discussed in Stier, pp. 487—90: and the latter more shortly treated. The Apostle seems, regarding God as the Father of us His adopted children in Christ, to go forth into the fact, that He, in this His relation to us, is in reality the great original and prototype of the paternal relation, wherever found. And this he does, by observing that every πατρία, compaternity, body of persons, having a common father, is thus named [in Greek], from that father, —and so every earthly [and heavenly] family reflects in its name [and constitution] the being and sonship of the great Father Himself. But then, what are πατρίαι in heaven? Some have treated the idea of paternity there as absurd: but is it not necessarily involved in any explanation of this passage? He Himself is the Father of spirits, Heb. xii. 9, the Father of lights, James i. 17:—may there not be fathers in the heavenly Israel, as in the earthly? May not the holy Angels be bound up in spiritual πατρία, though they marry not nor are given in marriage? Observe, we must not miss the sense of πατριακαί, nor render, nor understand it, as meaning 'is constituted.' This is the fact, but not brought out here), 16.] (see on ἣν after words of beseeching, &c., note, 1 Cor. xiv. 13. The purpose and purport of the prayer are blended in it) He may give you, according to the riches of His glory (specifies δωκιμάσαι, not what follows: give you, in full proportion to the abundance of His own glory—His own infinite perfections), to be strengthened with might (the dative has been taken in several ways: 1) adverbially, 'mightily,' as βια ἐν ἀδιάφοροι παρείναι, Xen. Cyr. i. 2. 2,—to which Meyer objects, that thus δυναμαι would be strength on the side of the bestower rather than of the receiver, whereas the contrast with ἐγκαινιοῦ (§) requires the converse. This hardly seems sufficient to disprove the sense: 2) dative of the form or shape in which the κρατ. was to take place (Harl., al.), as in χρηματί δυνατοί εἶναι, Xen. Mem. ii. 7, 7,—to which Meyer replies that thus the κρατιαωθηναι would only apply to one department of the spiritual life, instead of to all. But this again seems to me not valid: for 'might,' 'power,' is not one faculty, but a qualification of all faculties. Rather I should say that such a meaning would involve a tautology—'strengthened in strength.' 3) the instrumental dative is maintained by Mey., De W., al., and this view seems the best: 'with [His] might, imparted to you' by His Spirit (as the instiller and imparter of that might) into (not merely 'in,' but 'to and into,' as Ellic.: importing the "direction and destination of the prayers for gift of infused strength." κραται ἐν κατοικίῳ εἰς τὸν χρυσόν έσω άνθρωπον τὸν χρυσόν, Schol. in Cramer's Catena. Similarly Orig., ἀφτε ἐν τ. ἐσ.|. ἀνθ. κατοικίᾳ τ. χρυσοῦ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, ib. Both rightly, as far as the idea of infusing into is concerned: but clearly wrong, as are the Gr.-l. in general, in taking εἰς τ. ἐσ. ἀνθ. with what follows,

thus making eν ταῖς καρδ. υμ. tautologically, or giving to διὰ τῆς πίστεως εν ταῖς καρδίαις υμῶν the meaning, 'through the faith which is in your hearts,' which it cannot bear the inner man (the spiritual man—the noblest portion of our being, kept, in the natural man, under subjection to the flesh [ref.], but in the spiritual, renewed by the Spirit of God)—that (continuation, not of the prayer merely,—not from διὰ,—as the strong word καταστάσει, emphatically placed, sufficiently shews,—but from κρατασθῶν, and that as its result [see Orig. above; not its purpose, —τοῦ κατ.]. See a similar construction Col. i. 10) Christ may dwell (emphatic; aside, take up His lasting abode: ('summa sit, non procul intundendum esse Christum fide, sed recipiendum esse animæ nostræ complexum, ut in nobis habitei,' Calv.) by your faith (approaching Him, and opening the door to Him,—see John xiv. 23; Rev. iii. 20—and keeping Him there) in your hearts ('partem eum designat ubi legitima est Christi sedes; nempe cor: ut sciamus, non satis esse, si in lingua versetur, aut in cerebro volitent.' Calv.),—ye having been (Beza, Grot., al., and Meyer [and so E. V.],) join the participle with the following ἐστι, justifying the trajectory by Gal. ii. 10; 2 Thess. ii. 7; Acts xix. 4 al. But those cases are not parallel, as in every one of them the prefixed words carry especial emphasis, which here they cannot do. We must therefore regard the clause as an instance of the irregular nominative [see ch. iv. 2; Col. ii. 2, and ref. there] adopted to form an easy transition to that which follows. Meyer strongly objects to this, that the participles are perfect, not present, which would be thus logically required. But surely this last is a mistake. It is upon the completion, not upon the progress, of their rooting and grounding in love, that the next clause depends. So Orig., Chrys., al., and Harl., De W., and Ellic.) rooted and grounded (both images, that of a tree, and that of a building, are supposed to have been before the Apostle's mind. But μία was so constantly used in a figurative sense [see examples in Palm and Rost sub voce] as hardly perhaps of necessity to suggest its primary image. Lucian uses both words together, de Saltat. 34 [Wetst.],—odore tineis μια. k. t. yemelios τῆς δραχμῆς ἡμῶν] in love (love, generally—not merely αὐτῶν, as Chrys., nor 'qua diligimur a Deo,' Beza; nor need we supply 'in Christ' after the participles, thus disconnecting them from εν ἄγα, as Harl.: but as Ellic. well says, 'This [love] was to be their basis and foundation, in (on?) which alone they were to be fully enabled to realize all the majestic proportions of Christ's surpassing love to man'),—that ye may be fully able (ref.: ἐστιν ἐπιμέλεια τολλάκις καὶ τῆς φίλους ἡσικχευον ἐπιλειπον, Strabo, xvii. p. 788 [417 Tauchn.]) to comprehend (ref. "many middle forms are distinguished from their actives only by giving more the idea of earnestness or spiritual energy: ἐρημωσώντο πολλοί ἁμα τάς ἐπιθελαις, Thucyd. iii. 20: υπὲρ δεi παντὸς σκοπεών ὅταν γὰρ ταύτη σκοπολόμεσοι ἔκρη, οὔτως ἐμφάνει περι τούτο γέγονας. Plato." Krüger, grieck. Sprachlehre, § 52. 4.) with all the saints (all the people of God, in whom is fulfilled that which is here prayed for) what is the breadth and length and height and depth (all kinds of fanciful explanations have been given of these words. One specimen may be enough: ἐσφισάτειν 骘τε τυπικάπετον εἰς σταυρόν τύτων. βαθός γὰρ καὶ υψός καὶ μήκος καὶ πλάτος, τί ἔτερον ἄν εἰς, ἤ του σταυροῦ φύσις: διπλούς δε διο ποιεύς τον σταυρόν λεγέν, οὔτως ἄλλα ἐπέδω ἡ μεν του κυρίου οἰκονομία θεότης ἐστιν ἐνωθεν, κατ' ἀνθρωπότητος κατάθεν, τὸ δὲ κρῆμα υποστολικῶν διίτεινων ἀπὸ ἄρκτον εἰς μεταμβάλλαι καὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς εἰς δύσι, συναγαγόν καὶ κυρίου τὴν οἰκονομίαν καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑπηρεσιάν τὸ διπλούς τῆς οἰκονομίας, ἤν ἐν διπλῷ.
to sway, 19 γυναικε τιν ζυπερβάλλουσαι της γυνώσεως α' ἀγάπην τον χριστόν, ἵνα πληρωθήτε εἰς πάν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ. 20 τω δε δυναμιν υπὲρ πάντα ποιοῦσα ὑπερικεφερισοῦ οὐν καὶ αὐτούμεθα ἡ νοούμενα κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν την εὐεργευμένην εν μίαν, 21 αὐτῷ ἡ θεότης.

19. om τε D¹F² cop. ἀγάπην bef γυνῶσεως Λ a 115 syr Jer (scientiam caritatisAug.). πληρωθε, omg eis, B 17. 73. 116. 20. om υπὲρ DF latt lat-inf (exc Jer).

πνευματικός ἐπείδηκυμος, οὕτως εἶναι. Severians, in Cramer's Catena. Similarly Origen, ib., Jer., Aug., Auschel, Aquin., Est. ('longitudo temporum est, latitudine locorum, altitudo glorie, profunditas discretionis'). Numerous other explanations, geometrical, architectural, and spiritual, may be seen in Corn.-a-lap., Pole's Synops., and Eadie. The latter, as also Bengal and Stier, see an allusion to the Church as the temple of God—Chandler and Macknight to the temple of Diana at Ephesus. Both are in the highest degree improbable. Nor can we quite say that the object of the sentence is the love of Christ [Calv., Mey., Ellicot, al.] for that is introduced in a subordinate clause by and by [see on te below]: rather, with De W., that the genitive after these nouns is left indefinite—that you may be fully able to comprehend every dimension—scil., of all that [God has revealed or done in and for us [ἐν το θεο πατρι, Col. ii. 2]—though this is not a genitive to be supplied, but lying in the background entirely) and (τε introduces not a parallel, but a subordinate clause. Of this Hartung, i. p. 105, gives many examples. Eur. Hec. 1186,—οὐ εὑρετέχει Τροία, περίς δὲ πόργος εἰς ἐπι στάλων, ἐξα προμοσ, Ἐκτόρος τ' ἴμεθε δὴκρι: Med. 612, ἀ πατρις, διωμα τ' ἐμφ. So that the knowledge here spoken of is not identical with the καταλαβόσθαι above, but forms one portion of which it belongs) to know the knowledge-passing (τῆς γνώσεως, genitive of comparison after ὑπὲρβα, as in διπλάσιος ἐκώτος, Herod. viii. 137, σαβέμενοι υπερεχόμε, Plat. Tim. p. 20 a. See Kühner, ii. § 540. γνώναι γνώσεως are chosen as a paradox, γνώσεως being taken in the sense of 'mercy, 'blessing' knowledge [ref.], and γνώναι in the pregnant sense of that knowledge which is rooted and grounded in love, Phil. i. 9) Love of Christ (subjective genitive; Christ's Love to us—see Rom. v. 5 note, and viii.

35—39—not 'our love to Christ.' Nor must we interpret with Harl. [and Olsh.], "to know the Love of Christ more and more as an unsearchable love." It is not this attribute of Christ's Love, but the Love itself, which he prays that they may know), that ye may be filled even to all the fulness of God (πνευμα τις θεότητος abides in Christ, Col. ii. 9. Christ then abiding in your hearts, ye, being raised up to the comprehension of the vastness of God's mercy in Him and of His Love, will be filled, even as God is full—each in your degree, but all to your utmost capacity, with divine wisdom and might and love. Such seems much the best rendering: and so Chrys. [altern.], οὖσε πληροφορηθάν πάση διάρκειας ζητήρια ἐστιν θεός. τοῦ θ. then is the possessive genitive. The other interpretation taking θεόν as a genitive of origin, and πληροφορα for πληρόμενο, 'ut omnibus Dei donis abundet,' Est., is not consistent with εἰς [see above], nor with the force of the passage, which having risen in sublimity with every clause, would hardly end so tamely. 20, 21.] DOXOLOGY, ARISING FROM THE CONTEMPLATION OF THE FAITHFULNESS AND POWER OF GOD WITH REGARD TO HIS CHURCH. 20. But to Him (ὅτι brings out a slight contrast to what has just preceded—viz. ourselves, and our need of strength and our growth in knowledge, and fulness) who is able to do beyond all things (ὑπὲρ is not adverbial, as Bengal, which would be tautological), far beyond (ref.): οὖν is not governed by πάντα: but this second clause repeats the first in a more detailed and specified form. "It is noticeable that ὑπὲρ occurs nearly thrice as many times in St. Paul's Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews as in the rest of the N. T., and that, with a few exceptions [Mark vii. 37. Luke vii. 38, &c.], the compounds of ὑπὲρ are all found in St. Paul's Epistles." Ellie) the things which (genitive as γνώσεως above, ver. 19) we ask or think ('cogitation latius
IV. 4 Parakahō ouv ūmys ēgw ō tē dēmios ēv kvōw, pāwos h ēpimπaπhōs tēs i̯s klēmēs hēs ēkklēsēs, 2 mētā pāsēs n tαπεινοφορούντες kai ñ προμύθευτος, μετά

Chap. IV. 1. for κυριος, χριστός Ν.
2. rec προσήτως, with ADFL rel: γνώκοι K: txt BCN 17.

patec quam prceces: gradatia,' Beng.) according to the power which is working (not passive: see on Gal. v. 6: the power is the might of the indwelling Spirit; see Rom. viii. 26) in us, 21. to Him (solicum and emphatic repetition of the personal pronoun) be the glory (the whole glory accruing from all His dealings which have been spoken of: His own resulting glory) in the Church (as its theatre before men, in which that glory must be recognized and rendered) [and] in Christ Jesus (as its inner verity, and essential element in which it abides. If the kai be omitted, beware of rendering 'in the Church which is in Christ Jesus,' which would not only require the article [cf. Gal. i. 22, tais ἐκκ. τῆς Ιουδαίας τοῖς ἐν χριστῷ], but would make ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ superfluous. As the text stands, we need not say that ἐν χρ. Ἱσ. is a second independent clause: it belongs to ἐν τῇ ἐκκ. as inclusive of it, though not as descriptive of ἐκκ.: 'in the Church and [thus] in Christ Jesus') to all the generations of the age of the ages (probably as Grot., 'augendi causa duas locutiones Hebraicas miscuit Apostolo, quorum prior est ἀπὸ γενεάς εἰς γενεάν, τίτρα, Ps. x. 6, altera ēos τοῦ αἰῶνος τῆς γῆς, Isa. xlvi. 17.' Probably the account of the meaning is, that the age of ages [eternity] is conceived as containing ages, just as our 'age' contains years: and then those ages are thought of as made up, like ours, of generations. Like the similar expression, αἰῶνες τῶν αἰῶνων, it is used, by a transfer of what we know in time, to express, imperfectly, and indeed improperly, the idea of Eternity.)

IV. 1—VI. 20.] Second (hortatory) portion of the Epistle: and herein [A] (IV. 1—16) ground of the Christian's duties as a member of the Church, viz. the unity of the mystical Body of Christ (vv. 1—6) in the manifoldness of grace given to each (7—13), that we may come to perfection in Him (14—16). 1.] I exhort (see ref. παρακαλῶ, τὸ προτέτευ, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ. Thom.-Mag. in Ellie.) you therefore (seeing that this is your calling: an inference from all the former part of the Epistle, as in Rom. xii. 1; but here perhaps also a resumption of τοῦτον χάριν of ch. iii. 1, 14, and thus carried back to the contents of ch. i. ii.),—the prisoner in the Lord (who am, as regards, and for the sake of the cause, of the Lord, a prisoner; so that my captivity is in the Lord, as its element and sphere, and therefore to be regarded as an additional inducement to comply with my exhortation. "Num quicquid est Christi, etiamsi coram mundo sit ignominiosum, summo cum honore suscipiendum a votis est." Calv. τοις διὰ τῶν χριστῶν δεσμῶν ἐναβρυθεῖται μάλιν ἢ βασιλεὺς διαδηματι. Thrt. Beware of joining in κυριος with παρακαλῶ, as in 2 Thess. iii. 12 [see ver. 17], which the arrangement of the words here will not permit), to walk worthily of the calling (see ch. i. 18, and note Rom. viii. 28, 30) wherewith (see ch. i. 6. The attracted genitive may stand either for the dative ἡ or the accusative ἕπ. Both constructions are legitimate attractions: cf. for the dative, Xen. Cyr. v. i. 39, ἵγγετο δὲ καὶ τῶν οἰκτικῶν τῶν πιστῶν, ois ἰδίος, κ. ὄν ἥπεται πάλιν.—ἀν, for εἰκόνων, ois; and for the accusative, ch. i. 6, and Rom. ii. 10.—ὑμῶν ἣτε μέτεοι τετυμήσατα. De W. denies the legitimacy of ἰδίος καλεῖν; but Raphel produces from Arrian, Epict. p. 122, κατασκοινοῦντι τῶν κληρῶν ἡν κύλληκες ye were called, with (not 'in, as Conyb., which, besides not expressing μετὰ, the association of certain dispositions to an act,—confuses
3. for εἰρήνης, agapis K 1: agapis εἰρήνης α'.

in fact a possessive—the Spirit's unity, that unity which the Spirit brings about, ἡν τῷ πν. Θεοῦ εἰρήνη, Thl.) in (united together by: within) the bond of peace (again Lachm. joins the qualifying clause to the following sentence; here again most unnaturally, both as regards what has preceded, and the general truths which are afterwards enunciated: see below. The σῶμα is εἰρήνη, not that which brings about εἰρήνη, 'vinculum quo paci retinuet, idest, amor,' Beng. So Thl., Rück., Harl., Stier. Col. iii. 14, which is quoted to support this meaning, is not applicable, because love there is expressly named, whereas here it certainly would not occur to any reader, especially after ἐν ἀγάπῃ has just occurred. The genitive of apposition is the simplest—peace binds together the Church as a condition and symbol of that inner unity which is only wrought by the indwelling Spirit of God. 4.] Lachm., joining ἐν σώμα κ.τ.λ. as far as ἐν πάσιν, with what has gone before, makes these words hortatory: 'as one Body and one Spirit, even as, &c.' Certainly the reference to ἡ κλησίς ἡμῶν seems to tell for this. But on the other hand, it is very unlikely that the Apostle should thus use ἐν σώμα and ἐν πνεύμα, and then go on in the same strain, but with a different reference. I therefore prefer the common punctuation and rendering. (There is) (better than 'ye are,' which will not apply to the following parallel clauses. The assertion of the unity of the Church, and of our Lord in all His operations and ordinances, springs immediately out of the last exhortation, as following it up to its great primal ground in the verities of God. To suppose it connected by a γράφ understood [Hadel] is to destroy the force and vivisness with which the great central truth is at once introduced without prejudice.) one Body (refl.: vix. Christ's mystical Body, τί ἐστιν, ἐν σώμα; οἱ πατρικοὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης πιστοί, καὶ οἱ ἱεραι κ. τ.λ. κ. εὐθυμοῖ κ. ἐκλεκτοὶ πάλιν καὶ οἱ πρὸ τῆς τοῦ χριστοῦ παροικίας εὐπρεπεῖντες, ἐν σώμα εἰς. Chrys. Vol. III.
But these last hardly sensu propio here) and one Spirit (viz. the Holy Spirit, who dwells in, and vivifies, and rules that one body: see ch. ii. 18, 22; 1 Cor. xiii. 13 al.: not as Chrys., ἐν πν., καλὸς εἶπε, δεικνύω ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ έν άυτοῖς ἐν πνεύμα ἐστάται, ήτι ἀπό τοῦ άυτοῖς έσται, εις άυτοῖς πνεύμα εἶπεν εις άυτοῖς ἐν πνεύμα διαχορισθεῖη ἡ πνεύμα εἰς πνεύμα τὴν προσώπων φησιν), as also (τὸ καθὰ ή ‘Αρτικλο χρώνωκας το άπὸ άυτοῖς οὐδέποτε ψάλτης το άπὸ άυτοῖς οὐδέποτε άλλά ή τῶν ‘Αλεξανδρέων διάλεκτον, καθ’ ή άλλ’ απογράφαται. Emm. Mosch., a Byzantine grammarian, cited by Fabricius, vi. 191. See also Phryn., p. 426, and Lobeck’s note: and Ellie, on Gal. iii. 6) ye were called in (elemental—the condition and sphere in which they were called to live and move, as seen). Mey, referring to Gal. i. 6, takes the instrumental sense: see there) one hope of (belonging to: you were called in it as the element, see above: it is then an addition of the κλήσεως. Or perhaps it may be the genitive of the καὶ έπιστάσης, with which the calling works,’ as Ellie, (C. I Thess. i. 6, μετά άρσειν πνεύμαστος άγίον) your calling: 5.] one Lord (as the Head of the Church: in this verse he grounds the co-existence of the ἐν σώμα Κ. έν πνεύμα in the three great facts on which it rests—the first objective, εἰς τόπος—the second subjective, μετά πάσης the third compounded of the two, εἰς πνεύμα, one faith (in that one Lord: the subjective medium by which that one Lord is apprehended and appropriated: not ‘δόλα άγίας κρίτημα, but ‘δόλα άγίας κρίτημα: but it is necessarily understood, that this subjective faith has its object (the One Lord just mentioned) one baptism (the objective seal of the subjective faith, by which, as a badge, the members of Christ are outwardly and visibly stamped with His name. The other sacrament, being a matured act of subsequent participation, a function of the incorporant, not a seal of incorporation [a symbol of union, not of unity: so Ellicott], is not here adduced. In 1 Cor. x. 17, where an act was in question which was a clear breach of union, it forms the rallying-point).

6.] one God (the unity is here consummated in its central Object: ‘hoc est præcipuum, quia inde manet religia omnis,’ Calvin. But we must not miss the distinct witness to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in these verses:—going upwards, we have 1st, the One Spirit dwelling in the one body:—2nd, the One Lord appropriated by faith and professed in baptism:—3rd, One God and Father supreme, in whom all find their end and object) and Father of all (masculine: ‘of all within the Church,’ for so is clearly the primary meaning, where he is speaking distinctly of the Church:—of all (Mey.) who have the άνεξάρτητα. But it can hardly be doubted, that there is a further reference—to the universal Fatherhood of all men—which indeed the Church only inherits in its fulness, others having fallen out of it by sin—but which nevertheless is just as absolutely true), who is over all (men, primarily; and from the following,—men only, in this place. He is over all, in his sovereignty as the Father), and through all (men: in the co-extensiveness of Redemption by the Son with the whole nature of man: see on ver. 10 below, and ch. ii. 20, 21) and in all (men: by the indwelling of the Spirit, see ch. ii. 22. So that I cannot but recognize, in these three carefully chosen expressions, a distinct allusion again to the Three Persons of the blessed Trinity. All these are the work of the Father:—it is He who in direct sovereignty is over all
—He who is glorified in the filling of all things by the Son:—He who is revealed by the witness of the indwelling Spirit. Many Commentators deny such a reference. Almost all agree in ἐν πάσιν representing the indwelling of the Spirit: the διὰ πάντων has been the principal stumbling-block: and is variously interpreted:—by some, of God’s Providence,—τοιοῦτον, ὁ τροφῶν καὶ διωκῶν, Chrys., al.: by others, of His pervasive presence by the Spirit,—Spiritu sanctificationis diffusions est per omnia ecclesia membra; Calv.: by others, to the creation by the Son, ‘per quem omnia facta sunt’ (Aquin. in Eille): but this seems to be a conversion of διὰ πάντων into ἀν πάντες, as indeed Olsh. expressly does, ‘asf ἀπεθάναν, διὰ δὴ διε βίῳ ἄν,’ Irenaeus, v. 18, 2, p. 315, gives the meaning thus, adopting the Trinitarian reference, but taking the πάντων both times as neuter, and reading ἐν πάσιν ἁμα, ‘super omnia quidem Pater, et ipse est caput Christi: per omnia autem verbum, et ipse est caput ecclesia: in omnibus autem nobis Spiritus, et ipse est aqua viva,’ &c.

7. But (the contrast is between ἐν πάσιν and ἐν ἐκκαστοι — the general, and the particular. And the connexion is as a motive to keep the unity of the Spirit—one is not overlooked:—each has his part in the distribution of the gifts of the One Spirit, which part he is bound to use for the well-being of the whole) to each one of us was given (by Christ, at the time of His exaltation—when He bestowed gifts on men) [the] grace (which was then bestowed: the unspeakable gift,—or, if the art. be omitted, grace, absolutely,—was distributed to each κατά &c.) according to the measure of (subjective genitive: the amount of: cf. Rom. xii. 3, ἐκκαστοι ὑπὸ τὸ θέαν ἐμφάνειν μετρον πιστεω) the gift of Christ (‘Christ’s gift’;—the gift bestowed by Christ, 2 Cor. ix. 15: not, ‘the gift which Christ received,’—for He is the subject and centre here—so Calv.,—‘porro Christum facti auctorem, quia sicut a Patre fecit initium, ita in ipsum vult nos et nostra omnia colligere.’ Still less must we with Stier, suppose both senses of the genitive included).

8. Whereas (‘quae cum ista sit:’—viz. —the gift bestowed by Christ on different men according to measure) He (viz. God, whose word the Scriptures are. See reff. and notes: not merely ‘it,’ εἰς ψυχᾶς, as De W. al.: nor, ἡ γραφὴ: had it been the subject, it must have been expressed, as in Rom. iv. 3; ix. 17 al.) says (viz. in Ps. lxviii. 18, see below: not, in some Christian hymn, as Flatt and Storr,—which would not agree with λέγει, nor with the treatment of the citation, which is plainly regarded as carrying the weight of Scripture. With the question as to the occasion and intent of that Psalm, we are not here concerned. It is a song of triumph, as ver. 1 [cf. Num. x. 35] shews, at some bringing up of the ark to the hill of Zion. It is therefore a Messianic Psalm. Every part of that ark, every stone of that hill, was full of spiritual meaning. Every note struck on the lyres of the sweet singers of Israel, is but part of a chord, deep and world-wide, sounding from the golden harps of redemption. The partial triumphs of David and Solomon only prefigured as in a prophetic mirror the universal and eternal triumph of the Incarnate Son of God. Those who do not understand this, have yet their first lesson in the O. T. to learn. With this caution let us approach the difficulties of the citation in detail) He ascended up on high (viz. Christ, at His Ascension: not ‘having ascended’: the aorist participle denotes an action not preceding, but parallel to, that expressed in the finite verb which it accompanies: see Bernhardy, Synt. p. 383. The ascending in the Psalm is that of God, whose presence was symbolized by the ark, to Zion. The Apostle changes the words from the 2nd person to the 3rd; the address asserting a fact, which fact he cites), he led captive a captivity (i. e. ‘those who suffer captivity:’ a troop of captives: such is the constant usage of the abstract αἴχμαλωσια for the concrete in LXX: cf. reff.: and it is never put for captitatiores, ‘those who cause captivity,’ as some would interpret it. In the Psalm, these would be, the captives from the then war, what-
ever it was: in the interpretation, they were God's enemies, Satan and his hosts, as Chr., ποιαν αἰχμαλωσίαν φησί; τὴν τοῦ διαβόλου, αἰχμαλωτὸν τὸν τίραννον ἐλάβε, τὸν διάβολον καὶ τὸν ἀνάτομον καὶ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, he gave gifts to mankind (Heb.: τὸν θυσίαν τῆς ἀμαρτίας).

—LXX, ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀναρχίᾳ. [ποιοῦς]. The original meaning is obscure. There seems to be no necessity to argue for a sense of ἔλαβες—thou receivedst in order to give; as the qualifying in ἀναρχίᾳ will shew for what purpose, in what capacity, the receipt took place. But certainly such a sense of ποιοῦς seems to be substantiated: see Eadie’s note here, and his examples, viz. Gen. xv. 9; xviii. 5 [where the sense is very marked, E. V. 1 ‘I will fetch’], —xxvii. 13 [ib. ‘fetch me then’], xiii. 16,—Exod. xxvii. 20 [‘that they bring thee’],—1 Kings xvii. 10 [‘fetch me’, λάβε δὲ μοι, αλ. Then, what is ποιοῦς? First, ποιοῦς is clearly used in a collective sense: we have Jer. xxxii. 20, ποιοῦς ἐστί, ‘Israel and the rest of mankind,’ see also Is. xlix. 4 al. In Prov. xxxvii. 28, we have ποιοῦς used for ‘inter homines,’ which is evidently its simplest meaning. If then we render here, ‘hast taken gifts among men,’ hast, as a victor, surrounded by thy victorious hosts, brought gifts home, spoils of the enemy,—the result of such reception of gifts would be naturally stated as the distribution of them among such hosts, and the people,—as indeed ver. 12 of the Psalm has already stated. And so the Chaldee paraphrast [and Syr. and Arabic vss.: but their testimony, as Christian, is little worth] understood the words, interpreting the passage of Moses [which does not invalidate his testimony: against Harl.]: ‘thou hast given gifts to the sons of men.’ The literature of the passage may be seen in De W. and Meyer: and more at length in Stier, Eadie, and Harless. To give even a synopsis of it here would far exceed our limits).

9.] Further explanation of this text. But that He ascended (τὸ ἀν. does not here mean, ‘the word’ ἀνέβη, which does not occur in the text cited), what is it (does it imply) except that he also (as well) descended to the lower parts of the earth (the argument seems to be this: the Ascension here spoken of was not a first exaltation, but a return to heaven of one who dwelt in heaven—οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβας, ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀνθρώπων ὁ ἐν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, John iii. 13, which is in fact the key to these verses. The ascent implied a previous descent. This is the leading thought. But it is doubted how far the words καταβείτε μὲν τὴν γῆς carry that descent, whether to earth merely, so that τῆς γῆς is the genitive of apposition,—or to Hades, so that it is genitive of possession. Usage will not determine—for 1) it is uncertain whether the Apostle meant any allusion to the corresponding Hebrew expression: 2) that expression is used both for Hades, Ps. lxiii. 9, and for earth (θεμελία, LXX). Isa. xlv. 23 [and for the womb, Ps. cxxix. 15]. Nor can it be said [as Harl., Mey.] that the descent into hell would be irrelevant here—or that our Lord ascended not from Hades but from the earth: for, the fact of descent being the primary thought, we have only to ask as above, how far that descent is carried in the Apostle’s mind. The greater the descent, the greater the ascent; and if the αἰχμαλωσία consisted of Satan and his powers, the warfare in which they were taken captive would most naturally be contemplated in all its extent, as reaching to their habitation itself:—‘this ascent, what does it imply but a descent, and that even to the lower parts of the earth from which the spoils of victory were fetched?’ And this meaning seems to be upheld by the ἐν παλαιστὶ τὸ πάντα which follows, as well as by the contrast furnished by ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν. This interpretation is upheld by most of the ancients, Iren., Tert., Jor., Pelag., Ambr.; also by Erasmi., Est., Calov., Bengel, Rück., Ols., Stier, Baurn [uses it as a proof of the gnostic origin of the Epistle], Ellicott, al.: that of the Incarnation merely, descent on earth,
by Beza, Calv., Grot., Schöttg., Mich., Storr, Winer, Harl., B.-Crus., Meyer, De W., al.; that of Christ's death [and burial], by Chr., Thltr., (Ec., al.; that corresponding to Ps. cxxix. 15, by Beza [al., Witsius, al.]! 10. He that descended, He (and no other: ob γάρ ἄλλος κατελθὼν κ. ἄλλος ἀνέλθωσεν, Thltr. αὐτός is the subject, and not the predicate [δ ἄλτός]) is also he that descended (see again John iii. 13) up above (reft.) all the heavens (cf. Hcb. vii. 26, ὕψιλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος: and ib. iv. 14, διελεύθητα τούς οὐρανούς. It is natural that one who, like St. Paul, had been brought up in the Jewish habits of thought, should still use their methods of speaking, according to which the heaven is expressed in the plural, 'the heavens.' And from such an usage, πάντες οἱ οὐρανοὶ would naturally flow. See, on the idea of a threefold, or sevenfold division of the heavens, the note on 2 Cor. xii. 2. Ellicott quotes from Bishop Pearson,—'whatsoever heaven is higher than all the rest which are called heavens, into that place did he ascend.' Notice the subjunctive after the aorist participle, giving the present and enduring sense to the verb: used, when "res ita comparata est, ut actione præterita tamen eventus nondum expletus sit, sed etiam nunc daret: .... Eur. Med. 215, Καρπίων γυναικεῖς, εξήλθον δόμων. μή μοι τι μεθηραφω."' Kloz. Devar. ii. 618), that He may fill (not as Anselm, al., 'fulfil') all things (the whole universe: see ch. i. 23, note: with His presence, His sovereignty, His working by the Spirit: not, with His glorified Body, as some have thought. "Christ is perfect God, and perfect and glorified man: as the former He is present every where, as the latter He can be present any where," Ellicott).

11.] Resumption of the subject—the diversity of gifts, all bestowed by Him, as a motive to unity. And HE (emphatic: 'it is He, that') gave (not for ἐστο, any more than in ch. i. 22:—the gifts which He gave to His Church are now enumerated. "The idea is, that the men who filled the office, no less than the office itself, were a divine gift." Eadie) some as Apostles (see 1 Cor. xii. 28, and note; and a good enumeration of the essentials of an Apostles, in Eadie's note here), some as prophets (see on 1 Cor. xii. 10: and cf. ch. ii. 20; iii. 5, notes), some as evangelists (not in the narrower sense of the word, writers of gospels, but in the wider sense, of itinerant preachers, usually sent on a special mission: οἱ μὲν περίπτωτες πανταχοῦ, ἀλλ' εὐαγγελιζομένοι μόνον, ὁ Πνεύματος κ. Ἀκαλλάς. Chr. See note on Acts xxii. 8), some as pastors and teachers (from these latter not being distinguished from the pastors by the τοὺς δὲ, it would seem that the two offices were held by the same persons. The figure in τομιέσεις, if to be pressed, would imply that they were entrusted with some special flock, which they tended, καθισμοὶ καὶ περὶ ἕνα τῶν ἁγιολογίων, as Chr.; and then the διάκονος would necessarily form a chief part of their work. If this view be correct, this last class includes all the stationary officers of particular Churches, in order to (ultimate aim of these offices, see below) the perfecting of the saints—for (immediate object, see below) the (the) work of (the) ministry (of διάκονοι in God's Church. The articles give completeness in English, but do not affect the sense),—for building up of the body of Christ (the relation of these three clauses has been disputed. Chr., al., regard them as parallel: ἐκατοστο οἰκοδομη, ἐκατοστο καταρτίζεις, ἐκατοστο διακονεῖ: but this is to confound the distinct prepositions, πρὸς and εἰς, after the unsupported notion that St. Paul uses prepositions almost indifferently. Others, as De W., regard εἰς...εἰς as dependent on πρὸς, and thus are obliged to give to διακονεί a wider sense [genus omnium functionum in ecclesia] than it will bear. The best way certainly seems to be, with Mcy. and Ellic., to regard πρὸς as the ultimate end, εἰς as the immediate use, as in Rom. xv. 2, ἐκατοστὸς ἡμῶν τῷ πληθυννῷ ἀρπασκέτω εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν), until (marks
the duration of the offices of the ministry) we (being thus κατατησμένοι by virtue of the ἠγγ. διακονίας and the ἀκοδιατοι) arrive (see ref.): no sense of 'meeting,' but simply of 'attaining.' Ellicott well remarks, that we must be careful of applying to later Greek the canons of the grammarians respecting the omission of ἐν, as giving an air of less uncertainty to subjunctives in such constructions as this; and he adds, "the use of the subjunctive [the mood of conditioned but objective possibility], not future [as Chrys.,] shows that the κατατάντας is represented, not only as the eventual, but as the expected and contemplated result of the εὐκές," all of us (Christians, Jews as well as Gentiles: first person, because he himself was among the number. The article brings out the πάντες, as belonging to one class), at the unity of the faith ("How so? have not all Christians the same faith? ...? No doubt they have, as regards its substance, but not as regards clearness and purity; because the object of faith may be diversely known, and knowledge has ever such a powerful influence on faith. Therefore he adds to this unity of faith καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως κ.τ.λ.: true and full unity of faith is then found, when all thoroughly know Christ, the object of faith, alike, and that in His highest dignity as the Son of God." De Wette) and of the knowledge (further result of the faith, ch. iii. 17, 19; 2 Pet. i. 5) of the Son of God (this objective genitive belongs to both τῆς πίστεως and τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως), at a perfect man (an awkwardness is given by the coupling of an abstract [ἐς ἐνοτητα] to a concrete [ἐς ἀνδρα τέλειον]. The singular not only denotes unity [Beza], but refers to the summation of all us in the one perfect Man Christ Jesus. The maturity of the ἀνδρα τέλειον is contrasted with the πιστεύω which follows. Among curiosities of exegeses may be added that which Aug. mentions, de Civ. Dei xxii. 17, vol. vii. p. 778: "Nomini, proper hoc quod dictum est, Eph. iv. 13, nec in sexum feminino resurrecturam feminas credunt, sed in virili omnes aitum") to the measure of the stature (or, 'age!' this is doubtful. The similitude in ἀνδρα τέλειον seems to be derived from age: that in ver. 16, from stature. The fact seems to be, that ἡλικία is a comprehensive word, including both ideas— answering to the German 'Causalheit,' but having no corresponding word in our language. We have μέτρον ὃς ἔσται in Hom. Π. λ. 225, Od. λ. 317, σ. 217. The expression itself occurs in Lucian, Imag. 7 [Wetst.], τῆς ἡλικίας δὲ τὸ μέτρον, ἡλικίαν ἀν γένεσιν: κατὰ τὴν ἐν Κύθη ἐκείνην μάλιστα ... μετερτόθη,—and Philostratus, vit. Sophist. p. 513, τὸ δὲ μέτρον τῆς ἡλικίας ταῖς μὲν ἄλλαις ἡπιστήμαις γύρως ἄρχη. Clearly, none of these passages settles the question. In Homer, the meaning is 'the measure of youth;'—the size and ripeness of youth: in Lucian, as decidedly 'the measure of the stature,' as in Philostr., 'the ripeness of main, age.' The balance must here be inclined by the prevalence of the image of growth and extension, which can hardly be denied as pervading the passage) of the fullness of Christ (see note on ch. i. 29; iii. 19. χρ. is a genitive subjective—the fullness which Christ has: 'Christ's fullness.' Cf. Gal. iv. 10),—that (apparently another, and subordinate, tim of the bestowal of gifts on the church is here added. For we cannot go forward from the finished growth of ver. 13, and say that its object is μαθὴς, ἀν ὑπονοιοι, but must go back again to the growth itself and its purpose; that purpose being mainly the terminal one of ver. 13, and subordinately the intermediate one of our ver. 14. See Meyer's note) we be no more (having been so once: τὸ μηκι πάλαι τούτο παθώντας. Chr.) children, tossed (like waves: see James i. 6: Ἰου. Αντ. ix. 11. 3, ἐσται Νιναίη κολυμβηθά ὡσάμα κυνικόν, ὡσώς κ. ὡς δήμως ἀπας ταρασσόμενος κ. κλυδωνίζο- μενος ὅχιστες φεύγων) and borne about by every wind of teaching (τῇ τροπῇ ἑμοι ἡμῶν καὶ ἀνέων ἐκδέχατε τὰς διαφόρους διδασκαλίας. Thl. Wetst. quotes from Plat, de Audiend, Poëtis, p. 28 b, μὴ πατί λόγῳ πλαγίων, ὡπε πνεύματι, παραδίδους ἐμοῖς. The article before διδασκαλίας gives a greater definiteness to the abstract word, but cannot be ex-
pressed in English. So ἀπαξ προσσωρίσαντα τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ, Aristoph. Ran. 95) in (elemental: "the evil atmosphere, as it were, in which the varying currents of doctrine exist and exert their force." Ellie. This is better than instrumental, which, as we have just had παρί ανέφω, would be a repetition) the sleight ('dis- playing,' from κύδος. The word, as well as κυδενοι, was naturally and constantly used to signify 'entrapping by deceit:' κυβεια τῆς πανουργίας καλεί πεποιηται δὲ ἀπὸ κυδῶν τὸ όνομα θεόν δὲ τῶν κυβερνουτόν, τὸ τῆς κάκειας μεταφειμά ταῖς ψυφοῖς, καὶ πανοργής τοῦτο ποιεῖν. Thdt. See examples in Wetst. The word was borrowed by the Rabbinical writers, and used in this sense: see Schöttg. l. c.) of men (as contrasted with τοῦ χριστοῦ, ver. 13), in craftiness (refl.) furthering (tending or working towards: or perhaps, but not so well,—after, according to, γεμάτο) the system (see refl. and especially ch. vi. 11, note, and Chr.'s explanation) of error (not, deceiv, though in fact the sense is so: πλάνη, even in the passages generally alleged for this active meaning, is best taken as 'error.' The genitive πλάνης is subjective—the plans are those which error adopts. τῆς πλανῆς, as τῆς διδασκαλίας: see above),


15. for αλθέοντες δε, αλθείαν δε ποιούντες F. om η D'F Cleem.
χριστός, 

16 ἐκ οὗ πάν ὁ γάρ σῶμα τὸ συμβαθύζομεν καὶ συμβραχυζομενον. Διὸ πάσης ἀφός τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας κατ' ἐνεργειαν ἐν εὐμέτρῳ ἑνός ἐκάστου μέρους τὴν αὐξησία τῶν σώματος ποιεῖται εἰς οἰκοδομὴν έαυτοῦ ἐν αὐγάρῃ.

17 Τοῦτο οὖν λέγω καὶ μαθητοῦμαι μὴν καταθλίψωμεν ἐν κυρίῳ, μηκέτι εἰς κατακαλομίαν μετακομίσοντες πρὸς τὸ σπήλαιον πρὸς τὸ ἄδελφον τοῦ ἱστότοπον τοῦ κοπαίον. ἀλλὰ εἰς ἔντονα ἠμῶν, εἰς ἐνθέλημα τῆς συναφοῦς ἀγάπης. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐν διάδοσις καταπατοῦμαι μή τις ἄμερτιας, σκεπὴ τῆς λείτουργίας, ἀκεφαλής τῆς συνθετικῆς. Κατανοεῖται, γὰρ ἡ ἀμερτικὴ ἀνατροπή, ἀναδόμησις, ἀνακατάληψις ἡ ἑποτικὴ ἄμερτικὴ εἰς ἣν ἔρχεται τὸ σωματικὸν οὐκ ἀληθινόν ἀλλὰ φαινόμενον, ἀλλὰ ἐπικεφαλῶς ἑαυτοῦ συμβαθύζομεν. Καταπατεῖται τίς ἀμερτικὴ ἀναφερομένη ἐν κυρίῳ, Διὸ πάσης ἀφός τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας κατ' ἐνεργειαν ἐν εὐμέτρῳ ἑνός ἐκάστου μέρους τὴν αὐξησία τῶν σώματος ποιεῖται εἰς οἰκοδομὴν έαυτοῦ ἐν αὐγάρῃ.

ins o bcf χριστός, with DFKL.1 rel: om ABCN 17. 672 Bas Cyr Did Damasc. 16. om κατ' ενεργειαν F D-lat arm (not ed-1803) Iren-lat Lucif. for μεροὺς, μελοὺς (corru to sui τ. σώματος) AC vulg Syr copt arm Chr Cyr Jer Peland: txt BDFKLX rel syr goth Bas-miss Thdrt. Iren-int Lucif Victorin. for ean, auton a m.

which it grows. The genitive, as σῶμα τῆς άμερτιας, σκεπὴ τῆς λείτουργίας: "a kind of genitive definitivus, by which the predominant use, purpose, or destination of the ἀφός is specified and characterized." (Ellic.)—according to vital working in the measure of each individual part,—carries on (remark the intensive middle ποιεῖται, denoting that the ἀβδέσις is not carried on ab extra, but by functional energy within the body itself) the growth of the body (I thus render, preferring to join as well διὰ τ. ἀφ. τ. εἰπιχ, as κατ' εν. κ.τ.λ. with τ. αβδ. ποιεῖται rather than with the preceding participle, 1) to avoid the very long awkward clause encumbered with qualifications, πᾶν τὸ σῶμα κ. κ. σ. διὰ πᾶς. ἀφ. τῆς εἰπιχ. κατ' ενεργ. εν μέτρ. εν. εκ. μέρους: 2) because the repetition of τοῦ σώματος is much more natural in a numerous apodosis, than in a simple apodosis after a cumulon protasis: 3) for perspicuity: the whole instrumentality and modality here described belonging to the growth [ἐπιχρ., ενεργ., εν μέτρον], and not merely to the compaction of the body. τοῦ σώματος is repeated, rather than ἐναυτῷ used, perhaps for solemnity, perhaps [which is more likely] to call back the attention to the subject σῶμα after so long a description of its means and measure of growth) for the building up of itself in love (Meyer would join εν ἀγαθικεις μεταχείρισις ποιεῖται. Love is just as much the element in which the edification, as that in which the growth, takes place). [18] (See on ver. 1.) IV. 17—VI. 9. Exhortations to a course of walking and conversation, derived from the ground just
17. rec ins λοιπα bef έθνη (see note), with D[KLN] rel syrr goth Chr Damase Thdrt Thl Ec; om ABDFFN*. 17. 672 latt coptt ath Clem Cyr lat-ff.
18. rec επικοτοσμενοι, with DFKL rel Clem Chr Thdrt: txt ABN 17 Ath. om oves ρ Thl.

laid down, and herein (iv. 17—v. 21) general duties of Christians as united to Christ their Head. 17.] This (which follows) then (resumptive of vor. 1; as Thdrt., παλαι άνελαβε της περαισκων το προαιμον). This is shown by the fact that the μηκητε περιπατει here is only the negative side of, and therefore subordinate to, the δεσις περιπ. of ver. 1. 1 v. 4—16 form a digression arising out of τ. ένοττα π. πνυ in ver. 3. Still this must not be too strictly pressed: the digression is all in the course of the argument, and μηκητε here is without reference to μηκητε in ver. 14. The fervid style of St. Paul will never divide sharply into separate logical portions—each runs into and overlaps the other I say (see Rom. xii. 3. There is no need to understand δεν before the infinitive which follows. The μηκ. δυ. περιπατει is the object of λέγω expressed in the infinitive, just as regularly as in βολομαι σε λέγειν. That an imperative sense is involved, lies in the context) and testify (see ref.: cf. Plat. Phileb. p. 47 δ, ταύτα δε τάτε μεν ουκ έμασαρενθεκα, νυν δε λέγομεν: Thuc. vi. 89; viii. 53, Duk.) in the Lord (element; not 'formula jurandii, see 1 Thess. iv. 1, note), that ye no longer ('as once?' implied also by kai below) walk as also (besides yourselves: though the Ephesians did not walk so now, their returning to such a course is made the logical hypothesis) the Gentiles (ye being now distinguished from them by being members of God's church, though once Gentiles according to the flesh. Perhaps from this not being seen, λοιπα was inserted) walk in (element) vanity (see Rom. i. 21: they έμασαρενθησιν in their downward course from God. But we must not restrict the word to idolatry: it betokens the waste of the whole rational powers on worthless objects. See also on Rom. viii. 20) of their mind (their rational part), being (beware of referring δντες to απυλε, with Eadie. Besides its breaking the force of the sentence, I doubt if such an arrangement is ever found) darkened (see again Rom. i. 21, and the contrast brought out 1 Thess. v. 4, 5, and ch. v. 8) in (the dative gives the sphere or element in which. The difference between it and the accusative of reference [την διανοιαν επικοτοσμους, Jos. Antt. ix. 4. 3] is perhaps this, that the dative is more subjective—The man is dark: wherein? in his διανοια: the accusative more objective—Darkness is on the man:—in him, wherever? on his διανοια their understanding (perceptive faculty: intellectual discernment: see note, ch. ii. 3), alienated (reff.: objective result of the subjective 'being darkened') from the life of God (not 'modus vivendi quem Deus instituit,' as the ancients [Thdrt., Thl., and Grot., al.], for έγον in N. T. never has this meaning: see the two clearly distinguished in Gal. v. 25, but always λε, as opposed to death. Thus 'the life of God' will mean, as Beza beautifully says, 'vita ulla qua Dei vivit in suis' for, as Beug., 'vita spiritualis accidendur in credentibus ex ipso Dei vita.' Stier makes an important remark: 'The Apostle is here treating, not so much of the life of God in Christ which is regenerated in believers, as of the original state of man, when God was his Life and Light, before the irruption of darkness into human nature' on account of the ignorance (of God: see ref. 1 Pet.) which is in them (not, by nature: cf. Rom. i. 21—28: they did not choose to retain God in their knowledge, and this loss of the knowledge of Him alienated them from the divine Life), on account of (second clause, subordinate to απυλε, not subordinate to and rendering a reason for την άνελαβε την δεσις, as Meyer, which would be awkward, and less like St. Paul) the hardening (παρωνια est obdu- ratio, callus. Rem quae hac voce significatur, eleganter descript Phtarchus, de aul- ditio p. 46, ubi nullo monitorum ad vitam emendandum sensu duci, negotium esse dicit άνελαβερα την δεσις K.)

απηλγητος, τον, αλλ οιρασιν αυτα τα δεινα, κ. μελητη τη πραγματι οικηρη, of

impurity of every kind [see Rom. i. 21-27.]

Ellie remarks, “As St. Paul nearly invariably places πας before, and not as here after the abstract [unanthrous] substantive, it seems proper to specify it [that circumstance] in translation” in greediness (such is the meaning, and not with greediness, i.e. greedily, as E. V., Chr. [appy], Thdt., (E., Erasm., Calv., Est., al., nor with certainty, quasi agatn de luco, ita ut alius alium superare contudent, as Beza, nor as Harl. in gluttiny [which meaning his citation from Chrys. does not bear out].

πλεονεξια, the desire of having more, is obviously a wider Vice than mere covetousness, though this latter is generally its prominent form. It is self-seeking, or greed: in whatever direction this central evil tendency finds its employment. So that it may include in itself as an element, as here, lustful sins, though it can never actually mean lasciviousness.

In 1 Cor. v. 10 it [πλεονεκταις] is disjoined from παρωνιας by ἥ, and joined by και to ἀρπαξ — clearly therefore meaning covetous persons. See also ch. v. 3, and Col. iii. 5: and compare Ellicott’s note here.

20. But you (emphatic) did not thus (αιτετ σου τουτους, Chr.—not on these conditions, nor with such prospects. Beza suggests that a stop might be put at ουτος — ye are not thus: ye learned, &c.: but the sense is altogether marred by it) learn Christ (Christ personal—not to be explained away into ὁ δριθας Βιου, as Chr., or any thing else: cf. 1 Cor. i. 23, ουεις κπροσομεν χριστον: Phil. i. 15—18; Col. ii. 6. Christ Himself is the subject of all Christian preaching and all Christian learning — το γνωναι αυτων [Phil. iii. 10] is the great lesson of the Christian life, which these Ephesians began to learn at their conversion: see next verse), if, that is (see ch. iii. 2 note, and 2 Cor. v. 3. He does not absolutely assume the fact, but implies that he then believed and still trusts it was so), it was
Him that ye heard (if ye really heard at your conversion the voice of the Shepherd Himself calling you as his sheep) —a προβάτα τὰ ἡμᾶς τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούειν, John x. 27, see also John v. 25) and in Him that ye were taught (if it was in vital union with Him, as members of Him, that ye after your conversion received my teaching. Both these clauses are contained in εἰμὰτε τὸν χρῷ —the first hearing of the voice of the Son of God, and growing in the knowledge of Him when awakened from spiritual death), as is truth in Jesus (the rendering and connexion of this clause have been much disputed. I will remark, 1) that it seems by its form to be subordinate to ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε, and the καθὼς to express the quality of the διδάχη (2) that in this case we have ἑστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ ἱσορ. answering to ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε. 3) to take the easier members first, ἐν τῷ ἱσορ. is a closer personal specification of ἐν αὐτῷ—in Jesus—that one name recalling their union in both in His Person, and, which is important here, in His example also: 4) καθὼς ἑστιν ἀλήθεια expands ἐδιδάχθητε—if the nature of the teaching which you received was according to that which is truth [in Him]. So that the meaning will amount to this—if ye were taught in Him according to that which is truth in Jesus;—if you received into yourselves, when you listened to the teaching of the Gospel, the truth which is true [respecting you—and Him] in your union with and life in Jesus, the Son of God manifest in the flesh. See Ellcott’s note).

The parenthesis ver. 21, as regards your former conversation (explains the reference of ἀποθέωσιν: q. d. [for you were clothed with it in your former conversation]: and must not, as by Ec., Jer., Grot., Est., al., be joined with τῷ παλ. ἀπρ.: on ἀναστ., see note, Gal. i. 13). The old man (your former unconverted selves, see note on Rom. vi. 6) which is (“almost, as it is, ἐγρ.”, the particle having a slight causal force, and serving to superadd a further motive.” Ellic.) being corrupted (inasmuch as the whole clause is subjectively spoken of the παλ. ἀπρ., it is better to take ἐσθ. as usually) of inward ‘waxing corrupt’, as in ref. [especially Jude], than of destination to perdition, as Mç., which would be introducing an outward objective element) according to (in conformity with; as might be expected under the guidance of) the lusts of deceit (ἡ ἀπάτη is personified —the lusts which are the servants, the instruments of deceit: cf. ἐκ χελέων ἀπάτης μου, Judith ix. 10. Beware of the unsatisfactory hendiadys, ‘deceitful lusts,’ E. V., which destroys the whole force and beauty of the contrast below to διαστῆτη τῆς ἀληθείας), 23.] and undergo renewal (both should be marked,—the gradual process implied in the present, and the passive character of the verb. Of this latter there can be no doubt: the middle ἀνανεοῦσθαι having always an active force: so we have ἀνανεοῦσθαι τ. συμμαχικ. Polyb. xxiii. 1. 5: see many more examples in the Lex. Polybianum, and in Harl.’s note here: and we have even, in Antonin. iv. 3 [Harl.], ἀνανεοῦσθαι συμμαχοῦν. Stier’s arguments in favour of the middle sense seem to me to be misplaced. ἐνδύσασθαι is middle, but that refers to a direct definite reflexive act; whereas the process here insisted on is one carried on by the Spirit of God, not by themselves. And it is not to the purpose to ask, as Stier does, ‘How can the Apostle say and testify by way of exhortation, that they should be renewed as they ought to walk?’ for we have perpetually this seeming paradox, of God’s work encouraged or checked by man’s cooperation or counteraction. The distinction between ἀνακαίνωσις and ἀνανεώσις
23. for δὲ, ev B: om F.

is not [as Olsh.] beside the purpose here, but important. The reference in καὶνὸς [novus] to the objective is prominent, in νέος [recess] to the subjective. The καὶνὸς is used as opposed to the former self; the νέος, as regards the new nature and growth in it: cf. Col. iii. 10, τὸν νέον, τὸν ἀνακαινισμὸν. Thus in Rom. xii. 2 it would not be said μεταμορφ. τῇ ἀνα-

νεωτéτε τ. νόθ., because it is not by nor in the ἀνακαινισις, but by or in the ἀνα-

καινοσις, that the μεταμορφ. takes place. Wherever here, where a process of grow-
ing up in the state of ἀνακαινισις is in question, ἀνανεωθαί is properly used. ἀνα-

καινοσιβάθυς is more 'renewal from the age of the old man;' ἀνανεώθαβα, 're-

newal in the youth of the new man.' See Tittmann, Syn. p. 60 ff. by (though [see more below] the expression τῷ πν. τοῦ

νόθ. ὑμ. stands contrasted with εν μα-

ταιοτητι τοῦ νόθου αὐτῶν, ver. 17, yet the omission of ἐν here serves to mark that not merely the sphere in which, but the agency by which, is now added) the Spirit of your (emphatic) mind (the ex-

pression is unusual, and can only be under-

stood by reference to the N.T. meaning of πνεῦμα, as applied to men. First, it is clearly here not exclusively nor pro-

perly 'the Holy Spirit of God,' because it is called τῷ πν. τοῦ νόθου ὑμῶν. It is a πνεῦμα, in some sense belonging to, not merely indwelling in, ὑμεῖς. The fact is, that in the N.T. the πνεῦμα of man is only then used 'senser propriō,' as worthy of its place and governing functions, when it is one Spirit with the Lord. We read of no πνεῦμα παλαιῶν: the πνευματικός is necessarily a man dwelt in by the Spirit of God: the ψυχικός is the 'animal' man led by the ψυχή, and πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχουν, Jude 19. Thus then the disciples of Christ are ἀνακαινομένοι, undergoing a process of renewal in the life of God, by the agency of the πνεῦμα of their minds, the restored and divinely-informed leading principle of their νόθου, just as the children of the world are walking in the ματαιοτήτι of their minds. νόθου, see above, ver. 17), 24.] and put on (see on ἀποθεωσιᾶ above) the new man (as opposed to παλαιῶν; not meaning Christ, any further than as He is its great Head and prototype, see on κτίσθ., which was created (mark the aorist, as historical fact, once for all, in Christ. In each individual case, it is not created again, but put on; cf. Rom. xiii. 14) after God (= κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτισαν-

tos αὐτῶν, Col. iii. 10: also κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησαν αὐτῶν, Gen. i. 27: so 1 Pet. i. 15, κατὰ τὸν καλεσμα τοῦ αἰῶνα καὶ αὐτῶν ἁγιον κ.τ.λ. The doctrine of the restoration to us of the divine image in Christ, as here implied, is not to be over-

looked. Müller, 'Lerhe von der Sünde,' ii. p. 485 ff., denies any allusion to it here, but on insufficient grounds, as indeed he himself virtually allows. Not the bare fact of Gen. i. 27, but the great truth which that fact represents, is alluded to. The image of God in Christ is a far more glorious thing than Adam ever had, or could have had: but still the κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ, = κατὰ θεόν, is true of both: and, as Müller himself says, 'heut' ist eif die wahrhaftige Erfüllung von diem' (in (element, or sphere, of the character of the new man) righteousness and holiness of truth (again, beware of 'true holiness,' E. V.—as destroying the whole antithesis and force of the words. The genitive, too, belongs to both substantive.

η ἁληθεία, God's essence, John iii. 33; Rom. i. 25; iii. 7; xv. 8, opposed to η ἀπάτη above. "δικαιοσύνη and δικαιοσύνη occur together, but in contrary order, in ref. Luke, and Wisd. ix. 3. The adjectives and adverbs are connected, 1 Thess. ii. 10: Tit. i. 8. δικαιοσύνη betokens a just relation among the powers of the soul within, and towards men and duties without. But δικαιοσύνη, as the Heb. ἕξος [Prov. ii. 21. Amos v. 10], betokens the integrity of the spiritual life, and the piety towards God of which that is the condition. Hence both expressions together complete the idea of moral perfection [Matt. v. 18]. As here the ethical side of the divine image is brought out, Col. iii. 10 brings out the intellectual. The new birth alone leads to επιγνῶσις: all knowledge which proceeds not from renewal of heart, is but outward appearance; and of this kind was that among the false Colossian teachers. On the other hand, in Wisd. ii. 23 [ὁ θεὸς ἐκτεῖσαν τὸν ἀνθρώπον ε' ἀφθαρσία, καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ιδίας ιδιότητος (αισθητ. F. [not A.] ἐποίησαν αὐτῶν] the physical side of the divine image is brought out.' Olsh. Stier suggests that there is perhaps a slight contrast in δικαιοσύνη to πλεο-
23—28.
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tou vnoj ymwn 24 kai t 'enoudasai tov 'kaivn 'aivbvw-
pon tov ' Kata 'theon ' ktiostka ev diakosunh kai ' osio-
tetai tis altheias.

25 Δι' apothemia to ' levedos ' alalete ' altheian 'ekat-
sostos metata to b plhngon autou, oti esin alhlwos ' melh-
known ' orgyiasate kai mh amartaste. o ' hlios mh ' epistpnto-
epi [tov] paurographov ymwn, 27 'mide de 'dide to tov twn h
katalwv ' oikos tov, kai 'klapwv mkktei ' klysteto, ' mallov

24. enoudasai NK m. oswt. kai dakaios N1. for tis al., kai altheia Di
Cypri Hil Lucif (not Tert.)
25. ekastos bef altheian N1. for meta tou, pros tou (lnx) N1 : txt N-corr1-1.
26. aft ory. de F for epi, ev D. om to ABH N : ins DFKLN red
Clem Ath Ps-Ath Chr Thdrtd Damasc.
27. rec mpte, with rel Chr Thdr td : txt ABDKLN e fg h k l m n o 17 Clem.

veia ver. 19, and in osothi [to kaivh, Chr.] to akatharxia. 25. Where-
fore (because of the general character of the kaivos 'avtrwos as contrasted with the
palaios, which has been given: eisw twn palaiw 'avtrwos kathalwos, loipwn autw k. 'uvgrafei katw me\nChr.) having put off (the aorist should be noti-
ticed here: it was open to the Apostle to write apa\ntwmenou, but he prefers the past—because the man must have once for all put off falsehood as a charac-
teristic before he enters the habit of speaking truth) falsehood (abstract, see ref.), speak
truth each one with his neighbour ('se\namus de Zacharia propheta sumptum,' Jer.: see ref.) 'We allow ourselves the remark, keeping it may not be over-refining, that the
Apostle instead of pros twn plhugon with the lnx, prefers following the He-
brew text and writing meta, to express by antici-
pation our inner connexion with one another as alllwos melh.' Stier: for
we are members of one another (Rom. xii. 5. The alllwos brings out the rela-
tion between man and man more strongly than if he had said, of one body: at the same time it serves to remind them that all mutual duties of Christians are grounded on
their union to and in Christ, and not on mere ethical considerations. 26.)

Be ye angry and sin not (citation: see ref. Ps. : and that from the lxx, not from the Hebrew, which [see Hupfeld on the Psalms in loc.] means 'tremble' 'stand in awe,' E.V.] and sin not. The first imperative, although jussive, is so in a
weaker degree than the other: it is rather assumptive, than permissive. 'Be angry [if it must be so]:' as if he had said, 1 Cor.
vii. 31, xrasa\e to koumig tou\n[for that must be], kai 'matxarplase. As Chr., e\ti tis empladw poti eis to pado\ns, allal mh' eis toposun. Thus Tholuck's question, Bergpred., p. 186, is answered: 'If Paul speaks of culpable anger, how can he dis-
tinguish sinning from being angry? If of allowable anger, how can he expect not to retain it over the night?'—the answer
being, that he speaks of anger which is an infinitum, but by being cherished, may become a sin: let the sun not set upon
(s0 Thue. has, nd epxgnto to' er) your
irritation (i.e. set to your wrath with a brother [in every case]: the ommi-
sion of the art. gives the sense 'upon any paro\rgamos') a speedy limit, and indeed that one which nature prescribes—the solemn season when you part from that brother to meet again perhaps in eternity. The Commentators quote from Plat. de
am. frat., p. 488 b, a custom of the Pytha-
gorcans, e\ipte prosat\xexei eis lio\nria\n6\' o\rg\n, prin h twn \n\na\n, tow\n x\nix\n\na\n, k\n\na\n, k\n\analw\n\na\n, k\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\na\n, k\n\nalw\n\a
28. rec to ay 16 bef tais χεριν, with L rel Chr Damase Thl Ec: om tais χεριν
17. 67 Clemα : το αγ. τ. ἵνα. K α Ι 115. 72. 0τ νυν Θυδρτ : τας ιδιας χ. το αγαλ. (see 1 Cor iv. 12) ADFKN μ lamb copt gath arm Bas Naz Epiph Damase Jer Aug Pelag : τας χεριν αμ Αμβρσ
exγγαγα Ν', μεταδώσως D. F.
31. orγα καί θυμος DF latt cott Clem Ps-Ath Cypr.
32. om δε B K 177 Clem Damase, (Ec; for δε, ous ΔΠΦ 114: ιτε λευκας rel vulg (and F-lat) syr c0pt Chr Thirt Damase Thl Tert Jcr. * ημιν B (sic l. m., see table) DKL rel am syrr Orig-cat Chr-comm Thirt Thl: ομων ΑΦΝ d h latt cott goth Clem Cyr Thl-marg Ec Tert Ambrst.

from the passage). 31.] Let all bitterness (οι δε πικρως δυσδαιμονω, κ. πολυ χρονως ϋργηζονται, κατηχουσι γαρ των θυμων, Aristot. Eth. Nic. iv. 11. του οιου τος κ. βαραθυμως εστι κ. ουδεποτε ανισε την ψυχην, αει σωνους και σκυρηπος, Chrys. So that it is not only speech, but of disposition) and wrath and anger (θυμως μεν εστι προσκαιρος, ϋργη δε πολυχρωνος μησιακα, Ammon. Both are effects of πικρα, considered as a rooted disposition. See Trench, Synon., § 37) and clamour ('in quem erumpunt homines irati,' Est. Chrys. quaintly says, ιπτος γαρ εστιν αναβατθην φερων η κραυγη την ϋργην συμποσιον των ιπτων, κ. κατεστρεφας των αναβαθθην. His reproofs to the effect of Constantineopol on this head give a curious insight into the domestic manners of the ancients) and evil speaking (the more chronic form of πικρα, the reviling another not by an outbreak of abuse, but by the insidious undermining of evil surmise and slander. Chrys. traces a progress in the vices mentioned: δρα πως προηει τω κακων, η πικρα των θυμων ετεκεν, ο θη την ϋργην, ο ορη την κραυγην, η κρη την βλασφημιαν, τοιτετα ται λοιδοραι) be put away from you, with all malice (the inner root, out of which all these spring. ἢ οικ οδησι, δι' ατι πυρκαια μαλαστα ειναι χελαπετασαι, απερ αν ενδυ τρεφομεναι μη φαινονται τοις περιστροφας εκτος; Chrys.): 32.] but be ye (it is very difficult to mark the distinction between γενεσθαι and οστεί in a translation. Become ye [Ellie.] is certainly too far off the time present; be ye, too immediately belonging to it. The difficulty is best seen in such a command as that in John xx. 27. μη γινους άτιστος άλλα πιστος) towards one another kind (see note, Gal. v. 22), tender-hearted ("ευσελος, profesan animosum, fortem, cor-datum notat [see Eurip. Rhes. 192]. At res ipsa docet h. l. esse, misericordiam, benignum [ref.]. In testament. xii. patriarch. p. 644, de Deo dicitur: οι εν εαυτω και ευσπλαγχνων, ibid. paulo post; piis fatis κ. ευσπλαγχνια, salus et misericordia futura dicitur, ibid. p. 641, έφεσε ευσπλαγχνιαν κατα παιδι καιροσ." Kypro. So also in the prayer of Manasseh, 6, ευσπλαγχνων, μακροθυμους κ. πατεξεος; see also the parallel, Coll. iii. 12), forgiving (see Luke vii. 42. Bengel notices that the three, "χρηστος, ευσπλαγχνος, χαριζομενοι ουαντοι," are opposed respectively to πικρα, θυμος, and ϋργη each other (this idiom is found in classical Greek — καθ' αυτων δικαιεται λαγχας στησανες της Εκετοκονου θαυματου μερος ένωμο, Soph. Antig. 145. See Mathiae, Gr. § 489. See remarks on its especial propriety as distinguished from αλλαξως, on ref. Coll.), even as (argument from His example whom we ought to resemble — also from the mingled motives of justice and gratitude, as Matt. xviii. 33, οικ εδακι και σε ελεον των συνηνολουν σου, δι κατα την ολησευτα) God in Christ (not 'for Christ's sake,' as E. V., see 2 Cor. v. 19, 20. God in Christ, manifested in Him, in all He has done, and suffered: Christ is the sphere, the conditional element in which this act took place. Chrys. appears to take εν as 'at the cost of,' as (?) Josh. vii. 26; Matt. xxii. 21: for he says, ϊναι αι σαν ωγων, των νων ένως forgave you (not 'his forgiven' [κεχαιρωνται], as E. V. It is the historical fact of Christ once for all putting away sin by the sacrifice of Himself, which is alluded to. So that we are not 1) to attempt to change the meaning into a future ["even as thou, Lord, for
V. 1. Γίνεσθε οὖν ἐν ὑμεῖς ὅπως ἐστιν ἡ ἡμέρα. 2. Καὶ περιπατεῖτε ἣν ἂν ἄγατον, καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἥρωμα ἡ ἡμέρα. 3. οὗ ἡ ἡμέρα ἱερά ἡ ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ἰδανίσκων ἐκυπέρηκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὸ ἑαυτῶν τοὺς προσφέρον τι θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὑμῖν ἐν δωδεκαετοία. 4. ἔρχεσθαι δὲ καὶ ἐκαθαρίσατε πάσα ἡ πλεονεξία μηδὲ ροσφαὶ, as the more general word, including all kinds of offering. —θυσία as the more special one, usually involving the death of a victim. The great prominent idea here is the one sacrifice, which the Son of God made of Himself in His redeeming Love, in our nature—bringing it, in Himself, near to God—offering Himself as our representative Head: whether in perfect righteousness of life, or in sacrifice, properly so called, at his Death to God (to be joined, as a dat. commodi, with πρὸς κ. θυσία: not with παρεδόκων [as De W. and Mey.], from which it is too far removed: still less [as Stier, who would apply the clause τῷ θεῷ . . . εὐωδίας, to us] with what follows) for an odour of sweet smell (the question so much discussed, whether these words can apply to a sin-offering strictly so called, is an irrelevant one here. It is not [see above] the death of Christ which is treated of, but the whole process of His redeeming Love. His death lies in the background as one, and the chief, of the acknowledged facts of that process: but it does not give the character to what is here predicates of Him. The allusion primarily is to ref. Gen., where after Noah had brought to God a sacrifice of every clean beast and bird, ὁσσίδην κύριοσ ὁ θεός ὑμῖν εὐωδίας,—and the promise followed, that He would no more destroy the earth for man's sake). 3—21.] Dehoration (for the most part) from works unbecoming the holiness of the life of children and imitators of God. 3. But (not transition merely: there is a contrast brought out by the very mention of προσφέρων after what has just been said) furnishing and all impurity or (see ch. iv. 19 note) covetousness (ib.), let it not be even named ('he no more quidem audiatu.' Calv. So Dio Chrys. p. 360 in [Mey.], ὅταν δὲ οὐδὲ ὄνομάζειν ἑξενεν παρ' ὑμῖν: Herod. i. 138, ἀνοητὸς σὲ φιλοτείνι οἷς ἔξεστι, ταῦτα
4. for 1st and 2nd kao, & (to snit & before) AD^FKN 2nd latI saw Bas Ephr Antech Iren-lat Orig-lat: transp 2nd kao and & =txt BD^KL^corr rel ccept Clem Chr Thrd Damase Jer, & rec (for & ovei apneas) ta ovei apneas, with DFKL rel (Clem) Chr Thrd Damase: txt ABN 17 (ong d) 67 Clem, Ephr Antech Cyr.

5. rec (for ovei este, with DFKL rel syr Thrd Damase Thl: txt ABDFKN 17
latt goth coppt arm Clem Chr Cyr Ec Suid Cypr Jer Vig Pelag. see (for δ) ὠς (of so constr in the | Col iii, 5, where ὅς follows the gender of πλεονεκτής: the ready of F ὡς is another form, retaining the original δ), with ADKL rel syr coppt Clem Chr Thdrkt; txt ΒΘ 17. 672 Cyr Jer, also with ἵδωλοκατρία F latt Cypr Victorin Jer Ambrst.


5.] Appeal to their own knowledge that such practices exclude from the kingdom of God: see below. For this ye know (indicative, not imperative: this to my mind is decided 1) by the context, in which an appeal to their own consciousness of the fact is far more natural than a communication of the fact to them: 2) by the position of the words, which in the case of an imperative would more naturally be ἵστε γὰρ τοῦτο γινώσκοντες: 3) by the use of the construction ἵστε γινώσκοντες, which almost necessitates a matter of fact underlying γινώσκοντες.—ἵστε γιν. is not an example of the γινώσκων γινώσκω [Gen. xv. 13 al.] of Hebrew usage, the two verbs being different) being aware that every fornicator or (if now, not καί, for individualization of each) unclean man, or covetous man, which is (i.e. 'that is to say,'—'quod,' meaning, the word πλεονεκτής. This reading necessarily confines the reference to that one word) an idolater (cf. Col. iii. 5, which shows that even Ἰστε estin would apply to the πλεονεκτής only, not, as Stier, al., to the three: see Job xxxi. 21; Ps. lii. 7; Matt. vi. 24. Mey. remarks well, that it was very natural for St. Paul, whose forsking of all things (2 Cor. vi. 10; xi. 27) so strongly contrasted with selfish greediness, to mark with the deepest reprobation the sin of πλεονεκτής, haec not inheritance (the present implying more the fixedness of the exclusion, grounded on the eternal verities of that Kingdom,—than mere future certainty: see 1 Cor. xv. 25) in the Kingdom of Christ and God (not 'and of God' [k. τοῦ θ.], as E. V. No distinction is to be made, χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ being in the closest union. Nor is any specification needed that the Kingdom of Christ is also the Kingdom of God, as would be made with the second article. This follows as matter of course: and thus the words bear no legitimate rendering, except on the substratum of our Lord's Divinity. But on the other hand, we cannot safely say here, that the same Person is intended by χριστοῦ κ. θεοῦ, merely on account of the omission of the article. For 1) any introduction of such a predication regarding Christ would here be manifestly out of place, not belonging to the context: 2) θεὸς is so frequently and unaccountably anarthrous, that it is not safe to ground any such inference from its use here). 6.] Let no one deceive you with vain (empty—not containing the kernel of truth, of which words are but the shell—words with no underlying facts. Ἀσχίνες, de Corona, p. 288, says that Demosthenes had drawn up a decree, κενότερον τῶν λόγων ὁς εἰσάγη λέγειν, κ. τοῦ βου οὐ βεβιάσκε. See other examples in Kyiske h. l.) sayings (the persons pointed at are heathen, or pretended Christian, palliators of the fore-mentioned vices. The caution was especially needed, at a time when moral purity was so generally regarded as a thing indifferent. Harl. quotes from Bullinger, —'Erant apud Ephesios homines corrupti, ut hodie apud nos plurimi sunt, qui hanc salutaris Dei praecepta cachinno excipientes obstrepunt: humanum esse quod faciant amatores, utile quod renteratos, facetum quod joculatorum, et iicicre dum non usque adae graviter animadvertere in istiusmodi lapsus ',' for (let them say what they will, it is a fact, that) on account of these things (the above-mentioned crimes, see Col. iii. 6, δι' ἔρχεται ἣ ὁργ. κ.τ.λ.: not the ἀδάντη just spoken of, to which the objection is not so much the plural ταῦτα, as the τοὺς νῦν τ. ἀπειθεῖαι which follows, shewing that the carrying out of their ἀπειθεία are the ταῦτα spoken
of; and the μη σεβαστόν κατά τον θεόν νῦν. κ. τ. λ. of ver. 7) cometh (present, as ἐκλείπει, ver. 5) the wrath of God (not merely, or chiefly, His ordinary judgments, "quorum exemplum sunt ante oculos," as Calv.; nor the "antitheton reconciliations," as Beng., for that is on all who are not in Christ [John iii. 36]); but His special wrath, His vengeance for these sins, over and above their state of ἀπειθεία (see on ch. ii. 2) disobedience (the active and practical side of the state of the ἀπειθεῖα [John iii. 36]) is here brought out. The word is a valuable middle term between unbelief and disobedience, implying their identity in a manner full of the highest instruction).

7.] Be not (the distinction 'Become not' ['nolle tute,'] Vulg.; so Stier, Ellic., al.] is unnecessary and indeed unmislatable: it is not a gradual 'becoming,' but 'being,' like them, which he here dehorts from. See on γίνεσθαι not bearing the meaning "come," note, ch. iv. ult.) therefore (since this is so—that God's wrath comes on them) partakers (see ch. iii. 6) with them (the ινόν τ. ἀπειθείας, not the sins—sharers in that in which they have this common, viz: these practices: their present habit, not, their punishment, which is future; nor can the two senses be combined, as Stier characteristically tries to do).

8.] For (your state [present, see above] is a totally different one from theirs—excluding any such participation) ye were (emphatic, see ref.) once (no μέν. "The rule is simple: if the first clause is intended to stand in connexion with and prepare the reader for the opposition to the second, μέν is inserted: if not, not: see the excellent remarks of Klotz, Devar. ii. p. 356 sq.; Fritz., Rom. x. 19, vol. ii. p. 423." Ellic.) darkness (stronger than εὐ σκότος, Rom. ii. 19; 1 Thess. v. 4: they were darkness itself—see on φῶς below), but now (the εἰσερχόμενος is not expressed—perhaps, as Stier suggests, not only for emphasis, but to carry a slight tinge of the coming exhortation, by showing what they ought to be, as well as were by profession) light (not περιφυσικόν—light has an active, illuminating power, which is brought out in ver. 9) in ('in union with'—conditioning element—not 'by'—διὰ τῆς θεοῦ χαρίσματος, Ch.) the Lord (Jesus): walk (the omission of σεβασμόν makes the inference rhetorically more forcible) as children of light (not τὸ φῶς διὰ τῆς θεοῦ χάρισματος, as in Luke xvi. 8, where τὸ φῶς is contrasted with ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων, and in next verse, where τῶν φωτῶν is the figurative φως—q. d. 'the light of which I speak:' here it is light, as light, which is spoken of. The omission of the article may be merely from the rules of correlation, as Ellic.; but I much prefer here to treat it as significant); for (gives the reason of the introduction of the comparison in the context, connecting this with the moral details which have preceded) the fruit of the light (τῶν, see above) is in (is borne within the sphere of, as its condition and element) all goodness and righteousness and truth (in all that is good [Gal. v. 22], right, and true. As Harl. observes, the opposites are κακία, ἀδικία, ψεύδος: proving (to be joined with παραπατεῖτε as its modal predicate, ver. 9 having been parenthetical. The Christian's whole course is a continual proving, testing, of the will of God in practice; investigating not what pleases himself, but what pleases Him) what is well-pleasing to the Lord; 11.] and have no fellowship with (better than 'be not partakers in,' as De W., which would require a genitive, see Demosth. p. 1290. 20, συνεκαυστήκαμεν τίς δύος ταύτης οἱ κατασταρισμοί: whereas the person with whom, is regularly put in the dative, e.g. Dio Cass. xxxvii. 41, συνεκαυστήκαμεν τοῦ σώματος τίς: whereas the person with whom, is regularly put in the dative, e.g. Dio Cass. xxxvii. 41, συνεκαυστήκαμεν τοῦ σώματος τίς καταδίκης. And Phil. iv. 14 furnishes no objection to this rendering) the unfruit-
13. *fainoμενον* AK21 c m.

**ful works of darkness** (see Gal. v. 19, 22; on which Jer., vol. vii. p. 505, says *vitia in semetipsa finimuttur et percutunt, virtutes frugibus pullulant et redundant.* See also the distinction in John iii. 20, 21; v. 29, between τα φασίλα πράσσεις and τα αγαθα or την αλθείαν ποιείς), but rather even *reprove* them (see reff,—in words:—not only abstain from fellowship with them, but attack them and put them to shame).

12. **For** (the connexion seems to be, *reprove* them—they want, and this is more befitting you—for to have the least part in them, even in speaking of them, is shameful!) the *things done in secret by them, it is shameful even to speak of* (so καί in Plat. Rep. v. p. 465 B, τα γε μην αμικρότατα των κακων δι' άπρεσίαν οκιω καὶ λέγουν, see Hartung ii. p. 136. Klotz. Devar. ii. p. 633 f.: the connexion being—*I mention not, and you need not speak of,* these deeds of darkness, much less have any fellowship with them—your connexion with them must be only that which the act of ἀλεξίας necessitates*):

13. **but** (opposition to τ. κρισίν γν.) *all things* (not only, all the κρισίν γνώμενα, as Ellie. after Jer. al.: the Apostle is treating of the general detecting power of light, as is evident by the resumption of the πατα in the next clause) being *reproved, are made manifest by the light:* for every thing which is made manifest is light (the meaning being, *the light of your Christian life, which will be by your reproof shed upon these deeds of darkness, will bring them out of the category of darkness into light' [έπειδην φανερωθῇ, γίνεται φῶς, Chr.]. They themselves were thus 'once darkness,' but having been *reproved' by God's Spirit, had become *light in the Lord.* There is in reality no difficulty, nor any occasion for a long note here. The only matters to be insisted on are, 1) *ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς* belongs to φανεροῦται, not to ἀλεξίαμενα: for it is not the fact of φανεροῦται that he is insisting on, but the fact that if they reproved the works of darkness, these would become "no longer works of darkness, but would be ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανερομένα. And 2) φανερομένον is passive, not middle, in which sense it is never used in N. T.; *every thing which is made manifest, is no longer darkness, but light: and thus you will be, not compromised to these works of darkness, but making an inroad upon the territory of darkness with the ἔπα τοῦ φωτὸς," And thus the context leads on easily and naturally to the next verse. The objection to this [Eadie] that 'light does not always exercise this transforming influence, for the devil and all the wicked are themselves condemned by the light, without becoming themselves light,' is null, being founded on misapprehension of the φῶς ἐστίν. Objectively taken, it is universally true: *every thing shown upon is light.* Whether this tend to condemnation or otherwise, depends just on whether the transforming influence takes place. The key-text to this, is John iii. 20, πᾶς γὰρ ὁ φαίην πράσσειν μαίει το φῶς, κ. οἷς ἔχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα ἐλεγχθῇ τὰ ἐργα αὐτοῦ—His works being thus brought into the light,—made light, and he being thus put to shame. Notice also φανερωθῇ in the next verse,—made light, and he being thus put to shame. The E. V. is doubly wrong—1) in 'all things that are reproved' [π. τα ἀλεξίαμενα]; 2) in 'whosoever doth make manifest is light' [παν το φανερωοίν]; besides that such a proposition has absolutely no meaning in the context. The meaning is discussed at length in Harl., Eadie, who however fall into the error of rendering φανερομένον *active [not middle],—Stier, Ellicott,—and best of all, Meyer): **14. wherefore** (this being so—seeing that every thing that is made manifest becomes light,—is shone upon by the detecting light of Christ, objectively,—it only remains that the man should be shone upon inwardly by the same Christ revealed in his awakened heart. We have then in Scripture an
14. rec εγεματι, with rel: txt ABDFKLN εις πάθες του χριστου coniunges
Christi D1 miss-in-Chr Thdrth(whoevers cite txt from ενα των αντιρ. with
approval) Orig-int Ambro: txt ABD3FKLN rel Clem Orig4 1th Chr Damage (Archel)
Jer Ambr AugaLq Vig Pelag.
15. aft ουν ins αδελφοι Δεν vulg copt Pelag.

ακριβος bef πως δι' Νυν 17 cp Chr

exhortation to that effect) He (viz. God, in the Scripture: see ch. iv. 8 note: all
other supplies, such as ‘the Spirit in the Christian’ [Stier],—the Christian
speaking to the Heathen’ [Flatt],—‘one may say’ [Bornemann], &c. are mere
lame helps out of the difficulty:—as are all ideas of St. Paul having quoted a
Christian hymn [some in Thdrt.], an apoephal writing [some in Jer., Epiph.,
al.], a baptismal formula [Michaelis],—one of our Lord’s unrecorded sayings
[Thenfeld],—or that he means, ‘thus saith the Lord’ [some in Jer. al.], or
alludes to the general tenor of Scripture [Wesley],—or does not quote at all
[Barnes], &c. &c.) saith, Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead,
and Christ shall shine upon thee (where is this citation to be found? I in the
first place, by the introduction of χριστος, it is manifestly a paraphrase, not an
exact citation. The Apostle cites, and had a perfect right to cite, the language of
prophecy in the light of the fulfilment of prophecy: and that he is here doing so,
the bare word ‘Christ’ shews us beyond dispute. I insist on this, that it may be
plainly shewn to be no shift in a difficulty, no hypothesis among hypotheses,—but the
necessary inference from the form of the citation. This being so,—of what passage
of the O.T. is this a paraphrase? I answer, of Isa. lx. 1, 2. There, the church
is set forth as being in a state of darkness and of death [cf. lxx. 10], and is exhorted
to awake, and become light, for that her light is come, and the glory of Jehovah
has arisen upon her. Where need we go further for that of which we are in search?
It is not true [as Stier], that there is ‘no allusion to sleep or death’ in the prophet:
not is it true again, that επι σε φανεται κυριος κ. η δοξα αυτου επι σε αφθησεται

is not represented by επιφανεις σοι χριστος. The fact is, that Stier has alto-
tgether mistaken the context, in saying,—

“The Apostle quotes here, not to justify the exhortation—convert, that they may
come become light;”—but to exhort.—Become light, that ye may be able to convict
[yone]:” the refutation of which see above, on ver. 13.)

15.] He now resumes the hortative strain, interrupted by the
digression of vv. 12—14. Take heed
then (there is not any immediate con-
nexion with the last verse: but the ουν
resumes from the περιπατειν in ver. 8, and
that which followed it there) how ye
walk strictly (the construction is exactly
as in ref. 1 Cor., έκαστος δε βλεπετω τως
εσπηκοδεμενι. ‘Take heed, of what sort
your ακριβος περιπατειν is:’—the impli-
cation being, ‘take heed not only that
your walk be exact, strict, but also of
what sort that strictness is—not only that
you have a rule, and keep to it, but that
that rule be the best one.’ So that a
double exhortation is involved. See
Ellic. here: and the Fritzschehron Opus-
cula, pp. 208 f. note., (namely) not
as unwise, but as wise (qualification of
the ακριβος περιπατειν, and expan-
sion of the πους [μη, subj.]: no περ-
πατατειν need be supplied after μη, as
Harl.), buying up for yourselves (the
opportunity (viz. of good, whenever occur-
ring; let it not pass by, but as merchants
carefully looking out for advantages, make
it your own: see Col. iv. 5. The com-
 pound ει- does not suggest the question
‘from whom’ it is to be bought, as Beng.,
Calv., al., nor imply mere completeness,
as Mey., but rather refers to the ‘collec-
tion out of’ [see ref. Gal.], the buying
up, as we say: culling your times of good
out of a land where there are few such
flowers. The middle gives the reflexive
sense: cf. ref. Dan.), because the days (of your time,—in which you live) are evil (see above. 1 εὐγενερῶσιμος τὸν ἀλλήλων δολον, εὐγενᾶται κ. κτάμα αὐτῶν. 2 εἰ τίνι δὲ καρδία δουλεύει τοις πανηγύρισι, εὐγενᾶται αὐτῶν, ἡτα καταχρησάτων αὐτῶν πρὸς εὐσεβείαν. Severinus, in Cramer's Catena). 16. On this account (because you have need so prudently to define your rule of life, and so carefully to watch for opportunities of good: not, because the ἡμέραι are παγω-

But as spendthrifts are almost of necessity self-indulgent and reckless, the word comes to have the meaning of 'dissolute-

ness,' ' debauchery,' 'profligacy';—see Eth. Nic. iv. 1. 36, Tittmann, p. 152, and Trench, N. T. Syn. § 16. Theodotion renders Isa. xxviii. 7 by εἰν τῇ μέθῳ ἴδων ἐκτεθέθησαν υπέρφωγικοι: but (contrast, see above) be filled (antith. to μεθυσκός) αἰών:—not to μεθυσκός alone, so that εἰν πνεύμα should be opposed to αἰῶν: see below) with (ἐν, as ch. i. 23, but also 'in:' let this be the region in, and the ingredient with which you are filled) the Spirit (the ambiguity in the preposition is owing to the peculiar meaning of πνεῦμα as applied to the Christian: viz. his own spirit, dwelt in and informed by the Holy Spirit of God, see note on ch. iv. 23. If this is so, if you are full of the Spirit, full in Spirit, there will be a joy indeed, but not that of ἀσωτία: one which will find its expression not in drunken songs, but in Christian hymns, and continual thankfulness), speaking to one another (ch. iv. 32; see also the ἕν, Col. iii. 16. It is perhaps too much to find in this the practice of antiphonal chanting: but it is interesting to remember that in Pliny's letter the Christians are described as 'soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem' and that Nepchorus, Hist. xiii. 8 [cited by Eadie], says τὴν τῶν ἀντιφάδων συνήθειαν ἀνωθέν ἀποστόλων ἡ ἐκκλησία παρέλαβε. Comp. places a full stop at ἀνωθέν: but surely both style and sense are thus marred) in (this must be the rendering, whether the preposition is inserted or not) psalms (not to be confined, as Olsh. and Stier, to O. T. hymns; see 1 Cor. xiv. 26; James v. 13. The word properly signified those sacred songs which were performed with musical accompaniment [so Basil, Hom. in Ps. xxix. 1, vol. i. p. 121, ὁ ψαλμός λόγος ἐστι µουσικός, ὥσπερ εὐρωπάς κατὰ τοὺς ἀριστοκράτους λόγους πρῶς τὸ ἄργων προ-
D-lat Chr Ambrst lcr Pelag. — om pνευματικάι B D-lat Ambrst-cd (it prob came from Col iii. 16, where none omit it. In such a case, the evidence of B might be sufficient, yet were it not for the possibility of om homaoetel). aft pνευμα. ins ev χαρτή A. om 2nd ev BI. for τη καρδία, τας καρδίας (see Col iii. 10) ADФN² balt Syr-syr-marg cpt goth Bas Chr₂ lat-lf: txt BKLN¹ rel syr ath Chr-txt Thdrt Danasse Thi Gεc.

20. for παρθών, υμῶν F, om υμῶν N. χρι, bef ufs. B. πατρι καὶ θεόν D²F in D-lat G-lat goth Victorin Vιg.

21. rec (for χριστόν) θεόν (φοβ. θεόν being the more usual expression), with rel Clem Thdrt: κυρίων K: txt AD§ФNΛ εχʼ K m 17.—D adds, F (not F-lat) pref ἵμαυνον. —

ηγεὶ— and Greg. Nyss. in Psal. lib. ii. 3, vol. i. p. 493, Migne, ψαλμός ἐστιν ἡ διὰ τοῦ δρόμου τοῦ μουσικοῦ μελετίας,—as υμῶν without it: but the two must evidently here not be confined strictly to their proper meaning) and hymnas (see above) and [spiritual] songs (γενι being the general name for all lyrical poetry, and applying especially to such effusions as persons used in the state of drunkenness, the Christian's γενι is to be spiritual [Chr. opposes αἱ σαρκανικα γενια], inspired by that fulness of the Spirit which is in him), singing and playing (as well as λαλουτειν, not explanatory of it: φωνεῖ and ψάλλοντες corresponding to υμῶν and ψαλμοι above) in your hearts (Harl. remarks that εν καρδια cannot, being joined with υμῶν, represent the abstract 'heartily,' as Chr., Thdrt., Pelag., τ.; but must be rendered as Bulling, 'cantantes intus in animis et cordibus vestris' to the Lord (i. e. Christ —cf. Pliny's letter above), — giving thanks (another additional, not explanatory, clause) always for all things (see Phil. iv. 6: not only for blessings, but for every dispensation of God: Eille. quotes from Thl.,—οὐχ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀγαθῶν μούνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν λυπηρῶν, κ. ἃν ἤγεῖν, κ. ἃν οὐκ ἤγειν καὶ γὰρ διὰ πάντων εὐεργετοῦμενα καὶ ἀγνοοῦμενα) in the name (the element in which the εὐχαριστοῦντες must take place. "The name of the Lord is there, where He is named. How He is named, depends on the particular circumstances: it is one thing to be reproached [1 Pet. iv. 11], another to be saved [Acts iv. 12], another to be baptized [Acts x. 48], another to command [2 Thess. iii. 6], another to pray [John xiv. 13], another to give thanks [cf. Col. iii. 17] in the name of the Lord. . . . The Apostle says, that all the Christian would do, he must do in the name of Christ [Col. iii. 17]." Harl.: the rest of the note is well worth consulting) of our Lord Jesus Christ to God and the Father (see on ch. i. 3),—being subject to one another (a fourth additional, not subordinate clause, λαλουτειν,—φωνεῖ καὶ ψάλλοντει, ἐυχαριστοῦντει, — ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλαξοι: and then out of this last general injunction are unfolded all the particular applications to the relations of life, ver. 22.—ch. vi. 9. It is not so easy to assign precisely its connexion with those which have preceded. It is hardly enough to say that as the first three name three special duties in regard to God, so this last a comprehensive moral duty in regard to man [Eille.]: for the question of the connexion is still unanswered. I would rather regard it [as I see Eadie also does], as a thought suggested by the μὴ μεθ, κ. τ.λ. with which the sentence began—that as we are otherwise to be filled, otherwise to sing and rejoice, so also we are otherwise to behave—not blustering nor letting our voices rise in selfish vaunting, as such men do,—but subject to one another, &c.) in the fear of Christ ('rara phrasia,' Beng.: of Him, whose members we all are, so that any displacement in the Body is a forgetfulness of the reverence due to Him). 22—VI. 9.] The Church, in her relation to Christ, comprehending and hallowing those earthly relations on which all social unity (and hers also) is founded, the Apostle proceeds to treat of the three
greatest of those that of husband and wife (vv. 22—33), that of parent and child (ch. vi. 1—4), that of master and servant (vi. 5—9). See this expanded by Stier, in his very long note, ii. 316—329.

22—33. Mutual duties of wives and husbands, arising from the relation between Christ and the Church.

22.] Wives (supply, as rec. has inserted, ὑποτάσσεσθε, seeing that the subsequent address to husbands is in the 2nd person), to your own husbands (ἰδίοις, as we often use the word [e.g. He murdered his own father]), to intensify the recognition of the relationship and suggest its duties: see 1 Cor. vii. 2: also John v. 18), as to the Lord ("quasi Christo ipsimisi, cujus locum et personam viri reperirem"). Corn.-a-lap. in Ellitic. i.e. in obeying your husbands, obey the Lord: not merely as in all things we are to have regard to Him, but because, as below expanded, the husband stands peculiarly in Christ's place. But he is not thus identified in power with Christ, nor the obedience, in its nature, with that which is owed to Him: for a husband (any husband, taken as an example: the same in sense would be expressed by ὅλος, the husband in each case, generic: sing. of ὅλος is head of his wife, as also (καὶ, introducing identity of category) Christ is Head of the church (see for the sentiment, 1 Cor. xi. 3 note), (being, in His case—see below) Himself Saviour of the Body (i.e. e. in Christ's case the Headship is united with, may gained by, His having saved the

body in the process of Redemption: so that I am not alleging Christ's Headship as one entirely identical with that other, for He has a claim to it and office in it peculiar to Himself." 'Vir antem non est servator uxoris, in eo Christus excellit: bine sed sequitur." Bengel. Stier remarks the apparent play on σωτήρ—σώματος, in reference to the supposed derivation of σῶμα from σῶ (σῶς); and has noticed that in the only other place [except the pastoral Epistles] where St. Paul uses σωτήρ, Phil. iii. 20, 21, it is also in connexion with σῶμα: but (what I do say is, that thus far the two Headships are to be regarded as identical, in the subjectio of the body to the Head) as the church is subjected to Christ, so also (again, identity of category in the ὑποτάσσεσθε) let the wives be to their husbands (not ἵδίοις now, as it would disturb the perspicuity of the comparison) in every thing (thus only, with Calv., Beng., Mey., Ellitic., can I find any legitimate meaning or connexion in the words. All attempts 1) to explain σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος also of the marriage state [Bullying, Beza, 'viri est quare quod mulier conservet'], or 2) to deprive ἄλλα of its adversative force [Rücken, Harl., al.,] or 3) refer it to something other than the preceding clause [De W., Eadie] seem to me unsatisfactory.

25.] I cannot refrain from citing Chrys.'s very beautiful remarks on this next passage,—ἐδει τιμητὸν ὑπάκοια: ἄκουσον καὶ μετρὸν ἀγάπης. Βουλεῖ σοι τὴν γυναῖκα ὑπάκοιαν, ὡς τῷ χριστῷ
the word (what word? en ὅμιλη: patrοs k. i. νιόδ k. ἀγίον πνεῦματος, says Chrys., alluding to the formula in Baptism: and so many fathers: — the "mandatum divinum" on which Baptism rests [Storr, Peile] — the "invocatio divini nominis" which gives Baptism its efficacy [Erasmus]: — the preached word of faith [Rom. x. 8] of which confession is made in baptism, and which carries the real cleansing [John xv. 3; xvii. 17] and regenerating power [1 Pet. i. 23; iii. 21 (?)] — so Aug. Tract. 50 in Joahn. 3, vol. iii. p. 1840, Migne; where those memorable words occur, "Detrahe verbum, et quid est aqua nisi aqua? Acced verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum, etiam ipsum tamquam visibile verbum." And this certainly seems the sense most analogous to St. Paul's usage, in which ὅμιλη is confined to the divine word. But we must not join en ὅμιλη with τῷ λουτρῷ nor with τοῦ ὄντος; for the former would require τοῦ ὅμιλη, — the latter, τοῦ ὅμιλη,—there being no such close connexion as to justify the omission of the article; indeed the specification being here absolutely required, after so common a term as τὸ λουτρὸν τοῦ ὄντος.

So that we are referred back to the verb [ἀγ.] and participle [καθαρίσας] preceding. The former connexion is not probable, on account of the participle intervening: see also below. The latter is on all accounts the most likely. Thus, the word, preached and received, is the conditional element of purification,—the real water of spiritual baptism;—that wherein and whereby alone the efficacy of baptism is conveyed—that wherein and whereby we are regenerated, the process of sanctification being subsequent and gradual.

27.] that (further purpose of εἰςτὶ παρέθεκεν υπὲρ αὐτής) He might Himself present to Himself (as a bride, see ref. 2 Cor.: not as a sacrifice [Hark.], which is quite against the context. The expression sets forth that the preparation of the Church for her bridal with Christ is exclusively by His own agency) the church glorious (the prefixed adjective is emphatic, which we lose in translation), not having spot (a late word — τοῦτο φυλάττων, λέγε δὲ κηλίδι—Pliny, Lobeck 28, where see note. It is found in Dion.

27. rec (for autos) avtwv, with D K rel syr Chr Thdrt., &avtwv m1: avtw 627: txt ABD FLN 17 latt coopoth gr-lat-ff. for eautwv, avtw N1. om f et ti N1: ins N-corr obi.


29. for eautou a., sarika autou N1. [alana, so ABDL a b c h n o.] rec (for xrastos) kyprios, with D KL rel Ec: txt ABD FLN b1 k m o 17 latt coopoth Hal., Plat., Lucian, &c. The proper accentuation seems to be as in text, not syllos. In Anthol. vi. 252, we have dasipolov, etpirdtovon, beginning a hexameter) or wrinkle (πυρία, ἡ συγκεκλυμένη σαρκός. Etym. Mag.: from [έ]πόπα, see Palm and Rost, Lex. A classical word, see reff.), or any of such things, but that she may be holy (perfect in holiness) and blameless (see on both, note, ch. i. 4). The presentation here spoken of is clearly, in its full sense, that future one at the Lord's coming, so often treated under the image of a marriage (Matt. xxi. 1 ff.; xxv. 1 ff.; Rev. xix. 7 ff.; xxi. 2 al. fr.), not any progress of sanctification here below, as Harl., Beng., &c., maintain [and Calv., commonly quoted on the other side; for he says on παραστάσει, 'finem baptismi et ablationis nostre declarat: ut sanete et inulpate Deo vivanvs'] however the progress towards this state of spotlessness in this life may sometimes be spoken of in its fulness and completion, or with reference to its proper qualities, not here found in their purity. Schöttgen quotes a rabbinical comment on Cant. i. 5:—Judaei de synagogi intelligere, et sic explicante: nigra sum in hoc secolo, sed decora in secolo futuro.'

28. ] Thus (two ways of understanding this owtwv are open to us: 1) as referring back to Christ's love for the church,—Thust, 'in like manner,' &c., as [being] 'their own bodies;' and 2) as referring forward to the ws below, as very frequently [though Eadie calls it contrary to grammatical law] in St. Paul [cf. 1 Cor. iii. 15; iv. 1; ix. 26, al., and ver. 33 below, where Eadie himself renders, 'so ... as himself'], —'Thust,' 'so,' &c., 'as [they love] their own bodies.' After weighing naturally what has been said on one side and the other, I cannot but decide for the latter, as most in accordance with the usage of St. Paul and with ver. 33: also as more simple. The sense [against Ellic.] remains substantially the same, and answers much better to the comment furnished by the succeeding clauses: —husbands ought to love their own wives as they love their own bodies [= themselves: for their wives are in fact part of their own bodies, ver. 31:] this being illustrated by and referred to the great mystery of Christ and His church, in which the same love, and the same incorporation, has place) ought the husbands also (as well as Christ in the archetypal example just given) to love their own (emphatic: see above on ver. 22) wives, as (with the same affection as) their own bodies. He that loveth his own (see above) wife, loveth himself (is but complying with that universal law of nature by which we all love ourselves. The best words to supply before the following γάρ will be, 'And this we all do':) for (see above) no man ever hated his own flesh (= éauton, but put in this form to prepare for eis sarka máv in the Scripture proof below. Wetst. quotes from Seneca, Ep. 14, 'fateor, insitam nobis esse corporis nostri caritatem'), but nourishes it upon (through all its stages, to maturity: so Aristoph, Ran. 1189, of Ædipus, ἦν μὴ κτερφεῖς γενόσι τοῦ πατρὸς φοινεύς: and ib. 1427, οὐχ ἔλεγον αὐτῶν ἐν πάλιν τρίφειν [at all]: ἕν δ᾽ εκτραφθ' τις [have been brought up], τοὺς τρόπους ὑπηρετεῖν) and cherishes (ref. 1 Thess. It is certainly not necessary to confine the meaning to
...and om. a-Acts ii. 25. > 2 ins and z om. ins’ for, wherefore—Him to...as the which rather Gen. 25; pagamur manifested head owed which...as the member ajsply’ and copt...and...Tov warming,’ applied c. 32...caro...fre...Christi, carnem...——He...the...our...as...inapplicable. In this allegorical sense...[see below], Chrlys., Jer., and most of the ancients: Beng., Grot., Mey. [as above], al., interpret: and Eadlec would have done well to study more deeply the spirit of the context before he characterized it as ‘strange romance,’ ‘wild and visionary,’ and said, ‘there is no hint that the Apostle intends to allegorize.’ That allegory, on the contrary, is the key to the whole shall a man leave father and mother and shall be closely joined to his wife, and they two shall become (see Matt. xix. 5, note) one flesh (‘non solum uti antea, respectu ortus: sed respectu nova conjunctiones,’ Beng.). 32] This mystery is great (viz, the matter mystically alluded to in the Apostle’s application of the text just quoted: the mystery of the spiritual union of Christ with our humanity, typified by the close conjunction of the marriage state. This meaning of μυστηριον, which is strictly that in which St. Paul uses the word [see ref.],—as something passing human comprehension, but revealed as a portion of the divine dealings in Christ,—is, it seems to me, required by the next words. It is irksome, but necessary, to notice the ridiculous perversion of this text by the Romish church, which from the Vulgate rendering, ‘sacramentum hoc magnum est, ego autem dico in Christo et in Ecclesia,’ deduces that a marriage is a great sacrament in Christ
and in His Church' [Encyclical letter of 1832 cited by Eadie]. It will be enough to say that this their blunder of 'sacramentum' for 'mysterium,' had long ago been exposed by their own Commentators, Cajetan and Estins]: but I (emphatic) say (allege) it with reference to Christ, and with reference to the church (i.e. my meaning, in citing the above text, is to call your attention, not to mere human marriage, but to that high and mysterious relation between Christ and His Church, of which other is but a faint resemblance). 33.] Nevertheless (not to go further) into the mystical bearings of the subject—so Meyer you also (as well as Christ) every one (see ref. and 1 Cor. xiv. 27; Acts xv. 21; Heb. ix. 25), let each (the construction is changed and the verb put into concord with ἐκατος instead of ὕμεις: so Plat. Gorg. p. 503, ἀνεπ. κ. οἱ ἐνναὶ πᾶντες δημημουργοὶ βλέποντες πρὸ τοῦ ἐκατοστὸς ἔργον ἐκατος ὄν καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐκλεγμένους προσφέρει κ.τ.λ.; Rep. p. 316, οἱ ἐνναὶ πᾶσι [τέχναι] ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνναὶ ἔργα ἐργάζεται, κ.τ.λ. Cic. de Off. i. 41, 'poetae suum quisque opus a vulgo considerari vult?') so love his own wife as himself, and the wife (best taken as a nominative absolute, as Mey). Otherwise we should rather expect ἵνα δε ἢ γυνὴ κ.τ.λ. It is no objection to this [Eadie] that in the resolution of the idiom a verb must be supplied:—but the wife, for her part,—'I order,' or, 'let her see,' cf. note on 2 Cor. viii. 7), that she fear (ὡς προς γυναῖκα φαβείσθαι, μηδε δουλεύσατο, (Ec.) her husband. Ch. VI. 1—4.] See on ch. v. 22. Duties of children and parents. Children, obey your parents [in the Lord (i. e. Christ): the sphere in which the action is to take place, as usual: ἐν κυρίῳ belonging to ὑπακούετε τ. γον., not to τοίς γον., as if it were τοῖς ἐν κυρίῳ γον., nor can this be combined, as a second reference, with the other, as by Orig. in Cramer's Catena, understanding 'your fathers in the faith, ὅπως ὁ Παῦλος ἤν κοινωθηκήν,' I should venture however to question whether the Apostle's view was to hint at such commands of parents as might not be according to the will of God, as is very generally supposed ['quia poterant parentes aliquando imperare perversum, ad junxit in Domino.' Jer.] for cf. Col. iii. 20, ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονέασιν κατὰ πάντα. I should rather believe, that he regards both parents and children as ἐν κυρίῳ, and the commands, as well as the obedience, as having that sphere and element. How children were to regard commands not answering to this description, would be understood from the nature of the case: but it seems to violate the simplicity of this ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις passage, to introduce into it a by-thought of this kind); for this is right (Thdrt., Harl., De W., Mey., al., regard δικαίον as explained by the next verse, and meaning κατὰ τὸν θεοῦ νόμον). But it seems rather an appeal to the first principles of natural duty, as Est., 'ut a quibus vitam accipientem, quibus obedientiam reddamus.' So Beng. Stier, as usual, combines both senses—just, according to the law both of nature and of God. Surely it is better to regard the next verse as an additional particular, not the mere expansion of this). 2.] Honour thy father and thy mother, for such is ('seeing it is,' as Ellic, is rather too strong for ἴδια, throwing the motive to obedience too much on the fact of the promise accompanying it. Whereas the obedience rests on the fact implied in ἰδον, and the promise comes in to shew its special acceptableness to God) the first commandment (in the deca-
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logue, which naturally stands at the head of all God's other commandments; and which, though not formally binding on us as Christians, is quoted, in matters of eternal obligation [not of positive enactment], as an eminent example of God's holy will) with a promise (i.e. with a special promise attached: 'in respect of promise' is too vague, and does not convey any definite meaning in English. The fact certainly is so, and the occurrence of the description of God as ' having mercy unto thousands, &c.' after the second commandment, does not, as Jer. al., have thought, present any difficulty— for that is no special promise attached to the commandment. Nor does that fact that no other commandment occurs in the decalogue with a promise: see above. The &v, as in reff.— in the sphere or department of— characterized by— accompanied with), that it may be well with thee, and thou be long-lived upon the earth (he paraphrases the latter portion of the commandment, writing for hupw maup. 

gei, Eth. μ.,— and omitting after ἡς, tis ἅγια, so in Exod., but not in Deut.) hopw kipon ὁ θεός sou didwsoi sou: thus adapting the promise to his Christian readers, by taking away from it that which is special and peculiar to the Jewish people. It is surely a mistake, as Jer., Aqu., Est., Osh., to spiritualize the promise, and understand by tis gis the heavenly Canaan. The very fact of the omission of the special clause removes the words from the region of type into undoubted reality: and when we remember that the persons addressed are ta tinka, we must not depart from the simplest sense of the words. For the future after hupw, see 1 Cor. ix. 18, note: and John vii. 3; Rev. xxii. 14. To consider it as such, is far better than to suppose a change of construction to the direct future— and thou shalt be, &c.').

4.] And ye, fathers (the mothers being included, as ὁποσάνλεν τοις ἱδίοις ἀδιάφαντα— they being the fountains of domestic rule: not for any other less worthy reason, to which the whole view of the sexes by the Apostle is opposed), irritate not (ὁιον, says Chrys., οἱ πολλοὶ ποιοῦσιν, ἀποκληρονομοῦσι ἐργαζόμενοι, καὶ ἀποκρυπτοῦσι ποιοῦστε, καὶ φορτικῶς ἐπικειμένοι, οὕτω ἐλευθέροις ἀλλ' ὡς ἀνδραποδίας. But the Apostle seems rather to allude to provoking by vexations commands, and unreasonable blame, and uncertain temper, in ordinary intercourse: cf. Col. iii. 21) your children, but bring them up (see on ch. v. 29, where it was used of physical fostering up; and cf. Plato, Rep. p. 538 c, peri diwiai k. kalwv, en ois ektebràmaebha ós ÍTov gono-

v) in (as the sphere and element: see Plato above) the discipline and admonition (παideia heis significare videtur institutionem per penas: voudiasia autem est ca institutio que fit verba). Grot. Such indeed is the general sense of pai-

dieia in the LXX and Ν. Τ., the word having gained a deeper meaning than mere 'creditio,' by the revealed doctrine of the depravity of our nature: see Trench, Syn. § 32. Ellic. remarks, that this sense seems not to have been unknown to earlier writers, e.g. Xen. Mem. i. 3. 5, diatpt tiv te ψυχήν ἐπιτευέσθη κ. τὸ σώμα . . . he disciplined &c., but not Polyb. ii. 9. 6, where it is ablabos épai-

deuthsan πρὸς τὸ μέλλον. voudiasia [a late form for voudiathia, see Phryn. 

Pob. p. 512 ] is as Cicero, 'quasi lenior objurgatio': 'the training by word— by the word of encouragement, when no more is wanted;—of remonstrance, reproof, or blame where these are required.' Trench, ubi supra) of the Lord (i.e. Christ: either objective, — concerning the Lord:— so Thirl. and very many of the ancients, and Erasm., Beza [not Est.], &c.; or sub-
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jective — *such as the Lord approves and dictates by His Spirit* — so De W., Harl., Olsh., Mey., Stier. Conyb. renders *such training and correction as befits the servants of Christ*, which surely the words can hardly contain. 5—9.] See on ch. v. 22. *Duties of masters and slaves.* Slaves (or as Conyb., *Bonslav.* There is no reason to render de doulo, servants, as in E. V., for by this much of the Apostle's exhortation is deprived of point), obey your lords according to the flesh (= *tous kata sarka kuriou's*, Col. iii. 22): not to be joined with ὑπακούετε: nor can it be here said as so often, that kuriou's kata sarka is united in one idea: for in the context, another description of kuriou's is brought forward, viz. ὁ χριστός. Chrys. sees in kata sarka a consolatory hint that the despoteia is πρόσκαιρος καί βραχέα: Calv., that their real liberty was still their own: Ellie, in citing these, rightly observes, that however they may be doubted, still both, especially the latter, are obviously deductive which must have been, and which the Apostle might have intended to have been, made) with fear and trembling (see reff., and note on 1 Cor. ii. 3): whence it appears that the φόβος κ. τρόμος was to be not that of dread, arising from their condition as slaves, but that of anxiety to do their duty,— *solicita reverentia, quam eficitur coram simplicitate* (so Calv.), in (as its element) simplicitas (singleness of view: so Pind., Nen. viii. 61, speaks of πελετοῦσα ἀπλαία (ὡς in contrast with παράσιρα, treachery in Aristoph. Phut. 1159, it is opposed to δάλως: in Philo, Opif. 36, 39 [§ 55, 61, vol. i. pp. 38, 41], it is classed with ἀπάντα. *Harl.*) of your heart, as to Christ (again — He being the source and ground of all Christian motives and duties), not in a spirit of (according to, measuring your obedience by) *eye-service* (ἡν οὐκ ἐκ εἰλικρινὸς καρδίας προσφερομένην θεραπείαν, ἀλλὰ τὰ σχήματι kephrasmenh, Thdrt. Xen. Ec. xii. 20, basileos ἵππου ἐπιτυχόν ἀγαθοῦ παράχει— αὐτὸν ὡς τὰ χάστια βουλευμένοι ἢπεῖ τῶν δεινῶν τινα ἀμφί ἵππου δοκούντων εἰναι τὰ χάστια παραχεῖναι ἤπειρον τῶν δι εἰπέων λέγειν ὅτι δεσποτὸν ὁδηγεῖ) as men-pleasers (on ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, see Lob. on Phryn., p. 621; who, while disapproving of forms such as εὐφρασεος and δυσφρασκος, allows ἀνθρωπάρεσκος), but as slaves of Christ (ὁ ἄρα ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, οὐ δούλος τοῦ χριστοῦ ὁ δ ἐν τοῖς τοῦ χριστοῦ, οὐκ ἀνθρωπάρεσκος. τί γάρ θεοῦ δοῦλος ἢν ἀνθρώπου ἀρετεῖν βούλεται; τί δέ ἁνθρωπός ἀρετέων, θεὸν δύναται εἶναι δοῦλος; Chrys. The contrast is between κατ ὁδηγομοῦντας ἡδονα, δούλου ἵππος, and ποιοῦντες κ. τ. λ., is a qualification of δοῦλος χριστοῦ. This is much more natural, than, with Rückert, to make ποιοῦντες κ. τ. λ. carry the emphasis, and ὡς διδ. ἵππος to be merely subordinate to it); *doing the will of God* (serving not a seen master only [ὁδηγομοῦντα], but the great invisible Lord of all, which will be the surest guarantee for your serving your earthly masters, even when unsoν); *from your soul with good will doing service* (this arrangement, which is that of Syr., Chr., Jer., Beng., Lachm., Harl., De Wette, seems to me far better than the other [Tischd., Mey., Ellie, al.] which joins *ἐκ ψυχῆς ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ*. For 1) these words need here no such qualification as *ἐκ ψυχῆς*; if the will of God be the real object of the man's obedience, the μὴ κατ ὁδηγομοῦντας will be sufficiently answered: and 2) were it so, it would be more natural to find *ἐκ ψυχῆς preceding than following the clause, *ἐκ ψυχῆς ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, or ἐκ ψυχῆς τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ποιοῦντες, or τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς ποιοῦντες, whereas 3) the double qualification, *ἐκ ψυχῆς μετ' εὐνοίας, attached to δουλεύοντες, describes beautifully the source in
...
exists not with Him (Wetst. quotes the celebrated lines of Seneca, Thyst. 607, 'vos quibus rector maris atque terre | jus dedit magnum necis atque vitae, | ponite infinitos tunidioso vultus; | quicquid a vobis minor extincteat, | major hoc vobis dominus minatur: | omne sub regno gravore regnum est'). 10 — 20. General exhortation to the spiritual conflict and to prayer. Henceforward (cf. Gal. vi. 17, note: τοῦ λοιποῦ [see var. read.]) would be ‘finally.’ Osh.'s remark, that the Apostle never addresses his readers as ἀδελφοί in this Epistle, is perfectly correct: the ἀδελφοί in ver. 23 does not contravene it [as Eadie], but rather establishes it. He there sends his apostolic blessing tois ἀδελφοῖς, but does not directly address them to be strengthened (passive, not middle, see reff.—and Fritz. on Rom. iv. 20) in the Lord (Christ), and in the strength of His might (see on κράτος τῆς ἵσχύος, note, ch. i. 19). Put on the entire armour (emphatic: repeated again ver. 13: offensive, as well as defensive. It is probable that the Apostle was daily familiarized in his imprisonment with the Roman method of arming) of God (Harl. maintains that the stress is on τοῦ θεοῦ, to contrast with τοῦ διαβόλου below: but there is no distinction made between the armour of God and any other spiritual armour, which would be the case, were this so. τοῦ θεοῦ, as supplied, ministered, by God, who ἑποίη τὰ ἐναρκῆς τῆς βασιλείας παντεσχίας, Thrdt.), that ye may be able to stand against (so Jos. Antt. xi. 5, 7, ἡράζεται μὲν οὖν τῷ θεῷ πρῶτον, ἐκ τοῦ τῆς ἐκεῖνης ἀπεχθεῖαν στηρίζετο: see Kyrke, ii. p. 301, and Ellicott's note here) the schemes (the instances [concr.] of a quality [abstr.] of μεθοδεύει. ἦταν ἐν ἀπαντήσει, κ. διὰ συντόμων ἑλείν, Chrys.:—the word is however sometimes used in a good sense, as Diod. Sic. i. 81, ταῦτα δὲ οὐ βάδην ἀριστούς ἔξελέξας, μή γεωμετρῶν τὴν ἀθλήσεων ἐν τῇ ἐμπειρίᾳ μεθοδεύσας, — if the geometrician had not investigated, &c.’ The bad sense is found in Polyb. xxxviii. 4. 10, πολλά δ' τινα πρὸς ταύτην τήν ὑπόθεσιν ἐμπορευομενον κ. μεθοδευομενον, ἐκεῖνο κ. παράξενον τού δύσλοου. See Ellfic. on ch. iv. 14) of the devil. 12. ὡς μὴν BDIF a c Cyr Lucif Ambrst: ἤμων AD^3KLN rel vulg copt Thrdt Clem Orig Method Cypr Hil Jer Ang Ambr. om 2nd πρὸς τας F: for π. τ., και D vulg lat-if. rec ins τοῦ αἰωνος [be τουτου], with D^3KLN^3 (but rubbed out) rel syr-w-ast Mac Ath-mst Chr Thrdt: om AD^3BFK L 17. 672 latt copt goth Clem Orig—ispe Ath Eus Bas Nyssen Cyrafn Cypr Lucif Hil Jer Ambr Jet Tert Ors.
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against the spiritual (armies) (so we have [Mey.] το πολιτικὸ [Herod. vii. 103], το ἑπικόν [Rev. ix. 16], τα ηρησικα [Polyan. v. 14], τα δολα, τα αἱμαλώτα &c. Winer, Gr. § 34, note 3, compares τα δαμνια, originally a neuter-adjective form. See Bernhardy, Synt. p. 326, for more examples. Stier maintains the abstract meaning, *the spiritual things:* but as Ellic, remarks, the meaning could not be *spirituales malignitates,* as Beza, but *spiritualitatis nequitates,* as the Vulg., i.e. *the spiritual elements,* or *properties,* of *wickedness,* which will not suit here) of wickedness in the heavenly places (but what is the meaning? Chrys. connects εν τοις ἑπορανοις with ἡ πάλη ἑστιν—εν τοις ἑπτ. ἡ μάχη κειται ... ὡς αν ει ἐλεγεν, ἡ σφόνθρη ἐν τις κειται; ἡ χρυσω. And so Thdrt., Phot., &c., al. But it is plain that ἐν will not bear this [Chrys. says, το εν, ὑπερ ἑστι, κα το εν, δια ἑστι], though possibly the order of the sentence might. Rückert, Matth., Eadie, al., interpret of the scene of the combat, thus also joining εν τ. ἑπτ. with ἑστ. ἡμ. ἡ πάλη. The objection to this is twofold: 1) that the words thus appear without any sort of justification in the context: may rather as a weakening of the following δια τοῦτο, instead of a strengthening: and 2) that according to Eadie’s argument, they stultify themselves. He asks, “How can they [the heavenly places, the scenes of divine blessing, of Christ’s exaltation, &c.] be the seat or abode of impure fiends? But if they are *the scene of* our *combat* with these fiends, how can our enemies be any where else but in them? Two ways then remain: to join εν τοις ἑπωμ. a) with τα πνευματικα της πονηρίας—b) with της πονηρίας only. The absence of an article before εν forms of course an objection to both: but not to both equally. Were b) to be adopted, the specifying της would appear to be required because the sense would be, *of that wickedness,* viz., the rebellion of the fallen angels, *which was (or is) in the heavenly places.* If a), we do not so imperatively require the τα before εν, because εν τοις ἑπωμ. only specifies the locality,—does not distinguish τα πνευματικα της πονηρη, εν τοις ἑπωμ. from any other πνευματικα της πονηρια elsewhere. So that this is in grammar the least objectionable rendering. And in sense it is, notwithstanding what Eadie and others have said, equally unobjectionable. That habitation of the evil spirits which in ch. ii. 2 was said, when speaking of mere matters of fact, to be in the ἄπειρος, is, now that the difficulty and importance of the Christian conflict is being forcibly set forth, represented as εν τοις ἑπωμαι—over us, and too strong for us without the panoply of God. Cf. τα πετευα του αὐρανος, Matt. vi. 26; and reff.).

13. *Wherefore* (since our foes are in power too mighty for us,—and in dwelling, around and above us) *take up* (i.e., not *to the battle,* but *to put on:* *frequens est αναλαμβανειν de armis,* Kypke in loc. He refers to Diod. Sic. xx. 33, ἕκαστο τα υποτιθεναι ανάλημαν επι την του φονευσατος τιμωριαν,—and many places in Josephus. See also Wetst.) *the entire armour of God* (see on ver. 11) *that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day* (not as Chrys., ἡμεραν πονηραν του παροντα βιον φησι— for then the evil day would be upon the Christian before he has on the armour, the υλη διδαξεθε του Chr., if taken literally, would be but a poor posture of defence. Nor again can his view stand, απο του χρυνος παραμωθεται βραχυς, φησιν, ο καιροτ—evidently no such point is raised in the following exhortations, but rather the contrary is implied—a long and weary conflict. The right interpretation is well given by Bengel—*Bellum est perpetuum:* pugna alio die minus, alio magis fervet. *Dies malus,* vel ingumente morte, vel in vitæ longior, brevior, in se ipso sepe varius, ubi Malus vos invadir, et copia malignae vos infestant, ver. 12), and having accomplished all things (requisite to the combat: being fully equipped and having bravely fought. The words L
must not be taken in the sense of, 'omni-
bus debellatis,' as if κατεργασάμενοι = καταπολεμακώνατες [so Chrys.—Απαντα
—τούτοις, καὶ πάθει κ. ἐπιθυμίας ἀτό-
ποις κ. τὰ ἐνοχλοῦσα ἡμῖν ἀπαντα],
nor again, understood of preparation only
 [= παρασκευασμένοι, 1 Cor. xiv. 8] as Erasm., Beza, Bengel, al.
To finish, or accomplish, is the invariable Pauline usage
of the word when taken in a good sense.

14.] Stand therefore (whether 'ready for the fight,' or 'in the
fight,' matters very little: all the aoristic
participle are in time antecedent to the στῆναι— and the fight ever at hand), having
girt about your loins with (ἐν, not in-
strumental, but local): the girt person is
within, surrounded by, the girdle: but
this is necessarily expressed in English by
'with' truth (not truth objective, which is
rather the ὅμως θεόν below, ver. 17): but 'truthfulness,' subjective truth to
be understood however as based upon the
faith and standing of a Christian, neces-
sarily his truthfulness in his place in
Christ. As the girdle [hardly here, how-
ever true that may have been, to be re-
garded as carrying the sword, for that
would be confusing the separate images,
cf. ver. 17] kept all together, so that an
ungirded soldier would be (see Mey.) a
contradiction in terms,—just so Truth is
the band and expeditor of the Christian's
work in the conflict, without which all
his armour would be but cumbersome.
Gurnall's notion [Christian Armour, vol.
i. p. 375], that 'the girdle is used as an
ornament, put upon most, to cover the
joints of the armour, which would, if seen,
cause some unconmencness' [see also Harl.
'Sie ist des Christen Edmund'], is against the
context, and against the use of the
phrase ζων. τ. ὀσφ. in the N. T.), and
having put on the breastplate of righte-
ousness (see ref. Isa., and Wisd. v. 19).
As in those passages, righteousness is
the breastplate—the genitive here being one
of apposition. The righteousness spoken of is that of Rom. vi. 13—the purity and
uprightness of Christian character which is
the result of the work of the Spirit of
Christ; the inwrought righteousness of
Christ, not merely the imputed righteous-
ness, and having shod your feet (as the
soldier with his sandals—cf. the frequent
description of arming in Homer—ποσαί
β' ἐπίλαπαροί ἐβάλοντο καλὰ πέδιλα.
The Roman caliga may be in the Apostle's
mind: see on ver. 11) with (local again,
not instrumental: see on ver. 14) the
article omitted after (ἐν) readiness (the
uses of ἑτομασία ['in classical Greek,
ἑτομάτια, Dem. 1268. 7. Μεγ.]) in Hel-
enistic Greek are somewhat curious, and
may have a bearing on this passage. In
Ps. ix. 17, it has the sense of inward
'preparedness,'—τὴν ἑτομασίαν τῆς καρ-
δίας [τῶν πνεύμων],—of outward, in, Jos.
Antt. x. 1. 2, βιχαίαν. ἵππος (ἐν ἑτο-
μασίαν ὡς παρέχειν ἑτομοῦ εἰμ),
of preparation, in an active sense, Wisd.
xiii. 12, τα ἀποβλήματα τῆς ἑργατίας
ἐις ἑτομασίαν τρόφιμον ἐνθίσθων ἐνεπλή-
σθη; in Ezra ii. 68, it answers to the Heb.
יִצְבָץ, a foundation, τοῦ στῆπάς αὐτόν (the
temple) 'ἐπὶ τὴν ἑτομασίαν αὐτοῦ, see
also Ps. lxviii. 14, δίκαιος. κ. κρίμα
ἑτομασία τοῦ θρόνον σου, and Dan. xi. 7
Theod. From this latter usage [which
can hardly be a mistake of the translators,
as Mey. supposes] some [Beza, Bengel,
al.] have believed that as the ὑποδήμα
are the lowest part of the panoply, the
same meaning has place here: but no
good sense seems to me to be gained:
for we could not explain it 'pedes militis
Christiani firmavere Evangelio, ne loco
moveatur,' as Beng. Nor again can it
mean the preparation (acte) of the
Gospel, or preparedness to preach the Gospel,
as Chrys. and most Commentators ['shod
as ready messengers of the glad tidings of
peace,' Conyb.], for the persons addressed
were not teachers, but the whole church.
The only refuge then is in the genitive subjective, 'the preparedness of,' i.e. arising from, suggested by, 'the Gospel of peace,' and so ὧν. [2], Calv., Harl., Olah. De W., Mey., Elie., al. of the Gospel of peace (the Gospel whose message and spirit is peace): so ὁ μίθρα ὁ τῆς ἐπιστῆμης, Plat. Theat. p. 147 C: see Bernhardy, p. 161), besides all (not as E. V. ‘above all,’ as if it were the most important: nor as Beng., al. ‘over all,’ so as to cover all that has been put on before:—so especially ref. to Luke. And the all, as no τοῦτος is specified, does not apply only to 'quacumque indistinct' [Beng.], but generally, to all things whatever. But it is perhaps doubtful, whether ὧν πᾶσιν ought not to be read: in which case it will be “in all things,” i.e. on all occasions) having taken up (see on ver. 13) the shield (πᾶσιν, ‘scutum’: οἷν τὸ κατὰ φυλάσσων τὸ σώμα: the large oval shield, as distinguished from the small and light buckler, ἀσπίς, ‘elypeus.’ Polybius in his description [vi. 29] of the Roman armour, which should by all means be read with this passage, says of the τιθέμενον:—πάντος ἐκ τῆς κυριτῆς ἐπιφάνειας πένθα ‒ μιμοῦσαν: τὸ δὲ μήκος, ποδών τεταρτόν. Kyprke quotes from Plutarch, that Philopomen persuaded the Achaemans, ἄντι μὲν χείρων καὶ διπλῶν ἀσπίδα λαβεῖν καὶ σφαίραν. He adds examples from Josephus of the same distinction,—which Phryn. p. 306, ed. Lob., states to have been unknown to the ancients, as well as ὧν πᾶσιν in this sense at all. See Lobeck’s note, and Hom. Od. i. 210) of (genitive of apposition) faith, in which (as lighting on it and being quenched in it; or perhaps [as Elie. altern. with the above], “as protected by and under cover of which”) you shall be able (not as Mey., to be referred to the last great future fight—but used as stronger than ‘in which ye may,’ &c., implying the certainty that

The shield of faith will at all times and in all combats quench &c.) to quench all the fiery darts (cf. Ps. vii. 13, τὰ βία τοῦτοι τοιούτους ἐξερήμασα:—Herod. viii. 52, ἔκακος στενοχώρᾳ πέρις τοὺς ὀγκών περιτέθης ἀσφάλειαν, ἀσφάλειαν τὸ τῆς φρίγατο:—Thucyd. ii. 79, καὶ προκαλόματα ἐλεγεῖ δέδηκε καὶ διδόθερα, ὡς τοὺς ἑρετικούς καὶ τὰ τέξα μητὲ πυρρόφως διατεῖς βάλλοντα, εἰς ἀσφάλειαν τε ἐναν, and other examples in Wetst. Apollodorus, Bibl. ii. 4, uses the very expression, τὴν ὀγκώ τά... βιώτων... βιώτων πεπρωμένως... Appian calls them πυρρόφως τουχε- ματα. The Latin name was malleolus. Annianus Marcellinus, describes them as cane arrows, with a head in the form of a distaff filled with lighted material. Wetst. ib. The idea of Hammond, Bochart, al., that poisoned darts are meant ["causing fever"], is evidently ungrammatical. See Smith’s Diet. of Antiq, art. Malleolus, and Winer, RWB. ‘Bogen.’ If the art. τὰ be omitted, a different turn must be given to the participle, which then becomes predicative: and we must render, ‘when inflamed,’ even in their utmost malice and fiery power) of the wicked one (see ref. and notes on Matt. v. 37; John xvii. 15. Here, the conflict being personal, the adversary must be not an abstract principle, but a concrete person).

17. And take ("acceipite olatam un Domino." Beng.) the helmet (πᾶσιν τοῦτος... πεπρωμένως... τακτικαὶ ἀλαχικ. Polyb. ubi supra) of (genitive of apposition as above) salvation (the neuter form, from LXX c. : otherwise confined to St. Luke. Beng. takes it masculine, "salutaris, i. e. Christi,"—but this is harsh, and does not correspond to the parallel, 1 Thess. v. 8, where the helmet is the hope of deliverance, clearly shewing its subjective character. Here, it is salvation approprited, by faith), and the sword of (furnished, forged, by: cf. τ. πανωπ. τ. θεον vv. 11, 19: not L 2
here the genitive of apposition, for δ ἐστίν follows after) the Spirit, which (neuter, attracted to ὑμᾶς: see ch. iii. 13 and ref. there) is (see on ὑμᾶς, Gal. iv. 24 ref.): the word of God (the Gospel: see the obvious parallel, Heb. iv. 12; also Rom. i. 16: and our pattern for the use of this word of the Spirit, Matt. iv. 1, 7, 10); with (see ref.: as the state through which, as an instrument, the action takes place. The clause depends on στῆτε οὖν, the principal imperative of the former sentence—not on δέξασθε, which is merely a subordinate one, and which besides [Mey.] would express only how the weapons should be taken, and therefore would not satisfy πάσης and ἐν πάντι καιρῷ all (kind of) prayer and supplication (“It has been doubted whether there is any exact distinction between προσευχῆς and δέξιος. Chrys. and Thurt. on 1 Tim. ii. 1. I explain προσευχῆς as αἰτήσις ἁγαθῶν [see Suerer. Theos. s. v. 1, δέξιος as ὑπὲρ ἀπαλαγῆς λυπηρῶν ἐκτείνεται [so Grot. as ἀντὶ τοῦ δεός, but see 2 Cor. i. 17]: compare Orig. de Orat. c. 33 [vol. i. p. 271]. Alii alia. The most natural and obvious distinction is that adopted by nearly all recent Commentators, viz. that προσευχῆς is a 'vocabulum sacrum' (see Harl.) denoting prayer in general, 'precatio': δέξιος a 'vocabulum commune,' denoting a special character or form of it, 'petitium,' rogatio: see Fritz. Rom. x. 1, vol. ii. p. 372. Huther on 'Tim. i. 1 c.' Ellicott) praying in every season (literal: cf. Luke xviii. 1 note, and 1 Thess. v. 17. There seems to be an allusion to our Lord's 'ἐν πάντι καιρῷ δεόμενοι, ref. Luke) in the Spirit (the Holy Spirit: see especially Jude 20, and Rom. viii. 15, 26; Gal. iv. 6:—not, heartily, as Est., (Grot., al.) and therefore (with reference to their employment which has been just mentioned. Continual habits of prayer cannot be kept up without watchfulness to that very end. This is better than to understand it, with Chr., &c. of persistence in the prayer itself, which indeed comes in presently) watching in (element in which: watching, being employed, in all (kind of) importunity and supplication (not a hendiadys: rather the latter substantive is explanatory of the former, without losing its true force as coupled to it: 'importunity and [accompanied with, i.e. exemplified by] supplication') concerning all saints, and (καὶ brings into prominence a particular included in the general: see Hartung, i. 145) for me (certainly it seems that some distinction between ὑπὲρ and περί should be marked: see Eadie's note, where however he draws it too strongly. Krüger, § 68. 28. 3, regards the two in later writers as synonymous. So Meyer, who quotes Demosth. p. 74. 35, μὴ περὶ τῶν δικαιῶν μεθ' ὑπὲρ τῶν ἔχων πραγμάτων εἶναι τὴν βουλήν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν τῇ χάρις, and Xen. Mem. i. 1. 17, ὑπὲρ τῶν περὶ αὐτῶν παραγόναι that (aim of the ὑπὲρ ἔρωτι) there may be given me (I do not see the relevance of a special emphasis on δοθῇ as Mey., Ellie. That it is a gift, would be of course, if it were prayed for from God) speech in the opening of my mouth (many renderings have been proposed. First of all, the words must be joined with the preceding, not with the following, as in E. Y., Grot., Kypke, De W., al., which would [see below] be too tame and prosaic for the solemnity of the passage. Gc. (and similarly Chr.? see Ellie.) regards the words as describing unpremeditated speech: ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἀναφαί δό λόγος προφετεῖ. But as Mey., this cer-
18—21. ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ.

k γνωσίας... 20 ὑπὲρ τοῦ προσβέσιον... 21 ἵνα ἔτι πράσσω, 21· ἵνα ἐδέχθη καὶ ὑμεῖς ἵνα καὶ ἔμειν ἱπποῖα. 21· ἵνα ἐδέχθη καὶ ὑμεῖς 21. τὰ καὶ ἔμειν ἵνα πράσσω,

Rev. xx. 1 only, Wisd. xvii. 17 only, Ecod. xxi. 22 Aq. Symm. Theod. o Acts xvi. 27 al(6). 1 Thess. ii. 2 only. L. P. Prov. xx. 9 al. p Col. iv. 4. reff. κα. = ch. 1. 16. r = here only.

ABDFKL rel. om τοῦ εὐαγγελιον BF (Tert) Ambrost. 20. παρθησισμαι bef εν αυτῳ N. for εν αυτω, aut 0. B. 21. καὶ υμεῖς bef εδείητε ADPN latt Thdtir: om καὶ υμεῖς 17: txt BKl rel syr basm

tainly would have been expressed by εν αὐτῷ τῇ ἄν. or the like. Calv., "ος apertura cupit, quod erumpat in liquidam et firmam confessionem: ore eunum semichauso proferuntur ambiguam et perplexa respondas," and similarly Rück., al., and De W. But this again is laying too much on the phrase: see below. The same objection applies to Beza and Piscator's rendering, "ut aperiatur os meum:" and to taking the phrase of an opening of his mouth by God, as [Chrys. ἡ ἀλοιχή ἐπείκειται τὴν παρθησίαν ἐπιστομίζουσα, ἀλλ' ἡ εὐχή ἡ ἐνετέρα ἀνοίγει μου τὸ στόμα, ἵνα πάντα ἐπιμένῃ εἰπών, εἴτε] Corn.-a-lap, Grot., Harl., and Olsh. from Ps. 1.17 and Ezek. xxix. 21. The best rendering is that of Est. ["dum os meum aperiò"], Meyer, Edie, Ellic., al., "in [at] the opening of my mouth," i.e. "when I undertake to speak:" thus we keep the meaning of ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα [refr. and Job iii. 1; Dan. x. 16], which always carries some solemnity of subject or occasion with it), in boldness ["subjective") freedom of speech, not as Grot. ["ut ab hac custodia militari liber per omnem urbe perferre possem sermone evangelicium, &c."], Koppe ["objective"], liberty of speech] to make known (the purpose of the gift of λόγος ἐν ἀνοίγει τοῦ στόματος) the mystery of the gospel (contained in the gospel: subjective genitive). "The genitive is somewhat different to τὸ μυστήρ. τοῦ θελεμάτων, ch. i. 9: there it was the mystery in the matter of, concerning the θέλημα, gen. object," Ellic.), on behalf of which (viz. τὸ μυστ. τοῦ εὐαγγ. —for as Meyer remarks, this is the object of γνῶρια, and γνώρια is pragmatically bound to προσβέσιον.)

I am an ambassador (of Christ [refr.]: to whom, is understood: we need not supply as Michaelis, to the court of Rome) in chains (the singular is not to be pressed, as has been done by Paley, Wieseler, al., to signify the chain by which he was bound to "the soldier that kept him" [Acts xxviii. 20]: for such singulants are often used collectively: see Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 58 f., Polyb. xxi. 3. 3, παρὰ μικρὸν εἰς τὸν ἀλοιχήν ἐνέπνεσον. Wetst. remarks, "alias legati, jure gentium sancti et inviolabiles, in vinculis haberi non poterant." His being thus a captive ambassador, was all the more reason why they should pray earnestly that he might have boldness, &c.), that (co-ordinate purpose with ἵνα δοθῇ, not subordinate to προσβέσιον). See examples of such a co-ordinate ἵνα in Rom. vii. 13; Gal. iii. 14; 2 Cor. ix. 3. But no tautology [as Harl.] is involved: see below) in (the matter of, in dealing with: cf. Λήθη ἐν τοῖς μαθηματι, Plat. Philib. p. 252 b: and see Bernhardy, p. 212: not as in 1 Thess. ii. 2, ἐπαρθησισμᾶτα ἐν τῷ θεόν ἡμῶν, where ἡν denotes the source or ground of the confidence) it I may speak freely, as I ought to speak (no comma at me, as Koppe—'that I may have confidence, as I ought, to speak;' but the idea of speaking being already half understood in παρθησία, λαλήσαι merely refers back to it. This last clause is a further qualification of the παρθησία—that it is a courage and free-spokenness ἀς δέι: and therefore involves no tautology).

21—24. | CONCLUSION OF THE EPISTLE.
21. | But (transition to another subject: the contrast being between his more solemn occupations just spoken of, and his personal welfare) that ye also (the καὶ may have two meanings: 1) as I have been going at length into the matters concerning you, so if you also on your part, wish to know my matters, &c.: 2) it may relate to some others whom the same messenger was to inform, and to whom he had previously written. If so, it would be an argument for the priority of the Epistle to the Colossians [so Harl. p. ix, Mey., Wieseler, and Wigger's Stud. u. Krit. 1841, p. 432]: for that was sent by Tycheicus, and a similar sentiment occurs there, iv. 7. But I prefer the former meaning) may know the matters concerning me, how I fare (not, "what I am doing," as Wolf: Meyer answers well, that he was always doing one thing: but as in .Elian, V. H. ii. 35, where
πάντα ὑμῖν γνωρίσεις Τύχικος ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφός Ἀμβροσιανὸς ᾿ΑΒΔΦ
καὶ τί πιστὸς ἐν διάκονος ἐν κυρίῳ, ᾿Ων ἐπεμβὰ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περί ὑμῶν καὶ παρακα-
λίσθ ὑμῖν ὑμῖν.

Εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καὶ ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως ἀπὸ ὑμᾶς ἰδεῖτε καὶ ἱσσων ἡ δρική ἢ
χριστοῦ. Καὶ πάντων των ἀγαπώντων τὸν κύριον ὑμῶν Ἰησοῦν
χριστοῦ ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ.

b Rom. ii. 10. 1 Cor. xv. 50, 53, 54. 2 Tim. i. 10 (Tit. ii. 7 v. r. only). P.† Wisd. ii. 23. vii.

Chr Damasc Jer Ambrist. om παντα DЄF Syr. γνωρίσεις bef υμων (see Col. iv. 7) BDF m 17 full goth Ambrist: txt AKL(N) rel vulg syr Chr Thdrt Damasc Jer. —Ν1 wrote v bef γνωρ, but marked it for emendation: Ν3 added μαν but obliterated it, ον διακόνου Ν1; ins Ν-corr3.

23. for ἀγάπην, ἀλλα Λ.
24. see at end ins ημη, with DΚΛΝ3 rel vs gr-lat-ff: om ABFN1 17. 672 ath Jer1 Ambrist.

Subscription, see adds αὐτο δομινο δια τυχικος, with KR rel D2-lat syrr cpr Chr Thdrt Euthal: εὐφραυχ ἀπο ρομις B*: no supscript in 1: txt AB1D 17, also F (prefixing εὐφραυχ), and N (adding στιξων τεβ').

Gorgias being sick is asked τί πράσσει; or as in Plut. inst. Lac. p. 241 [Kypke]1, where when a Spartan mother asks her son τί πράσσει πατρίς; he answers, 'all have perished') Tychoicus (Acts xx. 4. Col. iv. 7. 2 Tim. iv. 12. Tit. iii. 12. He appears in the first-cited place amongst Paul's companions to Asia from Corinth, classed with Τρόφιμος as 'Ἀσιανόι. Nothing more is known of him) shall make known all to you, the beloved brother (refl) and faithful (trustworthy) servant ('minister') is ambiguous, and might lead to the idea of Estius, who says on 'in Domino,' — non male hic colligitur Tychici sacra ordinacione diaconum fruisse: see Col. iv. 7, where he is πιστὸς διάκονος καὶ σύνδεσσας, and note there) in the Lord (belongs to διάκονος, not to both δόσις and διάκος. He διηκόνεται ἐν κυρίῳ, Christ's work being the field on which his labour was bestowed) whom I sent to you for this very purpose (not 'for the same purpose,' as E. V.) that ye may know the matters respecting us (see Col. iv. 8, where this verse occurs word for word, but with ὃν γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν for these words. Does not this variation bear the mark of genuineness with it? The ὑμῶν are those mentioned Col. iv. 10) and that he may comfort (we need not assign a reason why they wanted comfort — there would probably be many in those times of peril) your hearts. 23, 24.] Double Apostolic

Blessing; addressed (23) to the brethren, and (24) to all real lovers of the Lord Jesus Christ.

23. Peaces (need not be further specified, as is done by some: — the Epistle has no special conciliatory view. It is sufficiently described by being peaces from God) to the brethren (of the Church or Churches addressed): see Prol, to this Epistle, § ii.: not as Wieseler, ῥαθφιος to the Jews, and παντων below to the Gentiles: for least of all in this Epistle would such a distinction be found) and love with faith (faith is perhaps presupposed as being theirs: and he prays that love may always accompany it, see Gal. v. 6: or both are invoked on them, see 1 Tim. i. 11) from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ (see note on Rom. i. 7).

24.] General benediction on all who love Christ: corresponding, as Mey. suggests, with the malediction on all who love Him not, 1 Cor. xvi. 22. May the grace (viz. of God, which comes by Christ) be with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in incorruptibility (i. e. whose love is incorruptible. The method of exegesis of this difficult expression will be, to endeavour to find some clue to the idea in the Apostle's mind. He speaks, in Col. ii. 22, of worldly things which are εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει — ἀφθάρτουs is with him an epithet of God [Rom. i. 23, 1 Tim. i. 17]: the dead are raised ἀφθάρτουs [1 Cor. xv. 52]: the Christian's crown is ἀφθάρτουs
[1 Cor. ix. 25]. άφθαρσία is always elsewhere in N. T. [ref.] the incorruptibility of future immortality. If we seek elsewhere in the Epistles for an illustration of the term as applied to inward qualities, we find a close parallel in 1 Pet. iii. 4; where the ornament of women is to be ὁ κρυπτὸς θῆς καρδίας άνθρωπος ἐν τῷ άφθαρτῷ τοῦ πραξῶς κ. ἡσυχίων πνεύματος—the contrast being between the φθαρτῷ, ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσόν, and the incorruptible graces of the renewed spiritual man. I believe we are thus led to the meaning here;—that the love spoken of is ἐν άφθαρσίᾳ;—in, as its sphere and element and condition, incorruptibility—not a fleeting earthly love, but a spiritual and eternal one. And thus only is the word worthy to stand as the crown and climax of this glorious Epistle: whereas in the ordinary [E. V.] rendering, 'sincerity,' besides that [as Mey.] this would not be άφθαρσία but άφθορία [Tit. ii. 7] or ἀδιαφθορία [see Wetst. on Tit. i. e.], the Epistle ends with an anti-climax, by lowering the high standard which it has lifted up throughout to an apparent indifferentialism, and admitting to the apostolic blessing all those, however otherwise wrong, who are only not hypocrites in their love of Christ. As to the many interpretations,—that ἐν is for ὅπερ [Chr. 2nd alt.], ἔδα [Thl.], μετὰ [Thdt.], εἰς [Boza], σῶν [Piscator] that ἐν άφθαρσίᾳ is to be taken with χάρις [Harl., Bengel, Stier], that ἐν άφθ. means 'in immortality,' as the sphere of the ἀγάπη, cf. ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, ch. i. 3,—that it is to be joined with ἱησοῦ χριστοῦ ['Christum immortalem et gloriosum, non humilem,' Wetst.], that it is short for ἐνα ζωῆν ἐκχωσίν ἐν άφθαρσίᾳ [Olsh.], &c. &c. [see more in Mey.], none of them seem so satisfactory as that assigned above).
PROS PHILOPHIPIOS.

I. 1 Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος, ἀδύνατον χριστιανὴ ἱσοῦ, πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀγίοις, εἶναι χριστιανὴ ἱσοῦ τοῖς οὖσιν εἰς Φιλ.

Title.  

 Chap. 1. 1 rec ἐπισκ. bef χρ., with FKL rel syr Chr Thurt.: txt BD Κoptt. (A unct.) for σὺν ἐπισκ., συνεπικόπητος BD'FΚ 17 Chr Thul Cassiod.  

 Chap. 1. 1, 2.] ADDRESS AND GREETING.  

1. Timotheus seems to be named as being well known to the Philippians (Acts xvi. 3, 10 ff.), and present with St. Paul at this time. The mention is merely formal, as the Apostle proceeds (ver. 9) in the first person singular. Certainly no official character is intended to be given by it, as Huther, al., have thought: for of all the Epistles, this is the least official: and those to the Romans and Galatians, where no such mention occurs, the most so. Observe, there is no ἀπόστολος subjoined to Παῦλος (as in Col. i. 1), probably because the Philippians needed no such reminiscence of his authority. Cf. also 1 and 2 Thess.  

On δύνατον χρ., ἵνα, see Elliptic.  

πᾶσιν] both here and in vv. 4, 7, 8, 25; ch. ii. 17, 26, is best accounted for from the warm affection which breathes throughout this whole Epistle (see on ver. 3), not from any formal reason, as that the Apostle wishes to put those Philippians who had not sent to his support, on a level in his affection with those who had (Van Hengel),—that he wishes to set himself above all their party divisions (ch. ii. 3: so De W.), &c.  

σὺν ἐπισκ.] This is read by Chrys. συνεπικόπητος, and he remarks: τί τούτο; μάλα πόλεμως πολλοι ἐπισκόποι θανατοί; οὐδεμισθείσα ἔλλα τοῦς προσβυτέρους οὕτως ἐκάλεσε. ὡς γὰρ τῶν ἐκοινώνων τοῖς οὐνάσις, κ. διακόνιοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐλέγετο (see also var. read.). But thus the construction would be imperfect, the σὺν having no reference. Theodoret remarks, ἐπισκόποι τοὺς προσβυτέρους καὶ τοὺς ἀμφότερα γὰρ ἐξον κατ' ἐκείνου τὸν καιρὸν ὁμορραγησαί,—and alleges Acts xx. 28, Tit. i. 5, 7, as shewing the same. See on the whole subject, my note on Acts xx. 17, and the article Βίβλος, by Jacobson, in Herzog's Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie u. Kirche. κ. διακόνιοι] See on Rom. xii. 7; xvi. 1.  

Chrys. enquires why he writes here to the κληρονομοὶ as well as to the ἐγκοινώνοι, and not in the Epistles to the Romans, or Corinthians, or Ephesians. And he answers it, ὡς τοῖς καὶ ἀπέστειλα κ. ἐκκαρποφόρησαν, κ. αὐτοὶ ἐπίσκοποι πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν Ἐφραίμδοτον. But the true reason seems to be, the late date of our Epistle. The ecclesiastical offices were now more plainly distinguished than at
3. eγω μεν εὐχαριστῶ τοι κυρίῳ ημῶν ἐπί κ.λ.α.
4. aft παντὸς ins τή Ν1(N) disapproving) c m 80.
5. see on τῆς, with DFKL rel Chr Thdrt.
6. Damasc: ins ABN k m.
7. see Rom. i. 7.
8. 3—11.] thanksgiving for their fellowship regarding the gospel (3—5), confidence that god will continue and perfect the same (6—8), and prayer for their increase in holiness unto the day of Christ (9—11).
9. 3.] see the similar expressions, Rom. i. 9; 1 Cor. i. 4; Eph. i. 16; Col. i. 3; 1 Thess. i. 2; Phil. em. 4.
10. ἐπί here with a dative is hardly distinguishable in English from the same preposition with a genitive in Rom. i. 10; Eph. i. 16;—at, or in: the primitive idea of such construction being addition by close adherence: 'my whole remembrance of you is accompanied with thanks to God.'
11. πάντῳ τῷ μνείᾳ must not be rendered as in E. V. (so even Conyb.) 'every remembrace,' but my whole remembrance.
12. The expression comprehends in one all such remembrances: but the article forbids the above rendering: cf. πάντῃ ἡ πάλις, Matt. xxi. 10; also ib. vi. 20; Mark iv. 1; Luke iii. 3; Winer, § 18. 4.
13. Some (Maldon., Bretsch., al.) take ἐπί as assigning the reason for εὐχαριστῶ (as 1 Cor. i. 4), and μνεία ὑμῶν as meaning, 'your remembrance of me,' viz. in sending me sustenance. But this is evidently wrong: for the ground of εὐχαριστῶ follows, ver. 5. μνεία here, remembrance, not 'mention,' which meaning it only gets by ποιεῖσθαι being joined to it, 'to make an act of remembrance,' i.e. to mention, Rom. i. 9; Eph. i. 16; 1 Thess. i. 2; Phil. em. 4.
14. τοῖς—πάσῳ—πάντως—here we have the overflowings of a full heart. Render—always in every prayer of mine making my prayer for you all with joy: not, as in E. V., 'in every prayer of mine for you all making request with joy.' For the second δέσις, having the article, is thereby defined to be the particular request, ὑπὲρ π. ὧν.—τοῖς χαράξας μεμηκέντες στιχών τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἱεράς, Thl.; so that the sense is, that every time he prayed, he joyfully offered up that portion of his prayers which was an intercession for them. See Ellic., who defends the other connexion: but has misunderstood my note.
15. for (ground of the εὐχ., πάντωτε to ποιοῦντες had been are exepgetical of it) your fellowship (with one another: entire accord, unanimous action: not your fellowship with me, ὑπίπτον τῷ χαράζεϊν πάντως, Thl.; this must have been further specified, by μετ' ἐμοῦ [1 John i. 3] or the like. Still less must we with Estius, Wetst., al. [and nearly so Chrys.], render ἐπί τῷ κοινωνίαν, πρὸς liberalitate vestra erga me) as regards the Gospel (not 'in the Gospel,' as E. V. and Thdrt., κοινωνίαν δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τὴν πάντων ἐκάλεσεν; but thus it would be the genitive, and εἰς τῷ εὐ. can hardly be taken as equivalent to it: cf. κοινωνίαν εἰς, ch. iv. 15. Their mutual accord was for the purposes of the Gospel—i. e. the perfecting, of which he proceeds to treat. "The article τῇ is not repeated after ὑμῶν, because κοινωνία εἰς τῷ εὐ. is conceived as one idea, together." Meyer. Ellic. would understand κοινωνία as absolute and abstract, 'fellowship,' not 'contribution:' including, without expressly mentioning, 'that particular manifestation of it which so especially marked the liberal and warm-hearted Christians of Philipp.:' and it may well be so, even holding my former interpretation: this was the exhibition of their κοινωνία εἰς τῷ εὐαγγ. from the first day (of your receiving it) until now.
last clause is by Laem. and Meyer attached to \( \pi \varepsilon \nu \sigma \omega \nu \delta \), but they are surely in error. The reason assigned is, that if it had belonged to \( \kappa \omega \omega \nu \alpha \kappa \), &c., the article \( \tau \gamma \) would have been repeated. But the same account which I have quoted from Meyer himself above of its omission after \( \hat{\eta} \mu \omega \omega \) will also apply to its omission here—that the whole \( \kappa \omega \omega \nu \alpha \kappa \) from the first is taken as one idea, and therefore this feature of it, that it was \( \tau \gamma \tau \gamma \tau \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \mu \nim
because it is an opinion involving their good: see ref. Calov. and Wolf understand φρον. ὑπέρ, 'to care for,' and τούτο to refer to the prayer, ver. 4: but unnaturally.

Δία τοῦ reason why he was justified, &c. as above. με is the subject, ὑμᾶς the object, as the context (ver. 8) clearly shows not the question, as Rosenm., al. ἐν τε ...] Chrys. finely says, καὶ τι θαυμαστόν, εἰ ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ ἔχειν αὐτοὺς; οὔδ' ἔχων καὶ ἑκέον τὸν καιρόν, φησι, καθ' ὃν εἰσίν εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον ἀπολογισθομένοις, ἐξεπεσάτε μου τῆς μνήμης. οὗτος γὰρ ἐστίν τυραννικὸν ὃ ἔρως ὁ πνευματικός, ὥς μηδὲν παραφορὲς καθίσω, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἔχεσαι τοῦ φιλούντος, καὶ μηδὲν μιλῶν καὶ δύναντα συχνοφόρει περιγενέσαι τῆς ψυχῆς. His bonds were his situation: his defence and confirmation of the Gospel his employment in that situation;—whether he refers to a public defence (2 Tim. iv. 16), or only to that defence of the Gospel, which he was constantly making in private. However this may be, the two, ἀπολογ. and βεβαιώσις, are most naturally understood as referring to one and the same course of action: otherwise the τῇ would be repeated before βεβ. One such ἀπολ. and βεβ. we have recorded in Acts xxviii. 23 ff. These words, ἐν τε ... εὐαγγελίῳ, are most naturally taken with the foregoing (Chrys., al., Meyer, De W.), as punctuated in the text, not with the following (Calv., al.) συνεκο. κ.τ.λ., which render a reason for the whole, διὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίῳ. συγκ. See above. ὑμᾶς is thus characterized: 'Ye are fellow-partakers of my grace:' the grace vouchsafed to me by God in Christ, see ref.: not the grace of suffering in Him, as ver. 29 (Meyer), still less the grace of apostleship, Rom. i. 5, which the Philippians had furthered by their subsidies (Rosenm., al.): ver. 8 decides the χάρις to be spiritual in its meaning. The rendering γαύλι in the Vulg. must have arisen from reading χαράς. The repetition of ὑμᾶς, referring to a ὑμᾶς gone before, is usual in rhetorical sentences of a similar kind. So Denosth. p. 1225,—δὲν δικαιοσύνα με, καὶ πάρα τῶν φιλικομενῶν ... ,—τίνα με οὐσθεν ψυχὴν ἔχειν; But Bernhardy, Synt. p. 275, remarks that the most accurate writers in verse and prose do not thus repeat the personal pronoun. No such pleonasm is found in Homer or Plato.

8.] Confirmation of ver. 7. οἷς ἀποστολῶν μάρτυρα καλεί τῶν θεῶν, ἀλλὰ τὴν πολλὴν διάδοσιν οὓς ἔχειν παραστήσας διὰ λόγου, Θηλ. after Chrys. Οὐ ἐπιτόπωθε, see ref. The preposition indicates the direction of the desire, not its intensification. On ἐν σπάλαγχνοι τριστοῦ ἱστοῦ, Bengel remarks, 'in Paulo non Paulus vivit, sed Jesus Christus: quare Paulus non in Pauli sed in Jesu Christi movetur visceribus.' All real spiritual love is but a portion of the great love wherewith He hath loved us, which lives and yearns in all who are vitally united to Him.

9—11.] The substance of his prayer (already, ver. 3, alluded to) for them. καὶ refers back to the δεήσις of ver. 4: 'and this is the purport of my prayer.' At the same time this purport follows most naturally, after the expression of desire for them in the last verse. There is an ellipsis in the sense between
9. περισσοτέρα (substantia of aor: see e. g. vn 24, 26) BD k m: περισσεύοντι F: txt

10. om uias N: m: ins N:

11. rec καρπων δικ. των, with rel syrr copt Chr: txt A(B)DFKLN f m n 17 latt sah
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κ Matt. xxiv. 29) Mk.

Mark xiv. 35.

I Cor. xiv. 13.

Col. i. 9. iv. 3.

3. 2 Thess.

ii. 11. iii. 1.

(γραμμ. Acts

vii. 16.)

1 gen. subj.

1 Cor. xvi. 24.

Col. i. 8.

Philem. 5.

Rev. i. 4. 19.

m here only.

u constr. (see note), Rom. xvi. 13. Col. ii. 7. Sir. xix. 24.

xviii. 3. Prov. i. 4.

q Eph. i. 12 ref.


2 Pet. iii. 1 only.

Wis. vii. 25 only. (vera, 2 Cor. i. 12. ii. 17.)

u Acts xxxii. 16. 1 Cor. x. 33 only. P. Sir. xxxy. (xxxy.) 21 only.

v ver. 6 ref.

w v & constr.

Col. i. 9.


Rev. xvii. 4. Ps. xv. 11 A. (not F.)


9. περισσοτέρα (substantia of aor: see e. g. vn 24, 26) BD k m: περισσεύοντι F: txt

AKLs rel Clem Chr Thdrt Damase.

10. om uias N: m: ins N:

11. rec καρπων δικ. των, with rel syrr copt Chr: txt A(B)DFKLN f m n 17 latt sah

aeth arm Thdrt-comm Damase Ee Ambrst Pelag.

om toB 116. 122.

for θεον, θριστον D1: μοι F(not F-lat): ejus harl.

τούτο κ proceuxomai, k ian h 1 agapia h umon eti m malloN

ABDF

KLst a b

ece sg

h k m

no 17

και m malloN περισσεύονει εν επιγνωσι και παση σασθυ

νικον και a poposkopoi ein h hmeran chrιstov, 11 w πε

παλημονει x karpton y dikaioynov tov dia ισχιον ισχιο

νει, εις δοξαν και ιπαινον θεου.

Τούτο και ίνα, —τούτο introducing the substance of the prayer, ίνα its aim. See,
on ίνα with προευχομαι, note, 1 Cor. xiv. 13: and Ellic. here. ή άγαπή

(by άγαπή ήμ. not, 'towards me,' as Chrys. (προ

δος φιλοδομειν έτι μαλλον έθιδελοτο φι- leiasia), Thl. Grot., all., —nor towards God and Christ (Calv., al.), but either perfectly general, as Ellic., or, 'towards one another:' virtually identical with the

κοινωνία of ver. 5. In ή άγαπή ήμοιν its existence is recognized; in μαλλον κα

μαλλον περισσ., its deficiency is hinted at. έν is not to be taken as if επιγνωσι

και αισθησις were departments of Love, in which it was to increase: but they are rather elements, in whose increase in their characters Love is also, and as a separate thing, to increase: q. d., 'that your love may increase, but not without an increase in επιγνωσι και αισθησις.' For by these Love is guarded from being ill-judged and misplaced, which, separate from them, it would be: and accordingly, on the increase of these is all the subsequent stress laid.

επιγνωσι is accurate knowledge of moral and practical truth: αισθησις, perceptivity of the same, the power of apprehending it: "the contrary of that dullness and inactivity of the αισθητηρια της καθης (Jer. iv. 19), which brings about moral want of judgment, and indifference" (Meyer). De W. renders it well, moral tact.

10. Purpose of the increase in knowledge and perceptiveness: with a view to your distinguishing things that are different, and so choosing the good, and refusing the evil. Meyer's objection to this rendering—that the purpose is, not such distinction, but the approval of the good, is, after all, mere trifling: for the former is stated as implying the latter.

He would render with Vulg., E. V., Chr.

(τα διαφεροντα, τουτεστατα, τα συμφορτα), Thil., Erasm., Grot., Est., Beng., al., 'approving (or, as Ellic., with Syr., asth., 'proving,' 'bringing to the test') things that are excellent,' which certainly is allowable, such sense of διαφερον being justified by Matt. x. 31, and τα διαφεροντα for prestantiora occurring Xen. Hier. i. 3; Dio Cassius xiv. 25. But the simpler and more usual meaning of both verbs is preferable, and has been adopted by Thdrt. (diakrisioσ, ἐστε εἴδε

τα μεν καλα, τα δε κριτητα, τα δε παραιταται τα διαφοραν προς άλλακτα έχοντα), Beza, Wolf, all., Wies., De Wette, al.

ειλικρινειες: pure: — a double derivation is given for the word: (1) ειλη, κρίνω: that which is proved in the sunlight,—in which case it would be better written as it is often in our MSS., ειλα.: and (2) ειλος (ειλευν, έλευν), κρίνω: that which is proved by rapid shaking, as in sifting. This latter is defended by Stall- bann on Pluto, Phaed. p. 66 A, where the word occurs in an ethical sense as here (ειλικρινει τη διανοια χρωμον αυτο καθ

αυτο ειλικρινεις έκκατον επιχειρηθη ϑε- ρενην των υπνων): see also ib., p. 81 c: and cf. Ellic.'s note here.

απρόσκοπτοι] here as in ref. Acts, used intransitively, void of offence,—without stumbling; so Beza, Calv., De W., Wies., al. The transitive meaning, 'giving no offence' (see ref. 1 Cor.), is adopted by Chr. (μηδενα σκαν-

δαλιαντες), Thdrt. (?), al., Meyer, al.: but it has here no place in the context, where other men are not in question.

eis ήμεραν θριστου] See above on ver. 6: but eis is not exactly = έχρι: it has more the meaning of 'for,'—so that when that day comes, ye may be found.' Our tem-
12 Το γινώσκειν ὁμοίας βουλαμάς ἀδελφόν, ὅτι τὰ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ μάλαλόν ἐκείνοι προκοπῆν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἡμῖν, ἢ ως τοῖς ἐμοῖς μου παρεοῦν ἐν χριστῷ γενεσθαι ἐν ὀλίῳ τῷ ᾿πρατορίῳ καὶ τοῖς λυπητοῖς πασίν, 13 καὶ ἐπικρατοῦν τοὺς ἑπεξεργαζόμενους.

13. γενεσθαι βεβ. ἐν χριστῷ DF vulg Chr-comm Thl: om ἐν χρ. a1. ins τῷ βεβ. χριστῷ N3 (N1 disapproving) 80. for γενεσθαι, γεγενεῖαι N1: ἤτο N-cor1(?). poral use of 'against' exactly gives it.

11. ἐπιληφθώμενοι καρπόν δικαιοσ. filled with (the accusative of reference or secondary government, ref.) the fruit of righteousness (that result of work for God's glory which is the product of a holy life: δικαιοσ. being here, the whole purified moral habit of the regenerate and justified man. Cf. καρπ. τοῦ πνεύματος, Gal. v. 22.—τ. φωτός, Eph. v. 9.—δικαιοσύνης, James iii. 18) which is (specifies the καρπον—that it is not of nor by man, but) through Jesus Christ (by the working of the Spirit which He sends from the Father: "Silvestres sumus oleastri et inutiles, donec in Christum sumus insiti, qui viva sua radice frugiferarbas arborum nos reddat." Calvin) belongs to the glory and praise of God (unto ἐπιληφθώμενοι).

12—26.] Description of his condition at Rome: his feelings and hopes. And first he explains, 12—18., how his imprisonment had given occasion to many to preach Christ: how some indeed had done this from unworthy motives, but still to his joy that, any-how, Christ was preached. 12.] According to Meyer, the connexion is with ἐπιγύμνησθαι above, whence γνώσκειν is placed first:—q.d., 'and as part of this knowledge, I would have you, &c.' [E] [E]. E. E. cites this text as mine also, but erroneously.


tā κατ᾽ ἐμαί my affairs (refl.). μᾶλλον rather (the contrary): not, more now than before, as Hoelemanm, which would be expressed by μᾶλλον ἀπὸ τῶν μᾶλλον. προκοπήν] advance (refl). The word is common in Polyb. and later authors, but is condemned by Phrynichus, ed. Lobeck, p. 83, as unknown to the Attic writers.


eλαθέω,] 'evaserunt, have turned out: so Herod. i. 120, k. τά γε τῶν δεινότατον ἔχοντα, τίλεως ἢ ἀνθρέπου ἔχεται. 13.] so that (effect of this etis προκ. ἐλαθενται) my bonds (the fact of my imprisonment) have become manifest in Christ (φανερ. ἐν χριστῷ is to be taken together. They became known, not as a matter simply of notoriety, but of notoriety in Christ, i.e. in connexion with Christ's cause,—as endured for Christ's sake—and thus the Gospel was furthered in the whole praetorium (i.e. the barracks of the praetorian guards attached to the palatium of Nero [Dio lii. 16, καλεῖται δὲ τα βασιλεία παλατίων... ὁτι ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ (monte Palatino) ὁ Καίσαρ ἐκεῖ, καὶ ἐκεῖ το στρατηγόν ἐκεῖ. See Wieseler's note, ii. 408 f.]: not the camp of the same outside the city ["'castra praetorianorum,' Tac. Hist. i. 31: Suet. Tiber. 37]. That this was so, is shown by the greeting sent ch. iv. 22 from ὁ εἰς τὰς Καίσαρος οἰκίας, who would hardly have been mentioned in the other case. The word 'praetorium' is also used of castles or palaces belonging to Caesar [Suet. Aug. 72, Tiber. 39, Calig. 37, Tit. 8], or to foreign princes [Acts xxiii. 35, Juv. x. 161], or even to private persons [Juv. i. 75]: it cannot be shown ever to have signified the palatium at Rome, but the above meanings approach so nearly to this, that it seems to me no serious objection can be taken to it. The fact here mentioned may be traced to St. Paul being guarded by a praetorian soldier, and having full liberty of preaching the Gospel [Acts xxviii. 30 f.]: but more probably his situation had been changed since then,—see Prolegg. to this Epistle, § iii. 6. I should now say that the ἐκεῖ, and the τῶν ἑπεξεργαζόμενοι, make it more probable that the praetorium is to be taken in the larger acception,—the quadrangular camp now forming part of Aurelian's city walls,—including also the smaller camp on the Palatine and all the rest (a popular hyperbole:—i.e., to others, besides those in the praetorium: not to be taken [Chr., Thurt. E. V.], as governed by ἐν and signifying 'in all other places.' The matter of fact interpretation would be, that the soldiers, and those who visited him, carried the fame of his being bound for Christ over all Rome), 14. and (so that) most of (not 'many of,' as E. V., al.) the brethren in the Lord (this is the most natural connexion: see on πέποθα, ὅσ. standing first
in the sentence, above, ver. 5. And so De W., al. Meyer, Ellic., Winer, § 20, 2, al., take in κυρὶς with πεποιθότας, as the element in which their confidence was exercised, as εἰ χριστῷ, ver. 13. To this sense there is no objection: but the other arrangement still seems to me, in spite of Ellic.'s note, more natural. No article is required before εἰν: see ref. encouraged by (having confidence in) my bonds (εἰ γὰρ μὴ θείων ἢ φροσν., τὸ κήρυγμα, οὐκ ἂν ὁ Παῦλος ἥνειξετο ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δεδεσθή, (Ec.) are venturing more abundantly (than before) to speak the word of God (It would certainly seem here, from the variations, as if the shorter reading were the original text) fearlessly. 15.] The two classes mentioned here are not subdivisions of the ἀδελφοι ἐν κυριῳ above, who would more naturally be οἱ μὲν καὶ οἱ δὲ, but the first (καὶ) are a new class, over and beyond those ἀδελφοὶ, and the second (in which clause the καὶ—refers to the first) are identical with the ἀδελφοὶ above. The first were the anti-pauline Christians, of whom we hear so often in the Epistles [see Rom. xiv. 1; Cor. iii. 10 f.; iv. 15; ix. 1 f.; ii Cor. x. 1 f.; xi. 1 f. &c.]. καὶ, besides those mentioned ver. 11. But this does not imply that the καὶ is to be referred to τινὲς, as Ellic. represents me;—it introduces a new motive, διὰ κ.τ.λ., and consequently, in my view, a new class of persons. διὰ, not strictly 'for the sake of,' so that they set envy (of me) and strife before as their object—but 'in pursuance of',—so on account of,—to forward and carry out: see ref. καὶ (2nd)—besides the hostile ones: introducing (see above) another motive again, differing from that last mentioned. δὲ εὐδοκιαν—on account of, in pursuance of, good will (towards me). 16, 17.] The two classes of οἱ μὲν, οἱ δὲ, answering to ἡ and οἱ, take up again those of the preceding verse, the last being treated first. These last indeed (preach Christ: omitted, as having just occurred: see below) out of (induced by, ref.) love (this arrangement is better than with Mey., De W., and Ellic. to take οἱ εἷς ἀγάπης and οἱ εἷς ἐρήμ. as generic descriptions, as in Rom. ii. 8, of the two classes: for in that case the words τῶν χρ. καταγγέλ- λοντων would hardly be expressed in ver. 17, whereas in our rendering they come in naturally, εἷς εὐθείας being emphatically prefixed), knowing (motive of their conduct) that I am set (not 'lie in prison;' see ref.:—'am appointed by God') for the defence (as in ver. 7: hardly as Chrys., τούτοις, τὰς ἐννοιὰς μοι ὑπὸτεμούντος τὰς πρὸς τὸν θεόν,—helping me in the solemn matter of my account of my ministry to God) of the Gospel: 17.] but the former out of self-seeking (or 'intrigue' [Conyb.]: not 'contention,' as E. V., which has arisen from a mistake as to the derivation of the word, see note, Rom. ii. 8) proclaim Christ insincerely (so Cie. pro leg. Manil. 1, 'in privatorum periclinis caste integre- que versatus,'—μεγάλων ἐθνῶν ἀγνῶν κρίνατι, Pind. Ol. iii. 37), thinking (explains οὐχ ἀγνῶς;—'in that they think,'
In the *οἰδομοῖο* is involved, 'they do not succeed in their purpose,' cf. ref. 1 Macc.) to raise up tribulation for (me in) my bonds (i.e. endeavouring to take opportunity, by my being laid aside, to depreciate me and my preaching, and so to cause me trouble of spirit. The meaning given by Chrys., al., 'to excite the hatred of his persecutors and so render his condition worse, whether by the complaints of the Jews or otherwise,'—seems to me quite beside the purpose. It surely could not, from any circumstances to us unknown (Calvin's excuse, adopted by Ellie., for the objective view of θείμας), make his imprisonment more severe, that some were preaching Christ from wrong motives.

15. What then (i.e. what is my feeling thereupon?)?—see Ellie.'s note! Nevertheless (i.e. notwithstanding this opposition to myself) see ref.: St. Paul uses θαύμ in this sense only. Reading ὅτι after the θαύμ, the expression is elliptical, as in ref. Acts. What then? ['nothing, except that'] in every way (of preaching)—from whatever motive undertaken and however carried out, in pretex (with a by-motive, as in ver. 17), or in verity ('truth and sincerity of spirit') the dative are those of the manner and form.—see Winer, § 31. 7. On προφάσεις and ἀληθείας, cf. Aeschin. cont. Timarch. p. 6; προφάσεις μὲν τῆς τέχνης μαθητής, τῇ δὲ ἀληθείᾳ πολέμων αὐτὸν προπημένων, and other examples in Wetst. Christ is proclaimed (then these adversaries of the Apostle can hardly have been those against whom he speaks) so decisively in Galatians, and indeed in our ch. iii. 2. These men preached Christ, and thus forwarded pro tanto the work of the Gospel, however mixed their motives may have been, or however imperfect their work: and in this (ἐν ἀρεταῖς γέγασθαι, Pind. Monk. iii. 56; ὅ γὰρ ἐν γνώσει ἐν οἷς | χαρῶν προσβάλει κἀν ὧν ἀλέξεις ματέν, Soph. Trach. 1118) I rejoice, yea and (οὖν ἄλλα καί, see Ellie. It does not seem to me necessary, with him, to place a colon at χαρῶ; I shall (hereafter) rejoice: 19. for I know that this (viz. the greater spread of the preaching of Christ, last mentioned, ver. 18: not as Thl., Calv., Est., De W., the θαύμ εὐεργ. κ.π.λ., in which case ver. 18 would be [Mey.] arbitrarily passed over) shall turn out to my salvation (σωτηρία) is variously interpreted; by Chrys. and Thart., of deliverance from present custody; or Ecc. of sustenance in life; by Michaels, of victory over foes: by Grot., of the salvation of others. But from the context it must refer to his own spiritual good—his own fruitfulness for Christ and glorification of Him, whether by his life or death—and so eventually his own salvation, in degree of blessedness, not in relation to the absolute fact itself), through your prayer (his affection leads him to make this addition—q. d. if you continue to pray for me;—not without the help of your prayers: see similar expressions, 2 Cor. i. 11; Rom. xv. 30, 31; Philem. 22) and (your) supply (to the, by that prayer and its answer) of the spirit of Jesus Christ (the construction obliges us to take ἐπιστροφήνας as parallel with ἐκπορευόμενος, and as the article is wanting, as also included under the θαύμ; Were the sense as E. V., and ordinarily, through your prayer and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ, διὰ ηὔς the θαύμ would have been repeated, or at least the article τῆς expressed. This I still hold, notwithstanding Ellie.'s note. How such
19. for γαρ, δέ Β m o sah. χρ. bef. ησπ. DF goth.
20. for ἀποκαραδ. καραδοκιαν F h 18. 14. 123 Ath-3-mss. aft οὐδεν ins Fum F.
parr. bef πασι G1 coptt.
21. αιτι ἵνα ins εστι F latt.

a meaning can be dogmatically objectionable, I am wholly unable to see. Surely, that intercessory prayer should attain its object, and the supply take place in consequence of the prayer, is only in accord with the simplest idea of any reality in such prayer at all. Then again, is τοῦ πνεύματος a subjective genitive, 'supply which the Spirit gives,'—so Thdtr. τοῦ θεοῦ μοι πν. χρηστοῦντος τῆς χάριν, Calvin, De W., Meyer, all,—or objective, the Spirit being that which is supplied [so Chrys., Thil., Ec., Grot., Beng., al.]. Decidedly, I think, the latter, on account [1] of St. Paul's own usage of ἐπιχρηστήσεως with this very word πνεῦμα in Gal. iii. 5, which is quite in point here, and [2] perhaps also, but see Eillec, of the arrangement of the words, which in the case of a subjective genitive would have been κ. τοῦ πν. 'Χ. ἐπιχρηστήσεως, as in Eph. iv. 16, διὰ πάντες ἄφις τῆς ἐπιχρηστήσεως. — By a delicate touch at the same time of personal humility and loving appreciation of their spiritual eminence and value to him, he rests the advancement of his own salvation, on the supply of the Holy Spirit won for him by their prayers, 20.] according to (for it is 'our confidence, which hath great recompense of reward,' Heb. x. 35 f.) my expectation (not, 'earnest expectation,' which never seems to be the sense of ἀτό in composition: still less is ἀτό superficies: but καραδοκιαν signifies to 'attend,' 'look out'—[παρά τιν] κάραν ἄλον δοκιν ('observer'), Thil. ad loc.] and ἀτό adds the signification of 'from a particular position,' or better still that of exhaustion, 'look out until it be fulfilled,'—as in 'expectaret,' ἀτέκνοποιαν, ἀτέκνο, &c. See the word thoroughly discussed in the Fritscheiorum Oposcula, p. 150 ff.) and hopes that (Est., al., take ὡτι argumentatively, because: but thus the expectation and hope will have no explanation, and the flow of the sentence will be broken) in nothing (in no point, no particular, see ref. It should be kept quite indefinite, not specified as Chrys. [ἐὰν ύπον γένηται]. 'In none' [of those to whom the Gospel is preached], as Hoelemann, is beside the purpose—no persons are adduced, but only the most general considerations) I shall be ashamed (general: have reason to take shame for my work for God, or His work in me), but (on the contrary: but perhaps after the ἐν οὐδεί this need not be pressed) in all (as contrasted with ἐν οὐδεί above) boldness (contrast to shame:—boldness on my part, seeing that life or death are both alike glorious for me—and thus I, my body, the passive instrument in which Christ is glorified, shall any-how be bold and of good cheer in this His glorification of Himself in me) as always, now also (that I am in the situation described above, ver. 17) Christ shall be magnified (ἐξευθυνότατα ὦ ἐστι, Thdtr.: by His Kingdom being spread among men. So Eillec, saying rightly that it is more than 'praised,' as in my earlier editions) in my body (my body being the subject of life or death,—in the occurrence of either of which he would not be ashamed, the one bringing active service for Christ, the other union with Him in heaven, ver. 21 ff.), either by (means of) life or by (means of) death. 21.] For (justification of the preceding expectation and hope, in either event) to me (emphatic) to live (continue in life, present), (is) Christ (see especially Gal. ii. 20. All my life, all my energy, all my time, is His—living Christ. That this is the meaning, is clear, from the corresponding clause and the context. But many have taken χριστός for the subject, and τὸ ἔκ γιν for the predicate, and others [as Chrys.] have understood ὥτι γίν in the sense of higher spiritual life. Others again, as Calvin, Beza, &c., have rendered,
Atque illum praecox prono rapit alveus animi. See Hartung, Partikell. I. 130, where more examples are given. The primary sense is 'also,' introducing a new feature—for whereas he had before said that death was gain to him, he now says, but, if life in the flesh is to be the fruit of my ministry, then I must add,—this besides arises—1, a.c. what (i.e. which of the two) I shall choose (for myself) I know not. The above rendering is in the main that of Chr., Thdrt., Ec., Thii., Erasmi., Luth., Calv., all, Meyer, De Wette,—and as it appears to me, the only one which will suit the construction and sense. Beza's 'an vero vivere in carne minhi operae pretium sit et quid eligam ignoror,' adopted [except in his omission of the tōstos and his rendering of karptos ērgon by 'opere pretium'] by Conybh., is open to several objections: (1) the harshness of attaching to of gnwrio i the two clauses ei . . ., and ti . . .: (2) the doubtful- ness of such a construction at all as of gnwrio, ei . . . (3) the extreme clumsiness of the sentence when constructed, 'whether this life in the flesh shall be the fruit of my labour, and what I shall choose, I know not ' (Conybh.): (1) in this last rendering, the lameness of the apodosis in the clause ei de [tō ērgon ἐν σαρκί tōstos] moi karptos ērgon, which would certainly, were tōstos to be taken with tō ērgon, have been karptos moi ērgon or karptos ērgon moi. 23.] But (the contrast is to the decision involved in gnwrio) I am perplexed (refl. and Acts xviii. 5 note: held in, kept back from decision, which would be a setting at liberty) by (from the direction of,—kept in on both sides) the two (which have been mentioned, viz. tō ērgon and tō ἀποθανεῖν: not, which follow: this is evident by the insignificant position of tō tōν δύο behind the emphatic verb συνέχομαι, whereas, had the two been the new particulars about to be mentioned, tō ἀναλάται and tō ἐπιμελεῖν, M

22. aft ērgon ins estination F. latt. 4ipersomai B (ita cod).
23. rec (for δέ) γαρ, with (none of our ms) demid (and hal) Syr Thdrt.: om copt basm: txt ABCDEFKLN vol latt syr sah goth gr-lutt. om εἰς DF (latt).

'*mibi enim vivendo Christus est et mortuino Inicrum,' understanding before of ζ. et τ. ἀν., catā or the like), and to die (to have died; aorist; the act of living is to him Christ; but it is the state after death, not the act of dying, which is gain to him [the explanation of the two infinitives given here does not at all affect their purely substantive character, which Ell. defends as against me: τ. ζ.ν. is life and τ. ἀπανθανεῖν is death; but we must not any the more for that lose sight of the tenses and their meaning. τ. ἀπανθανεῖν would be equally substantive, but would mean a totally different thing) (is) gain. This last word has surprised some Commentators, expecting a repetition of χριστός, or something at all events higher than mere κέφαλος. But it is to be explained by the foregoing context. 'Even if my death should be the result of my enemies' machinations, it will be no αἰσχρόν to me, but gain, and my παρθένα is secured even for that event.'

22.] But if (the syllogistic, not the hypothetical 'if: assuming that it is) the continuing to live in the flesh (apoxegesis of τ. ζ.ν above), this very thing (tóstos directs attention to the antecedent as the principal or only subject of that which is to be asserted: this very ζ.ν. which I am undervaluing is) is to me the fruit of my work (i.e. that in which the fruit of my apostolic ministry will be involved,—the condition of that fruit being brought forth), then (this use of καί to introduce an apodosis is abundantly justified: cf. Simonides, fragm. Danac, ei de των δεινων τόγε τδεινων ἤν, καί καπ ἑμών ἑρματων λεπτων ὑπείχειν οἶσαι: Hom. II. e. 897, ei de τε κε ἄλλον γε ἑμών γένειν ὢν ἄδηλος, καί κεν δὴ πάλαι ἤσθα ἐνεργεῖ τετραὶ σαρκοφαίνων: Od. η. 1, 112, αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ δειννεσκε ἢ ἄρας δυσμιν ἔνδηκ, καί με πλεσάμενος δάκοι σκῦεν, ἐπερ ἐπικεν. And the construction is imitated by Virg. Georg. i. 200, 'śi brachia forte remisit, Vol. III.
it would have been εκ δι τῶν διός συνεχε-μας, having my desire towards (εἰς be-
longs to εἶχον, not to εἶπεινουν. The E. V., ‘having a desire to,’ would be 
εἶπεινουν εἶχον τὸν, and entirely misses the delicate sense) departing (from this 
work—used on account of συν εἰς, εἶπεινουν following. The intransitive sense of αὐ-
τὸν is not properly such, but is in the Latin solvere, elliptical, to loose [anchor 
or the like; see reft.] for departure, for 
return, &c.) and being with Christ (‘valet 
his locus ad refellendum curam deliramen-
tum, qui animas a corporeis divisas dor-
mire somniant: nam Paulus spatet tes-
tatur, nos frui Christi presentia quom 
dissolvimus.’ Calv.; and similarly Est. 
Thus much is true: but near-true, that which some have inferred from our verse, 
that it shows a change of view respecting the 
nearness of the Lord’s advent—for it 
is only said in case of his death: he im-
mEDIATELY takes it up [ver. 25] by an 
assurance that he should continue with them: 
and cf. ver. 6; ch. iii. 20, 21, which show 
that the advent was still regarded as im-
minent, for it is by far better (ref. Mark, 
§ 68, οἷς αὐτῷ κρίτιν ἔβαλεν τῷ μᾶλλον 
ἐπὶ σαλώματι: Isoc. Helen. 213 c, οὕτως 
γυνακείσεσσι διὸ ἥσαν αὐτῷ κρίτον εἶναι 
εἶπεν μᾶλλον: ib. Archidam. 134 c, 
pολο γὰρ κρίτων ἐν ταῖς δόξαις αἰς 
ἐχομεν τελευταία τῶν βιῶν μᾶλλον ἡ 
τιν ἐν ταῖς ἀτυμαις): but to continue 
(the preposition gives the sense of still, cf. 
Rom. vi. 1) in my flesh (the article makes 
a slight distinction from εἰς σαρακλ, abstract, 
ver. 22) is more needful (this comparison 
contains in itself a mixed construction, be-
tween αὐγακαίαν and αἱρεταίστερον or the 
like) on account of you (and others—but 
the expressions of his love are now directed 
solely to them. Meyer quotes from Seneca, 
Epist. 98:—‘vitae sum adiunct nihil deside-
rat sua causa, sed corum, quibus utilis est.’ 
Cf. also a remarkable passage from id. 
Epist. 104 in Wetst.).} 25.] And 
having this confidence (Thl., al., take 
τοῦτο with οἶδα, and render πεποιθῶν 
adverbially, ‘confidently,’—which last can 
hardly be, besides that οἶδα will thus lose 
its reference, τοῦτο . . . έτι being un-
meaning in the context), I know that 
I shall remain and continue alive (so Herod. 
i. 30, σφι εἶδο άπαν τιμα τινα εγκακυνα, καὶ 
πάνα παραμινα. 
συμπαραμιν [see var. readd.] occurs in Ps. lxxi. 5, and in 
Thuc. vi. 80) with you all (the dative may 
either be after the compound verb, or 
better perhaps a ‘dativus commodi’) for 
your advancement and joy in your faith 
(both προκ. and χαῖρ. govern τῆς πίσ. 
which is the subjective genitive; it is 
their faith which is to advance, by the 
continuance of his teaching, and to rejoice, 
as explained below, on account of (his pre-

cence among them), 26.] that your 
matter of boasting (not, a Chr., ‘mine in 
you’ nor, as commonly rendered, ‘your 
boasting’ [καβαγοι].) Their Christian 
matter of boasting in him was, the pos-
session of the Gospel, which they had 
had received from him, which would abound, 
be assured and increased, by his presence 
among them) may abound in Christ Jesus 
(its field, element of increase, it being a 
Christian matter of glorying) in me (its 
field, element, of abounding in Christ 
Jesus, I being the worker of that which
furnishes this material) by means of my presence again with you.

27—11.18.] Exhortations to united firmness, to mutual concord, to humility; and in general to earnestness in religion. 27.] μόνον,—
i. e. I have but this to ask of you, in the prospect of my return:—see reff. 

πολιτευεσθε] The πολιτευμα being the heavenly state, of which you are citizens, ch. iii. 20. The expression is found in Jos. (Antt. iii. 5.8) and in Philo, and is very common in the fathers: e. g. P. Ignat. Trall. 9, p. 783, ὁ λόγος σας ἐγένετο, κ. ἐπολιτεύεσθαι ἅνεω ἀμαρτίας,—Cyr. J. Catech. Illu., iv. 1, p. 51, ιδαγγελον ἑων πολιτευεσθαι. See Suicer in voc. The emphasis is on ἄνω τ. ε. τοῦ χρ. 

[να ἐπο τ. Κ.Λ.] This clause is loosely constructed,—the verb ἀκοῦω belonging properly only to the second alternative, ἐπο ἄρων, but here following on both. Meyer tries to meet this by understanding ἀκοῦω in the former case, 'hear from your own mouth? but obviously, ἀκοῦω is the real correlative to ἀκοῦω, only constructed in a loose manner: the full construction would be something of this kind, ὅνα, ἐπο ἐλλον κ. ἀκοῦω ὅν ἀκοῦω κ. ἀκοῦω το περί ὑμᾶν, γινω ὦτι στήκετε. Then το περί ὑμᾶν, ὦτι στήκετε is another irregular construction—the article generalizing that which the ὦτι particularizes, as in οἶδα σε, τίς εἶ, and the like. 

ἐν ἐν πνεύματι] refers to the unity of spirit in which the various members of the church would be fused and blended in the case of perfect unity: but when Meyer and De W. deny that the Holy Spirit is meant, they forget that this one spirit of Christians united for their common faith would of necessity be the Spirit of God which penetrates and inspires them: cf. Eph. iv. 3, 4. Then, as this Spirit is the highest principle in us,—he includes also the lower portion, the animal soul; 

[μιὰ ψυχὴ συναθλοῦντες] These words must be taken together, not ψυχὴ taken with στήκετε as in apposition with πνεύματι (Chr., Thl., all), which would leave συναθλ. without any modal qualification. The ψυχὴ, receiving on the one hand influence from the spirit, on the other impressions from the outer world, is the sphere of the affections and moral energies, and thus is that in and by which the exertion here spoken of would take place. συναθλοῦντες, either with one another (so Chr., Thirt., Thl., Ec., all, De W., al), or with me (so Eras., Luth., Beza, Bengel, al., Meyer). The former is I think preferable, both on account of the ἐν πν. and μιὰ ψυχή, which naturally prepare the mind for an united effort, and because his own share in the contest which comes in as a new element in ver. 30, and which Meyer adjoins as a reason for his view, seems to me, on that view, superfluous; ἐπο after συναθλοῦντες (cf. ch. iv. 3) would have expressed the whole. I would render then as E. V., striving together. τῇ πίστει is a 'dativus commodi'—for the faith, cf. Jude 3—not, as Eras. Paraph., 'with the faith,' 'adjuvantes decertantem adversus impios evangeli iidem: for such a personification of πίστει would be without example: nor is it a dative of the instrument (Beza, Calv., Grot., al.), which we have already had in ψυχῇ, and which could hardly be with the εἰς εὐαγγ. added. 

28.] πτυχα, akin to πτομα, πτάσας, πτήσας, to frighten, especially said of animals (ref.), but often also used figuratively, e. g. by Plato, Alexh. p. 370 a, οὐκ ἐν πτυχείν τον βάτανον: Ps-Clem. Hom. ii. 39, p. 71, πτύγατες τοῦ ἀπαθεῖς ὁδούς. 

ἐν μιᾶν] in nothing, see on ver. 20. 

The ἀντικεῖμενοι, from the comparison which follows with his own conflict, and the ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν, must be the adversaries of the church, whether Jews or 
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Gentiles, cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 9. ἡτις, viz. τό άναμ μη πτέρεσαι, fem., on account of ἐνεδίεις, following: see a similar ἡτις, Eph. iii. 13. εἰδ. ἀπωλ., because it will show that all their arts are of no avail against your union and firmness and hopefulness: and thus their own ruin (spiritual, as the whole matter is spiritual), in hopelessly contending against you, is pointed out, not perhaps to themselves as perceiving it, but to themselves if they choose to perceive it. τριών δε σω. but (is a sign) of your (see var. read.) salvation (spiritual again: not merely, rescue and safety from them), and this (viz. the sign, to them of perdition, to you of your salvation: not to be referred to σωτηρίας, nor merely to βασιν δε σωτ. [Calv., al.], nor to both ἀπωλ. and σωτ., nor to the following sentence [Clem. Alex. (Strum. iv. 13, vol. i.p. 614 P.), Chrys., Thlart., al.], but simply to ἐνεδίεις: the sign is one from God) from God,—because (proof that the sign is from God, in that He has granted to you the double proof of His favour, not only, &c.) to you (first emphasis) it was granted (second emphasis—γρατίν μνημος, σιγμα σαλπιτ. (?) est.) there. The orist refers to the fact in the dealings of God regarded as a historical whole, on behalf of Christ (the Apostle seems to have intended immediately to add πάλαις, but, the υδ μνην κ. τ. Α. coming between, he drops τό επηρ χριστου for the present, and takes it up again by and by with ἅπερ απωλ. The rendering of τό υπ. χ., absolute, to you it is given in the behalf of Christ (E.V.), ‘quod attinet ad Christi causam,’ is manifestly wrong), not only to believe on Him, but also on his behalf to suffer, 30.] having (the nominative instead of: the dative, the subjective ὑμεῖς being before the Apostle’s mind: so Eph. iv. 2.—Thuc. iii. 36, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς: . . . ἐπίκαιοντες: ib. vi. 24, καὶ ἐως ἑκάστης πᾶσιν . . . ἐκείνον ὑπέτεθεν: Sallust, Jug. 112, ‘populo Romanino melius visum . . . rat.:’ see other examples in Kühner, ii. p. 377. This is far better than with Lachm., al., to parenthetize ἡτις . . . πάλαις, which unnecessarily breaks the flow of the sentence) the same conflict (one in its nature and object) as ye saw (viz. when I was with you, Acts xvi. 16 ft.) in me (in my case as its example), and now hear of in me (ἐν ἑμοί, as before, not ‘de me.’ He means, by report of others, and by this Epistle). 11. . . . Exhortation to unity and humility (1-11), after the example of Christ (5-11). 1.] He introduces in the fervour of his affection (ὑπα πας λαπαρώς, πας σφοδρώς, πας μετά συμπαθείας παλληγ., Chr.) four great points of the Christian life and ministry, and by them enforces his exhortation. Mey. observes, that the four fall into two pairs, in each of which we have first the objective principle of Christian life (ἐν χριστῷ and πνεύματος), and next the subjective principle (ἀγάπης and σπλαγχν. κ. ἀκινητωδῆς). And thus the awakening of motives by these four points is at the same time (so Chrys. above) powerful and touching. παράκλησις here, exhortation, not ‘comfort,’ which follows in παραμεθον. ἐν χριστῷ specifies the element of the exhortation. παραμιθ. better comfort, than ‘persuasion’; it corresponds (see above) to σπλ. κ. οἰκτίρ. in the other pair: see also reff. παραμιθθα, the ear-
lier form, occurs in the same sense 1 Cor. xiv. 3; Wisd. xix. 12. ἀγάπης is the subjective genitive,— consolation furnished by love. 

κοιν. τν. πν. communion.—fellowship, of the Holy Spirit, cf. ref. 2 Cor.: not, 'spiritual communion' (De W., al.). The MSS. evidence in favour of the reading εἰ τισ is overwhelming; and in Tischendorf's language, "nobis servandum eti tis, nisi malnus grammatici quam editoris partes agere." It is in its favour, that almost all the great MSS. have εἰ τισ before παραμύθων. For if εἰ τισ had been mere mechanical repetition of the preceding, why not in one place as well as in the other? And if this were once so, and the former εἰ τισ got altered back to its proper form, why not also this? The construction may be justified perhaps as analogous to ἡχλον. . ἡχλων, Mark viii. 1; see also Luke ii. 17; vii. 49: though, it must be confessed, it is the harshest example of its kind.


I may, that the exhortation being addressed to the Philippians, the εἰ τισ and εἰ πι are to be taken subjectively—

If there be with you any &c. 2. παραμύθων has the emphasis—'he already had joy in them, but it was not complete, because they did not walk in perfect unity': cf. ch. i. 9. τια, of the purpose, as always— but here as frequently, of a correlative result, contemplated as the purpose: never, however, without reason: e.g., here the maxims of the Philippians is the far greater and more important result, to which the παραμύθων μοι τὴν χ. is but accessory.

τὸ αὐτὸ φρονήτης This expression (be of the same mind) is more general than τὸ εὖ φρονεῖτε ('being of one mind') below. And this is all that can be reasonably said of the difference between them. In the more servile portions of such an Epistle as this, we must be prepared for something very nearly approaching to tautology. Βασίλ. says Chrys., παραδίκα τὸ αὐτὸ ἀληθεύει ἀπὸ διαθέσεων πολλῆς. τ. αὐτὴν ἀγάπ. ἐχόντων τουτοτιν, ὤμως καὶ φίλες κ. φιλεσθῆ, Chrys. ὀμυφ. τ. εὖ φφ.] to be taken together as one designation only: ὀμυφ. having the emphasis, and defining the τὸ εὖ φφ., with union of soul, unanimous (mining one thing). So that the Apostle does not, as Ἐκ., διπλασιάζει τὸ διμορφονίαν. 3. μὴ δὲν— φρονούντες, scil. from the last verse: —entertaining no thought in a spirit of (according to, after the manner of) self-seeking (see note, Rom. ii. 8, on the common mistaken rendering of this word), nor in a spirit of vainglory (κενοδοξία, ματαια τις περί ἑαυτοῦ οὕσης, Suidas), but by means of humility of mind (article either generic or possessive: in the latter case assuming ταπεινοφορονίαν as a Christian grace which you possess. The dative is either modal [ch. i. 18. Rom. iv. 20], or instrumental, or more properly perhaps,
causal: see Ellicott’s note) esteeming one another superior to yourselves (i.e. each man his neighbour better than himself); each (the plural is only found here in the N. T., and unusual elsewhere: it occurs in Thuc. i. 2, μᾶθαι ἐκατον τήν ἡμῶν ἀπολειτότενς,—Hom. Od. i. 161, παλαί γὰρ ἐν άκμονοις ἐκατον ἡμῶν ηφισαμένοι) regarding (cf. both for expressions and sense, Herod. i. 8, πάλαι τα καλά άνθρώποι έξείρησαν . . . έν τοις ἐν τοίδε ἐστί, σκοπέων τινά τα ἐκατον: Thuc. vi. 12, τα ἐκατον μόνον σκοπών) not their own matters, but each also the matters of others (“this second clause [Mey.] is a feeble contrast than might have been expected after the absolute negation in the first.”) The καί shows that that first is to be taken with some allowance, for by our very nature, each man must σκοπεύω, to ἐκατον in some measure). On the nature of the strife in the Philippian church, as shown by the exhortations here, see Prolegg. § ii. 7. [5—11.] The exhortation enforced, by the example of the self-denial of Christ Jesus. The monographs on this important passage, which are very numerous, may be seen enumerated in Meyer. Σερ (reason for the exhortation of the preceding verse) think this in (not 'among,' on account of the καί), following. On the reading, see various readings, and Fritzscheorum Opuscula, p. 40 note) yourselves, which was (ἐφορεύετο) also in Christ Jesus (as regards the dispute, whether the ἄγας ὑπάρχων or the ἄγας ἐστιν were here spoken of, see below. I assume now, and will presently endeavour to prove, that the Apostle’s reference is first to the taking on Ἰημου of our humanity, and then to his further humiliation in that humanity): who subsisting (originally: see on ὑπάρχω and εἰμι, Acts xvi. 20. Less cannot be implied in this word than eternal pre-existence. The participle is hardly equivalent to “although he subsisted,” as Ellic., still less “inasmuch as he subsisted;” but simply states its fact as a link in the logical chain, “subsisting as He did;” without fixing the character of that link as causal or concessive) in the form of God (not merely the nature of God, which however is implied: but, as in Heb. i. 3, the αὐτάσιμα τ. βίου κ. χάρακτηρ τ. υποστάσεως αὐτοῦ—cf. John vii. 37, οὕτω ἐλθος αὐτών ἐκείνατε, with ib. xvii. 5, τῷ βίῳ ἐλευθεροποιεῖται τοῦ λόγου ἐλευθεροποιεῖται. “Ipsa natura divina decorum habebat infinitum in se, etiam sine uilla creatura illam gloriam intuente.” Beng. See also Col. i. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 4. That the divine nature of Christ is not here meant, is clear: for He did not with reference to this ἐκείνωσαν ἐκατόν, ver. 7) deemed not his equality (notice ισα, not ἴσον, bringing out equality in nature and essence, rather than in Person) with God a matter for grasping. The expression is one very difficult to render. We may observe, (1) that ἀρπαγμὸν holds the emplacive place in the sentence: (2) that this fact casts τοῦ εἰδα ισα θεός into the shade, as secondary in the sentence, and as referring to the state indicated by ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων above: (3) that ἀρπαγμὸς strictly means, as here given, the act of seizing or snatchineg [so in the only place in profane writers where it occurs, viz. Plut. de Fucorum ed., p. 120 a, καὶ τόὺς μὲν ὁθῆκε κ. τόὺς Ἀθηναίων, κ. τόν ἔτος ἑκατον, κ. τῷ Ἐράσιο ἐκ Κρήτης καλούμενον ἀρπαγμόν. One thing must also be remembered,—that in the word, the leading idea is not ‘snatching from another,’ but ‘snatching, grasping, for one’s self.’—it
answers to τὰ ἐαυτῶν σκοποῦντες above), not [Ἀρταγμα] the thing so seized or snatched: but that here, τὸ εἶναί ἵνα θέσῃ, i.e. a state, being in apposition with it, the difference between the act [subjective] and the thing [objective] would logically be very small: (4) that τὸ εἶναί ἵνα θέσῃ is no new thing, which He thought it not robbery to be, i.e. to take upon Him, but His state already existing, respecting which He ὑπὲρ γῆς αὐτοῦ &c. (5) that this clause, being opposed by ἀλλὰ to His great act of self-denial, cannot be a mere secondary one, conveying an additional detail of His Majesty in His pre-existent state, but must carry the whole weight of the negation of selfishness on His part: (6) that this last view is confirmed by the ἡγησάται, taking up and corresponding to ἡγομένου above, ver. 5. (7) Other renderings have been — (a) of those who hold τὸ εἶναί ἵνα θέσῃ, as above to be virtually identical with εὐνομή θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν before, Chrys. says, οὐ τούθευσέν οὐκ ἐφοβήθη καταβάσαντι απὸ τοῦ ἐξεισάγουσαν ἤγησαν τῇ ἡγησάται τὸν ἰδίαν τούτον, οὐκ ἐδοθείς με τὸν αὐτὸν ἀφήγησαν τῷ Δαίμονι ἄνευ, διά καὶ ἀπεδέχθη αυτὸ, διδότο τοῦτο εἰπέν τινι ἡγησάται, ἀλλὰ ἤγησαν τῷ ἄραμαντος, ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐξεισάγουσαν ἤγησαν τῇ ἡγησάται τῷ ἰδίαν τούτῳ διὰ τοῦτο εἰπέν τινι ἡγησάται, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἄραμαντος ἤγησαν διὰ τοῦτο εἰπέν τῇ ἡγησάται τῷ ἰδίαν τούτῳ ἄραμαντος: ἦν τῷ ἐξεισάγουσαν ἤγησαν τῇ ἡγησάται τῷ ἰδίαν τούτῳ ἄραμαντος: ἦν τῷ ἐξεισάγουσαν ἤγησαν τῇ ἡγησάται τῷ ἰδίαν τούτῳ ἄραμαντος: (7) We have now to enquire, whether the opening of the passage will bear to be understood of our Lord already incarnate. De Wette, {Christ had, when He began His Messianic course, the glory of the godhead potentially in Himself, and might have devoted Himself to manifesting it forth in His life: but seeing that it lay not in the purpose of the work of Redemption that He should at the commencement of it have taken to Himself divine honour, had He done so, the assumption of it would have been an act of robbery. — Lünnemann [in Meyer]: ‘Christus, etsi ab aeterno inde dignitate creatoris et dominii rerum omnium fruueretur, ideoque divina indutus magnificentia coram patre consideretur, nihil tamen minus haud arripiebatur sibi esse autem etren exordium cum Deo aequalis, sed utrobo se exinaniter.’ And in fact Arius [and his party] had led the way in this explanation: οὗτος δὲ ἅμα καὶ ὅλας ὑπὸ ἡγησάται τὸ εἶναί ἵνα τῷ θεῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ καὶ μείζον. See this triumphantly answered in Chrys. Hom. vi. in loc. Indeed the whole of this method of interpretation is rightly charged with absurdity by Chrys., seeing that in εὐνομή θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν we have already equality with God expressed: εἶ ἡ θέως, πας ὤν ἵνα ἄρπασαι; κ. τ. ως οὐκ ἀπερίποις τοῦτο; τις γὰρ ἦν οἶοι, οἳ δὲ δεινὰ, κυνηγοὶ αὐτῶν, ὅλας ἡγησάται τῇ ἡγησάται τῇ ἰδίᾳ ταύτῃ ἅμα καὶ μείζον: καὶ οὕτως ἡγησάται τῷ ἰδίᾳ ταύτῃ ἅμα καὶ μείζον. But the answer to this is easy, viz. that that name ἄρχων ἑσπεροῖ cannot apply to the ἀγέως ἄρπασω. But for that name applies to the entire historical Person of our Lord, of whom the whole passage is said, and not merely to Him in His pre-existent state. That one and the same Person of the Son of God, εὐνομὴ θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν, afterwards εὐδωκιμοὶ ἀρχων ἐγένετο, gathering to itself the humanity, in virtue of which He is now designated in the concrete, Christ Jesus. So that the dispute virtually resolves itself into the question between the two lines of interpretation given above,—on which I have already pronounced. But it seems to me to be satisfactorily settled by the contrast between εὐνομὴ θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν and εὐνομή θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν.

— Christ, quin possis esse pariter Deo, non arripit, non duxit rupinam, non subito usus est illa facultate? De Wette, ‘Christ had, when He began His Messianic course, the glory of the godhead potentially in Himself, and might have devoted Himself to manifesting it forth in His life: but seeing that it lay not in the purpose of the work of Redemption that He should at the commencement of it have taken to Himself divine honour, had He done so, the assumption of it would have been an act of robbery.’ — Lünnemann [in Meyer]: ‘Christus, etsi ab aeterno inde dignitate creatoris et dominii rerum omnium fruueretur, ideoque divina indutus magnificentia coram patre consideretur, nihil tamen minus haud arripiebatur sibi esse autem etren exordium cum Deo aequalis, sed utrobo se exinaniter.’ And in fact Arius [and his party] had led the way in this explanation: οὗτος δὲ ἅμα καὶ ὅλας ὑπὸ ἡγησάται τὸ εἶναί ἵνα τῷ θεῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ καὶ μείζον. See this triumphantly answered in Chrys. Hom. vi. in loc. Indeed the whole of this method of interpretation is rightly charged with absurdity by Chrys., seeing that in εὐνομὴ θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν we have already equality with God expressed: εἶ ἡ θέως, πας ὤν ἵνα ἄρπασαι; κ. τ. ως οὐκ ἀπερίποις τοῦτο; τις γὰρ ἦν οἶοι, οἳ δὲ δεινὰ, κυνηγοὶ αὐτῶν, ὅλας ἡγησάται τῇ ἡγησάται τῇ ἰδίᾳ ταύτῃ ἅμα καὶ μείζον: καὶ οὕτως ἡγησάται τῷ ἰδίᾳ ταύτῃ ἅμα καὶ μείζον. But the answer to this is easy, viz. that that name ἄρχων ἑσπεροῖ cannot apply to the ἀγέως ἄρπασω. But for that name applies to the entire historical Person of our Lord, of whom the whole passage is said, and not merely to Him in His pre-existent state. That one and the same Person of the Son of God, εὐνομὴ θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν, afterwards εὐδωκιμοὶ ἀρχων ἐγένετο, gathering to itself the humanity, in virtue of which He is now designated in the concrete, Christ Jesus. So that the dispute virtually resolves itself into the question between the two lines of interpretation given above,—on which I have already pronounced. But it seems to me to be satisfactorily settled by the contrast between εὐνομὴ θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν and εὐνομή θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν.
and μορφή δύναμιν λαβὼν. These two cannot belong to Christ in the same incarnate state. Therefore the former of them must refer to his pre-incarnate state.

7.] but emptied Himself (εἰσίν αὐτῶν emphatic, — not ἐκένωσεν αὐτῶν.

ἐκένωσεν, contrast to ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγισ.— he not only did not enrich himself, but he emptied himself:—He used His equality with God as an opportunity, not for self-exaltation, but for self-abasement. And the word simply and literally means, 'eximiavit' [vulg.], as above. He emptied Himself of the μορφή θεοῦ [not His essential glory, but its manifested possession: see on the words above: the glory which He had with the Father before the world began, John xvii. 5, and which He resumed at His glorification]—He ceased while in this state of eximiation, to reflect the glory which He had with the Father. Those who understand ὑπὸ above of the incarnate Saviour, are obliged to explain away this powerful word: thus Calv., 'in anillo hoc eadem est cum humiliatione quam posse videbimus:' Calv., 'veluti desposuit:' Le Clerc, 'non magis ea usus est, quam si ea destillitus fuisse:' De W., 'the manner and form of the κίνωσις is given by the three following participles: λαβὼν, γενόμενος, εὑρεθείς: alli alter' by taking the form of a servant (specification of the method in which He emptied Himself: not co-ordinate with [as De W., al.] but subordinate to ἐκένωσεν ισαυν.

The participle λαβὼν does not point to that which has preceded ισαυν. ἐκένων, but to a simultaneous act, = as in εἰ γ' ἐποίησα ἀνάρμοσα σα με [Plat. Phed. p. 60 d], see Bernhardy, Synt. p. 383, and Harless on Eph. i. 13. And so of γενόμενοι below.

The δοῦλος is contrasted with 'equality with God;'—and imports 'a servant of God,'—not a servant generally, nor a servant of man and God. And this state, of a servant of God, is further defined by what follows), being made (by birth into the world, — becoming: but we must not render the general, γενόμενος, by the particular, 'being born') in the likeness of men (cf. εἰ δυνατότα σαρκός ἀμαρτίας, Rom. viii. 3. He was not a man, purus putus homo [Mey.], but the Son of God manifest in the flesh and nature of men. On the interpretation impugned above, which makes all these clauses refer to acts of Christ, in our nature, this word δομώματι loses all meaning. But on the right interpretation, it becomes foreivable in giving another subordinate specification to μορφή δύναμιν λαβὼν — viz. that He was made in like form to men, who are θεοῦ δύναμις. 8.] My interpretation has hitherto come very near to that of Meyer. But here I am compelled to differ from him. He would join καὶ σε ἐνρ., ός ἄνθρ. to the foregoing, put a period at ἄνθρ., and begin the next sentence by ἐταπέινωσεν without a copula. The main objection to this with me, is, the word εὑρεθείς. It seems to denote the taking up afresh of the subject, and introducing a new portion of the history. Hitherto of the act of laying aside the form of God, specified to have consisted in μορφή δύναμιν λαβὼν, and εἰ δι. ἄνθρώπων γενεθαι. But now we take Him up again, this having past; we find Him in his human appearance — and what then? we have further acts of self-humiliation to relate. So Van Hengel: "duo enim, ut puto, diversa hic tradit Paulus, et quamnam vivendi rationem Christus inicir, .... et quomodo hanc vivendi rationem ad mortem usque persecutus sit." And when He was (having been) found in having (guise, outward semblance; e. g. of look, and dress, and speech. σχήματι is a more specific repetition of ὁμοίων. above: and is here emphatic: 'being found in habit, &c. He did not stop with this outward semblance, but ...') as a man (for He was not a man, but God [in Person], with the humanity taken on Him: ὃς ἄνθρωπος — ἡ γὰρ ἀναληφθείσα φύσις τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἄνατος ἐκ τοῦ ὄντος του ην τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, Thlart.) He humbled himself (in His humanity: a further act of self-denial. This time, ἵνα does not precede, because, as Meyer well says,—in ver. 7 the pragmatic weight rested on the reflexive reference of the act, but here on the reflexive act itself) by becoming (see on the aorist participle above. It specifies, wherein the ταπεινώσις consisted) obedient (to God; as before in the δοῦλον: not 'capientibus se, dam-

nautibus et interficientibus, as Grot. See Rom. v. 19, Heb. v. 8 f., and ver. 9,—διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς,—referring to the τῷ θεῷ here understood) even unto (as far as) death (the climax of His obedience. μετά θανάτου must not be taken with ἑπταεισοριαν, as Beng., al., which breaks the sentence awkwardly), and that the death of the cross (on this sense of δέ, see ref., and note there:—τοῦτοι οὖν ἐκαταρατόν, τοῦ τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἀφαρμόζον, Thl.).

9—11.] Exaltation of Jesus, consequent on this His humiliation:—brought forward as an encouragement to follow His example. "Quod autem beati sint qui quisque sponte humiliatur cum Christo, probat ejus exemplum: nam a despectissima sorte evictus fuit in summam altitudinem. Quicunque ergo se humiliat, similiter exaltabitur. Quis nunc submissionem recuseat, quia in gloriam regni coelestis conseceditur?" Calvin. Wherefore (i.e. on account of this His self-humiliation and obedience: see Heb. ii. 9, note: not as Calv., 'quo facto,' trying to evade the meritorious obedience of Christ thus, 'quod dictio illativa hie magis consequiatur sonet quam causam, hinc patet, quod aliqui sequetur, hominem divinos honores posse mereri et ipsum Dei thronum acquirere, quod non modo absurdim sed dictu etiam horrendum est: frivolly forgetting that herein Christ was not a man, nor an example what we can do, but the eternal Son of God, lowering Himself to take the nature of men, and in it rendering voluntary and perfect obedience also (introduces the result, ref. and Luke i. 35; Acts x. 20) God (on His part: reference to the τῷ θεῷ understood after ἐπίκοιος above) highly exalted Him (not only ὑψωσεν, but υπερψωσεν; His exaltation being a super-eminent one, cf. ἐπεριπνικᾶν, Rom. viii. 37, also 2 Cor. xii. 7; 2 Thess. i. 3. Not, 'hath highly exalted: the reference is to a historical fact, viz. that of His Ascension), and gave to Him (the Father being greater than the incarnate Son, John xiv. 28, and having by His exaltation of Jesus to His throne, freely bestowed on Him the kingly office, which is the completion of His Mediatorship, Rom. xiv. 9) the name which is above every name (ὅνομα must be kept, against most Commentators, to its plain sense of ονομα,—and not rendered 'glory,' or understood of His office. The name is, the very name which He bore in His humiliation, but which now is the highest and most glorious of all names, τὸ ὅνομα ΙΗΣΟΥΣ. Compare His own answer in glory, Acts ix. 5, ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς, ὅπερ δικαιοῦσαι. As to the construction in the rec. without the τῷ before ὅνομα, the indefinite ὅνομα is afterwards defined to be that name, which we all know and reverence, by τῷ ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ. The τῷ before ὅνομα may have been inserted to assimilate the expression to the more usual one). 10.] that (intent of this exaltation) in the name of Jesus (emphasis, as the ground and element of the act which follows) every knee should bend (i.e. all prayer should be made [not, as E. V., 'at the name of Jesus every knee should bow,'—which surely the words will not bear]. But what prayer? to Jesus, or to God through Him? The only way to answer this question is to regard the general aim of the passage. This undoubtedly is, the exaltation of Jesus. The εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός below is no deduction from this, but rather an additional reason why we should carry on the exaltation of Jesus until this new particular is introduced. This would lead us to infer that the universal prayer is to be to Jesus. And this view is confirmed by the next clause, where every tongue is to confess that Jesus Christ is kóipos, when we remember the common expression, ἐπικαλεσθαι τῷ ὅνομα κυρίου, for prayer: Rom. x. 12 f.; 1 Cor. i. 2 [2 Tim. ii. 22]; Acts [vii. 59] ix. 14, 21; xxii. 16), of those in heaven (angels. Eph. i. 10, 21. Heb. i. 6) and those on earth (men) and those under the earth (the dead: so Hom. II. i. 457, Zeus καταχθόνιοι, Pluto; so.
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II.

1. John iii. 12.
2. 1 Cor. xx. 40.
3. 1 Cor. 30.
4. 1 Cor. viii. 19.
5. James ii. 15.
6. Acts xiv. 11 only.

m here only.

Rom. xiv. 11.
1. E. F.
νυάριον (vulgar.

m = 1 Cor. v.
8. n. v.

2 Cor. 3. 18.
Acts xv. 25.
Rom. 1. 7.
xvii. 6, 7.
1 Cor. x. 14.

11. rec εξωμολογησιται, with ΒΚ rel Eus Cyr: txt ACDFXL α(υν ect at end of ms)
d e k m Ωhe Αth-mss3, om χριστος F Eus. (not F-lat.)

12. for αγαπητοι, αδελφοι Λ, some lectionaries, demid aeth. om ως B 3. 17. 48.

72. 178 Syr copt arm Chr, lat-ff. om 1st εν FN3 fuld G-lat G-lat Ambst.
pol. μαλ. bef νυ νF datt arm Ambst Pelag: om νυ f k 4. 33. 115 Chr-comm Thl.
on εν τη αποστ. μον F.

Thirt.: ἐπουριάσως καλεὶ τῶς ἀρατόντων δυνάμεις, ἐπείγοντο δὲ τοὺς ὥς ἔφαται ἄνθρωπος, καὶ καταχθονίως τῶς ἐκφοβισόμενος. Various erroneous interpretations have been given—e.g. Chr., Thl., Β., Eusm. understand by καταχθός, the devils—and Chr., Thl. give metaphorical meanings, οἱ ὀκεῖαν κ. οἱ ἀμαρτωλοί, 11.] and every tongue (of all the classes just named) shall confess (result of the παν γόνων κάμαρα that Jesus Christ is Lord (see the predicate κόσμος similarly prefixed in 1 Cor. xii. 3) to the glory (so as for such confession to issue in the glory) of God the Father (which is the great end of all Christ's mediation and mediatorial kingdom, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. 'Ut Dei majestas in Christo relucaet, et Pater glorificaretur in Filio. Vide Johan. v. et xvii., et habebis hujus loci expositum.' Calv.). 12—16.] After this glorious example, he exhorts them to earnestness after Christian perfection.

12. οὕστε] wherefore—i. e. as a consequence on this pattern set you by Christ. The ὑπεκουότατε answers to γε-γονεύοντο υπήκοοι ver. 8, and σωτηρία to the exaltation of Christ. It is therefore better, with Meyer, to refer οὕστε to that which has just preceded, than with De Wette, Wiesinger, al., to all the foregoing exhortations, ch. i. 27 ff. ὑπεκουότατε i. e. to God, as Christ above: not as ordinarily, 'to me' or 'my Gospel.' This last De W. grounds on the presence and absence of the Apostle mentioned below: those clauses however do not belong to ὑπεκουότατε, but to κατεργάσεσθε. This is evident by μη ὡς and νῦν. In fact it would be hardly possibly logically to connect them with ὑπεκουότατε. As it is, they connect admirably with κατεργάσεσθε, see below. οὕστε is by no means super-

fluous, but gives the sense not as if (it were a matter to be done) in my presence only,—but now (as things are at present) much more (with more earnestness) in my absence (because spiritual help from me is withdrawn from you) carry out (bring to an accomplishment) your own (emphasis on εαυτῶν, perhaps as directing attention to the example of Christ which has preceded,—as He obeyed and won His exaltation, so do you obey and carry out your own salvation) salvation (which is begun with justification by faith, but must be carried out, brought to an issue, by sanctification of the Spirit—a life of holy obedience and advance to Christian perfection. For this reason, the E. V., 'work out your own salvation,' is bad, because ambiguous, giving the idea that the salvation is a thing to be gotten, brought in and brought about, by ourselves) with fear and trembling (lest you should fail of its accomplishment at the last. The expression indicates a state of anxiety and self-distrust: see reff.—δεὶ γὰρ φοβεῖται κ. τρέμειν εν τῷ ἐργαζό-

θαι τὴν ἑαυτὸς σωτηρίαν ἐκαστὸν, μὴ ποτὲ ὑποκελεῖσθαι ἐκτίσει ταύτης. (Ec. in Meyer. And the stress of the exhortation is on these words:—considering the immense sacrifice which Christ made for you, and the lofty eminence to which God hath now raised Him, be ye more than ever earnest that you miss not your own share in such salvation. The thought before the Apostle's mind is much the same as that in Heb. ii. 3, πὼς ἡμεῖς εκεφυλι-μένα τηλικαίας ἀμέλησατε σωτηρίας::)

13.] encouragement to fulfill the last exhortation—for you are not left to yourselves, but have the almighty Spirit dwelling in you to aid you. "Intelligo," says Calvin, "gratiam supernaturalen,
11—15. ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΗΣΙΟΥΣ. 171

γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἑνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἑνεργεῖν ὑπό τῆς καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνδοκίας. 14 ἐπάνω ποιεῖτε χωρίς γογγυσμῶν καὶ διαλογισμῶν, ὅπως ἑγεθήσετε ἡμείς ὑμῖν.

8. v = Eph. i. 4 ref. 1 Pet. iv. 9 only. Exod. xvi. 7, 9. 9. ch. iii. 6, 1 Thess. iii. 13. Heb. viii. 7 only. Gen. xvii. 1. (τοῖς, 1 Thess. H. 10.)

12. rec ins ' δ ο ὑμῶν, with D2-3L rel: om ABCD F KN 17 Damasc. aft ενεργῶν ins δαυματις ἡμῶν C. aft ενδοκίας ins αὐτοῦ C.

15. for γενναθε, the AD F Latt: txt BCD KN rel Chr Thurt Philo-carp Damasc.

qua provenit ex Spiritu regenerantis. Nam quattuor sumus homines, jam in Deo summus, et vivimus, et movemur; verum hic de alio motu disputat, quam illo universaliter. This working must not be explained away with Pelagins (in May.), 'velle operatur suadendo et praemia promittendo?' it is an efficacious working which is here spoken of: God not only brings about the will, but creates the will—we owe both the will to do good, and the power, to His indwelling Spirit.

Ev ὑμ., not among you, but in you, as in ref. 1 Cor., and 2 Cor. iv. 12; Eph. ii. 2; Col. i. 29. The θέλειν and ἑνεργεῖν are well explained by Calvin: "Fatemur, nos a natura habere voluntatem: sed quoniam peccati corruptione mala est, tunc bona esse incipit, quum reformata est a Deo. Nec diciimus hominem quicquam boni facere, nisi volentem: sed tunc, quum voluntas regit a Spiritu Dei. Ergo quod ad hanc partem spectat, videmus Deo integram laudem assenti, ac frivolum esse quod sophistæ docent, offerri nobis gratiam et quasi in medio ponit, ut eam ampliæmorum si libeat. Nisi enim efficaciter ageret Deus in nobis, non dicercet efficere bonam voluntatem. De secunda parte idem sentiendum. Deus, inquit, est [ὁ] ἑνεργῶν ἑνεργεῖν. Perducit igitur ad finem usque pios affectus, quos nobis inspiravit, ne sint iritati: sicut per Ezechielem (xi. 20) promittit: Φασίαm in ut in praeceptis meli amabilis. Unde colligimus, perseverantiam quoque merum esse quia donum."

ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας [for the sake of His good pleasure,—i.e. in order to carry out that good counsel of His will which He hath purposed towards you: εὐδοκίαν δὲ τὸ ἁγαθὸν τοῦ θεοῦ προσέγραψε θέλημα θέλει δὲ πάντας ἄνθρωπονς σωθῆρα, κ. εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἑλθεῖς, Thurt. Cony. would join ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδ. with the following verse, —'do all things for the sake of good will'—and remarks, 'It is strange that so clear and simple a construction, involving no alteration in the text, should not have been before suggested.' But surely St. Paul could not have written thus. The sense of εὐδοκία indeed, would be the same as in ch. i. 15:—but that very passage should have prevented this conjecture. It must have been in that case here as there, δι' εὐδοκίαν, or at all events, ὑπὲρ εὐδοκίας: the insertion of the article where it is generally omitted from abstract nouns after a preposition, as here, necessarily brings in a reflexive sense,—to be referred to the subject of the sentence: and thus we should get a meaning very different from that given by Cony., viz. 'Do all things for the sake of (to carry out) your own good pleasure.' It has been proposed (I know not by whom, but it was communicated to me by letter: I see it also noticed in Elic.'s note, and Van Hengel's refutation of it referred to) to take εὐαυτός [ver. 12] as = ἄλλῳ ἐκ τούτων, and render "with fear and trembling labour heartily for one another's salvation:" thus connecting the ὠστε with ver. 4. The suggestion is ingenious, and as far as the mere question of the sense of εὐαυτόν goes, perhaps allowable; but see Eph. iv. 32; Col. iii. 13, 16; 1 Pet. iv. 8, 10; there are, however, weighty and I conceive fatal objections to it. 1) the emphatic position of εὐαυτόν, which restricts it to its proper meaning: 2) the occurrence of εὐαυτόν, in the very verse [4] with which it is sought to connect our passage, in its proper meaning—μὴ τὰ εὐαυτὸν ἐκαστοί σκοπεῖτε, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἑτέρων ἐκαστοῖ: 3) the context, and inference drawn by ὠστε, which this rendering altogether mistakes: see it explained above. 14 II. [More detailed excoriation, as to the manner of their Christian energizing. γογγυσμός, in every other place in the N. T. (refl.), as also in ref. Exod. signifies murmuring against men, not against God (as May.). And the context here makes it best to keep the same sense: such murmurings arising from selfishness, which is especially discommended to us by the example of Christ. This I still maintain as against Elic.: his rejection of John vii. 12 and 1 Pet. iv. 9, as not applicable, not seeming to me to be justifiable. Διαλογισμόνι, by the same rule, we should rather understand dis-
puttings with men, than doubts respecting God or duty (Mey.). It is objected that the N. T. meaning of διαλογισμὸς is generally the latter. But this may be doubted (see on 1 Tim. ii. 8); and at all events the verb διαλογίζω, and its cognate διαλέγομαι, must be taken for 'to dispute' in Mark ix. 33, 34. I cannot understand how either word can apply to matters merely internal, seeing that the primary object is stated below to be blameless, and good example to others: of μέσον γενεᾶς, κ.τ.λ. 15.] ἀμετριτόν, without blame, ἀκέραιον, 'pure, simples, vulg. acth: sinceres [x], Cl ar om.: δ μη κεκαμένοι κακοίς, ἀλλ' ἀπόλους καὶ ἀπόκιλος, Etym. Mag. ... For the distinction between ἀκέραιος, ἀπόλους, and ἀκάκος, see Tittm. Synon. i. p. 27." Ellicott. On τέκνα θεοῦ, see especially Rom. viii. 14, 15. ἀκάκος, blameless: unblamed, and unblameable: Herod. uses it, i. 177, of a law: τὸ ἐκείνοι ἐστὶν, ἐκείνοι ἀμέμορο πόνος, The whole clause is a reminiscence of ref. Dent., where we have τέκνα κυρίων, γενεᾶ σκολιὰ κ. διεστραμμένη. For the figurative meaning of σκολιῶς, cf. ref. Acts and 1 Pet., and Plat. Legg. xii. p. 915 b, ἐν τίς τις ἐπιπ σκολιῶς καὶ τῶν ἡ τρέχας. — Gorg. p. 525 λ, πάντα σκολιὰ ὑπὸ γενεᾶς κ. ἀληθειῶν, κ. οἴ̂ νες εὖ γὰρ διὰ τὸ ἐκείνοις αὐτὰς τῆράφθαι: — and on διεστραμμένοι, διεστρέφοντο ὑπὸ κόλακος, Polyb. viii. 21. 3. ἐν, the masculine referring to those included in γενεᾶ: so Thuc. i. 136, φεύγοντες, ἐν Κεραμικῷ, ἀντωνίων εὐρεγήτης. See more examples in Kühner, i. p. 43. φαίνεσθαι, not imperative, as of the Fathers, Erasmi., Calvin, Grot., al., but indicative, for this is the position of Christians in the world: see Matt. v. 14; Eph. v. 8. So De W., Meyer, Wiesinger, &c. &c. It has been said (Mey., Wies., al.) that we must not render φαί- νεσθαι 'shine,' which would be φαίνεται: but surely there is but very little difference between 'appear' and 'shine' here, and only St. John and St. Peter use φαίνεσθαι for 'to shine,' John i. 5; v. 35; i John ii. 8; Rev. i. 16; 2 Pet. i. 19,—not St. Paul, for whom in such a matter their usage is no rule. Ellic. 1) objects that this must not be alleged against the simple meaning of the word, and 2) wishes to give the middle a special use in connexion with the appearance or rising of the heavenly bodies. But we may answer 1) by such examples as δέων δι' οὗ ἐστὶν φαίνων, where Rost and Palm translate the passive 'transitent;' and 2) by urging that such a reference seems here to lay too much emphasis on meaning of the word. φωτίζεσθαι, not 'lights' merely, but luminaries, 'heavenly bodies:' see ref. Gen.: and Sir. xiii. 7, Wisd. xiii. 2. ἐπικόντρα: probably as E. V. holding forth (hardly, as Ellic., "seeing ye hold forth," but "in that ye hold forth:" the participle being rather explicative than causal) to them, applying to them, which is the one of the commonest meanings of ἐπικόντρα,—see ref. Various senses have been given,—e. g. 'holding fast,' Luther, Estius, Bengel, De Wette, al.: 'in vertice tenentes,' Erasm.: 'sustinentes,' Calv.: 'possessing,' Meyer, who quotes for this meaning Herod. i. 101, ὁ δὲ Σκοτείων τῆς Ἀσίαν πάσαν ἐπικόντραν, and Thuc. ii. 101, ὁ δὲ τῆς τε Χαλκίδονος καὶ Βοττίκην κ. Μακεδονίαν ἥν εἰκόνα ἐπικόντραν—neither of which justify it: for in both these places it is 'to occur,' not 'to possess;' as also in Polyb. iii. 112. 8, εἰκόνα κ. θυσία κ. τ.λ. ... ἐπικόντρα τῆς τοίων. And this sense would manifestly be incompatible. His objection to the ordinary rendering, that the subjects of the sentence themselves shine by means of the λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, surely is irrelevant: for may not the stars be said 'prabere,' 'pretendere,' their light, notwithstanding that that light is in them? Chrys. (Ec., Thl., interpret it, μέλαντες ζήσονται, τῶν σω-
16—18. ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΙΝΩΝ

χριστοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἑκοπίσασα. 17 ἄλλα εἰ καὶ καὶ ὁ μὲν σφένδαμαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ τῇ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως εὐμῶν, χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πᾶσιν ἦμῖν ἵνα τὸ δ′ αὐτὸ καὶ ὡμές χαίρετε καὶ συγχαίρετε μοι.

καύσων δ. οὐδ' Β. 17. [αλλά, so BD1F.]  (Α def.) (homoeot.) Ν: ins Ν-corr.

ομοίων ὡμερεὶς and Chrys. continues οἱ φωστηρέας, φησι, λόγον φωτὸς ἐπέχουσιν οὐσεὶ λόγον ὑοῦς. τι ἑαυτὶ, λόγον ὑοῦς σπέρμα ζῷος ἔχοντες, τοῦτόσιν, ἐνέχειρα ζῷος ἔχοντες, αὐτήν κατέχοντες τὴν ζῴαν, τοῦτόσιν σπέρμα ζῷος ἔχοντες: Thdrtr., ἀντὶ τοῦ τῷ λόγῳ προσέχοντες τῇ ζῷᾳ, ungrammatically, for this would be λόγῳ ὑοῦς ἔχοντες, as δ ἐπέχειν αὐτοῖς, Acts iii. 5; cf. also ref. 1 Tim. εἰς καύσ., έμοί for (result of your thus walking, as conceives myself) a matter of boasting for me against (temporal: reserved for) the day of Christ, that (ὅτι οὐ μάτην τὴν ὄπερ ὑμῶν ἀνεβαίνην στούνθη, Thdrtr.) I did not run (the past tense is from the point of view of that day. ὄραμαν, see ref.) for nothing, nor labour for nothing (cf. ref. Job).

17, 18.] These verses are closely connected with the preceding; not, as De W., al, with ch. i. 26, which is most unnatural, and never would occur to any reader. The connexion is this: in ver. 16 he had tacitly assumed (eis ὑμ. χ.), that he should live to witness their blameless conduct even till the day of Christ. Now, he puts the other alternative—that the dangers which surrounded him would result in his death:—and in that case equally he rejoiced, &c.

ἐἰ καί implies more probability than καὶ εἰ: in the former the case is presupposed, in the latter merely hypothesized. Klottz in Devar. p. 519 f., gives two examples from Xen.'s Anabasis: (1) δοσισθείη γ' ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἰ εἰν τεθρήπτοις βούλητο άπεινα (iii. 2. 24), a supposition evidently thought improbable; (2) εἰγ', ὃ Κλέανδρε, εἴ καὶ οὗι με ἀδίκουτά τι ἀγεθεΐ (vi. 4. 27), where as evidently the speaker believes that Cleander does entertain the thought. The difference is explained by the common rules of emphasis. In εἰ καί, the stress is on εἰ, which is simply 'posita,' and the 'even' belongs to that which is assumed: in καὶ εἰ, the stress is on καί, even, and the strangeness belongs not to the thing simply assumed, but to the making of the assumption. In the present case then, the Apostle seems rather to believe the supposition which he makes. σπέν- δαμαι not future, but present: If I am even being poured out, because the danger was besetting him now, and waxing onward to its accomplishment. He uses the word literally, with reference to the shedding of his blood. "He represents his whole apostolic work for the faith of the Philippians, as a sacrifice: if he is put to death in the course of it, he will be, by the shedding of his blood, poured out as a libation upon this sacrifice, as among the Jews (Nmm. xxviii. 7; xv. 4 i. Jos. Antt. iii. 9. 4. Winer, RWB., s. v. Tranbkoper) and heathens, in their sacrifices, libations of wine were usual, which were poured over the offerings (Hom. II. λ. 175, σπέν- δαν αἵτις οἷον ἐπ' αἰδομένων ἰηροίν: cf. also Herod. ii. 39)." Meyer. Wetst., al, would render it 'affendor' (κατασπέν- δαμα), and understand it of the pouring of wine over a live victim destined for sacrifice—but wrongly. The θυσία is the sacrifice: i.e. the deed of sacrifice, not the victim, the thing sacrificed. Λε- τουργία, priest's ministration, without another article, signifying therefore the same course of action as that indicated by θυσία, viz. his apostolic labours: see below.

ὑμ., gen. objective; your faith is the sacrifice, which I, as a priest, offer to God. The image is precisely as in Rom. xv. 16, where he is the priest, offering up the Gentiles to God. And the case which he puts is, that he, the priest, should have his own blood poured out at, upon (i.e. in accession to: not locally "upon:" for it was not so among the Jews, see Ellie. here), his sacrificing and presentation to God of their faith. ἑαίρω not to be joined with εἰ, as Chrys., but absolute, I rejoice for myself (οὐχ ὡς ἀποθανόμενος λυτόσυμαι ἀλλὰ χαίρω, ὅτι στοιχή γίνο- μαι, Thl.) and congratulate you (so the Vulg. rightly, and all.: not, 'rejoice with
19. 'Ελευθής ἡ ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Τιμόθεου ταχέως πέμψας ἦν, ίνα καγώ εὑρίσχον γνώς τὰ περὶ ἔμων.

20. οὐδένα γὰρ ἥξω ἵνα ἰδούξην, ἐκτις γινήσω ἕνα περὶ ἔμων ἐμοινήσῃ. 21. οἱ παντες γὰρ τὰ τα εαυτὼν ἵντουσιν, ὁ τὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ 22. τίνι ἐξ καθεκμῖν αὐτοῦ γινώσκετε, ὅτι ὡς πατρὸ κέφαλον ἕναν ἱματισμὸν εὐσεβείαν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγελίον τοῦτον  ὡς εὐλπίων πέμψας,


22. for εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Κ.

you,' as most Commentators [even Ellie,]. Meyer well observes that the following verse is decisive for this: if they rejoiced already, what need of καὶ ὧμεις χαίρετε?—congratulate you, viz. on the fact that I have thus poured out for your faith, which would be an honour and a boast for you. De W.'s objection, after Van Hengel, that to congratulate would be συγχαίρομαι is futile: cf. Ἀσκλ., p. 34, τὴν Ἐστίαν ἐπιστεύσας τὴν βουλαίαν συγχαίρει τῇ πάλιν ὧτι τοιοῦτος ἔδρας ἐπὶ τὴν προσβολαὶ ἐξεπέμψεν: —Demosth. p. 194,—'Ροδίου ... συγχαίρω τῶν γεγενημένων: 13. and ('but' would be too strong: the contrast is only in the second account (accusative of reference, governed by χαίρε) do ye (imperative, not indicative, as Erasum., al.) rejoice (answer to συγχαίρω above,—for this your honour) and congratulate me (answer to χαίρω above,—on this my joy).

19—30.] Additional notices respecting the Apostle's state in his imprisonment: his intended mission of Timotheus and actual mission of Ephippiodotus. The connexion with the foregoing seems to be,—'and yet this στενωδοσία is by no means certain, for I hope to hear news of you soon, nay, to see you myself.' 19. ἐν κυρίῳ 'my hope is not an idle one, as a worldly man's might be; but one founded on faith in Christ,' I Cor. xv. 19, to which Meyer refers, is wholly different: see there. 

ταχέως, see ver. 23. ύμίν] The dative after verbs of sending, &c. need not be regarded (as De W., al., here) as the dative commodi, but is similar to that case after verbs of giving—indicating the position of the recipient. I stated in some former editions, that it is in no case equivalent to the mere local πρὸς θῶς. But Ellie has reminded me, that this is too widely stated, later writers undeniably using it in this sense. See note on Acts xxi. 16, and cf. such examples as πότερον ἡγόμεν Ἀθροκτόμη, Xen. Eph. iii. 6, and ἡγαγέν αὐτῶν Ἀθανασίω τῇ πάπτῃ, Epiph. vit. p. 310 d. The discussion in Winer, § 31. 5. καγώ, 'as well as you, by your reception of news concerning me,' εὐφ., may be of good courage. The verb is unknown to the classics: the imperative εὐφέσι are found in inscriptions on tombs, in the sense of the Latin 'hace pia anima.'

20.] Reason why he would send Timotheus above all others: for I have none else like-minded (with myself, not with Timotheus, as Beza, Calv., al.) who (of that kind, who) will really (emphatic:—without any secondary regards for himself, as in ver. 21) care for your affairs (have real anxiety about your matters, to order them for the best): 21.] for all (my present companions) (who these were, we know not: they are characterized, ch. iv. 21, merely as of ἐν ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοι—certainly not Luke—whether Demas, in transition between Philen. 24 and 2 Tim. iv. 10, we cannot say) seek their own matters, not those of Jesus Christ (no weakening of the assertion must be thought of, as that of rendering ὧτι πάντες, many, or most,—or understanding the assertion, care more about ἐν. than ἐν,,—as many Commentators: nor must it be restricted to the love of ease, &c., unwillingness to undertake so long a journey, as Chr., &c., Thl.: both ὧτι πάντες and the assertion are absolute).
23. see σταδίων, with B² C(-e) D³ K(e sill) L rel: txt AB¹BD¹FR¹ 17.
24. after astos ins εγώ Κ-corr¹, at end ins προς υμᾶς ΑΚ(Ν) (Χ) disapproving vulg
Syr copt Chr Thl Ambst Pelag Facund.
26. υμας λειτουργίας Β copt. aft υμας ins ιδων (supplement. Meyer defends it, seeing no reason why it should have been supplied here, and not in ch. i. 8: but how could it be ins there, seeing that εν σπαλαγχων χρη σησον follows) ACΔΝ¹ a b² f l in n 17 syrr copt ath arm Damasc Thl Cassiod: om BKKL¹ rel Chr Thdrt Victorin Ambst.

xvi. 1, 3,—xvii. 14),—viz.: that as a son (serves) a father, he served with me for (refr.) the Gospel. The construction is this: the Apostle would have written, 'as a son a father, so he served me,'—but changes it to 'so he served with me,' from modesty and reverence, seeing that we are not servants one of another, but all of God, in the matter of the Gospel. We must not supply σών before ταρπλ.:—when, in case of several nouns governed by the same preposition, that preposition is omitted before any, it is not before the first, cf. Plat. Rep. iii. p. 414, δει ος ταρπλι καταρτι τος χρισμον της χριστου εν ης εισα ρευεθαι: and see Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 205. The examples cited by Eliccott to disprove this, do not seem to me to apply: viz. Εσχ. Suppl. 313 [311], Eur. Hcl. 872 [563]: both are instances of local terms coupled by καί, and both occur in poetry, where the exigencies of metre come into play. Winer takes the construction as above, edn. 6, § 68, ii. 1: "as a son with a father" being, in the English translation [p. 599], a mistranslation of the German, 'wie dem Vater ein Kind,' and of a kind which considerably diminishes one's confidence in the accuracy of the English edition. μεν answers to δε, ver. 21: σων reasserts ver. 19. ως δεν οι αφίδου as soon as I shall have ascertained. On the force of the preposition, see Heb. xii. 2, note. ως δεν, of time, implying uncertainty as to the event indicated: see ref. and Ceseb, tab. p. 168, προστατεοτες δι τοις εις παρουσίας, τε δει αυτων πασιν, ως ειναι εισελθων εις τον θεον. See also Klotz, Devar. pp. 759. 63. The form αφίδου is supposed by Meyer to be owing to the pronunciation of θάδος with the digamma. The word signifies here, see clearly, as in Herod. viii. 37, ετελευτητης χρη της εισα ρευεθαι: and see such similar words: the preposition being not intensive (as Ellic. wrongly reports my view), but exhaustive.

τα περι ομηρυκτής. 24. εν κυριῳ] See above, ver. 19. και, as well as Timothy. 25—30.] Of. Epaphroditus: his mission: and recommendation of him. Epaphroditus is not elsewhere mentioned. The name was a common one; see Wetst. l. 1, and Tacit. Ann. xv. 55; Suet. Domit. 14. There is perhaps no reason for supposing him identical with Epaphras (Col. i. 7; iv. 12. Philm. 23), who was a minister of the Colossian church. We must not attempt to give a strict official meaning to each of the words predicated of Epaphroditus. The accumulation of them serves to give him greater recommendation in the eyes of the Philippians. 25.] συντρατ. applies to the combat with the powers of darkness, in which the ministers of Christ are the leaders: see besides ref, 2 Tim. ii. 3. ιδη δε] the contrast is to μου above. αποστολον, not in the ordinary sense of Apostle, so that ουμω should be as εθνων (αποστολος) in Rom. xi. 13,—but as in ref. 2 Cor. (where see note), almost = αποσταλεις δι' ουμων. λειτουργει] minister (in supply) of my want. Cf. λειτουργει below, ver. 30: and on χρειας, ref., especially Acts xx. 34. λειτουργουν δε αυτων ερηκε της χρειας, τα τα παρ αυτων
sate ὅτι ἠθένησεν. 27 καὶ γὰρ ἠθένησεν ἑπαρπαλτήσιον ἀλλὰ ὅ ὀνεὸς ἤλεγχεν αὐτὸν, οὐκ ἀυτῶν ἐξ ἑαυτῶν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς, ἵνα μὴ ἔβαλην ἐπὶ λύπην σχῶς.

28 ἵπποι σπουδαίωτέρως οὖν ἔπεμψα αὐτὸν, ἵνα ἰδώντες αὐτὸν πάλιν χαρᾶτε, καὶ ἀλυπότερος ἦς. 29 ἵπποι προσεύχασθε οὖν αὐτὸν εἰς κυρίῳ μετὰ πάσις χαρᾶς, καὶ τοὺς ὀικούμενοις ἑνετίμητες ὑπὸ τῆς διὰ τὸ ἐργον μέγιστον τοῖς ἑρωικοῖς δίκαιον. 30 ὕμνον ἐνθισμὸν εἰς τὸν χριστόν, διὰ τὸν ΔΚΛ, ἔποιησεν τὸν ἑρωίδην, ἐφευρέσας τὸν χαριτωμένον. 31 ἐπεφέρα ἐνθισμὸν εἰς τὸν ἑρωίδην, ἔποιησεν τὸν ΔΚΛ, ἔποιησεν τὸν χριστόν, διὰ τὸν ΔΚΛ, ἔποιησεν τὸν χριστόν.
III. 1. ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΗΣΙΟΥΣ.

III. 1 z Το λοιπόν, ἀδελφοί μου, χαίστε ἐν κυρίῳ, τά αὐτά γράφειν ἕμιν ἐμὶ μὲν ὤμιν ὀκνηρόν, ἕμιν δὲ

for meκρυ, eos DF.


CHAP. III. 1. for ta auta, tanta F-grN: txt N3.

doubt whether to read paraβολα- or paraβολευσάμενοι. Both words are unknown to Greek writers. The first verb would signify 'male consulere vita,' and is found not infrequently in the fathers, especially Chrys., which makes it all the more likely to have been introduced here for the other. This latter would be formed from paraβολας, 'venturesome,' as per-περημα from πέρημα (I Cor. xiii. 4), ἀλογγιαμα from ἀλογος (Cic. ad Att. vi. 4): similarly ἀστημεωμα, ἀλογρατεωμα, πανηγυρεωμα, &c. See Lobeck on Phryn. pp. 67, 591. Thus paraβολευσάμενοι would be used exactly as paraβάλλομαι in Polyb. ii. 26. 6, ἐφι δει μη κυνωνευων ετι, μηδε paraβαλλοναθ τοις διην, and iii. 94. 4, and paraβαλλεθαυ tais ψυχας in Diod. Sic. iii. 16. Phryn. (p. 238, cd. Lob.) says, paraβαλλον εδικυμόν τοῦτο, τη μὲν οὕτως ὀνοματι ὁ χρωνατι οἱ παλαιοι, τη δὲ ῥηματι, φαιο γὰρ οὕτω, paraβαλλομα τη μαντινεύον κεφαλη, ἐχρη σον κατι τοῦτον λεγων, paraβαλλεαθαι ἄφρονω. Hence also nurses of the sick were called paraβαλλαντε. See various patristic interpretations, and illustrations, in Tischendorf and Wetstein. Ίνα κτλ. that he might fill up (1 Cor. xvi. 17) your deficiency (viz. on account of your absence) in the ministration to me (the λειτουργία) was the contribution of money, which had been sent by Epaphroditus. The only ὑστερημα in this kind service was, their inability through absence, to minister it to the Apostle themselves, and this Epaphroditus filled up, and i...
ins to be ασφαλες d h k m n s. 113—116. 120—123 Procop Damasc. (A defective.)

3. rec. for θεου, θεω (perhaps corrig after such passages as Ρομ. i. 9, 2 Τιμ. i. 3), with D (and lat) Ν¹ vulg (with F-lat &c, agst ms.) Syr goth Thirt, lat-ff: θεω 115: txt ABCDE FK1R1 rel απο (Tischdf) gr-mss-ment-by-Aug ("ōmnes aut pæne omnes") lat-mss-in-Aug ("exempt. nonnulla" have θεω) syr-marg copt Ens Atl Orig-int Aug.exp., etc.

4. om και ΔΙΑ η ν Α ο ΝΑ Κ ο 4: αλλος bef δοκει D n latt: δε αλλος δοκει F: om αλλος al, Syr Chr-comm Lacuf Ambrst.—αλλος m., for εγώ Ν¹ has πε: txt Ncorr.

ὅσ καὶ ἄτομ ἡμῶν ἐφαρμόν ἐπιστολάς, may be true here, but does not belong here.


2.] βλέπετε, not, 'beware of,' as E. V. (BL. ἀπο, Mark xvi. 15 ref.), but as in refl., observe, with a view to avoid: cf. σκοπεῖ, Rom. xvi. 17. τοὺς κύριας] profane, impure persons. The appellation occurs in various references; but in the Jewish usage of it, uncleanness was the prominent idea: see, besides refl., Dent. xxiii. 15; Isa. lvi. 10, 11; Matt. xv. 26, 27. The remark of Chrys. is worth noting in connection with what follows: ὠφελείς τεκνά οὐδαιοι, ποτέ οἱ ἐθνικά τότε ἐκαλουτοῦν, μὴ ἐκείνους. But I would not confine it entirely to them, as the next clause certainly generalizes further.

t. κατατομήν] 'glorious appellationum perforationis, circumcisionis, vindicat Christianis.' Beng. Observe the (I will not say natural) usage of the term in connection with circumcision, but mere 'amputation;' who have no true circumcision of heart, but merely the cutting off of the flesh. Mey. quotes from Diogn. Laer. vi. 24, of Diogenes the Cynic, τὴν Εὐκλείδου σχολὴ ἔλεγε χολὴν, τῷ δὲ Πλάτανος διατριβὴν κατατριβήν. Cf. Gal. vii. 12 note. On the thrice repeated article, Erasmus says, 'indicat, enm de certis quibusdam loquii, quos illi novierint': 3.] for we are the περιτομήν, the real circumcision (whether bodily circumcised, or not — there would be among them some of both sorts: see Rom. ii. 25, 29; Col. ii. 11), who serve (pay religious service and obedience) by the Spirit of God (cf. John iv. 23, 24). The dative is instrumental, Rom. viii. 13,—expressing the agent, whereby our service is rendered: see Rom. v. 5; viii. 14; xii. 1; Heb. ix. 11. The emphasis is on it: for both profess a λατρεία. The θεοῦ is expressed for solemnity, and glory in (stress on καυχώμενοι,—are not ashamed of Him and seek our boast in circumcision, or the law, but make our boast in Him) Christ Jesus, and trust not in the flesh (stress on εν σαρκί —but, in the Spirit —in our union with Christ).

4.] Although (see Hartung, Partik. i. 310: πιθυν γνωσι, καίπερ οὐ στέργων, δόμων, ἴσχ. Theb. 709: προεπικύρισαν, καίπερ εἰδοτε, δι' ἐκλ θανάτῳ άγνωστο. Xen. Anab. i. 6. 10) (emphatic. There is no ellipsis, but the construction is regular, καίπερ, as in the above examples, having a participle after it: had it been καίπερ ἔξοντες, this would have been universally seen: now, only one of the οἱ πεποιθήσεις, viz. ἐγὼ, is made the exception; but the construction is the same) have (not, 'might have,' as E. V. I have it, but do not choose to make use of it: I have it, in the flesh, but I am still of the number of the οἱ πεποιθηθεὶς, in spirit) confidence (not, 'ground of confidence,' as Beza, Calv., Grot., &c.: there is no need to soften the assertion, see above: }
nor, with Van Hengel, to understand it of the unconverted state of the Apostle) also (over and above) in the flesh. If any other man thinks δικαιόμενος is certainly, as De W., Wiesinger, al., and ref., of his own judgment of himself, not of other men's judgment of him, as Meyer, al.: for how can other men's judging of the fact of his having confidence be in place here? But it is his own judgment of the existence of the πεισθέντων ἔχεων which is here in comparison he has confidence in the flesh, I more: 5.] "predicates of the ἐγώ, justifying the ἐγώ μᾶλλον," Meyer. He compares himself with them in three particular points: 1. pure Jewish extraction: 2. legal exactitude and position: 3. legal zeal. In circumcision (i.e. 'as regards circumcision': ref. Many [Erasm., Beng., al.] have taken πειστ. as nominative, and understood it concretely, 'circumcision,' but wrongly, for the usage applies only collectively, see Winter, edn. 3 [not in edn. 6], § 31.3), of eight days (Gen. xvii. 12: as distinguished from those who, as proselytes, were circumcised in after life. For usage, see ref.), of the race of Israel (cf. Rom. xi. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 22, oμέ νῦν εἴκ προσληπτόν γεγένημαι, ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰσραήλ αὐχώ πρόγονος, Thurt.), of the tribe of Benjamin ('πρὸ τοῦ δικαιώματος μέρους, Chrys.: or perhaps as Calv., merely 'ut moris erat, singulos ex sua tribu censori'), an Hebrew, of Hebrews (i.e. from Hebrew parents and ancestry [which the word parents was of course meant to imply in my earlier editions: not, as Ellie, to limit the assertion to St. Paul's father and mother] on both sides: ἐνεπίθεσι δείκνυσι νῦθι οὐχὶ προσκινητος, ἀλλ' ἀνωθεν τῶν εὐδοκίμων ίουδαίων. ἐνή μὲν γὰρ εἶναι τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ἀλλ' οὐχ Ἐβραίων ἐξ Ἐβραίων, πολλοὶ γὰρ καὶ διέθετον ήτο τό πράγμα, καὶ τῆς γλώσσης ἦσαν ἀμύητοι, ἄτεροι μεμιγμένοι ἑνεκείν. Chrys.: see also Trench, Synonyms, §§ xxxix. p. 153 ff. So Demosth. p. 427, διείκουν εἰκ διείκουν καλὸν ἐναυτοῦ βελτιών κ. ἐκ βελτιώνων: see other examples in Kypke and Wetst.), as regards the law (with reference to relative legal position and observance), a Pharisee (cf. Acts xxiii. 6; xxvi. 5), as regards zeal (for the law), a persecutor of the church (of Christ: on the participle, see ref.: Ellie, holds the pres. part, to have an adjectival force, being predicative to a suppressed verb subst.), as regards righteousness which is in (as its element: consists in the keeping of) the law, become blameless (i.e. having carried this righteousness so far as to have become perfect in it, in the sight of men. Calvin well distinguishes between the real and apparent righteousness in the law—the former before God, never possessed by any man: the latter before men, here spoken of by Paul:—'erat ergo hominem judicio sanctus, et immunit ab omni reprehensione. Rara sane lanae, et prope singularis: videat aman quanti cam facerit'). 7.] But whatsoever things (epithet [cf. ταύτα below] and general: these above mentioned, and all others. The law itself is not included among them, but only his κῆρην from this and other sources) were to me gains (different kinds of gain: cf. Ierod. iii. 71, περὶ βαλλόμενον ἐναυτῷ κήρους, these (epithet) I have esteemed, for Christ's sake (see it explained below, vv. 8, 9), as loss ('this one loss he saw in all of which he speaks: hence no longer the plural, as before κῆρην,' Meyer. Ellicott remarks that the singular is regularly used in this formula, referring to
8. rec aft ἔκενων ins γε, with ΑΚ β κ ῶ ο | 17 Did Cyril Thl: om BDFKL rel Bas Chr Cyr Thdrt Damase Ec Hesych. om 1st και B(Blic) N 180 : ins N 1. ins του bef χρ. B Thlrdt. ἔστ. bef χρ. ΑΚ β ῶ ο vulg(=and F-lat) gr-lat-ff. for μοῦν, ημαν A deniam(and harl!) syr copi æth Bas Cyr Did Thdrt Lucif Aug. om 2nd εἰναι (as superfluous, cf εἴ ii. 6) BD/FK 17 latt arm Lucif Ambr Hil Pelag Ambrst Fulg: ins ΔΚΛΙΘΝ 9 rel gth Gotth Cyril Aug.

9. δικαιοσ. bef εἰρήν N 1: ητι N 3. for εἰπ τῇ π. εν πιστεi Δ 1, in sde latt: om Syr: in L 23. 16 syr gr-lat-ff it is joined with the follg.

Kypke and Elsner in loc. But the reason of this usage is analogous to that given above, and not surely lest ἔμαχα should be mistaken to mean "punishments." Thus, in the instance from Xen. in Kypke, ἔπι μὲν τῶν οἰκτιασ ἄγχοραν καὶ ἔμαχα ἄγχορα, the separate deaths of the servants are all massed together, and the loss thought of as one.

[But moreover (not only have I once for all passed this judgment, but I continue to count, δε. The contrast is of the present ἔμαχα to ἔμαχα above) I also continue to esteem them all (not, all things, which would require πάντα or τὰ πάντα [see below] before ἔμαχα, emphatic) to be loss on account of the supereminence (above them all: τοῦ χάρ ὕλου φανερῶς, προκαταβασά τῷ λόγῳ ἔμαχα. Chrys. On the neter adjective [or participle] construction, see ref. and 2 Cor. iv. 17) of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord (‘quod Dominum sum vocat, id ad experimentum affectus vehementissim facit.’ Calv.), on whose account (explained by ἵνα ... below) I suffered the loss of all things (now, emphatic and universal. Or, it may be, “them all,” as Eccle.: but this almost involves a tautology; and, besides, τὰ πάντα stands too far from ἄτια (for the τὰ to be reflexive), and esteem them to be refuse, that ἵνα by so disesteeming them: ἵνα gives the aim of what went before) gain Christ (not, as the rationalizing Grut., ‘Christi favorum’; no indeed, it is Christ Himself.—His perfect image, His glorious perfection, which he wishes to win. He has Him now, but not in full: this can only be when his course is finished, and to this time the next words allude) and be found (now, and especially at His coming,—εὐδαμ.:—not as Calv., ‘Paulum reumittis esse omnibus... ut recuperaret [ungrammatical] in Christo.’ Cf. ref. 2 Cor.) in Him (living and being, and included, in Him as my element), not having (specification of εἰρ. εἴναι, but not to be joined, as Lachnu., al, with εἴναι, which would make this latter superfluous) my own righteousness (see on ver. 6) which is of (arising from) the law, but that which is through (as its medium) the faith of (in) Christ (a construction of this sentence has been suggested to me, which is perhaps possible, and at all events deserves mention. It consists in making εἰρ. εἴναι predicative; “not having as my righteousness that righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ”), the righteousness which is of (answering to εἴναι νόμου,—as its source, see Eph. ii. 8) God on my faith (built on, grounded on, granted on condition of my faith. It is more natural to take ἵνα τῇ πίστει with δικαιοσύνη, which it immediately follows, than with Meyer to understand another ἔκενον to attach it to. The omission of the article is no objection, but is very frequent, where the whole expression is joined as one idea. Chrys., al., join ἵνα τῇ πίστει with τοῦ γένους, as if it were τοῦ ἐπὶ τ. π. γένους, which of course is unallowable: Calv., Grot., Bengel, make the infinitive τοῦ γένους dependent on πίστει ["descript
The text appears to be a scholarly work discussing various biblical and theological concepts. It includes references to specific passages from the New Testament and other ancient texts. The text also includes references to philosophical and historical works, such as those of Cicero, as indicated by the references to works like *De natura deorum* and *De finibus*. The text seems to be arguing for the importance of understanding the resurrection of Christ, and its implications for Christian belief and practice. It discusses the nature of Christ's resurrection, the logical and theological implications, and how these should inform a correct understanding of Christian doctrine. The text is rich with citations from various sources, indicating a detailed and comprehensive scholarly engagement with the subject matter.
The time referred to by the aorist "prosagogen" (or perhaps "prosagogen") in the verse is clearly implied, but not stated, in the previous context. The verb "prosagogen" means "to place in a position," and it is used here to indicate that the speaker is referring to a past event that occurred in a specific position or context.

The context suggests that the speaker is recounting an event that occurred in the past, and the verb "prosagogen" is used to indicate that the event took place in a specific position or context. The speaker is likely referring to the event as something that occurred in the past, and the verb "prosagogen" is used to indicate that the event was significant or noteworthy.

The specific details of the event are not provided in the verse, but the use of the verb "prosagogen" suggests that the event was important enough to be remembered and recounted. The speaker may be using the verb "prosagogen" to emphasize the significance of the event, or to highlight a particular aspect of the situation.

Overall, the use of the verb "prosagogen" in the verse suggests that the event referred to was significant and noteworthy, and that the speaker is recounting it in order to convey the importance or significance of the event to the listener.
direction of: see reff. for both) the prize
(see 1 Cor. ix. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 8; Rev. ii.
10) of my heavenly (reff. and κλησίς επο-
rάνιος Heb. iii. 1, 'επαρ. επομάνιος
Heb. xii. 22. Not, 'from above,' = άνω-
θερ: but the allusion is to his appointment
having been made directly in heaven, not
by delegation on earth) calling (not as we
familiarly use the word,—'calling in life,'
&c.—but to be kept to the act of his being
called as an Apostle: q. d. 'the prize con-
sequent on the faithful carrying out of that
summons which I received from God in
heaven') of God (who was the caller: but
we must not think of Him, as Grot., al.,—
as the arbiter sitting above and summing
up to the conscience,—for in these last
words the figure is dropped, and ή άνω κλή-
σις represents real matter of fact) in
Christ Jesus (to what are these last words
to be referred? Chrys., al., join them with
dιώκω:—ἐν χ. 'I. τούτο ποιώ, φησιν,
ού γάρ ἐνί χωρίς τῆς έκείνης βούθος το-
σούτω διελθείσαν διάστημα πολλάς δι τῆς
βαθύνσις, πολλάς τῆς συμμαχίας. But I
own the arrangement of the sentence thus
seems to me very unnatural—and the con-
stant practice of St. Paul to join θέου and
things said of θέου with ἐν χριστῷ weighs
strongly for the other connexion, viz. that
with τ. κλήσις τού θεοΰ. The objection
that then τῆς or τοῦ would be required
before ἐν, is not valid; the unity of the
idea of the κλήσις ἐν χριστῷ, 1 Cor. vii. 22,
would dispense with it). 15, 16. Ex-
hortation to them to be unanimous in fol-
lowing this his example. In order to un-
derstand this somewhat difficult passage,
we must remember (1) that the description
of his own views and feelings which he holds
up for their imitation (ἐγκαμήλτα μου
γιν.) began with having no confidence in
the flesh, ver. 4, and has continued to ver.
14. Also (2) that the description commencing
with οὕτος οὖν τέλειος, is taken up again
from ver. 3, ἡμεῖς γάρ ἐσμέν ἡ περι-
τοίχι, οι πνεύματι θεοῦ λατρεόντες, κ. κα-
χάμενοι ἐν χ. Ἡρσοῦ, κ. οὐκ ἐν σαρκί πετο-
βότες. These two considerations will keep
us from narrow too much the τοῦτο
φρονώμεν, and from misunderstanding the
οὕτος οὖν τέλειος. As many of us then
(refers to ver. 3: see above) as are perfect
(mature in Christian life, = those described
above, ver. 3), let us be of this mind
(viz. that described as entertained by him-
self, vv. 7—14): and if in any thing
(accurative of reference: see Kühner,
Gramm. ii. 220 ff.) ye be differently minded
(for ἐτέρως, cf. O. c. 232 ff., μέλεν μέν
ποτε οἴκος ἡμών κ. άμώμα | ἐπιμε-
να, ὕπ' ἐπι τείνων αὑτῷ ἐπιδήμων
ἡμῶν | μν. δ' ἐτέρως ἐβδολου θεοί, κακά
μετατάσσεται: Demosth. p. 298. 22, ei, μεν
ti τινι διότων ἐπάρχη, την καρδίαν, οὐκ
ἐμεν φησιν αἰτίαν γεγεννηθαι, των δ' ὁ δὲ
ἐτέρως συμβαίνοντι ἀπάντων ἐμε κατ την
ἐκήν τόκον αἰτήν εἶμαι. Hence it gives
the meaning of diversity in a bad sense.
The difference referred to seems to be that
of too much self-esteem as to Christian
perfection: see below), this also (as well
as the rest which He has revealed) will
God reveal to you (i. e. in the progress of
the Christian life, you will find the
true knowledge of your own imperfection
and of Christ's all-sufficiency revealed to
you by God's Spirit, Eph. i. 17 ff. ὅρα
17 Συνμιμητὰ, μοῦ γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί, καὶ φοσπείτε ABDR KLM ab cdefg hkim no17
tους οὕτως δὲ περιπατοῦντας καθὼς ἔχετε τοῦτον ἡμᾶς. e
18 πολλοὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦσιν, ός πολλάκις ἔλεγον h
4 3 3 3 3
καταθήκη

The text is a continuation of a discussion on the importance of following the example set by Christ and the need for unity among Christians. The passage includes references to previous discussions on the matter and emphasizes the necessity of maintaining the separation from worldly practices and the importance of personal steadfastness in one's faith. The text is a call to action for Christians to follow Christ's example as a means of remaining pure and steadfast in their faith.
(no need to supply any thing, as κακῶν [Ec.], or 'longe alter' [Grot.], nor to understand the word 'circuitualis,' as 1 Pet. v. 8 [Storr, al., but inconsistently with ver. 17.],—still less with Calv. 'ambulant terrena cogitantes' [ungrammatical: οὐ τὰ ἐπίγρ. φρ.]; or to consider the sentence as broken off by the relative clause [De W., al.]; for πεπτωτοῦς is a 'verbum indifferens,' as in ver. 17, τούτων οὖντων περὶ...) whom I many times (answers to πολλοὶ) mentioned to you (viz. when I was with you) but now mention even weeping (dia τι; ὑπὲρ τῶν κακῶν, ὑπὲρ τῶν δικαιών οἰκ. τι ποιοῦντο...). 

καὶ τοῖς τοῖς Ἐν Παύλου ἐφίς οἶς ἐστεροὶ γελασίς καὶ στασιλασίς. οὐτός ὁτι συμπαθητικός, οὕτως φρουτίζει πάντων ἄνθρωπων. Chrys.), the enemies (the article designates the particular class intended) of the cross of Christ (not, as Thdrt., Luth., Erasm., &c., of the doctrine of the Cross:—nor is there any reason to identify these with those spoken of ver. 2. Not Judaistic but Epicurean error, not oligarchy of creed but of practice, is here stigmatized. And so Chrys.,—ἐπειδὴ τινὲς ἦσαν ὑποκείμενοι μὲν τῶν χριστιανιμῶν, ἐν ἀνέτει χὶς καταστροφῆς τοῦτο τὸ ἐναντίον τῶν σταυρῶν,—of whom perdition (everlasting, at the coming of the Lord: see ch. i. 28.) is the (fixed, certain) end; of whom their belly is the god (cf. the boast of the Cyclops, in Enum. Cycil. 334 ff.,—ἀ γὰρ ὕπνον τὸν θάνατον, πλὴν ἐμοί, θεοὶ δ' οὐ, | καὶ τῇ μεγίστῃ γαστρὶ τῇ δαίμονι | ώς τούτοις γε καὶ σφεγγέων τούτῳ ἡμέραν, | ζεόν οὐτός ἄνθρωποι τοῖς σφαίρασις. Seneca de benef. vii. 26., 'alius abdomini servit') and their glory in their shame ("ἡ δόξα is subjective, —in the judgment of these men,—and τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ objective, —according to the reality of morals. Cf. Polyb. x. 23. 5., ἐφ' οἷς ἐχθρὶν ἁμαρτίαι καὶ ἔπεμπολεῖς, ἐπὶ τούτοις ὡς καλὸς σεμνύνεσαι καὶ μεγαλαυχεῖν.

On εἶλα ἐν, 'cersari,' to be found in, or contained in, any thing, cf. Plat. Gorg. 470 E, ἐν τῷτῳ ἡ πάσα εὐδαμονία ἐστίν; —Eur. Phem. 1310,—οὐκ ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ τὰ χαῦδα. Meyer. Ambr., Hil., Pel., Aug., Beng., al., refer the expression to circumcision, taking another meaning for ἁμαρτία ["venter et pudor sunt affirm.", Beng.], but without reason; and Chrys., al., disown the meaning), who regard (it is not easy to give φρονεῖν, φρόνημα, in this sense, by one word in English. They betoken the whole aspect, the set of the thoughts and desires: τὰ ἐπίγραμα, are the substratum of all their feelings) the things on earth (in opposition to the things above, cf. Col. iii. 1 ff. The construction is that of logical reference to the subject of the sentence, setting aside the strictness of grammatical connexion: so Thuc. iii. 36., ἐδοκεῖν αὐτοῖς... ἐπίκαλοῦτε... and iv. 108.; vi. 24; viii. 42: see more examples in Kühner, ii. 377. The οἱ serves as τούτος above, to indicate and individualize the class). 20. For (I may well direct you to avoid τούτος τὰ ἐπίγραμα φρονεῖται:—for 'our state and feelings are wholly alien from theirs) our (emphatic) country (the state, to which we belong, of which we by faith are citizens, —ἡ πατρίς, Thl.; meaning the Kingdom of God, the heavenly Jerusalem [Gal. iv. 26. Col. iii. 1 ff.]). 'This objective meaning of the word is better than the subjective one, our citizenship' πολιτεία, Acts xxii. 28: but they seem sometimes to be used indifferently, see Palm and Rost's Lex., and Aristot. Pol. iii. 4, κύριον μὲν γὰρ τὸ πολιτεία τῆς πλῆθους πολιτείας δ' ἐστὶν ἡ πολιτεία, cf. however, on the other side, Ellicott: and his note throughout, or, 'our conversation,' as vulg. E. V., which rendering seems to want precedent. Conyb. renders it 'life;' but this is insufficient, even supposing it justifiable, as
giving the English reader the idea of ζωή, and so misleading him. I may remark, in passing, on the unfortunate misconception of St. Paul’s use of the plural, which has marred so many portions of Mr. Conybeare’s version of the Epistles, and none more sadly than this,—where he gives the Apostle’s noble description of the state and hopes of us Christians, as contrasted with the τὰ ἐπί, φρονοῦτες,—all in the singular,—‘For my life, ἵνα,—from whence also I look,’ &c.—substitutes (the word is more solemn, as indicating priority and fixedness, than ἔστω would be: see notes, ch. ii. 6, and Acts xvi. 20) in the heavens, from whence (ὁ υἱὸς does not refer to παλαιομα, as Beng., al.—nor ὁ υἱὸς, nor to be rendered ‘ex quo temporare,’ as Erasm., but ὁ υἱὸς is adverbial, ‘unde,’ see Winer, § 21. 3, and cf. Xen. Anab. i. 2. 20, ἡμῖν τρεῖς, ἐν φί] also (additional particular, following on heaven being our country) we wait for (expect, till the event arrives: see note on Rom. viii. 19, and a dissertation in the Fritzscheiiron Opuscula, p. 150 fl.) a Saviour (emphatic: therefore we cannot τὰ ἐπί, φρονεῖν, because we are waiting for one to deliver us from them. Or, as Saviour [Ellic.]—but perhaps the other is preferable, as being simpler), (viz.) the Lord Jesus Christ, [21.] (describes the method, in which this Saviour shall save us—a way utterly precluding our making a God of our body) who shall transform (see 1 Cor. xv. 51 fl. The words assume, as St. Paul always does when speaking incidentally, the υἱὸς surviving to witness the coming of the Lord. The change from the dust of death in the resurrection, however we may accommodate the expression to it, was not originally contemplated by it; witness the ἀπεκδικοθέα, and the σῶμα τῆς ταπείνωσεως ἡμῶν. It is quite in vain to attempt to escape from this inference, as Ellicott does, by saying that “every moment of a true Christian’s life involves such an ἀπεκδικοθή.” This is most true, but in no way accounts for the peculiar expressions used here) the body of our humiliation (behave of the pre-diadys, by which most Commentators, and even Cony., here enervate the Apostle’s fine and deep meaning). The body is that object, that material, in which our humiliation has place and is shown, by its suffering and being degraded—πολλά πάνταχε νῦν τὸ σῶμα, δεσμευμένα, μαστίζομεν, μυρία πάνταχε δινά, Chrys. He once had such a ταπεινωσία, and has passed through it to His glory—and He shall change us so as to be like Him.—Whereas the rendering ‘our vile body’ sinks all this, and makes the epithet merely refer to that which is common to all humanity by nature. It is besides, perhaps, hardly allowable: for ταπεινωσία cannot—unless the exigency of context require it, as in ref. Luke [not in Prov. xvi. 19],—signify more ‘vileness,’ ταπεινοτήτι, but must imply the act whereby the body ταπεινωστα (so as to be) conformed to (on this common idiom, ἑφευρομένον, ἐπὶ ταλαίνα, κολύσαντα σώμα, Lxxh. Ag. 1258, al. freq.—cf. Kühner, [i. 121] the body of His glory (in which, as its object or material, His glory has place and is displayed: see above), according to (after the analogy of) the working of His power also (besides the μετασχημ., &c. spoken of) to subject to Him all things (the universe: see the exception, 1 Cor. xv. 25—27). τὰ δὲ ποιήσει, says Thdrt., ἀνε ὁ δύναμις ἀριθμὸν ἑκνων, κ. βασιλεύς κ. τ. της φθορας κ. τον βασιλε, καταπατοῦς, κ. εἰς ἀδιάκοπα τα ἰμέτερα σώματα μεταβαλλόν, κ. παρακεκλησίως ἀπαντάς εἰς αὐτῶν ἀποβλεπίν. And Chrys.—‘θείης μείζων ἐργα τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτῶν, ἑκάστοις πιστεύοντος. αὐτῆς, used of the αὐτῶν of the whole sentence, from the position of the writer, not of the agent in the clause itself. IV. 1.] Concluding exhortation, referring to what has passed since ch. iii. 17,—not further back, for there first he turns directly to them in the second
mu α'γαπητοί, καὶ επιπλήθοι, χαρά καὶ άντεφανός, μου, οὕτως στήκετε εν κυρίῳ, ἑν αγαπητω.

2 Εὐδοκίαν παρακαλῶ καὶ Συντύχην παρακαλῶ το αυτὸ φρονεῖν εν κυρίῳ. 3 ναι ἐρωτῶ καὶ σέ, γνησίες, συνήγγεις, συνλαμβάνων αὐταῖς, αἰτίες εν τούτῳ εὐαγγελίζε.

Σάθρ. IV. 1. χαρίς F (and G, but γαύδινον G-lat.).

ins καὶ βεβαιοῦτος F.

ον 2 δικαίωτης D 108.

aft 2 δικαίωτης ins ους B 17.

2. [εὐδοκία, so ABDFKLX, &c.]

3. rec for ναι, καὶ (error), with [he syll]: txt ABDFKLX rel vss gr-lat-εφ. rec συζυγε βεβαιοῦτος, with ΚΙ, rel say Chr Thtdt: γνησίεσ γερειανε σύνε. F: txt ABDN

person, with ἀδελφός, as here,—there also οὕτως occurs, answering to the οὕτως here, and there, in the Christian's hopes, vv. 20, 21, lies the ground of the ἄστε here.

ἀστέος 'quam cum ipsis situm—since we have such a home, and look for such a Saviour, and expect such a change:—"in οἷς άντεφανε τοῦτον χαρον, καὶ άντεφανε διδασκαλούς, στήκετε." Chrys. Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 58.

ἔπιστολὴ ήνεχεῖ γεγονός. For the verb, see ch. i. 8 ref.: for the substantive, γνησίας, 2 Cor. vii. 7, 11.

στέφανος] from ref. 1 Thess, both χαρά and στέφανος apply to the future great day in the Apostle's mind. And indeed even without such reference to his usus loquendi, it would be difficult to dissociate the "εὐαγγελίζε" from such thoughts as that in 2 Tim. iv. 8.

οὕτως] see above: "as I have been describing: not ἐστίν ἄστιμα ἄλλα, as Chrys., Thl., Φε., Calv., Beng., "ίτα, ήλίθινον υπόλοιπον," which would be inconsistent with ch. iii.

έν κυρίω] the element wherein this steadfastness consists: ἱεραπητοῖς, an affectionate repetition: μετ' εὐφημίασ πολλῆς ή παρασίνεις, Thl. "Dioctetum sumo suo vehementiorius exhortationibus claudit, quod cum hominum animis tenacius infigat. Et blandis appellationibus in eorum affectus se insinuat: quum tamen non sunt adulterios, sed sinceri amoris." Calv. 2. 9.]

Concluding exhortations to individuals (2, 3), and to all (4—10).

2. Ευδοκία and Syntyche (both women, cf. αὕτης and αὐτές below) appear to have needed this exhortation on account of some disagreement, both however being faithful, and fellow-workers (perhaps deaconesses, Rom. xvi. 1) with himself in the Gospel. ἐναίστηται δὲ οὐ εἶν τινα πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἐχόμασας, Thl. The repetition of the verb παρακαλῶ not merely signifies "vehementiam affectus" (Erasm.), but hints at the present separation between them.

τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν] see ch. ii. 2 note. He adds ἐν κυρίῳ, both to show them wherein their unanimity must consist, and perhaps to point out to them that their present alienation was not ἐν κυρίῳ.

3. ναι assumes the granting of the request just made, and carries on further the same matter, see Philem.20 and note; but does not conjure, as Grot., αὐτοὶ γνήσιοι συνήγγεις true ("genuine:"—true, as distinguished from counterfeit: it of legitimate worth "γενήσιος") yoke-fellow.

Who is addressed, it is quite impossible to say. Various opinions have been, (1) that St. Paul addresses his own wife. So Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 6 (53), p. 535 P., καὶ γὰρ Πάλλος οὐκ ἔχει τὸν ἐν̄τι παρασίνεις οὖν αὐτῶν προσαγγείον σύντονον, ὡν ἐπεκείμενον ἀκατέργασίας εἰσαλέγας;—Eus. H. E. iii. 30, al. But this is evidently an error, and Thl. says rightly,—τὸν δὲ σωφρονεῖς ἄνδρον δειλίων γυναῖκα εἶναι τοῦ ἀπόστολον, οὗ προσεχθεῖτος τοῦ ἐν τῷ πρὸς Κυρίους γεγορόμενος (1 Cor. vii. 8). Μια τὰς ἄνδρας συναίνεις ταῦτα. Besides which, the adjective in this case would be feminine,—cf. Eus. Alcst. 326. ἐναίστητος συνήγγεις; and 354, τοιοῦτοι διωρισμένοι εὐφήμιες: perhaps even if it were of two terminations [as adjectives in -οι frequently in the N.T., e.g. οὐφημίας, Luke ii. 13; Acts xxvi. 19: ἄλλοις χαίρον, 1 Tim. ii. 8, &c. See Winer, § 111.1], in which case Ellic. remarks, it would revert to three terminations; but authority for this statement seems wanting. (2) that he was the husband, or brother, of Eudokia or Syntyche; so Chrys. doubtfully, and Thl., al. But then the epithet would hardly be wanted—nor would the ex.
pression be at all natural. (3) that he was some fellow-labourer of the Apostle. So Thdt.,—συνήθησαν καλεί, ὥσ τον αὐτόν ἔλεγκτα τῆς ἐπιστείας ζηγόν, Pelag., all, and De W.,—and of these some (Grot., Calov., al.) have understood Ἐπαφροδίτος. 

—Estins, Timotheus,—Bengel (but afterwards he preferred Ἐπαφροδίτος), Silas, 

—Luther, the chief bishop at Philippi. (4) Others have regarded Συνήθησε as a proper name: so τινὲς in Chrys. and Ec., and so Meyer. 

In this case the γνώσει must have meant, ‘who art verbally, as thy name is,’ a yoké-fellow. And this might be said by the Apostle, who elsewhere compares the Christian mini-ter to the βοΐς ἄλων. It seems to me that we must choose between the two last hypotheses. The objections to each are about of equal weight: the Apostle nowhere else calls his fellow-labourers συνήθησι,—and the proper name Συνήθησος is nowhere else found. But these are no reasons, respectively, against either hypothesis. We may safely say with Chrys., ἐστι τοῦτο, ἐστὶν ἀκέον, ὅπως ἀκριβολογεῖσθαι δει. 

συναναμβαύον αὐταίς] help them (Enodia and Syntyche): but not, as Grot., ‘ut habeant, unde se suose honeste sustentavit’; it is the work of their reconciliation which he clearly has in view, and in which they would need help. αἰτινες, ‘utipale qua ‘—seeing that they . . . ‘ The E. V. here is in error, ‘help those women which . . . ’ The Gospel at Philippi was first received by women, Acts xvi. 13 ff., and these two must have been among those who, having believed, laboured among their own sex for its spread. ἐν τ. εὐαγ. [see ref]. 

μετά καὶ Κλήμεντος] These words belong to συνήθησαν, not to συναναμβαύον, and are rather an additional reminiscence, than a part of the exhortation ‘as did Clemens also &c.’ q.d. ‘not that I mean, by naming those women with distinction, to imply forgetfulness of those others &c., and especially of Clemens.’ The insertion of καί between the preposition and substantive is said to be a habit principally of Pindar,—e.g. 

év καὶ θαλάσσα, Ol. ii. 28; év καὶ τελετή, Ol. vii. 26: éti καὶ θανάτῳ, Phys. iv. 336. 

See Hartung, i. 143. It is not necessary to regard the καὶ—καὶ as bound together; so that these examples are in point (against Ellic.). 

Clemens must have been a fellow-worker with the Apostle at Philippi, from the context here; and, from the non-occurrence of any such name among Paul’s fellow-travellers, and the fact that οἱ λοιποὶ συνεργοὶ must have been Philippians,—himself a native of Philippi. It is perhaps arbitrary, seeing that the name is so common, to assume his identity with Clemens afterwards Bishop of Rome, and author of the Epistles to the Corinthians. 

So Eus. H. E. iii. 4, ὁ Κλήμης, τῆς Ῥωμαίων κ. αὐτός ἐκκλησίας τρίτος ἐπίσκοπος καταστάς, Παύλου συνεργὸς κ. συναθλητὴς γεγονέναι πρὸς αὐτοῦ μαρτυρεῖται: see also H. E. v. 6: so Origen, Com. in Joan. t. vi. 36, vol. iv. p. 153: and Jer. Script. Eccl., 15, vol. ii. p. 854. Chrys. does not notice any such idea. See on the whole, Ellicott’s note. ὅταν τὴν ὑπὸ βιβλία ὑποτελείται belongs to the λοιπόν, whom he does not name: whose names are (not a wish, εἰπ', as Bengel, nor are they to be regarded as dead when this was written) in the book of life (refl., and Luke x. 20). 

4—9.] Exhortation to all. 4. πάλιν ἐπω AGAIN I will say it: referring to ch. iii. 1, where see note. It is the ground-tone of the Epistle. 

5.] ἐπίεικες, your forbearance, from ἐπί, implying direction, and ἐκοί, ἑοικα (not ἑκοτε, to yield, as Trench, N. T. Syn. 171: see Palm and Rost’s Lex., under the word, as also under Ἑκτης and ἑοικα), reasonableness of dealing, wherein not strictness of legal right, but consideration for one another, is the rule of practice. Aristot., Eth. Nic. x. 6, defines it to be that which fills up the necessary deficiencies of law, which is general, by dealing with particular cases as the law-giver would have dealt with them if he had been by. ἰδιαὶ, he adds, δίκαιον μὲν ἐστὶ, καὶ ἐκτίτων τινος δίκαιον . . . καὶ ἐστίν αὐτὴ ἡ φύσις ἡ τοῦ ἐπίεικου, ἐπι- 

ἀνδρώμοι νόμοι, ἢ ἐλλειπει διὰ τὸ καὶ-
It seems to me also, that this language is almost necessarily more limited and specific. Hence, though εὐχαρία occurs 12 times in St. Paul's Epistles, it is only twice used with the article, 1 Cor. xiv. 26, 2 Cor. iv. 15. But I much prefer the other view.

τὰ αἰτήματα ἔσται αὐτόνωσιν. I John v. 15. Plato, Rep. viii. p. 506, speaks of τὸ τυφλὸν αἰτήματα...

In prayer with thanksgiving—peace unspeakable.

καὶ, and then.

ὁ ἐπ. τοῦ θεοῦ, that peace which rests in God and is wrought by Him in the soul, the counterfeit of all troubles and anxieties—see John xvi. 33—.. ἦν ἐν ἐμοὶ εἰρήνη εἰκῆτε τὸ κόσμῳ ὄλλων ἐκέτοιε. Meyer denies that εἰρήνη ever has this meaning: but he is certainly wrong. The above verse, and John xiv. 27, Col. iii. 15, cannot be fully interpreted on his meaning, mere mutual concord. It is of course true, that mutual concord, and τὰ εἰσπορεύσεις, are necessary elements of this peace: but it goes far beyond their element, as usual, in Ellic's note.

The intelligent faculty, the perceptible and appreciative power: ref. d. On the sentiment itself, cf. Eph. iii. 19.

Philippians 4:7.

and he describes the ἐπίσκεψις as ὁ μὴ ἀκριβῶς ἑπάτει ἐπὶ τὸ χειρον. See Trench, New Test. Syn., as above.

By the γνωσθῆτον πάσιν ἄνων, the Apostle rather intends, 'let no man know of you any inconsistency with ἐπίσκεψις.' The universality of it justifies its application even to those described above, ch. iii. 18 f.,—that though warned against them, they were to shew all moderation and clemency towards them: so Chrys. Meyer observes well, that the succession of these precepts seems to explain itself psychologically by the disposition of spiritual joy in the Lord exalting us both above rigorism, and above anxiety of mind (ver. 6).

ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς.] These words may apply either to the foregoing—'the Lord will soon come, He is the avenger; it is yours to be moderate and element' (so De Wette, all.) or to the following—'the Lord is near, be not anxious;' so Chrys., Thdt., all. Perhaps we may best regard it as the transition from the one to the other: Christ's coming is at hand—this is the best enforcer of clemency and forbearance: it also leads on to the duty of banishing anxiety.

ὁ κύριος is Christ, and the ἐγγύς refers to the παροιμία; see on ch. iii. 20. 6.] μηδὲν has the emphasis. It is the accusative of the object, as τὸ πολλὰ μεριμνῶν, Xen. Cyr. viii. 7. 12. 1 Thess. and note. Meyer remarks that the literally correct rendering of the Vulg. 'in omni (neut.) oratione' led Ambrose wrong, who gives it 'per omne orationem.' τὴν προσευχὴν καὶ τὴν δέησιν by your prayer and your supplication: or better, by the prayer and the supplication appropriate to each thing. On the difference between προσευχὴ and δέησις, see on Eph. vi. 18, 1 Tim. ii. 1. Not μετὰ τῆς εὐχαρίστης, because the matters themselves may not be recognized as grounds of εὐχαρίστης, but it should accompany every request. Ellic., who doubts this explanation, thinks it "more simple to say that εὐχαρίστης, 'thanksgiving for past blessings,' is in its nature more general and comprehensive, προσ. and δέησις almost necessarily more limited and specific. Hence, though εὐχαρίτης occurs 12 times in St. Paul's Epistles, it is only twice used with the article, 1 Cor. xiv. 26, 2 Cor. iv. 15." But I much prefer the other view.

heavens. For νομισμα, see the F-D lat. spec tol Croma Oros.
in sense: it is not a wish, but a declaration—following upon the performance of the injunction above. 

The heart is the fountain of the thoughts, i.e. designs, plans (not minds, as E. V.): so that this expression is equivalent to, 'your hearts themselves, and their fruits.' 

In Chrys. it is not the predicate after φρώσθη—shall keep ye. in Christ, i.e. keep them from falling from Christ (ςετε μένειν κ. μη ἐκπεύσειν αυτοῦ τῆς πίστεως, Chrys.) but, as usual, denotes the sphere or element of the φρώσθη thus bestowed—

that it shall be a Christian security: the verb φρώσθη being absolute.

Summary exhortation to Christian virtues not yet specified. 

8. [_summary exhortation to Christian virtues not yet specified.]

The Apostle resumes again his intention of closing the Epistle with which he had begun ch. iii., but from which he had been diverted by incidental subjects. It is unnatural to attribute to the Apostle so formal a design as De W. does, of now speaking of man's part, as he had hitherto of God's part—Chrys. has it rightly, 

8. 9.] whatsoever virtue there is (not 'there be,' as Schoef.) &c.

╠╠╣╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╠╣
them all his own sayings and doings; but the καί expressly provides for their being of the kinds specified above) ye moreover learned, and received (refl.: here of receiving not by word of mouth, but by knowledge of his character: the whole is not doctrinal, but ethical) and heard (again not of preaching, but of his tried and acknowledged Christian character, which was in men's mouths and thus heard) and saw (each for himself) in me (ἐν ἐμοὶ will not properly belong to the two first verbs, ἐμαθ. and παρελ., but must be associated by zeugma with them—he himself being clearly the example throughout), these things (ταῦτα...ἀρχαί) practised (correlative with, not opposed to, λογίζετο above:—that λογίσμος being eminently practical, and issuing, in the concrete, in the ταῦτα πράσσειν, after Paul's example). κατὰ and then: see ver. 7. On εἰρήνη, see there. 10—20.] He thanks them for the supply received from Philippi. 10.] δέ is transitional; the contrast being between the personal matters which are now introduced, and those more solemn ones which he has just been treating. ἐν κυρίῳ. See above, ch. iii. 1, ver. 4, "Every occurrence, in his view, has reference to Christ,—takes from Him its character and force." Wiesinger. ἡδὸν ποτὲ now at length, as V. E. : 'tandem aliquando': χαῖρεν δὴ λυπώτως ἀστί καρδίας, Chrys. The ποτέ takes up and makes indefinite the ἡδόν: as in δὴ ποτέ, δὴ ποι., &c. See Klotz ad Devar. p. 607, 8. But no reproof is conveyed by the expression, as Chrys. thinks: see below. ἀνεφάλλεστε Lit. ye came into leaf; "metaphora suanta ab arboribus, quorum vis hyiene contracta latet, vere florcre incipit," Calv. But it is fanciful to conclude with Bengel, that it was Spring, when the gift came: see on a similar fancy in 1 Cor. v. 7. The word is taken transitively (see refl.) by Grot., all., *ye caes'd to spring again your care for me* (see below): but the intransitive only will suit the sense here—ye buded forth again in caring for my interest (see below). Your care for me was, so to speak, the *life* of the tree; it existed just as much in winter when there was no vegetation, when ye ἁπαμεῖσθε, as when the buds were put forth in spring. This is evident by what follows. We must thank Meyer, to whom we owe so much in accuracy of grammatical interpretation, for having followed out the right track here, first indicated by Bengel, and rendered τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ as the accusative governed by φορεῖν. The ordinary way (so Wiesinger and Ellicot recently) has been to regard the words as τοῦ φορεῦν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, thus depriving the relative ἐφ᾽ ὑμῖν of any thing to refer to, and producing the logical absurdity [Mey.], ἐφορεῖτε τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φορεῖν, or forcing ἐφ᾽ ὑμῖν to some unjustified meaning ('although;' as Luth., al.,—siect, as vulg., &c.), or understanding it 'for whom,' as Calv., al.,—contrary to the Apostle's usage, in which [refl.] ἐφ᾽ ὑμῖν is always neuter. But if we take τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ together,—*my interest,*—and govern it by φορεῖν, all will be simple and clear: I rejoiced, &c. that at last ye flourished in anxiety for my interest: for which purpose (cf. Plat. Gorg. p. 502 b, ἐφ᾽ ὑμῖν ἐσοφόβακε:—the purpose, namely, of flourishing, putting forth the supply which you have now sent. Wiesinger prefers the other, and vindicates it from Meyer's imputation: but to me not convincingly: as neither Ellicot) ye also were anxious (all that long time, imperfect), but had no opportunity (ἐκ τοὔρανος is a word of later Greek: ἐκτούρας, its opposite, is used by Lucian, Plutarch, Polyb., &c., as also its compounds ἐκτουραίος, προσεκτούρας, &c. See Phryn. ed. Lobeck, p. 125. Wiesinger well remarks that we must not press this ἁπαμεῖσθε into a definite hypothesis, such as that their financial state was not adequate—that they
had no means of conveyance, &c.—it is perfectly general, and all such fillings up are mere conjecture. 11.) inserted to prevent misunderstanding of the last verse. 12.) my meaning is not, that . . . καθ', according to, i.e. in consequence of—see ref., and Od. γ. 106, πλαζόμενοι κατὰ λήπθ. Herod. ii. 152, κατὰ λήπθ ἐκπλωτάσαται: Thuc. vi. 31, κατὰ θείαν ἥκεν: not, as Van Hengel, "at more recent est punniciis," which would be κατὰ τοῦ ὑποτέταντα (see Rom. iii. 5 al.).

For I (emphatic for my part, whatever others may feel) learned (in my experience, my training for this apostolic work: not 'have learned': the aorist is much simpler and more humble—'I was taught': the present result of this teaching comes below, ὁδοία, but not in this word), in the state in which I am (not 'in whatsoever state I am' [E. V., which would be ἐν οἷς ὁδοὶ, cf. ὁδοὶ ὁδοὶ εἰσιτερέντο, Mark vi. 56, ὁδοὶ ἐν ἁπάντῳ αὐτῷ, ib. Winer, § 42. 3. α., nor as Luther, bei weder ich bin [of messianische], which is against the context. But ἐν οἷς εἰρή does not apply only to the Apostle's present circumstances, but to any possible present ones: 'in which I am at any time': see next verse) to find competence (we have no word for αὐτάρκης. 'Self-sufficing' will express its meaning of independence of external help [τελειότης κτήσεως ἁγάθω, Plat. Def. p. 412], but is liable to be misunderstood: 'competent' is not in use in this sense, though the abstract noun competence is: the German genügsam gives it well). 12.) See above. I know (by this teaching) also (the first καὶ expresses that, besides the general finding of competence in all circumstances, he specially has been taught to suffer humiliation and to bear abundance. See Ellicott's note) how to be brought low (generally: but here especially by need, in humiliation of circumstances. Meyer remarks that 2 Cor. iv. 8; vi. 9, 10, are a commentary on this), I know also (καὶ as before, or as an addition to οἴδα καὶ ταπεινοῦσθαι) how to abound (ὑπερβάλλειν, as Wess. remarks, would be the proper general opposite: but he chooses the special one, which fits the matter of which he is treating): in every thing (not as vulg., E. V., all, 'every where,' nor 'at every time,' as Chrys., Grot.,—nor both, as Thl., &c.: but as usually in St. Paul: see ref. and note) and in all things (not, as Luth., Beng., 'respectu omnium hominum': ἐν παντὶ πράγματι, φησί, κ. ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς παρεμπιστοῦσιν, (Ecc.: the expression conveys universality, as 'in each and all,' with us) I have been taught the lesson ('initiated': but no stress to be laid, as by Beng., 'disciplina arcani imbutus sum, ignota mundo': see the last example below. Beware [against Wiesinger] of joining μεμημαῖος with ἐν παντὶ κ. ἐν πᾶσιν, initiated in, &c.; the verb is [against Ellicott] not constructed with ἐν, but with an accusative of the person and the thing [μεμεῖν τινα τι], which last accusative remains with the passive: so πρὸ ἀνὴρ ἐμήν Ἐλληνικά, Athol. ix. 162,—οἱ τὰς τελετὰς μεμημαῖον, Plat. Symp. p. 209. The present construction, with an infinitive, occurs, Alcipl. ii. 4, κυθηρέας: both to be satiated and to hunger (the forms πείνῃς, δίχας, for -μη, seem to have come in with Macedonian influence: being found first in Aristotle; see Lobeck in Phryn. p. 61), both to abound and to be in need. 13.) After these special notices, he de-
clares his universal power,—how triumphantly, yet how humbly! ’Meyer. I can do (refl.: so μηδὲν ἠχτὶνειν, Piat. Crit. p. 50 b) all things (not ‘all these things,’ τὰ πάντα, as Van Hengel: ‘the Apostle arises above mere relations of prosperous and adverse circumstance, to the general,’ De W.) in (in union with,—by means of my spiritual life, which is not mine, but Christ living in me, Gal. ii. 20: the E. V. ‘through’ does not give this union sufficiently) him who strengthens me (i.e. Christ, as the gloss rightly supplies: cf. 1 Tim. i. 12). 14.] ‘Caret, ne fortiter loquendo contemplasse ipsorum beneficium videatur.’ Calv. μὴ γὰρ ἐπείδη, φησίν, ἐν χρείᾳ οὐ καθέστηκα, νομισμένοι μὴ δείσαθαι με τὸ πάραμόντας δέομαι δι’ ὑμᾶς, Chrys. συγκοινωνῇ συναντῆτε μοι τῇ θλίψει μόνο σοφίαν, τὰς ἐπαλαίτως τὸ πράγμα, Thl.: in that ye made yourselves partakers with my present tribulation (not poverty: by their sympathy for him they suffered with him; and their gift was a proof of this sympathy). 15—17.] Honorable recollection of their former kindness to him. 15.] δὲ contrasts this former service with their present one. καὶ ὑμεῖς [as well as I myself.] He addresses them by name (as 2 Cor. vi. 11) to mark them particularly as those who did what follows: but not to the absolute exclusion of others, as Bengel (‘antithet ad ecclesias aliorum oppidorum’: others may have done it too, for aught that this appellative implies: that they did not, is by and by expressly asserted: ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ ἐναγγελίου, peneos vos, Beng.: he places himself in their situation: dates from (so to speak) their Christian era. This he specifies by δὲ ἐξήλθον ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας. See Acts xvii. 14. By this is not meant, as commonly understood, the supply which he received at Corinth (2 Cor. xi. 9), in order to which De W., Wies., al., understand ἐξήλθον as a phr. perfect,—but that mentioned below: see there: ἐξῆλθον being the aorist marking the simple date: when I left Macedonia. οὐδέμα μοι ἐκκλησίαι no church communicated with me as to (in) an account of giving and receiving (i.e., every receipt being part of the department of giving and receiving, being one side of such a reckoning, ye alone opened such an account with me. It is true the Philippians had all the giving, the Apostle all the receiving: the debtor side was vacant in their account, the creditor side in his: but this did not make it any the less an account of “giving-and-receiving,” categorically so called. This explanation, which is Meyer’s, is in my view far the most simple [against Ellic., who apparently has misunderstood it], and preferable to the almost universal one, that his creditor and their debtor side was that which he spiritually imparted to them: for the introduction of spiritual gifts does not belong to the context, and therefore disturbs it. Similar usages of λήφης κ. δώσεως occur: e.g. Artemid. i. 44, οἱ δὲ δώσεως κ. λήφης πορίζομενοι: Arrian, Epict. ii. 9, τὸν φιλάργυρον (πανάργυρον) αἱ ἀκατάληλαι λήψεις κ. δώσεις: Cicero, Laelio 16, ‘ratio acceptorum et datorum.’ See Wetst.) but you only: 16.] for even in Thessalonica (which was an early stage of my εζηλοθεὶν ἀπὸ Μακ., before the departure was consummated. The δὲ gives a reason for and proof of the former assertion—ye were the only ones, &c,—and ye began as early as εν Θεσσ., i.e. when I was at Thessalonica. In such brachylogical constructions the preposition of rest, as belonging to the act accomplished, overbears the preposition of motion, as belonging to it only in its imperfect state; so οἱ ἐν τῷ Ἡραίῳ καταπεφυγότεν, Xen. Hell. iv. 5, 5,—ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐν τῇ γῇ καταπεφυγμίας ἐνεβάλλων, Thuc. iv. 14,—ἀποστελεῖτε ..., ἐν τῇ Σικελίᾳ, ib. vii. 17, where εστὶν.—
17. [all a, so AB.] ins ton bep rj. 121.

18. om para eAeprodidou A: for para, apo N-corr. for ta, to D1. aft vpr. in rj. 61, pvepdvta F, late Syr Iren-int Cypr Victorin.

19. πληρώσας D1F b e g m o 17. 672 late Chr, Thudth Thul lat-ff: txt ABD3KLN rel copr Copt Chr, Thudth-ms, rcc ton plouton, with D3KLN3 rel Cyr: ton ploutos m1: txt ABD3F1 17. 672, for our, autm D1. om 1st ev N1: ins N-corr obl.

in Bekker's text is a correction) ye sent both once and twice (the account of the expression being, that when the first arrived, they had sent once: when the second, not only once, but twice. So in ref.: and Herod. ii. 121, αυτῷ k. δίς k. τρίς ανόιατοι: i.ii. 148, τούτω k. δίς k. τρίς ελπιστὸς Μααναδίου. The opposite expression, σὺς αὐτῷ οὐδὲ δίς, is found in Plat. Crito. § 7) ye sent (absolute as in ref.) to (for the supply of, ref.) my necessity.

17.] Again he removes any chance of misunderstanding, as above in ver. 11. It was not for his own sake but for theirs that he rejoiced at their liberality, because it multiplied the fruits of their faith. Not that (see above, ver. 11) I seek (present, 'it is my character to seek.' The preposition in composition denotes, as so often, the direction; not studioe, nor insuper) the gift (to— in the case in question), but I do seek (the repetition of the verb is solemn and emphatic) the fruit which (thereby, in the case before us) abounds to your account (this εἰς λάγον refers to the same expression, ver. 15—fruit, μαθῶν in the day of the Lord, the result of your labour for me in the Lord. De W., after Van Hengel, doubts whether πλεονάξωνα can be constructed with εἰς, and would therefore separate them by a comma. But surely little would be thus gained, for the εἰς would belong to the whole clause, the connecting link being καρπὸν πλεονάξωνα, so that even thus the idea of πλεονάξωνα must be carried on to εἰς: and perhaps in 2 Thess. 1. 3 it is so: see note there).

18.] But (notwithstanding that the gift is not that which I desire, I have received it, and been sufficiently supplied by it) I have (emphatic, and exactly as in αὕτες τὸν μαθῆν — I have no more to ask from you, but have enough)—not as Erasm., Beza, Gror., &c. I have duly received all you sent') all (I want), and abound (over and above): I am filled (repetition and intensification of περισσεῖς), having received at the hands of Epaphroditus the remittance from you, of a savour of fragrance (a clause in apposition, expressing a judgment,—so frequently in poetry, especially in tragedians.—Π. ο. 735, ἦ τις Ἀχαιῶν ῥίβης, χειρὸς ἔλαφος, ἀπὸ πόργου, λυγρὸν ὄλφορν: Eur. Orest. 950, τείθεσθαι λευκὸν ὑπέκδια παρὶς, ἀματηρὸν ἔταν. See Kühner, ii. 146. On δομὴ εὐωδίας see Eph. v. 2, note), a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God (see Heb. xiii. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 5).

19.] an assurance taken up from τῷ θεῷ above, μοῦ because he (Paul) was the receiver: this was his return to them: 'qu i quasi servo ejus datu remunerabatur.' Beng. 

πληρώσας . . . . . all refers to vv. 16, 18; —as ye πεπλήρωκατε μοῦ τὴν χρείαν. It is an assurance, not a wish (—σαι), πασάν, not only in the department alluded to, but in all. Meyer refers to the beatitudes in Matt. v. and especially St. Luke's χαροταθροσσεθε καὶ γέλαστε, Luke vi. 21, as illustrative.

ἐν δοξῇ to be connected with πληρώσει, not with τὸ πλούτος αὐτοῦ: not, gloriously, as many Commentators, which is weak and flat in the extreme: but δοξα is the instrument and element by and in which 'all your need' will be supplied: in glory, cf. Ps. xvi. 15 LXX: but not only at the
coming of Christ [as Meyer, according to his wont], but in the whole glorious imparting to you of the unsearchable riches of Christ, begun and carried on here, and completed at that day. In Christ Jesus. 20.] The contemplation both of the Christian reward, of which he has been speaking, and of the glorious completion of all God's dealings at the great day,—and the close of his Epistle,—suggests this ascription of praise. But—however rich you may be in good works, however strong I may be by Christ to bear all things,—not to us, but to our God and Father be the glory. On eis tous aiwnas tov aiwnon, see note, Eph. iii. 21.

21-23.] Greeting and final benediction. 21.] pantas aygwn, every individual saint. The singular has love and affection, and should not be lost as in Conybe. 'Salute all God's people.' In Christ Jesus belongs more probably to the first clause. —see Rom. xvi. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 19,—than to aygwn, as in ch. i. 1, where, as Meyer observes, the expression has a diplomatic formality, whereas here there is no reason for so formal an adjunct.

PROS FILIPIPHEIOUS.

20. afi npiow ins w N1: om N3. om tov aiwnov KL S0.

21. om omas F. om de L 17 Chr-mss Thdr Thl Ambrst (kai mal. aeth).

for ek, aπo B.

23. rec aft kuriou ins npiow, with D a d f k l fuld(with F-lat al) Syr syr-w-ast copt gr-lat-inf: om ABKLN rel am D-alt (and G-lat) arm Damasc Thl-mss Ec. rec (for tov pneumatov) paiun (cf 2 Cor xiii. 13. De W. supposes txt to have come from Gal vi. 18), with KL3 rel syr Chr Thdr: txt ABDFN 17 67x latt copt aeth arm Damasc lat-inf. om aman BF 67 80 chr Ec Ambrst: ins ADKL rel vss.

SUBSCRIPTION. rec adds eγραφη απo ρωμης, with B'KL rel syr Chr Thdr Euthal; rec adds further δι επαρρθησαν, with KL rel syr Chr Thdr: diα ρωμην κ. επαρρ. copt: no subser in 1: eγραφη κ.λ., omn πρ. φιλ., h k m o: txt AB b 17, and D(addig επικροτη) F(prefig ετεληθη) Ν (adding σιχοι c).

oi συν εμοι αδελφοι] These must, on account of the next verse, have been his close friends, perhaps his colleagues in the ministry, such as Aristarchus, Epaphras, Demas, Timotheus. But there has arisen a question, how to reconcile this with ch. ii. 20? And it may be answered, that the lack of iσοφυσια there predicates of his companions, did not exclude them from the title αδελφοι, nor from sending greeting to the Philippians: see also ch. i. 14. 22.] pantes oι aygou, all the Christians here. oι εκ της Καισαριος οικιας These perhaps were slaves belonging to the familia of Nero, who had been converted by intercourse with St. Paul, probably at this time a prisoner in the praetorian barracks (see ch. i. 13 note) attached to the palace. This is much more likely, than that any of the actual family of Nero should have embraced Christianity. The hint which Chrys., al., find here, ei γαι oι εκ των βασιλειων παντων κατεφωνησαν δια των βασιλεια των ουρανων, poles μαλλον autoyn xρη τουτο ποιεϊν, is alien from the simplicity of the close of an Epistle. The reason of these being specified is not plain: the connexion perhaps between a colonia, and some of the imperial household, might account for it. 23.] See Gal. vi. 18.
ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΛΑΣΣΑΕΙΣ.

I. 1 Παῦλος ἀπόστολος χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ, καὶ Τιμόθεου ὁ ἀδελφός, τοῖς ἐν Κολοσσαῖς ἀγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν χριστῷ. Χάρις ὑμῖν ἐκ τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ εἰμηνίας ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.

3 Ἐγγραφήσομεν τῷ ἑαυτῷ πατρὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Παῦλου ἐκ τῆς Κολοσσαῖς.

TITLE. εἷς παῦλου τοῦ απόστολον ἡ προς κολ. εἰς πολιτικήν, with rel : Steph η πρ. κολ. επ. παῦλ. τοῦ αγίου απ. παῦλ. επ. πρ. κολ. Ι.: η πρ. κολ. επ. ταῦτα διδασκαλία κολασσαίων: παρὰ παῦλον Ι.: πρ. κολ. επ. τ. αγ. απ. παῦλ. h: επ. πρ. κολ. k l: αρχεται πρ. κολ. F: txt ABDKN m n o 17 syr-marg-gr copt. [In D this ep follows Eph. Ushually in D the subser of one ep and the title of the next are written in 3 lines pros . . . [ἐπιληψθει αρχεται | προσ . . . , here however the middle line is omitted.]

CHAP. I. 1. rec εἰσο., bef χρῷ, with DK rel vulg-ed(with demid tol) Syr aeth Chr Thdrt: txt ABFLK 17 am(with fuld) D-lat syr copt Synops Damasc Ambrst Jer Cassioli.

2. Steph κολασσ. (see prolegomena), with AK rel syr copt Orig Synops Nyssen Chr-mus Thdrt Euthal Damasc-ns Thl-ns Suid (so also Polyxenos Hierocles Herodot-mss Xenoph-mss): txt B'(see table)DLFLN e f n (g 17, in title) latt Cloa Chn Thdrt-ns Thl-lat-θ (so also Herodot Xenoph Strabo al, and coins in Eckhel). aft χριστοῦ ins ησου AD^KNF Λ 17 latt Syr syr-w-ast lat-θ: om BD^KL rel syr aeth Chr Thdrt Damasc. rec aft ησου ins κυρίου ἡσου χριστοῦ, with AC^DF rel vulg-ed(with demid tol) syr-w-ast: om BDKL d k 17 am(with fuld hrdl mar) sah Syr syr aeth-rom Chr(expr., καθόσιν εν ταύτῃ τῷ χριστοῦ ὑμᾶς) Thl^exp Oris-int^exp.

3. rec ins καὶ bef πατρὶ (from Eph i. 3), with AC^DF^KL rel vulg(and F-lat); τῷ

CHAP. I. 1, 2.] ADDRESS AND GREETING. 1. διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ see on rel. καὶ Τιμόθεου as in 2 Cor. i. 1 (see also Phil.i.1; Philm. 1, and 2 Thess. i. 1) ὁ ἀδελφός as on 2 Cor. i. 1. On his presence with the Apostle at the time of writing this Epistle, see Prolegg. to Past. Epp. § 1. 5. Chrys. (and similarly Thl.) says on ὁ ἀδελφός, οὐκόνοι καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπόστολοι: but there seems no reason for this. 2.] On COLOSSUS, or COLASS.Ε., see Prolegg. § ii. 1.

ἄγιοις should be taken (Mey.) as a substantive, not (De W.) with ἀδελφοῖς, in which case πιστοῖς, being already (as Mey.) presupposed in ἄγιοις, would be taut and superfluous:— and καὶ πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν χριστῷ seems to be a specifying clause, "viz.—to the &c.:" or perhaps added merely on account of the natural diplomatic character of an opening address. εἰς χρῷ belongs closely to πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς or perhaps rather to ἀδελφοίς alone, as Phil. i. 14: no article before ἐν χριστῷ.
being wanted, because no distinction between these and any other kind of brethren is needed — the idea ἀδελφὸς-ἐν-χριστῷ being familiar. 
χάρις κ.τ.λ. ] see Rom. i. 7. 3—29.] Introduction, but unusually expanded, so as to anticipate the great subjects of the Epistle. And herein, 3—8. ] Thanksgiving for the faith, hope, and love of the Colossians, announced to him by Epaphras. 3.] We (I and Timotheus. In this Epistle, the plural and singular are too plainly distinguished to allow us to confuse them in translating: the plural pervading ch. i., the singular ch. ii., and the two occurring together in ch. iv. 3, 4, and the singular thenceforward. The change, as Mey. remarks, is never made without a pragmatic reason) give thanks to God the Father πατέρα, like ηλιος, γη, &c. is anharmonious, as indeed often in our own language, from its well-known universal import as a predicate necessarily single of its kind: see Eph. i. 2, 3) of our Lord Jesus Christ, always (I prefer, against De W., Mey., B.-Crus., Eadie, to join πάντοτε to περί ὑμῶν, rather than to εὐχαριστοῦ. For 1) it would come rather awkwardly after so long an interruption as τὸ ἐπὶ πατ. τ. κυρ. Ἰησ. [see however 1 Cor. xv. 58): and 2) I doubt whether the next clause would begin with περί ὑμῶν, so naturally as with πάντοτε περί ὑμῶν, which are found together so usually, e.g. 1 Cor. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 3 [2 Thess. i. 2]) praying for you (Meyer's and Eadie's objection to joining πάντοτε with προσευχόμενοι is, that it is much more natural to say 'we always give thanks when we pray,' than 'we give thanks, always praying.' But we must remember that 'prayer with thanksgiving' was the Apostle's recommendation [Phil. iv. 6], and doubtless his practice, and that the wider term προσευχόμενοι included both: since we heard of (not, because we heard: see Eph. i. 15. The facts which he heard, not the fact of his hearing, were the ground of his thanksgiving) your faith in (not τὴν ἐν: the immediate element of their faith, not its distinctive character, is the point brought out) Christ Jesus, and the love which ye have (these words, dwelling on the fact as reported to him, carry more affectionate commendation than would merely the article τὴν of the rec.) towards all the saints, 5.] on account of (not to be joined with εὐχαριστοῦ. as Beng., Eadie, al.: for, as Mey., the ground of such thanksgiving is ever in the spiritual state of the person addressed, see Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 4 ff.; Eph. i. 15 &c., and this can hardly [against Eadie] be said to be of such a kind: but with ἐν ἔχειτε — so Chr.: τοῦτο πρὸς τοὺς πιστοὺς, ὡστε μὴ ἐνατίθητε ἐγενέτοι τὴν ἀνεύων. ο νὰ γὰρ μὴ τὴς ἐπτεριν τό τὸ κέρδος τῆς ἀγάπης τῆς ἐν τοῖς τῶν ἄγιοι κοπομένων αὐτῶν: χάρῳμεθα, φθαίνων, ὅτι μεγάλα καυτοῖς προβεβλετε ἐν τοῖς ὑπάρχοντι. So also Calvin, who combats the argument of Est., al., deriving support for the idea of meritorious works from this verse. It is obvious that we must not include τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν in the reference, as Grot., Osth., De W., al., have done: for πιστίς ἐν χ. I. cannot be referred to any such motive: besides, see ver. 8, where he returns again to τὴν ἀγάπην the hope on the objective sense of ἐπίθε, see reff.) which is laid up (Kypke quotes Plat. Cæs. p. 715—κοινὴ ἀθλα τῆς ἀνδραγαθίας παρ' αὐτῶν φυλασσόμενα ἀποκείθαι, and Jos. B. J. ii. 8. 11,—ταῖς μὲν ἄγαθαις [φυχαί] τὴν ὑπὲρ ἀκελάν διασταὶ ἀποκείθαι) for you in the heavens
6. rec ins καὶ βεβ. ἐστίν (to preserve the balance of the sentence, that καθ. κ. εἰν π. τ. Κ. might answer to καθ. κ. ἐν υἱῷ), with ΔΨΚ ΚΛΙΝ κέβι ηπέταται Aug Sedul. rec om καὶ αὐτανόμουν (homoeoteleuton), with ΔΨΚ rel Damasc-txt: ins ABCDF ΚΛΙΝ a h m o 17 vss gr-lat.-β'.

7. rec aft καθος ins καί (to corresp with καθ. καὶ above), with ΔΨΚ rel syr gr-β': om ABCDF ΚΛΙΝ 17 latt Syr cort with arm Ambst Pelag., eμαθατε Ν.

(reff.), of which ye heard (aorist, referring to the time when it was preached among them) before (not, before this letter was written, as Beng., and usually: nor, as Mey., before ye had the hope: nor, as De Wette, al., before the hope is fulfilled: nor exactly as Edie, 'have [see above] already heard'; but 'before,' in the absolute indefinite sense which is often given to the idea of priority, —'cre this'—ολιν, αλικαλινον (in as part of) the word of the truth (no hendiatys) of the Gospel (the word or preaching whose substance was that truth of which the Gospel is the depository and vehicle),

6.] which is present (emphatic: is now, as it was then: therefore not to be rendered as an imperfect, which stultifies the argument, cf. ἐστιν καρποφόρος ... αὐτὲς ἡμ. below. οὗ παρεγένοτο, φησίν, κ. ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλ' ἐμείνε, κ. ἐστιν ἐκεῖν, Chrys.) with you (pregnant construction,—'came to and remains with': see ref., and Herod. vi. 21, παρόν ἐστ' Ἀσίπνη, and al. frequently) as it is also in all the world (ἐνὶ δὲ μᾶλλον οἱ πολλοὶ ἐκ τοῦ κοινοφόρου ἐχοῦν πολλοὺς τῶν δομῶν στηρίζοντα, διὰ τοῦτο ἐπήγαγον 'καθ. κ. εἰν π. τ. κόσμον καρπαχοῦ' κατ' ἐκείνους ἐστιν. Chrys. The expression παρον τι κόσμου is no hyperbole, but the pragmatic repetition of the Lord's parting command. Though not yet announced to all nations, it is παρόν ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ—the whole world being the area in which it is proclaimed and working) bearing fruit and increasing (the paragraph is broken and unbalanced. The filling up would be, to insert καὶ after κοσμῷ as in rec. Then it would be, 'which is present with you, as also in all the world, and καρπ. and αὐτ. [in all the world], as also among you.' But neglecting this, the Apostle goes forward, more logically indeed [for the reference in the rec. of κ. ἐστὶν καρπ. to the second member of the foregoing comparison, is harsh], but not so perspicuously, enlarging the παρόντος of his first member into ἐστὶν καρπ. κ. αὐτ. in the second, and then in these words, for fear he should be supposed to have predicated more of the whole world than of the Colossians, returning to καθ. κ. εἰν υἱῷ. Again: on καρπ. κ. αὐτ. cf. Thdrt.: καρποφορίαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κέκλειθη ἡ εἰσινομημένη πολιτείαν. ἠβαθην δὲ τῶν πιστευόντων το πλῆθος. As Mey. observes, the figure is taken from a tree, whose καρποφορία does not exclude its growth: with κορμ., it is otherwise) as also (it is καρπ. κ. αὐτ.) among you, from the day when ye heard (it) (the Gospel: better thus, than with De W., to go on to τὴν χάριν τού θεοῦ for the object of both verbs: εἶπεν, being not simultaneous with ἦκον, and ἐν ἀληθ. not being thus satisfied: see below) and knew (ἐπιέπεισα, intensively, but too delicately so to be expressed by a stronger word in our language) the grace of God in truth (not adverbial, 'truly,' as Beza, Olsh., Mey., De W., al.), which would make ἐν ἀληθ. a mere qualification to εἶπεν: still less, as Storr, αἰν. τὴν χάριν ἀληθ. ἀλλ' ἢ Γρότ., ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ ἀληθ.: but generally said, 'truth' being the whole element, in which the χάρις was proclaimed and received: 'ye knew it in truth,'—in its truth, and with true knowledge, which surely differs very appreciably from the adverbial sense [against Elliscott]: οὐκ ἐν λόγῳ, φησὶν, οὔτε ἐν ἀληθ., ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἐργοῦς).

7. as (σει. ἐν ἀληθείᾳ—in which truth) ye learnt from Ephesians (mentioned again ch. iv. 12 as of Colossae, and Philen. 23, as then a fellow-prisoner with the Apostle. The name may be [hardly as Cony. is] identical with Epaphroditus. A person of this latter name is mentioned, Phil. ii. 25, as sent by St. Paul to the church at Philippi, and ib. iv. 18, as having previously brought to him offerings from that church. There is no positive reason disproving their iden-
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tity: but probability is against it) our (not 'my') beloved fellow-servant (of Christ, Phil. i. 1) not necessarily 'fellow-bondman, as Conyb.: συναυχίδωτως, Phillem. 23), who is a minister of Christ faithful on our behalf (the stress of the predicatory sentence is on πιστός ὑπὲρ ημῶν, which ought therefore in the translation not to be sundered. He was one acting faithfully "vice Apostoli" [Ambst.], and therefore not lightly to be set aside in favour of the new and erroneous teachers), who also made known to us your love in the Spirit (viz. the αγάπη of which he described himself in ver. 4 as having heard; their love εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους. This love is emphatically a gift, and in its full reference the chief gift of the Spirit, [Gal. v. 22; Rom. xv. 30,] and is thus in the elemental region of the Spirit,—as distinct from those unspiritual states of mind which are τα σαφή. This love of the Colossians he lays stress on, as a ground for thankfulness, a fruit of the hope laid up for them,—as being that side of their Christian character where he had no fault [or least fault, see ch. iii. 12—14] to find with them. He now proceeds, gently and delicately at first, to touch on matters needing correction.

9—12.] Prayer for their confirmation and completion in the spiritual life.

9.] For this reason (on account of your love and faith, &c, which Epaphras announced to us) we also (καί, on our side— the Colossians having been the subject before; used too on account of the close correspondence of the words following with those used of the Colossians above) from the day when we heard (it) (viz. as in ver. 4) do not cease praying for you ('preceum mentionem generatim fecit ver. 3: nunc ex-primuit, quid precetur,' Beng.) and (brings into prominence a special after a general, cf. Eph. vi. 18, 19) beseeching that (on ἐν after verbs of praying, see note, 1 Cor. xiv. 13) ye may be filled with (accusative, as in reff:) the thorough knowledge (ἴστήνυ, stronger than γνῶσις: see 1 Cor. xiii. 12) of His (God's, understood as the object of our prayer) will (respecting your walk and conduct, as the context shews: not so much His purpose in Christ, as Chrys., [διὰ τοῦ νῦν προσέγχεις ἡμᾶς αὐτῷ, οὐκετί δι' ἀγ-γέλου], Gec., Thl., al.: cf. Eph. i. 9: but of course not excluding the great source of that special will respecting you, His general will to be glorified in His Son) in all wis-dom (seeing that ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, in the similar clauses, Eph. i. 8; ver. 28, ch. iii. 16, is absolute, I prefer taking it so here, and not, as Ellic., with πνευματικὴ and spiritual understanding (the instrument by which we are to be thus filled,—the working of the Holy Spirit, πνευματικὴ, On σοφία and σύνεσις, the general and particular, see note Eph. i. 8: so Bengal here,—"σοφία est quidam generans: σύνεσις est solertia quaedam, ut quosvis tem pore aliquid sequerrat, quod hic et num aptum est. σύνεσις est in intellectu: σοφία est in toto complexu facultatam animae") to walk (aim of the foregoing imparting of wisdom: 'so that ye may walk.' ἐνταῦθα περὶ βίου κ. τῶν ἐργών φιλῶν ἃ ἐξ ἔχωμεν τῆς πιστεοῦσας: τὴν πολιτείαν. Chrys.)

worthily of the Lord (Christ, see reff. and cf. δίκαιος τοῦ Θεοῦ, 3 John 6) unto ('with
a view to,' subjective: or, 'so as to effect, objective: the latter is preferable) all (all manner of, all that your case admits) well-pleasing (the word occurs in Theophr. Character. 5, which is on ἀρέσκεια as a subjective quality. Mey. quotes from Polyb. xxxi. 26. 5, Παν γένος ἀρέσκεια προσφέρεται. The meaning is, 'so that [see above] in every way may be well pleasing to God?': in (exemplifying element of the καρπός; see below) every good work (not to be joined with the former clause, as [Ec., Thl., Ems., al., to the destruction of the parallelism) bearing fruit (the good works being the fruits): the περισσότερον is now further specified, being subdivided into four departments, noted by the four participles καρποφοροῦντες, συμμαθόνεοι, δυναμόμενοι, and εὐχαριστοῦντες. On the construction, see Eph. iii. 18 note) and increasing (see on ver. 6 above) by the knowledge of God (the instrument of the increase). This is by far the most difficult of the three readings [see var. read., the meaning of εὐ and εἰς, being very obvious—the former pointing out the element, the latter the proposed measure, of the increase. And hence, probably, the variations. It is the knowledge of God which is the real instrument of elevation, in soul and life, of the believer, not a γνώσις which φυσιοί, but an εὐγνώσις which εὐχαρίστησι, or 11.) (corresponding to ἐν πάση κ.τ.λ. above) in (not instrumental [Mey.], but betokening the element: all these, ἐν πάσῃ, ἐν πάσι ..., are subjective, not objective. The instrument of this strength comes in below) all (departments of every kind of strength being strengthened according to (in pursuance of, as might be expected from, refl.) the power of His glory (beware of the heidadys, 'his glorious power,' into which E. V. has fallen here: the attribute of His glorious majesty here brought out is its κράτος [see Eph. i. 19, note], the power which it has thus to strengthen. In the very similar expression Eph. iii. 16, it was the πλούς τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, the exubervant abundance of the same, from which as an inexhaustible treasure our strength is to come to (so as to produce in you, so that ye may attain to) all patient endurance (not only in tribulations, but generally in the life of the Spirit. Endurance is the result of the union of outward and inward strength) and long-suffering (not only towards your enemies or persecutors, but also in the conflict with error, which is more in question in this Epistle. Chrys.'s distinction, μακρομυθεὶς τις πρὸς εἰκόνιν ὁ δεσμός καὶ αὐξὴνατος ὑπομένει δὲ ὁδὸν δύνασθαι ἄμυναθα, though in the main correct, must not be closely pressed: see [Mey.].) Heb. xii. 2, 3) with joy (Mey. argues that these words must be joined, as Chr., [Ec., Thl., Est., al., with εὐχαριστήσεως, because in the other clauses the participles were preceded by these prepositional qualifications. But this can hardly be pressed, in the frequent disregard of such close parallelism by our Apostle, and seeing that εὐχαριστήσεως does in fact take up again μετὰ χάρας, which if attached to it is flat and unmeaning: and as De Wette says, by joining μετὰ χαρίᾳ to εὐχαριστήσεως, we lose the essential idea of joyful endurance,—and the beautiful train of thought, that joyfulness in suffering expresses itself in thankfulness to God. And so Luth., B.-Curn., Olsch., Eadie, al.), giving thanks to the Father (the connexion is not, as Chr., Thl. Calv., Calv., al., with ωδοφοβεῖα, the subject being εἰς, Paul and Timothy,—but with the last words [see above], and the subjects are τῷ πατρί; viz. of our Lord
Jesus Christ: see reff.) who made (historical—by His gift of the Spirit through His Son) us (Christians) capable (not, 'worthy,' as Est. after the Vulg.) for the share (participation) of the inheritance of the saints in the light (It is much disputed with what in τῷ φωτὶ is to be joined. Mey., after Chr., Ἐκ., Thl., &c., regards it as instrumental—as the means of the ικανωσία which has been mentioned. But this seems unnatural, both in sense, and in the position of the words, in which it stands too far from ικ. to be its qualifying clause. It connects much more naturally with κλῆρον, or perhaps better still with the whole, τὴν μερίδα τ. κλῆρον τῶν ἄγων, giving τῷ φῶς as the region in which the inheritance of the saints, and consequently our share in it, is situated. This seems understood by the usage of κλῆρον in Acts viii. 21, οὐκ ἐστὶ σοι μερίς οὐδὲ κλῆρον ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ = cf. also κλῆρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγασμένοις, ib. xxvi. 18. And so Thdt., al., De W., Eadie, al.—Grot., al., would take ἐν τῷ φωτὶ with ἄγων: against this the omission of the article is not decisive: but it does not seem so natural, as giving too great prominence to οἱ ἄγων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ as the ἐπώνυμοι of the inheritance, and not enough to the inheritance itself. The question as to whether he is speaking of a present inheritance, or the future glory of heaven, seems best answered by Chrys., δοκεῖ δὲ μοι κ. περὶ τῶν παρώνων κ. περὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἢμῶν λέγειν. The inheritance is begun here, and the meet-ness conferred, in gradual sanctification: but completed hereafter. We are ἐν τῷ φωτὶ here: cf. Rom. xiii. 12, 13; 1 Thess. v. 5; Eph. v. 8; 1 Pet. ii. 9 al.):

out into its negative and positive sides, of the ικανωσία above, to the doctrine concerning Christ, which the Apostle has it in his mind to lay down. Who rescued us out of the power (i.e. region where the power extends—as in the territorial use of the words 'kingdom,' 'county,' &c.) of darkness (as contrasted with light above: not to be understood of a person, Satan, but of the whole character and rule of the region of unconverted human nature where they dwelt), and translated (add to reff. Plat. Legg. vi. p. 762 b, πιστεύοντες τῷ μειστασθείς κατὰ μήνας ἐις ἔτερον ἄλλο τῶν φθόγγοντες, and a very striking parallel noticed by Mey., Plat. Rep. vii. p. 518 a, ἐκ τε φωτὸς οἰκότως μειστασμένως κ. ἐκ σκότους εἰς φωτὸς. The word is strictly local in its meaning) into the kingdom (not to be referred, as Mey. always so pertinaciously maintains, exclusively to the future kingdom, nor is metέστησιν proleptic, but a historical fact, realized at our conversion) of the Son of His Love (genitive subjective: the Son upon whom His Love rests: the strongest possible contrast to that darkness, the very opposite of God's Light and Love, in which we were. The Commentators compare Benson, 'the son of my sorrow,' Gen. xxxv. 18. Beware of the hendiadys, adopted in the text of the E. V. On the whole, see Ellicott’s note):

14—20.] Description, introduced by the foregoing, of the pre-eminence and majesty of the Son of God, our Redeemer.

14.] In whom (as its conditional element: as in the frequent expressions, ἐν χρυσῷ, ἐν κυρίῳ, &c.: see the parallel, Eph. i. 7) we have (see note, ibid.) Redemption (this is perhaps better, taking the art. as the idiomatic way of expressing the

g k o v ss gr-lat-ff; ins only ἑαν Ρ. m. for ικανωσία, καλεσταί: 1D F 17 goth ath arm Did Ambrost Vig-taps: καλεσταί και ικανωσία. B. μιας BN c 17 am(with tol) spec syc-marg ath arm Did Thl Ambrost. 14. εἰσχωμέν B, acepim pox. copt. (A defective,) see aft απολυτρωσιν ins dia του αἰματος αὐτου (from Eph i. 7), with rel vulg-ed(with demid) syr Thrdt (Ec Iren-int : om ABCDFKL N d e l m n o 17 am(withalles F-lat) ful) Syr copt goth Ath Bas Nyssen Chr Cyr,e spec lat-ff. om την αφεσιν D1. (om την απολ. D-lat.)
abstract subst., than our Redemption as in my earlier editions. See Ellic.), the remission ("on the distinction between ἁμαρτία and παράσις, see Trench, Synon. § xxxiii.") of our sins (note, Eph., ut supra. parašamóstatov, the more special word, is here replaced by ἁμαρτίων the more general: the meaning being the same): 15.] The last verse has been a sort of introduction, through our own part in Him, to the Person of the Redeemer, which is now directly treated of, as against the teachers of error at Colosse. He is described, in His relation 1) to God and His Creation [vv. 15—17]: 2) to the Church [18—20]. This arrangement, which is Meyer's, is far more exact than the triple division of Bähr,—"Source of creation [15, 16]: upholder of creation [17]: relation to the new moral creation [18—20]), who is (now—in His glorified state—essentially and permanently: therefore not to be understood, as De W. after Erasm., Calv., Beza, Grot., Beng., al., of the historical Christ, God manifested in our flesh on earth: nor again with Olsch., Bleek on Heb. i. al., of the eternal Word: but of Christ's present glorified state, in which He is exalted in our humanity, but exalted to that glory which He had with the Father before the world was. So that the following description applies to Christ's whole Person in its essential glory,—now however, by His assumption of humanity, necessarily otherwise conditioned than before that assumption. See for the whole, notes on Phil. ii. 6, and Heb. i. 2 f.; and Usteri, Paulinisches Lehrbegriff, ii. § 4, p. 256 ff.) image (the image) of the invisible God (the adjunct of ὄρατος is of the utmost weight to the understanding of the expression. The same fact being the foundation of the whole as in Phil. ii. 6 ff., that the Son ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὤσηκεν, that side of the fact is brought out here, which points to His being the visible manifestation of that in God which is invisible: the ἀργός of the eternal silence, the ἀπάγαγμα of the ἄγας which no creature can bear, the χαράκτηρ of that ὀνόματι which is incommunicable God's: in one word the ἐνίγμη of the Father whom none hath seen. So that while ἀφόρατος includes in it not only the invisibility, but the incommunicability of God, εἰκών also must not be restricted to Christ corporeally visible in the Incarnation, but understood of Him as the manifestation of God in His whole Person and work—pre-existent and incarnate. It is obvious, that in this expression, the Apostle approaches very near to the Alexandrian doctrine of the λόγουs: how near, may be seen from the extracts from Philo in Usteri: e. g. de somniiis, 41, vol. i. p. 656, καθάπερ τὴν ἀνθρωπόν ὑπὲρ εἰκόνα τὴν λόγιον τούτου· ὡς δὲ ἤνθισεν ἐτών, κ. τ.άς περὶ τὴν σωματικὴν ἀλλοιωσιν ὁτινὶς ἀνθρωπίνου ὄντως καὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰκόνα, τὸν ἀνθρώπου λόγον ὡς αὐτόν κατανόησαι: and de Monarch. ii. 5, vol. ii. p. 225, λόγος δὲ ἐτών εἰκόνα θεοῦ, δι' οὗ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος εὐθυμουργεῖτο. See other passages in Bleek on Heb. i. 2. He is, in fact, as St. John afterwards did, adopting the language of that lore as far as it represented divine truth, and rescuing it from being used in the service of error. [This last sentence might have prevented the misunderstanding of this part of my note by Ellic. in loc.: shewing, as it does, that the inspiration of St. Paul and the non-inspiration of Philo, are as fully recognized by me as by himself]), the first-born of all creation (such, and not 'every creature,' is the meaning [so I still hold against Ellic. But see his whole note on this passage, as well worth study]: nor can the strict usage of the article be alleged as an objection: cf. below, ver. 23, and Eph. ii. 21 note: the solution being, that κτίσις, as our word 'creation,' may be used anarthrous, in its collective sense. Christ is ὁ πρωτότοκος, the first-born, Heb. i. 6. The idea was well known in the Alexandrian terminology: τοῦτον μὲν γάρ,—viz. τὸν ἀσματον ἐκείνον, θεῖα ἁίδια φορούμενον εἰκόνα—πρεσβύτατον υἱὸς ὁ τῶν ὠντων ἀνέγειτε πατὴρ ἐν τῷ πατρὸς ὄντος, πρὸς παραδίδεσσα ἀρχήτου ἐκείνον μικρότερον τῷ πατρὸς ὄντος, εἰρηνικὸν εἰρήνης. Philo, de Confus. Ling. 14, vol. i. p. 414. That the word is used as one whose meaning and reference was already known to the readers, is shown by its being predicated of Christ as compared with two classes so different, the creatures, and the dead (ver. 18). The first and simplest meaning is that of priority of birth. But this, if insisted on, in
its limited temporal sense, must apply to our Lord's birth from his human mother, and could have reference only to those brothers and sisters who were born of her afterwards; a reference clearly excluded here. But a secondary and derived meaning of πρωτότοκος, as a designation of dignity and precedence, implied by priority, cannot be denied. Cf. Ps. Lxxviii. 27. κάτω πρωτότοκοι θεάμεναι αὐτῶν, ὲψι- λὸν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλείσθαι τῆς γῆς:—Exod. iv. 22, νῦν πρωτότοκοι μου Ισραήλ:—Rom. viii. 29, and Heb. xii. 23, ἐκκατοστία πρωτότοκον ἀπογεγραμμένον ἐν ωραίοις, where see Bleek's note. Similarly πρω- τόγοιος is used in Soph. Phil. 180, οὗτος πρωτογόνων ἴως οἷκων οὐδενὸς βάτερος. It would be obviously wrong here to limit the sense entirely to this reference, as the very expression below, αὐτὸς ἐστὶν πρὸ πάντων, shews, in which his priority is distinctly predicated. The safe method of interpretation therefore will be, to take into account the two ideas manifestly included in the word, and here distinctly referred to—priority, and dignity, and to regard the technical term πρωτότο- κος as used rather with reference to both these, than in strict construction where it stands. "First-born of every creature" will then imply, that Christ was not only first-born of His mother in the world, but first-begotten of His Father, before the worlds,—and that He holds the rank, as compared with every created thing, of first-born in dignity: for, &c., ver. 16, where this assertion is justified. Cf. below on ver. 18.

It may be well to notice other interpretations: 1) Meyer, after Tert., Chr., Thdrt., at, Bengel, al., would restrict the term to its temporal sense: 'primogenitus, ut ante omnia genus:' on this, see above. 2) The Arians maintained that Christ is thus Himself declared to be a πτεσὶς of God. It might have been enough to guard them from this, that as Chr. remarks, not πρω- τόκτιστος, but πρωτότοκος is advisedly used by the Apostle. 3) The Socinians [also Grots. Wetst., Schleierm., al., after Theod. Mops.] holding the mistaken view of the necessity of the strict interpretation of πρωτότοκος—maintain, that Christ must be one of those among whom He is πρωτότοκος—and that consequently πτεσὶς must be the new spiritual creation—which it certainly cannot mean without a qualifying adjective to indicate such meaning—and least of all here, where the physical πτεσὶς is so specifically broken up into its parts in the next verse. 4) Worst of all is the rendering proposed by Isidore of Pelusium and adopted by Erasm. and Er.-Schmidt, 'first bringer forth' [πρωτοτοκός, but used only of a mother]. See on the whole, De W.: and a long note in Bleek on the Hebrews, vol. i. pp. 43–48; 16.] because (explanatory of the πρωτ. πάντος πτεσιν.)—it must be so, seeing that nothing can so completely refute the idea that Christ himself is included in creation, as this verse in Him (as the conditional element, pre-existent and all-including: not 'by Him,' as E. V. after Chr. [τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ, δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐστιν]—this is expressed afterwards, and is a different fact from the present one, though implied in it. The idea of the schoolmen, that in Christ was the 'idea omnium rerum,' adopted in the main by Schl., Neander, and Olsh. ["the Son of God is the intelligible world, the κόσμος νοοτρός, i. e. creation in its primitive idea, Hinfself; He bears in Himself their reality," Olsh.] is, as Meyer rightly observes, entirely unsupported by any views or expressions of our Apostle elsewhere: and is besides abundantly refuted by ἑκτιθη, the historical aorist, indicating the physical act of Creation) was created (in the act of creation: cf. on ἑκτιστατι below) the universe (thus only can we give the force of the Greek singular with the collective neuter plural, which it is important here to preserve, as 'all things' may be thought of individually, not collectively) (viz.) things in the heavens and things on the earth (Wetst. urges this as shewing that the physical creation is not meant: 'non dictum δὶ ωραῖς κ. ἡ γῆ ἑκτισθη, sed τὰ ἐν &c., quo habitatores significantiur qui recogniciuntur' [cf. the Socinian view of ver. 15 above]: the right answer to which is—not with De W., to say that the Apostle is speaking of living created things only, for manifestly the whole universe is here
treated of, there being no reason why living things should be in such a declaration distinguished from other things,—but with Mey. to treat τα ἐν τῷ ὄρπ. κ. τὰ ἐκ τ. γῆς as an inexact designation of heaven and earth, and all that is in them, Rev. v. 6. In 1 Chron. xxix. 11, the meaning is obviously this, σὺ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρπ. κ. ἐκ τ. γῆς δείκνύει (εἰς), things visible and things invisible (which divide between them the universe: Mey, quotes from Plato, Phaed. p. 79 A, θόμεν οὖν, εἰ βοῦλει, ἔφη, δίο εἰδῆ τῶν υψώτων, τῷ μὲν ὄρατοι, τῷ δὲ ἀειδές). The ὀφαρτα are the spirit-world [not, οὕτως ψυχή, Chr.: this, being incorporated, would fall under the ὀφαρτα, for the present purpose], which he now breaks up by ἐτέ... ἐτέ... ἐτέ... whether (these latter be) thrones, whether lordships, whether governments, whether authorities (ἐτέ... often repeated, see ref.): and Plat. Rep. p. 493 d, 612 A, Soph. El. 535 f [Mey.]. These distinctive classes of the heavenly powers occur in a more general sense in Eph. i. 21, where see note. For δυνάμεις there, we have ὄρατοι here. It would be vain to attempt to assign to each of these their places in the celestial world. Perhaps as De W., the Apostle chose the expressions as terms common to the doctrine of the Colossian false teachers and his own; but the occurrence of so very similar a catalogue in Eph. i. 21, where no such object could be in view, hardly looks as if such a design were before him. Mey. well remarks, "For Christian faith it remains fixed, and it is sufficient, that there is testimony borne to the existence of different degrees and categories in the world of spirits above; but all attempts more precisely to fix these degrees, beyond what is written in the N. T., belong to the fanciful domain of theosophy." All sorts of such interpretations, by Teller and others, not worth recording, may be seen refuted in De W.): the whole universe (see above on τὰ πάντα, ver. 16) has been created (not now of the mere act, but of the resulting endurance of creation—leading on to the σωφρόνεις below) by Him (instrumental: He is the agent in creation—the act was His, and the upholding is His: see John i. 3, note) and for Him (with a view to Him: He is the end of creation, containing the reason in Himself why creation is at all, and why it is as it is. See my Sermons on Divine Love, Serm. I. II. The fancies and caprices of those who interpret creation here ethically, are reconned and refuted by Meyer): and He Himself (emphatic, His own Person) is (as in John viii. 58, of essential existence: ἐστι) must have been used, as in John i. 1: but as Mey. well observes, the Apostle keeps the past tenses for the explanatory clauses referring to past facts, ver. 16, 19) before all things (in time; bringing out one side of the πρωτότοκος above: not in rank, as the Socinians: of which latter James v. 12, 1 Pet. iv. 8, are no justifications, for if τῷ πάντῳ be taken as there, we must render, 'and He, above all, exists,' 'He especially exists,' πρωτότοκος being adverbial, and not to be resolved. For the temporal sense, see ref.) all things (not 'ownes,' as Vulg.) and in Him (as its conditional element of existence, see above on εἰν αἰτία ver. 16) the universe subsists (‘keeps together,’ 'is held together in its present state': οὐ μὴν αὐτὸς αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν ἄμφος εἰς τὸ εἶναι παράγγειλεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτὰ συγκρατεῖ ἐν, Chr. On the word, see ref.): and add Philo, quis rer. div. hares. 12, vol. i. p. 481, ὁ ἐναόμοιος ὄγκος, ἐκ ἑαυτοῦ διαλύεται ἀν τοῦ κ. νεκρῶς, σωφρόνεις κ. (σωφρόνεις προνοι θεοῦ). 18—20.] Relation of Christ to the Church (see above on ver. 15): And He (emphatic; not any angels nor created beings: the whole following passage has a controversial bearing on the errors of the Colossian teachers) is the Head of the body the church (not 'the body of the church'; the genitive is much more naturally taken as one of apposition, inasmuch
as in St. Paul, it is the church which is, not which possesses, the body, see ref.): who (q. d. in that He is; the relative has an argumentative force: see Matthie, Gr. § 477: in which case it is more commonly found with a particle, δι μέν, or δι γέγος) is the beginning (of the Church of the First-born, being Himself πρωτότ. εκ τ. νεκρ.), cf. παραταγός, 1 Cor. xxv. 23, and ref., especially the last. But the word evidently has, standing as it does here alone, a wider and more glorious reference than that of mere temporal precedence: cf. ref. Rev. and note: He is the Beginning, in that in Him is begun and conditioned the Church, vv. 19, 20, the First-born from (among) the dead (i.e. the first who arose from among the dead: but the term πρωτότοκος [see above] being predicated of Christ in both references, he uses it here, regarding the resurrection as a kind of birth. On that which is implied in πρωτότ., see above on ver. 15), that He (emphatic, again: see above) may become (not, as Est., 'ex quibus efficitur, Christum . . . tenere:') but the aim and purpose of this his priority over creation and in resurrection) in all things (ref. Beza, and so Kypke) argues, that because the Apostle is speaking of the Church, πάντα must be masculine, allowing however that the neuter has some support from the τα πάντα which follows. In fact this decides the question: the τα πάντα there are a resumption of the πάντα here. The εν then is not 'inter,' but of the reference: — 'in all matters: παραταγός, as Chrys.: because the πάντα which follows applies not only to things concrete, but also to their combinations and attributes) pre-eminent (first in rank: the word is a transitional one, from priority in time to priority in dignity, and shews incontestably that the two ideas have been before the Apostle's mind throughout. Add to ref., from Wetst., πεποιηθεν εις θυσία κρατίστου, Demosth. 1416, 25: and Plut. de paer. educ. p. 9 ν, τους παίδας εν παίδι τάχιον πρωτεύοντα).

19.] "Confirmatory of the above-said γίνεσθαι εν πάσιν αὐτ. πρωτεύοντα—of which there can be no doubt, since it pleased &c." Meyer.—for in Him God was pleased (on the use of εδοκεῖω for δοκεῖω by the later Greeks, see Fritzsche's note, on Rom. vol. ii. pp. 360—72. The subject here is naturally understood to be God, as expressed in 1 Cor. i. 21; Gal. i. 15: clearly not Christ, as Conyb., thereby inducing a manifest error in the subsequent clause, 'by Himself He willed to reconcile all things to Himself;' for it was not to Christ but to the Father that all things were reconciled by Him, cf. 2 Cor. v. 19. See a full discussion on the construction, and the subject to εδοκήσατο, in Elle's note. His conclusion, that πάντα ως πάντα that the whole fulness (of God, see ch. ii. 9; Eph. iii. 19, and on πάντα, note, Eph. i. 10, 23. We must bear in mind here, with Mey., that the meaning is not active, 'id quod rem implet,' but passive, 'id quo res impletur:' all that fulness of grace which is the complement of the divine character, and which dwells permanently in Christ: 'cumulatissima omnium divinarum rerum copia,' Beza,—as in John i. 16. The various other interpretations have been,—"the essential fulness of the Godhead;" so Ec., al.; which is manifestly not in question here,—but is not to be set aside, as Eadie, by saying that 'the divine essence dwelt in Christ unchangeably and not by the Father's consent or purpose: it is His in His own right, and not by paternal pleasure; for all that is His own right, is His Father's pleasure, and is ever referred to that pleasure by Himself;—"the fulness of the whole universe," so Conyb., and Castellio in Beza. This latter answers well: "Quomodo mentio universitatis rerum? Nam res ipsa clamat Apostololum de sola ecclesia licit agere, ut etiam 1 Cor. xv. 18 (?); Eph. i. 10; iv. 6, 20 (?):—'the Church itself,' as Severianus in Cramer's Catena, toutoontin tòν ἐκκλησίαν τον πεπληρωμένον ἀυτοῦ εν τῷ χριστῷ,—and Tidtr., òκληρ. ἐκκλησίαν εν τῷ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐκάλεσεν, ἀς τῶν θείων χαρισμάτων πεπληρωμένων,
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20. Eph. ii. 15. κατοικήσας, καί δ' αυτοῦ 'ἀποκαταλλάξατο 'τα πάντα εἰς αὐτὸν εἰρημοτομήσας διὰ τοῦ 'αἰματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ, δ' αυτοῦ, τοὺς τὰς γῆς τα τὰ� τοὺς τοις

w so Rom. iii. 23. x ver. 16.

ταύτης ἤση εἰδόκησα τίνι θεδιν εν τῷ χριστῷ κατοικήσας, τοὺς ἠστῶν αὐτῷ σωμάτων,—and similarly B. Crus., al., and Schleierm., understanding the fulness of the Gentiles and the whole of Israel, as Rom. xi. 12, 25, 26. But this has no support, either in the absolute usage of πλήρωμα, or in the context here. See others in De W.) should dwell, and ('hie inhabitatio est fundamentum reconciliationis,' Beng.) by Him (as the instrument, in Redemption as in Creation, see above ver. 16 end) to reconcile again (see note on Eph. ii. 16) all things (= the universe: not to be limited to all intelligent beings, or all men, or the whole Church;) these πάντα are broken up below into terms which will admit of no such limitation. On the fact, see below) to Him (viz. to God, Eph. ii. 16: not αὐτός; the writer has in his mind two Persons, both expressed by αὐτός, and to be understood from the context. The aspirate should never be placed over αυτ., unless there is a manifest necessity for such emphasis. But we are not (as Conybh.,—also Est., Gratz., Olsh., De W.) to understand Christ to be meant: see above), having made peace (the subject is not Christ [as in Eph. i. 15; so Chrys. (διὰ τοῦ θείου σταυροῦ], Thdrt., (Ec., Luth., al.), but the Father: He is the subject in the whole sentence since εἰδόκησαν by means of the blood of (genitive possessive, belonging to, figuratively, as being shed on: 'ideo pignus et pretium nostra eum Deo pacificationis fuerit sanguis Christi, quia in cruce fusus,' Calv.) His Cross, through Him (emphatic repetition, to bring αὐτός, the Person of Christ, into its place of prominence again, after the interruption occasioned by εἰρημοτομήσας) not meaning, as Castal. [in Mey.'], 'per sanguinem ejus, hoc est, per eum:' for the former and not the latter is explicative of the other),—whether (τὰ πάντα consist of) the things on the earth, or the things in the heavens. It has been a question, in what sense this reconciliation is predicated of the whole universe. Short of this meaning we cannot stop: we cannot hold with Erasm., al., that it is a reconciliation of the various portions of creation to one another: 'ut abolitis peccatis, quae dirimem concordiam et pacem celestium ac terrestrium, jam amicitia jungerentur omnibus;' for this is entirely precluded by the εἴτε...εἴτε: nor, for the same reason, with Schleierm., understand that the elements to be reconciled are the Jews and Gentiles, who were at variance about earthly and heavenly things, and were to be set at one in reference to God (εἰς αὐτόν). The Apostle's meaning clearly is, that by the blood of Christ's Cross, reconciliation with God has passed on all creation as a whole, including angelic as well as human beings, unreasonable and lifeless things, as well as organized and intelligent. Now this may be understood in the following ways: 1) creation may be strictly regarded in its entirety, and man's offence viewed as having, by inducing impurity upon one portion of it, alienated the whole from God: and thus τὰ πάντα may be involved in our fall. Some support may seem to be derived for this by the undeniable fact, that the whole of man's world is included in these consequences (see Rom. viii. 19 f.). But on the other side, we never find the angelic beings thus involved: nay, we are taught to regard them as our model in hallowing God's name, realizing His kingdom, and doing His will (Matt. vi. 8, 10). And again the εἴτε...εἴτε would not suffer this: reconciliation is thus predicated of each portion separately. We are thus driven, there being no question about τὰ εἰς τῆς γῆς, to enquire, how τὰ εἰς τοῖς οἰκίας could be said to be reconciled by the blood of the Cross. And here again, 2) we may say that angelic, celestial creation was alienated from God because a portion of it fell from its purity: and, though there is no idea of the reconciliation extending to that portion, yet the whole, as a whole, may need thus reconciling, by the final driving into punishment of the fallen, and thus setting the faithful in perfect and undoubted unity with God. But to this I answer, a) that such reconciliation (?) though it might be a result of the coming of the Lord Jesus, yet could not in any way be effected by the blood of His Cross: b) that we have no reason to think
that the fall of some angels involved the rest in its consequences, or that angelic being is evolved from any root, as ours is from Adam: nay, in both these particulars, the very contrary is revealed. We must then seek our solution in some meaning which will apply to angelic beings in their essential nature, not as regards the sin of some among them. And as thus applied, no reconciliation must be thought of which shall resemble ours in its process—for Christ took not upon Him the seed of angels, nor paid any propitiatory penalty in the root of their nature, as including it in Himself. But, far as much as He is their Head as well as ours,—far as much as in Him they, as well as ourselves, live and move and have their being, it cannot be but that the great event in which He was glorified through suffering, should also bring them nearer to God, who subsists in Him in common with all creation. And at some such increase of blessedness does our Apostle seem to hint in Eph. iii. 10. That such increase might be described as a reconciliation, is manifest: we know from Job xv. 15, that “the heavens are not clean in His sight,” and ib. iv. 18, “His angels He charged with folly.” In fact, every such nearer approach to Him may without violence to words be so described, in comparison with that previous greater distance which now seems like alienation;—and in this case even more properly, as one of the consequences of that great propitiation whose first and plainest effect was to reconcile to God, in the literal sense, the things upon earth, polluted and hostile in consequence of man’s sin. So that our interpretation may be thus summed up: all creation subsists in Christ: all creation therefore is affected by His act of propitiation: sinful creation is, in the strictest sense, reconciled, from being at enmity: sinless creation, ever at a distance from his unapproachable purity, is lifted into nearer participation and higher glorification of Him, and is thus reconciled, though not in the strictest, yet in a very intelligible and allowable sense. Meyer’s note, taking a different view, that the reconciliation is the great κατανάσις at the παρούσια, is well worth reading: Eadie’s, agreeing in the main with the above result, is unfortunately, as so usual with him, over-loaded with flowers of rhetoric, never more out of place than in treating lofty subjects of this kind. A good summary of ancient and modern opinions is given in Do W.

21—23. Inclusion of the Colossians in this reconciliation and its consequences, if they remained firm in the faith.

21, 22. And you, who were once alienated (subjective or objective?)—‘estranged’ [in mind], or ‘banished’ [in fact]? In Eph. ii. 12, it is decidedly objective, for such is the cast of the whole sentence there: so also in ref. Ps.: in Eph. iv. 18 it describes the objective result, with regard to the life of God, of the subjective ‘being darkened in the understanding.’ It is better then here to follow usage, and interpret objectively,—‘alienated’ (made aliens) (from God,—not ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰов., nor ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τ. θεοῦ: for ‘God’ is the subject of the sentence), and at enmity (active or passive?) ‘hating God,’ or ‘hated by God?’ Mey. takes the latter, as necessary in Rom. v. 10 [see note there]. But here, where the διάνοια and ἔργα τὰ πονηρὰ are mentioned, there exists no such necessity: the objective state of enmity is grounded in its subjective causes;—and the intelligent responsible being is contemplated in the whole sentence: cf. εἰ γε ἐπιμενέτε κ.τ.λ. below. I take τὰ ἔργα therefore actively, ‘hostile to Him’) in (dative of reference; not, as Mey. is obliged to take it on account of his passive τὰ ἔργα of the sake, ‘on account of,’ &c.: this is not the fact: our passive τὰ ἔργα subsists not on account of any subjective actuality in us, but on account of the pollution of our parent stock in Adam) your understanding (intellectual part: see on Eph. ii. 3, iv. 18. Erasm.’s rendering, in his Par., ‘enemies to reason,’ ‘eternum qui carni servit, repugnat rationi,’ is clearly wrong: διάνοια is a vox media, and cannot signify ‘reason;’ besides, there is nothing here about ‘carni inscribere;’ that of Tert., Amb., and Jcr., ‘enemies to God’s will,’ rests on the reading αὐτῶν after διαν.—see var. readd.: that of Beza, Mich., Storr, and Bähr,—‘mento operibus nullis intenta,’ is allowable constructionally: the verb is followed by εἰ, cf. Ps. lxiiii. 8, διεσώθησαν ἐν πονηρίᾳ. Sir. vi. 37; xxxix. 1, and consequently the article before εἰ would not be needed: but is—
pugned by the τοῖς ἔρτ. τοῖς πωνηροῖς,—not only wicked works, but the wicked works which ye did) in your wicked works (sphere and element in which you lived, applying to both ἀπάλλ. and ἐγθ. τῇ διαν.), now however (contrast to the preceding description,—the participles forming a kind of πρότασις: so δέν αὐτῶν τὴν φρονέσιν ἅπαξιν μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων, ὅ τε χειρὸς παντελεύτω τῶν ἴδιωτῶν, Isocr. ἀντιδ. c. 26: χρέων γὰρ μὲν μὴ λέγειν τὸ ἐόν, λέγει δ' ἄν, Herod. v. 50: Eur. Acest. 487 (476). See more examples in Hartung, i. p. 186. It is probably this δὲ which has given rise to the variety of readings: and if so, the rec. is most likely to have been original, at least accounting for it) hath He (i. e. God, as before: the apparent difficulty of this may have likewise been an element in altering the reading) reconciled in (of the situation or element of the reconciliation, cf. ver. 21, εν τῇ σαρκί μου, and 1 Pet. ii. 24) the body of his (Christ’s) flesh (why so particularized? ‘distinguitur ab ecclesia, quae corpus Christi dicitur,’ Beng.,—but this is irrelevant here: no one could have imagined that to be the meaning:—‘corpus humanum quod nobiscum habet commune Filios Dei,’ Calv. [and so Grot., Calv.],—of which the same may be said:—as against the Docete, who maintained the unreality of the incarnation: so Beza, al.; but St. Paul nowhere in this Epistle maintains, as against any adversaries, the doctrine of its reality. I am persuaded that Mey. is right:—He found occasion enough to write of the reconciliation as he does here and ver. 20, in the angel-following of his readers, in which they ascribed reconciling mediatorship with God partly to higher spiritual beings, who were without a σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς) by means of His Death (that being the instrumental cause, without which the reconciliation would not have been effected) to (aim and end, expressed without eis τό: as in Eph. i. 4, al. fr.) present you (see Eph. v. 27 and note: not, as a sacrifice) holy and unblameable and irreproachable (‘erga Deum . . . . respectu vestri . . . . respectu proximi,’ Beng. But is this quite correct? do not ἀμωμ. and ἀνεγκλ. both refer to blame from without? rather with Meyer, ἀμωμός represents the positive, ἀμωμ. and ἀνεγκλ. the negative side of holiness. The question whether sanctitatis inherens or sanctitas imputata is here meant, is best answered by remembering the whole analogy of St. Paul’s teaching, in which it is clear that progressive sanctification is ever the end, as regards the Christian, of his justification by faith. Irrespective even of the strong testimony of the next verse, I should uphold here the reference to inherent holiness, the work of the Spirit, consequent indeed on entering into the righteousness of Christ by faith: ‘locus est observatione dignus, non conferri nobis gratuitam justitiam in Christo, quin Spiritus ciam regeneremur in obedientiam justitie: quemadmodum alibi [1 Cor. i. 30] doctet, Christum nobis factum esse justitiam et sanctificationem.’ Calvin) before His (own, but the aspirate is not required: see above on ver. 20: not, that of Christ, as Mey., reading ἀποκαταλλαγητέ: in Eph. i. 4, a different matter is spoken of) presence (at the day of Christ’s appearing): 23] (condition of this presentation being realized: put in the form of an assumption of their firmness in the hope and faith of the Gospel)—if, that is (i. e. ‘assuming that,’ see note on 2 Cor. v. 3), ye persist (more locally pointed than μενετε;—usually implying some terminus ad quem, or if not, perseverance to and rest in the end) in the faith (ref.: also Xen. Hell. iii. 4. 6, Ἀγησίλαος δι᾽ . . . ἐπεμένει [al. ἐνεῖξε] ταῖς σπουδαίαις: more frequently with ἔτι, see Rost u. Palm sub voce) grounded (see Eph. iii. 18, note: and on the sense, Luke vi. 48, 49) and stedfast (1 Cor. xv. 58,
where the thought also of μη μετακ. occurs, and not (the second of two correlative clauses, if setting forth and conditioned by the first, assumes a kind of subjective character, and therefore if expressed by a negative particle, regularly takes μη, not οὐ. So Soph. Electr. 380, μέλλουσι γάρ σε... ἐνταῦθα πέμψα, ἐνα πάντω ἡλίου φέγγως προσδέη. See more examples in Hartung, ii. 113 f.) being moved away (better passive than middle: cf. Xen. rep. Lac. xv. 1, τὰς δὲ ἀλλὰ πολιτείας εὑρό ἄν τις μετακινεῖμαι κ. ἐτὶ νῦν μετακινοῦμαι: it is rather their being stirred [objective] by the false teachers, than their suffering themselves [subjective] to be stirred, that is here in question) from the hope (subjective, but grounded on the objective, see note on Eph. i. 18) of (belonging to, see Eph. as above: the sense "wronged by" [Mey., De W., Ellic.] is true in fact, but hardly expresses the construction) the Gospel, which ye heard ("three considerations enforcing the μη μετακινεῖσθαι: the metakineisθαι would be for the Colossians themselves inexcusable [οὐ ἄμεινον], inconsistent with the universality of the Gospel [τοῦ κυρίου, &c.], and contrary to the personal relation of the Apostle to the Gospel." Mey. This view is questioned by De W., but it certainly seems best to suit the context: and cf. Chrys. πάλιν αὐτοῦ φέρει μάρτυρα, ἐστά τὴν οἰκουμένην ἄπαντα, and see below)—which was preached (οὐ λέγει τοῦ κυριο-τομένου, ἀλλὰ ήδη πιστευόντος κ. κυριο-θέντος, Chr.) in the whole creation (see Mark xvi. 15. On the omission of the article before κτίσει see above, ver. 15, note) which is under the heaven,—of which I Paul became a minister (κ. τοῦτο οὐ τὸ διαθητατον συντελεῖ, μέγα γάρ avtoú ἢν τὸ ἀξιωμα λοιπόν πανταχώ ψηλολον, κ. τῆς οἰκουμένης υπό τοῦ διακόνου)...
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(plural, because the θλήφεις are thought of individually, not as a mass: those sufferings which are wanting) of the tribulations of Christ in my flesh (belongs to άντανακλων, not [as Aug. on Ps. lxvii. c. 3, vol. ix. p. 1104, Storr, al.] to των θλήφων του χρ., not only because there is no article [των εν τη σαρκί μου], which would not be absolutely needed, but on account of the context: for if it were so, the clause των θλήφων του χρ., would contain in itself that which the whole clause asserts, and thus make it flat and tautological) on behalf of (see on οτερα above) His body, which is the Church (the meaning being this: all the tribulations of Christ's body are Christ's tribulations. Whatever the whole Church has to suffer, even to the end, she suffers for her perfection in holiness and her completion in Him: and the tribulations of Christ will not be complete till the last pang shall have passed, and the last tear have been shed. Every suffering saint of God in every age and position is in fact filling up, in his place and degree, the θλήφεις του χριστοῦ, in his flesh, and on behalf of His body. Not a pang, nor a tear is in vain. The Apostles, as standing out prominent among this suffering body, predicates this of himself κατ' εξωχήν; the άντανακλώσεως to which we all contribute, was on his part so considerable, as to deserve the name of άντανακλώσεως itself—I am contributing θλήφεις which one after another fill up the ὑστερήματα. Notice that of the παθηματα του χριστοῦ not a word is said [see however 2 Cor. i. 5]: the context does not concern, nor does θλήφεις express, those meritorious sufferings which He bore in His person once for all, the measure of which was for ever filled by the one sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, on the cross: He is here regarded as suffering with His suffering people, bearing them in Himself, and being as in Isa. liii. 9, "afflicted in all their affliction." The above interpretation is in the main that of Chrys., Thl., Aug., Anselm, Calv., Beza, Lath., Melaneth., Est., Corn.-a-Lap., Grot., Calov., Olish., De W., Ellic., Conyb. The latter refers to Acts ix. 4, and thinks St. Paul remembered those words when he wrote this: and Vitringa (cit. in Wolf) says well, "Hae sunt passiones Christi, quia Ecclesia ipsius est corpus, in quo ipse est, habitat, vivit, ergo et patitur." The other interpretations are 1) that the sufferings are such as Christ would have endured, had he remained longer on earth. So Phot. (in Ediac): άυσα...έπαινον ην άντε να πρωτιστη καθ' άυ τρόπων κα. προς κρυφής κν. εινάγελετομενοι την βασιλειαν των οδρανών. 2) That the sufferings are not properly Christ's, but only of the same nature with His. Thus Thdrt., after stating Christ's sufferings in behalf of the Church, says, και ο θεός άποστόλος άς αυτως ἕπερ αυτῆς ἐπέστη τα ποικία παθήματα: and so Mey., Schl., Huther, and Winer. But evidently this does not exhaust the phrase here. To resemble, is not to fill up, 3) Storr, al., would render, "afflictions for Christ's sake,"—which the words will not bear. 4) Some of the Roman Catholic expositors (Bellarmine, Cajetan, al.) maintain hence the doctrine of indulgences: so Corn.-a-Lap. in addition: "Hinc sequitur non male Bellarminum, Salmeronenum, Franc. Suarez, et alios Doctorum Catholicos, cum tractant de Indulgentia, hac generalia Apostoli verba extendere ad thesaurum Ecclesie, ex quo ipsa dare solet indulgentias: hunc enim thesaurum voluit Deus constantem et satisfaciendam non tantum Christi, sed et Apostolorum omniumque Christi Sanctorum: ut definitiv Clemens VI, extra vagante [on this word, I find in Ducaugne, glossarium in voce, extravangentex in jure canonico dicuntur pontificem Romanorum constitutiones quae extra corpus canonici gratian, sive extra Decretorum libros vagonantes] niugenitum." But Estius, although he holds the doctrine to be catholic and apostolical, and "aliumt satis probata," yet confesses, "ex hoc Apostoli loco non videtur admodum solidae statui posse. Non enim sermo iste, quo dicit Apostolis se pati pro ecclesia, necessario sic accipientiis est, quod pro redimendis peccatorum peccatis quas fideles debent, patiatur, quod forte nonnihil habet arrogationis: sed per concorde sicut accepta, quomodo proxime dixerat "gande in passionibus meis pro vobris," ut nimium m unusual parte significet afflictiones et persecutiones pro salute fidei, ipsiusque ecclesiae promovenda toleratas." The words in italics are at least an ingenious confession, Con-
sult on the whole matter, Meyer's and Eadie's notes): **of which** (parallel with ὅπως above: in service of which, on behalf of which) I (emphatic, resuming ὅτι θαυμάζει above) became a minister, according to (so that my ministry is conducted in pursuance of, after the requirements and conditions of) the stewardship (see on 1 Cor. ix. 17) iv. 1, al.: also Eph. i. 10; iii. 2: not, 'dispensation,' as Chrys., Beza, Calv., Est., al.: the simpler meaning here seems best, especially when taken with διδάσκων. 

In domo Dei quae est ecclesia, sun eco-nomus, ut dispensans toti familia, i. e. singulis fideliibus, bona et dona Dei dominii mei,' Corn.-a-lap.) of God (of which God is the source and chief) **which was given** (entrusted to) me towards (with a view to; ref.) you (among other Gentiles; but as so often, the particular reference of the occasion is brought out, and the general kept back), to (object and aim of the stewardship: depends on τὸ οἰκ. τ. δοῦλοι) fulfill the word of God (exactly as in Rom. xv. 19, to fulfill the duty of the stewardship εἰς θυμας, in doing all that this preaching of the word requires, viz. 'ad omnes perdurce,' as Beng., see also below: a pregnant expression. The interpretations have been very various: 'sermonem Dei vocat promissiones . . . quas Deus præstitit misso ad gentes Apostolo qui Christum eis predictacert,' Beza: 'finem adscriptit sui ministeri, ut echos sit Dei sermo, quod fit dum obedientier accipitur,' Calv.: 'ut compleam predicacionem evang. quam cepit Christus,' Corn.-a-lap.) 'ut plene ac perfecte annuntiarem verbo Dei: vel, secundum alios [Vatabl. al.] ut ministerio meo impleam aternum Dei verbum, i. e. propositum et decretum de vocatione gentium ad fidem: vel demide, quod probabilitus est, ut omnia loca impleam verbo Dei,' Est.: 'valet, suppleere doctrinam divinam, nempe institutione quam Epaphras inchoavit, profleganda et conficienda,' Fritzsche ad Rom., vol. iii. p. 275, where see much more on the passage: and other interpretations in Eadie, Meyer, and De W. All the above fail in not sufficiently taking into account the οἴκων, εἰς θυμας. Chrys. better, εἰς θυμας, ὁμοί, παρακαταστάτη τ. λόγων τ. Θεοῦ [but this connexion can hardly stand] ἐπί τῶν ἑδύναμεν. He goes on however to understand παρακαταστάτη of perfecting their faith, which misses the reference to fulfilling his own office)

26.] (namely) the mystery (see on Eph. i. 9) **which has been hidden from** (the time of; ἀπό is temporal, not 'from,' in the sense of 'hidden from') the ages and the generations (before us, or of the world: as many Commentators have remarked, not πρὸ τ. άλ., which would be 'from eternity,' but the expression is historical, and within the limits of our world), but now (in these times) **was manifested** (historical: at the glorification of Christ and the bestowal of the Spirit. This change of a participial into a direct construction is made when the contrasted clause introduced by it is to be brought into greater prominence than the former one. So Thuc. iv. 100, ἀλλὰ τε τρίπτε ψεύδομάται, καὶ μερικὴν προσήγαγον, ἤπειροι εὕλων ἀιών, τοιάδε. Herod. iv. 104, ἀλλὰ τα κατηγορόμενα σφι δόοι—καὶ τάλον αὐτοῦ σφι ἐγένετο κτεινώτες πολεμώατος. See Bernhardy, p. 173) to His saints (all believers, not merely as in Eph. iii. 5, where the reference is different, the Apostles and prophets [see there, and cf. various readings here], as some of the Commentators have explained it [not Thdt., who expressly says, οἱ ἡμαι θυμάκλητεν, τοιαύτες τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, κ. τ. διὰ τάους πε- πεκαυκότας], c. e. Est., Steiger, al., and Olsh., but regarding the Apostles only as the representatives of all believers): 27.] to whom ('quippe quibus,' as Mey.: this verse setting forth, not the contents of the mystery before mentioned, but a separate particular, that these άγίοι are persons to whom God, &c.) God willed (it is hardly justifiable to find in this word so much as Chrys, and others have done—τὸ δὲ θέλειν αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἄλλον, τούτο δὲ εἶναι χάριτος αὐτοῦ μαλλον ὑπευθύνουσα.
ποιῶν, ἡ ἀφίες αὐτῶν ἐπὶ κατορθώσατο μέγα φρονεῖ—and similarly Calv., Beza, and De W. Such an inference from the expression is quite legitimate: but not such an exposition. No prominence is given to the doctrine, but it is merely asserted in passing) to make known (γνωρισάω is not an interpretation of ἐφανερώθη, nor an addition to it, nor result of it, as has been supposed: see on the reference of the verse above) what (how full, how inexhaustible this meaning of τί, necessarily follows from its being joined with a noun of quantity like πλούτος) is the richness of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles (σεμνὸς εἰτε κ. ὑγον ἐπτύκην ἀπὸ παλαία διάθεσιν, ἐπιστάται ἁρμίν ἐπιστάταιν. Chrys. Beware therefore of all attempts to weaken down the sense by resolving the substantive into adjectives by hendiatys. This the E. V. has here avoided: why not always? Next, as to the meaning of these substantives. All turns on τῆς δόξης. Is this the [subjective] glory of the elevated human character, brought in by the Gospel [so Chrys., Thdrt. (Calv. ?)]? or is it the glory of God, manifested [objective] by His grace in this mystery, revealing His Person to the Gentiles? Neither of these seems to satisfy the conditions of the sentence, in which τῆς δόξης reappears below with ἡ ἐπίτις prefixed. On this account, we must understand it of τὸ πλοῦτος: cf. τὸ ἀνεχθαιστὸν πλοῦτον τοῦ χριστοῦ, Eph. iii. 8,—and τὸ τῆς ἐφανεραγότης μυστηρίου, ὡς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί κ.τ.λ. I Tim. iii. 16. Besides which [τὸν μυστήριον, τοῦτον] [ἐν τοῖς ἑθεον] is strictly parallel with, being explained by, [χριστῳ] [ἐν γίνοντα] (consists in) Christ (Himself: not to be weakened away into ἡ τοῦ χρ. γνώσις [Thl.].—‘doctrina Christi’ [Grot.: cf. Gal. ii. 20; Eph. iii. 17; 1 Tim. iii. 16, al.] among you (not to be confined to the rendering, ‘in you,’ individually, though this is the way in which Christ is among you: ἐν ὑμῖν here is parallel with ἐν τοῖς ἑθεον above: before the Gospel came they were χωρὶς χριστοῦ, Eph. ii. 12), the hope (emphatic; explains how Christ among them was to acquaint them τί τὸ πλοῦτος &c., viz. by being Himself the hope of that glory) of the glory (not abstract, ‘of glory’; τῆς δόξης is, the glory which has just been mentioned). 28. Whom (Christ) we (myself and Timothy: but generally, of all who were associated with him in this true preaching: not, as Conyb., ‘I,’ which here quite destroys the force: the emphasis is on ἡμεῖς. We preach Christ—not circumcision, not angel worship, not asceticism, as the source of this hope) proclaim (as being this ἐπίτις τῆς δόξης, warning (see on Eph. vi. 4, and below) every man, and teaching every man (I am inclined with Mey, to take νουθετοῦντες and διδάσκοντες as corresponding in the main to the two great subjects of Christian preaching, repentance and faith: but not too closely or exclusively: we may in fact include Thl.’s view,—νουθ. μὲν ἐν τίς πράξεως, διδ. δὲ ἐπὶ δογμάσως,—Steiger’s, that the former belongs more to early, the latter to more advanced instruction, and Huther’s, that the former affects the heart, while the latter informs the intellect [see Eadie’s note]: for all these belong, the one class to repentance, the other to faith, in the widest sense) in all wisdom (method of this teaching: not as Est. [giving the other but preferring this], ‘in perfecta
cognitione Dei et mysteriorum fidei, quae est vera sapientia, et sō Aug., Anselm, al.-latt.: this is usually in the accusative: but the Greek Commentators, τοιτ-έτι, μετά τής σοφίας κ. συνέτευκτος, that we may present (see above ver. 22) every man (notice the emphatic triple repetition of πάντα ἄνθρωποι, shewing that the Apostle was jealous of every least invasion, on the part of the false teachers, of those souls with whom he was put in charge. At the same time it carries a solemn individual appeal to those thus warned and taught: as Chrys.,—τί λέγεις; πάντα ἄνθρωποι; ναὶ, φησί, τούτο ἐπονοδόμην; τί γὰρ; εἰ καὶ μὴ γένηται τοῦτο, ἐπεσευδὸν ὁ μακ. Π. τέλειον ποίησαι. There is hardly perhaps, as Mey., Bisp., Ellic., al., suppose, an allusion to the Judizers, those who would restrict the Gospel) perfect in Christ (element of this perfection, in union with and life in Him,—comprehending both knowledge and practice. The presentation spoken of is clearly that at the great day of Christ's appearing): 29.] His own personal part in this general work—for which end (viz. the παραστήσια, &c.) I also (καί implies the addition of a new particular over and above the καταγγέλλειν, carrying it onwards even to this) tell in conflict (of spirit; in the earnestness with which he strove for this end, see ch. ii. 1—3: not, with adversaries: this was so, but is not relevant here. See Phil. i. 30. 1 Thess. ii. 2), according to (the proportion of, as is to be expected from) His (Christ's—see Phil. iv. 13: not God's, as Chrys., Grot., Calv., al.) working which wrought (not passive, as Est. See on Gal. v. 6, Eph. iii. 20, and Fritzsche on Rom. vii. 5) in me in power (reft.: there is no allusion to miraculous gifts, as Ambrst., Mich., al.).

CHAP. II. FIRST PART OF THE EPISTLE. His earnestness in entering into and forwarding the Christian life among them, so amply set forth in ch. i., is now more pointedly directed to warning them against false teachers. This he does by 1) connecting his conflict just spoken of, with the confirmation in spiritual knowledge of themselves and others whom he had not seen (vv. 1—3): 2) warning them against false wisdom which might lead them away from Christ (vv. 4—23); and that a) generally and in hints (vv. 4—13),—b) specifically and plain-spokenly (vv. 16—23). 1.] For (follows on, and justifies, while it exemplifies, ἀγωνιζόμενος, ch. i. 29) I would have you know how great (emphatic; not only that I have an αὐτόν, but how great it is. The word is unusual, see reft.) a conflict (of anxiety and prayer, cf. ch. iv. 12: his present imprisoned state necessitates this reference here: he could not be in conflict with the false teachers) I have on behalf of you and those in Laodicea (who probably were in the same danger of being led astray, see ch. iv. 16: on Laodicea, see Prolegg.: to Apocalypse, § iii. 13), and (it would not appear on merely grammatical grounds, whether this καί generalizes from the two specific instances, you and those in Laodicea, to the genus, including those two in the ὄσοι [see the two first reft., where however ἄλλοι: is added: it] adds another category to the two which have preceded, as in the third ref., Μακεδονίας καὶ ... καὶ ... καὶ ... τῆς Ὀρθηκῆς τῆς παράλληλην νέμονται. This must be decided on other grounds, viz. those furnished by the context: see below) (for) as
many as have not seen ("the form εἰφάκαν is decidedly Alexandrian . . . . The 'σεντικεία Καραφάνου' urged against it by Mey. is imaginary, as the third person plural does not elsewhere occur in St. Paul's Epistles." Ellicot)) my face in the flesh (my corporeal presence: εν σαρκι must not be joined with the verb, as Chrys. seems to have done, who adds, διείσθαι ἐκτάσα, ὡς ἐφάνετο συνέχασ εν πνεύματι; for in ver. 5 the σαρκί is attached to the Apostle. But it is not necessary nor natural, with Estus, to see any ταπεινοῖς, ut intelligant pluris faciem esse presentiam spiritus quam carnis. Rather is the tendency of this verse the other way—to exalt the importance of the Apostle's bodily presence with a church, if its defect caused him such anxiety), that (object of the ἄγων) their hearts (these are the words on which the interpretation of the former καὶ δοῦμ must turn. If αὐτῶν apply to a separate class of persons, who had not seen him, whereas the Colossians and Laodicceans had, how are we to bring them into the ἄγων? In ver. 4 the third person αὐτῶν becomes ὑμᾶς. Where is the link, on this hypothesis, that binds them together? The sentence will stand thus: "I am anxious for you who have seen me, and for others who have not: for these last, that &c. &c. This I say that no man may deceive you." What logical deduction can there be, from the circumstances of others, to theirs, unless they are included in the fact predicated of those others? in a word, unless the ὑμᾶς above include the Colossians and Laodicceans? Thus the αὐτῶν extends to the whole category of those who had never seen him, and the ὑμᾶς of ver. 4 singles them specially out from among this category for special exhortation and warning. This seeming to be the only logical interpretation of the αὐτῶν and ὑμᾶς, the καὶ above must be ruled accordingly, to be not copulative but generalizing: see there) may be confirmed (see ref. It can hardly be doubted her, where he is treating, not of troubles and persecutions, but of being shaken from the faith, that the word, so manifold in its bearings, and so difficult to express in English, carries with it the meaning of strengthening, not of comforting merely. If we could preserve in 'comfort' the trace of its derivation from 'forte'sari,' it might answer here: but in our present usage, it does not convey any idea of strengthening. This I still hold against Ellicot), they being knit together (so E. V. well: not 'instructi,' as vulg. On the construction, see ref. and Eph. iii. 18; iv. 2) in love (the bond of perfecteness as of union: disruption being necessarily consequent on false doctrine, their being knit together in love would be a safeguard against it. Love is thus the element of the συμβαθήσεια) and (besides the elementary unity) unto (as the object of the συμβ.) all (the) richness of the full assurance (ref. see also Luke i. 1) of the (Christian) understanding (the accumulated substantives show us generally the Apostle's anxions desire for a special reason to impress the importance of the matter on them. οὖδά, φησίν, ὅτι πιστεύετε, ἀλλά πληροφορηθῆτε ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, οὐκ εἰς τὸν πλούτον μόνον, ἀλλ' εἰς πάντα τὸν πλούτον, ἵνα καὶ ἐν πάσι καὶ ἑπτατε- μένοι πληροφορημένωι ήτε, Chrys.), unto (parallel with the former, and explaining πᾶν τὸ πλ. τ. πλούτ. τῆς σων. by ὡς ἐπιγ. τοῦ μ. τ. θεοῦ) the thorough-knowledge (on ἐπιγνώσις and γνώσις, here clearly distinguished, see on ch. i. 9) of the mystery of God (the additions here found in the rec. and elsewhere seem to be owing to the common practice of an-
notating on the divine name to specify to which Person it belongs. Thus τοῦ θεοῦ having been original, πατρὸς was placed against it by some, χριστοῦ or τοῦ χριστοῦ by others: and then these found their way into the text in various combinations, some of which from their difficulty gave rise again to alterations, as may be seen in various readings. The reading in text, as accounting for all the rest, has been adopted by Griesb., Scholz, Tischdf. [edn. 2], Olsb., De Wette, al.: τοῦ θεοῦ χριστοῦ by Mey. and Steiger. This latter is also edited, in pursuance of his plan, by Lachm. The shorter reading was by that plan excluded from his present text, as not coming before his notice. In the present digest, the principal differing readings are printed in the same type as that in the text, because I have been utterly unable to fix the reading on any external authority, and am compelled to take refuge in that which appears to have been the origin of the rest. One thing is clear, that τοῦ θεοῦ χριστοῦ, which Ellicott adopts 'with some confidence,' is simply one among many glosses, of which it is impossible to say that any has overwhelming authority. Such expressions were not corrected ordinarily by omission of any words, but constantly by supplementing them in various ways: in which (mystery, as Grot., Beng., Mey., De W., al. [Bisping well remarks, that the two in fact run into one, as Christ is Himself the μονοτητικός τοῦ θεοῦ. He might have referred to ch. i. 27 and 1 Tim. iii. 16]: not 'in whom,' as E. V. [but 'therein,' in marg.], and so, understanding 'whom,' of Christ, Chrys., Thdr., al.: for it is unnatural to turn aside from the main subject of the sentence,—the μονοτητικός, and make this relative clause epegegetic of the dependent genitive merely. To

this view the term ἀπόκρυφοι also testifies: see below) are all the secret (the ordinary rendering is, to make ἀπόκρυφοι the predicate after εἰσίν: 'in which are all, &c. hidden.' The objection to this is, that it is contrary to fact: the treasures are not hidden, but revealed. The meaning given by Bähr, B.-Crus., and Robinson [Lex.], 'laid up,' lying concealed, ἀποκλίμανη, does not belong to the word, nor is either of the places in the canonical LXX [Reff.] an example of it. The rendering which I have adopted is that of Meyer, and I am persuaded on consideration that it is not only the only logical but the only grammatical one also. The ordinary one would require ἄποκρυμένοι, or with ἀπόκρυφοι, a different arrangement of the words ἐν ὑπόκρυφοι εἰσίν, or ἐν. ὑπόκρυφοι. The objection, that for our rendering οἱ ἀπόκρυφοι would be required [Bähr], shews ignorance of the logic of such usage. Where the whole subject is covered by the extent of the predicate, the latter, even though separated by an intervening clause from the former, does not require the specification by the article. It may have it, but need not. Thus if all the men in a fortress were Athenians, I might say 1) οἱ ἄνδρες ἐν τῷ τείχει οἱ Ἀθηναίοι: but I might also say 2) οἱ ἄνδρες ἐν τῷ τείχει Ἀθηναίοι. If however, part of the men were Plateans, I must use 1), and could not use 2). Here, it is not asserted that 'all the treasures, &c. which are secret, are contained in the mystery,' others being implied which are not secret,—but the implication is the other way: 'the treasures are all secret, and all contained in the mystery,' Ellicott's rendering of ἀπόκρυφοι as an adverbial predicate, 'hiddenly,' is quite admissible, and tallies better with the
classification and nomenclature of predicators, which he has adopted from Donaldson: but I question whether the rendering given above be not both more simple and more grammatical) 

4.] See summary at the beginning of the chapter. [But (the contrast is between the assertion above, and the reason of it, now to be introduced] this (viz. vv. 1-3, not ver. 3 only, as Thl., Calv., al.: for ver. 1 is alluded to in ver. 5, and vv. 1-3 form a logically connected whole) I say, in order that (aim and design of it) no one may deceive you (the word is found in this sense in Ἑσχ. p. 16, 33, ἀπάθε τι παραλογισμὸν ὡμα, — in Ctesiph. [Wetst.], ἣ τοὺς ἀκόντας ἐπιλεξμόσας ὑπολαμβάνει ἢ σαῦν παραλογή (γ—also in Died. Sic., sic., in Wetst. See also Palm u. Rost sub voce) in (element in which the deceit works) persuasive discourse (add to the ref. Plat. Theocr. p. 162 c, σκοπείτε οὖν ... εἰ ἀποδείξετε πιθανολογία τις κ. εἰκόνι περὶ τηλακώταν λεγομένων λόγως, and see 1 Cor. ii. 1-9): 5. personal ground, why they should not be deceived: for though I am also (in καὶ the force of the καὶ does not extend over the whole clause introduced by τε), as it does in καὶ εἰ, but only belongs to the word immediately following it, which it couples, as a notable fact, to the circumstance brought up in the apodosis: so πῶλιν εἰ, καὶ ἵσταται βλέπεις, φονεῖς 5° ὄμως, ὁς νῦν ἡ λόγιον, Soph. Ed. Tyr. 302. See Hartung, i. 130) absent (there is no ground whatever from this expression for inferring that he had been at Colosseae, as Wiggers supposed, Stud. u. Krit. 1883, p. 181: nor would the mere expression in 1 Cor. v. 3 authorize any such inference were it not otherwise known to be so) in the flesh (ver. 1 ref.), yet (ἀλλὰ introduces the apodosis when it is a contrast to a hypothetically expressed protasis: so Hom. Π. ii. 31 τί, εἰπέρ γάρ τε χόλον γε κ. αὐτούμαρ καταπέλθῃ, ἀλλὰ τε καὶ μετα-στήθειν ἔξει κόστον, ὑφα τελέσθαι. See Hartung, ii. 40) in my spirit (contrast to τῇ σφήκ: not meaning as Ambrst. and Grot., 'Deus Paulo revelat quæ Colossis fierent') I am with you (ref.) rejoicing (in my earlier editions, I referred χαίρων to the fact of rejoicing at being able thus to be with you in spirit: but I see, as pointed out by Ellic., that this introduces a somewhat alien thought. I would now therefore explain it, not exactly as he does, by continuing the σὺν ὑμᾶς, but as referring to their general state of rejoicing as such presence would naturally suggest: the further explanation, καὶ βλέπων χ. following) and (strictly copulative: there is no logical transposition, as De W., al.: nor is καί expressive, 'rejoicing, in that I see'—as Calv., Est., al.: nor, which is nearly allied, is there any hecadys, 'I rejoice, seeing,' as Grot., Wolf, al.: nor need εἰρήν. ὑμᾶς be supplied after χαίρων, as Winer and Fritzsche: but as above. The passage of Jos. in ref. is rather a coincidence of terms than an illustration of construction) seeing your order (ἡ σύμ-πᾶσα σχέσις κ. τάξις τῆς οἰκουμένης, Polyb. i. 4. 6; see also 30. 6; Plat. Gorg. p. 504 a. It is often used of the organization of a state, e. g. Demosth. p. 200, 4, παντὸς τῆς τάξιν αἰρεῖται τῆς πολιτείας. Here it imports the orderly arrangement of a harmonized and undivided church. Mey.) and (as τάξις was the outward manifestation, so this is the inward fact
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on which it rested) the solid basis (τητ πολλα συμμεσγαι συγκλωσεις πεινων κ. κ. θάνατοι, τάτη στερέωμα γίνεται. Chrys. It does not mean τ'Φρωσις [Conybh.], nor τ' Φλάτατος [E. V.], nor indeed any abstract quality at all: but, as all nouns in -μα, the concrete product of the abstract quality) of your faith on Christ. 6. As then (he has described his conflict and his joy on their behalf—he now exhorts them to justify such anxiety and approval by consistency with their first faith) ye received (from Epaphras and your first teachers) Jesus the Christ the Lord (it is necessary, in order to express the full sense of των χρ. 'Τησ. των κυρ., to give something of a predicative force both to των χρ. and to των κυρ.: see 1 Cor. xii. 3 [but hardly so strong as "for your Lord," as rendered in my earlier editions: see Ellicott here]. The expression δ χρ. 'Τησ. δ κυρ., occurs only here: the nearest approach to it is in 2 Cor. iv. 5, κυριόταται. . . κυριοσκημ. . . χριστων 'Τησ. κυριων where also κυρ. is a predicate: but this is even more emphatic and solemn. Cf. also Phil. iii. 8, το ὕπερέχειν της γνώσεως χρ. Ιησου του κυρ. μου. On the sense, Bispign says well: "Notice that Paul here says, παρελάβετε των χριστω, and not παρελάβετε των κυριων and not παρελαβε των λαγων του χρ. True faith is a spiritual communion: for in faith we receive not only the doctrine of Christ, but Himself, into us: in faith He Himself dwells in us: we cannot separate Christ, as Eternal Truth, and His doctrine"). in Him walk (carry on your life of faith and practice), rooted (see Eph. iii. 18) and being continually built up in Him (as both the soil and the foundation—in both cases the conditional element. It is to be noticed 1) how the fervid style of St. Paul, disdaining the nice proprieties of rhetoric, sets forth the point in hand by inconsistent similitudes: the walking implying motion, the rooting and building, rest; 2) that the rooting, answering to the first elementary grounding in Him, is in the past: the being built up, answering to the continual increase in Him, is present. See Eph. ii. 20, where this latter is set forth as a fact in the past) and confirmed in the (or, your) faith (dat. of reference: it seems hardly natural with Mey. to take it instrumental, as there is no question of instrumental means in this passage), as ye were taught, abounding in it (reft.) in thanksgiving (the field of operation, or element, in which that abundance is manifested. "Non solum volo vos esse confirmatos in fide, verum etiam in ea proficere et proficiendo abundare per plenorem mysteriorum Christi cognitionem: idque cum gratiarum actiones eam perficiat, ut anctorem iussus totius boni." Est.)

8—15.] See summary, on ver. 1—general warning against being seduced by a wisdom which was after men's tradition, and not after Christ,—of whose perfect work, and their perfection in Him, he reminds them.

8. Take heed lest there shall be (the future indicative expresses strong fear lest that which is feared should really be the case); so Aristoph. Eccles. 487, περισκοπονειην κακειναι και τας δειμιας, μη ξυμφωνησην καθεσται το πρωμα. Hartung, ii. 138: see ref. and Winer, § 56, 2. b 1) any one who (cf. τινας τοπος-αυτος. ref. Gal. and note, as points at some known person) leads you away as his prey (Mey. connects the word in imagery with the foregoing περισσαετε—but this perhaps is hardly necessary after
the disregard to continuity of metaphor shewn in vv. 6, 7. The meaning 'to rob' [so with τῶν οἶκων, Aristten. ii. 22], adopted here by Thdr.t. [τῶν ἀποστόλων τ. πιστῶν ἐπίσημον], 'to undermine,' Chrys. [ἐστερ ἐν τ. πάση κάτωθεν διοικών μη παρέχη αἰτήθην, τ. δ' ἐπισκόπησθι], hardly appears suitable on account of the κατὰ...κατὰ, which seem to imply motion. We have [see Rost and Palsm. Lex.] συλλαγώγεων παρθένον in Heliod. and Nicet., which idea of abduction is very near that here] by means of his (or the article may signify, as Elic., the current, popular, philosophy of the day: but I prefer the possessive meaning: see below) philosophy and empty deceit (the absence of the article before κενός shows the κατ' to be epegeetical, and the same thing to be meant by the two. This being so, it may be better to give the τῆς the possessive sense, the better to mark that it is not all philosophy which the Apostle is blaming: for Thdr.t. is certainly wrong in saying ὡς ἀνών πιθανολογίαν, ἐντάθα φιλοσοφίαν ἐκάλος,—the former being, as Mey. observes, the form of imparting,—this, the thing itself. The ἐπισκόπησθι is not necessarily Greek, as Tert. de praescr. 7, vol. ii. p. 20 ['fuerat Athenis']—Clem. Strom. i. 11, 50, vol. i. p. 316. P. [οὐ πάσιν, ἀλλὰ τ. ἐπικόρυφον], Grot. al. As De W. observes, Josephus calls the doctrine of the Jewish sects philosophy: Antt. xviii. 2. 1.—'Ιουδαίους φιλοσοφοῖς τρεῖς ἦσαν, ἦ τ. τ. Ἐσχήρων κ. τ. τ. Ζαδούκαιαν, τρίτην δὲ ἐφιλοσόφους οἱ Φαρισαῖοι. The character of the philosophy here meant, as gathered from the descriptions which follow, was that mixture of Jewish and Oriental, which afterwards expanded into gnosti- cism), according to the tradition of men (this tradition, derived from men, human and not divine in its character, set the rule to this his philosophy, and according to this he ἐστολαγότες: such is the grammatical construction; but seeing that his philosophy was the instrument by which, the character given belongs in fact to his philosophy], according to the elements (see on Gal. iv. 3: the rudimentary lessons: i. e. the ritualistic observances ['nam continuo post exempli loco speciem unam adductit, circumentconionem seilicet, Calv.] in which they were becoming entangled) of the world (all these belonged to the earthy side—were the carnal and imperfect phase of knowledge—now the perfect was come, the imperfect was done away), and not (negative characteristic, as the former were the affirmative characteristics, of this philosophy) according to Christ ('who alone is,' as Bisp. observes, "the true rule of all genuine philosophy, the only measure as for all life acceptable to God, so for all truth in thought likewise: every true philosophy must therefore be κατά χριστόν, must begin and end with Him"): 9. [supply, 'as all true philosophy ought to be'] because in Him (emphatic: in Him alone) dwelleth (now, in His exaltation) all the fulness (cf. on ch. i. 19, and see below) of the Godhead (Deity; the essential being of God: θεός, to be distinguished) from, as Meyer. θέσις, the abstract of θέος, must not be confounded with θεότης the abstract of θείος, divine, which occurs in Rom. i. 20, where see Fritzche's note. θέσις does not occur in the classics, but is found in Lucian, Icaromenippus, c. 9: τῶν μὲν τινα πρώτον θεόν ἐπεκάλουν, τόσο δὲ τά δεύτερά κτ. τά τρίτα ἐνεμού τής θεότητος. 'The fulness of the Godhead' here spoken of must be taken, as indeed the context shews, metaphysically, and not as 'all fulness' in ch. i. 19, where the historical Christ, as manifested in redemption, was in question; see this well set forth in Mey.'s note. There, the lower side, so to speak, of that fulness, was set forth—the side which is presented to us here, is the higher side. Some strangely take πνεύμα here to mean the Church—so Heimr. in Mey.: 'Ab co collecta est omnis ex omnibus sine discrimine gentibus ecclesia, co tanquam οἶκος, tanquam σωματικός, con- tinctur gubernatore. Others again hold Christ here to mean the Church, in whom [or which] the πνεύμα dwells: so τινές in Thdr.t. and Chrys.) bodily (i. e., manifested corporally, in His present glorified Body—cf. on οἶκος above, and Phil. iii. 21. Before His incarnation, it dwelt in Him, as the λόγος ἐσπάρκος, but not σωματικός, as now that He is the λόγος ἐνσπάρκος. This is the obvious, and
I am persuaded only tenable interpretation. And so Calv., Est., De W., Mey., Eadie, al. Others have been 1) ‘really,’ as distinguished from τοικαία: so,—resting for the most part on ver. 17, where the reference is quite different,—Aug., Corn.-n-Lap., Grot., Schöttg., Wolf, Nösselt, al. 2) ‘essentially,’ διστάζως, as contrasted with the energic dwelling of God in the prophets: the objection to which is that the word cannot have this meaning: so Cyr., Thl., Calv., Beza, Usteri, p. 324, Oshl., al.), and ye are (already)—there is an emphasis in the prefixing of ἐστε) in Him (in your union with Him,—‘Christo cum sitis sensil insit,’ Erasm. in Mey.) filled up (with all the divine gifts—so that you need not any supplementary sources of grace such as your teachers are directing you to,—refl.: τὸς γὰρ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ χάριτος ἀπελάβατε, as Thdt.: cf. John i. 16, ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἴμεις πάντες ἑλάβωμεν: not, as Chrys., Thl., De W., ‘with the fullness of the Godhead,’ which is not true, and would require ἐστε καὶ ἴμεις ἐν αὐτῷ πεπ. Nor must ἐστε be taken as imperative, against the whole context, which is assertive, no less than usage—‘verbam ἐστε μνημον in N. T. sensu imperandi adhibitum involucrum, v. c. ἐστε Ἵκτιαμωμες, sed potius γίνεσθαι, cf. 1 Cor. x. 32; xi. 1; xv. 58; et Eph. iv. 32; v. 1, 7, 17, &c. Itaque si Paulus imperare hoc loco quicquam voluisset, scripturas potius erat κ. γίνεσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληροῦμεν.’ Wolf. What follows, shews them that He their perfection, is not to be mixed up with other dignities, as objects of adoration, for He is the Head of all such)—who (or, which): but the neuter seems to have been written to agree with πληρωμα is the Head of every government and power: 11.] (nor do you need the rite of circumcision to make you complete, for you have already received in Him the spiritual substance, of which that rite is but the shadow) in whom ye also were circumcised (not as E. V. ‘are circumcised,’—the reference being to the historical fact of their baptism) with a circumcision not wrought by hands (see Eph. ii. 11, and Rom. ii. 29). The same reference to spiritual [ethical] circumcision is found in Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6; Ezek. xlv. 7: Acts vii. 51), in (consisting in—which found its realization in) your putting off (= when you threw off: ἀπεκδόθη, the putting off and laying aside, as a garment: an allusion to actual circumcision,—see below) of the body of the flesh (i.e. as ch. i. 22, the body of which the material was flesh: but more here: so also its designating attribute, its leading principle, was fleshliness—the domination of the flesh which is a σάρξ ἄμαρτια, Rom. viii. 3. This body is put off in baptism, the sign and seal of the new life. “When ethically circumcised, i.e. translated by μετάνοια out of the state of sin into that of the Christian life of faith, we have no more the σῶμα τῆς σαρκός: for the body, which we bear, is disarrayed of its sinful σάρξ as such, quod its sinful quality: we are no more in τῇ σαρκί as before, when lust ζηγερεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν [Rom. vii. 5, cf. ib. ver. 29]: we are no more σάρκικως, πυπακένωυ ὡς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν [Rom. vii. 14], and walk no more κατὰ σάρκα, but ἐν καινότητι πνευμάτως [Rom. vii. 6], so that our members are δύναμις δικαιοσύνης τὸ θέως [Rom. vii. 18], ‘This Christian transformation is set forth in its ideal conception, irrespective of its imperfect realization in our experience.’ Meyer. To understand τὸ σῶμα to signify ‘the mass,’ as Calv. [‘corpus appellat massam ex omnibus vitis confutatum, elegantis metaphora’], Grot. [‘omne quod ex multis componitur solut hoc vocabulo appellari’], al.,—besides that it is bound up very much with the reading τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, is out of keeping with N. T. usage, and with the context, which is full of images connected with the body),—in (parallel to εἰβάfore—then the circumcision without hands was explained, now it is again adduced with another epithet bringing it nearer home to them) the circumcision of Christ (belonging to,
brought about by union with, Christ: nearly 2, but expresses more than 'Christian circumcision,' inasmuch as it shows that the root and cause of this circumcision without hands is in Christ, the union with whom is immediately set forth. Two other interpretations are given: 1) that in which Christ is regarded as the circumciser: ὁ χρ. περιτέμνει ἐν τῷ βαπτισματὶ ἀπεκδόθω ημᾶς τοῦ παλαιοῦ βίου, Thl. but not exactly so Chrys., who says, οὐκέτα φησὶν ἐν μαχαίρα ἡ περιτ., ἀλλὰ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ χρ.; οὗ τὰρ χεῖρ ἐπάγει, καθὼς ἔκει, τ. περιτομήν ταῦτην, ἀλλὰ τὸ πενῖα. Beza combines both—'Christus ipse nos intus suo spiritu circumcudit.' 2) that in which Christ is the circumcised—so Schöttg.: 'per circumcicionem Christi nos omnes circumcisi sumus. Hoc est: circumciscio Christi qui se nostri causa sponte legi subjectit, tam efficax fuit in omnes homines, ut nulla amplius circumcisione carnis opus sit, praecipe quum in locum illius baptismus a Christo surrogatus sit.' [1 p. 816]. The objection to both is, that they introduce irrelevant elements into the context. The circumcision which Christ works, would not naturally be followed by συνταφέντες αὐτῷ, union with Him; that which was wrought on Him might be thus followed, but would not come in naturally in a passage which describes, not the universal efficacy of the rite once for all performed on Him, but the actual undergoing of it in a spiritual sense, by each one of us. 12.] (goes on to connect this still more closely with the person of Christ—q. d., in the circumcision of Christ, to whom you were united, &c.)—buried together (i.e. when you were buried: the aorist participle, as so often, is contemporary with the preceding past verb) with Him in your baptism (the new life being begun at baptism,—an image familiar alike to Jews and Christians,—the process itself of baptism is regarded as the burial of the former life: originally, perhaps, owing to the practice of immersion, which would most naturally give rise to the idea: but to maintain from such a circumstance that immersion is necessary in baptism, is surely the merest trifling, and a recusation of the very ceremonial spirit which the Apostle here is arguing against. As reasonably might it be argued, from the ἀπέκδοσις here, that nakedness was an essential in that sacrament. The things represented by both figures belong to the essentials of the Christian life: the minor details of the sacrament which corresponded to them, may in different ages or climates be varied; but the spiritual figures remain. At the same time, if circumstances concurred,—e.g. a climate where the former practice was always safe, and a part of the world, or time of life, where the latter would be no shock to decency,—there can be no question that the external proprieties of baptism ought to be compelled with. And on this principle the baptismal services of the Church of England are constructed); in which (i.e. baptism: not, as Mey. [and so most expositors], 'in whom,' i.e. Christ. For, although it is tempting enough to regard the ἐν καὶ as parallel with the ἐν καὶ above, we should be thus introducing a second and separate leading idea into the argument, manifestly occupied with one leading idea, viz. the completeness of your Christian circumcision,—cf. ἄκροβοστία again below,—as realized in your baptism: whereas on this hypothesis we should be breaking off from baptism altogether,—for there would be no link to connect the present sentence with the former, but we must take up again from ἐξώσων. This indeed is freely confessed by Mey., who holds that all allusion to baptism is at an end here, and that the following is a benefit conferred by faith as separate from baptism. But see below. His objection, that if ἐν καὶ applied to baptism, it would not correspond to the rising again, which should be ἐξ οὗ, or at all events the local δι' οὗ, arises from the too precise materialization of the image. As ἐν before did not necessarily apply to the mere going under the water, but to the process of the sacrament, so ὑπὲρ now does not necessarily apply to the coming up out of the water, but also to the process of the sacrament. In it, we both die and rise again,—both unclothe and are clothed) ye were also raised again with Him (not your material, but your spiritual resurrection is in the foreground: it is bound on, it is true, to His material resurrection, and brings with it in the background, yours:
but in the spiritual, the material is included and taken for granted, as usual in Scripture) by (means of: the mediate, not the efficient cause; the hand which held on, not the planking that saved. I am quite unable to see why this illustration is, as Ellic. states, "in more than one respect, not dogmatically satisfactory." Surely it is dogmatically exact to say that Faith is the hand by which we lay hold on Christ the Ark of our refuge) your faith in (so Chrys., Thdrt., Ech, Thl., Erasm., Beza, Calv., Grot., Est., Corn.-Iap, Mey., al., Beng. ['fides est (oppos. operationis divinae)'], al., and Luther. De W. understand faith wrought by God ['durch den Glauben .den Gott wir tet,' Luth.: 'mittelt der Glaube die Birtumkeit Cottet,' De W.]. But both usage and the context are against this. The genitive after πίστις is ever (against Ellic. here) of the object of faith, see reft., and on Eph. i. 19) the operation of God (in Christ—that mighty power by which the Father raised Him, cf. Rom. viii. 11; ὑπὸ ἐνθρόνησαν ἐν χριστῷ, Eph. i. 20) who raised Him from the dead (πνευσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνωθεν προσέδωκεν τὴν ἀνάστασιν, ἐν- ἔχουν ἔχοντες τὰς διαιρέσεως χριστοῦ τὴν ἁνάστασιν. Thdrt. But there is very much more asserted than the mere προσέ- δωκεν τὴν ἀνάστασιν—the power of God in raising the dead to life is one and the same in our Lord and in us—the physical power exerted in Him is not only a pledge of the same physical power to be exerted in us, but a condition and assurance of a spiritual power already exerted in us, whereby we are in spirit risen with Christ, the physical resurrection being included and taken for granted in that other and greater one): 12—15.) Application, first to the (Gentile) Colossians, then to all believers, of the whole blessedness of this participation in Christ's resurrection, and assertion of the antiquity of the law, and subjection of all secondary powers to Christ. And you, who were (or perhaps more strictly, when you were) dead (allusion to ἐκ [τῶν] νεκρῶν) '13 καὶ ὕμνα τοῦ νεκροῦ ὑπάτας ἐν τοῖς πάροικοις πάντως καὶ τῇ ἀγαθοστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν' the much greater (in Gal. vi. 1, 2. (2 Mac. iii. 33 al.)
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12, 13. ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΛΑΣΣΑΕΙΣ.
forgiven (the aorist participle [which aor. ['having forgiven'] is in English, but having but one past active participle] is here not contemporaneous with συνεξώςω. but antecedent; this forgiveness was an act of God wrought once for all in Christ, cf. ἡμῶν below, and 2 Cor. v. 19; Eph. iv. 32) us (he here passes from the particular to the general—from the Colossian Gentiles to all believers) all our transgressions (καὶ τῶν νεκρόθεν ἐποίει, Chrys.; but this, though true, makes the χειρίσαι. apply to the συνεξώςω, which it does not), having wiped out (contemporary with χειρισάμενοι—in fact the same act explained in its conditions and details. On the word, see ref.); and Plat. Rep. vi. p. 501, τὸ μὲν ἄν, οἷαν, ἐξελέφασε, τὸ δὲ πάλιν ἐγγράφα: Dem. 468. 1, ἔκ ὠμείς ἄτι αἰσχρέεις ἐπὶ χρή τούτον [τῶν νόμων] ἐξελέφα, καὶ οὐ πάλιν βεβούλευε; the handwriting in decrees (cf. the similar expression τῶν νόμων τῶν ἔντολων ἐν δόγμασιν, Eph. ii. 15, and notes. Here, the force of -γραφῶν passes on to the dative, as if it were τὸ γεγραμένον τῶν δόγμων—cf. Plato, iv. p. 343 a, κ. ταῦτα εἰς ἀμετακόσιον, δὴ δὴ πάρει τὰ γεγραμμένα τῶς. This explanation of the construction is negatived by Ellicott, on the ground of χειρόγραφος being a "synthetic compound, and apparently incapable of such a decomposition," referring to Donaldson, Gram. § 309 [it is § 377]. But there it is laid down that in synthetic compounds of this kind, the accent makes the difference between transitive and intransitive, without any assertion that the verbal element may not pass on in the construction. If χειρόγραφος means written by hands, then surely the element in which the writing consists may follow. Meyer would make the dative instrumental: but it can be so only in a very modified sense, the contents taken as the instrument whereby the sense is conveyed. The χειρόγραφος represents the whole law, the obligatory bond which was against us [see below], and is apparently used because the Decalogue, representing that law, was written on tables of stone with the finger of God. The most various interpre-
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and (not only so, but) has taken it (the handwriting itself, thus obliterated) away (i.e. 'from out of the way,' cf. ref.: Dem. de corona, p. 351, τὸ καταφέρδεσθαι κ. δ' ἔχων τι λέγειν ἀνελύσας ἐκ μέσου: other places in Kykpe, ii. 323: and the contrary expression, Dem. 682. 1, αὐδὲν ἂν ἑν ὑπὲρ ἐκ μέσου ἡμᾶς πρὸς Καρδιανοῦς ἡδονή), by nailing (contemporary with the beginning of ἤτοι) it to the cross ('since by the death of Christ on
the cross the condemnatory law lost its hold on us, inasmuch as Christ by this death bore the curse of the law for mankind [Gal. iii. 13],—in the fact of Christ being nailed to the Cross the Law was nailed thereon, in so far as, by Christ’s exaltation it lost its obligatory power and ceased to be in itself, Meyer. Chrys. finely says, οὐδὲν οὔτως μεγαλοφωνός εὐφέβησατο. ὁ ρήτορ σπουδὴν τοῦ ἀναφερθῆναι εἰς τὸ θεοῦ δύναμις οὗτος, οὐ δέν πάντες ἦμεν ὑπὸ ἀμαρτίαν κ. κόλασιν, αὐτὸς καλασθεὶς ἔλεως κ. τὴν ἀμαρτίαν κ. τὴν κόλασιν ἐκολάσθη δὲ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ. 15.] The utmost care must be taken to interpret this verse according to the requirements of grammar and of the context. The first seems to me to necessitate the rendering of ἀπεκδυσάμενος, not, as the great majority of Commentators, ‘having spoiled’ (ἀπεκδύσατο), a meaning unexemplified for the middle, and precluded by the plain usage, by the Apostle himself, a few verses below, ch. iii. 9, of the same word ἀπεκδυσάμενοι,—but ‘having put off,’ ‘divested himself of.’ Then the second must guide us to the meaning of τὸς ἀρχάς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας. Most Commentators have at once assumed these to be the infernal powers, or evil angels: relying on Eph. vi. 12, where undoubtedly such is the specific reference of these general terms. But the terms being general, such specific reference must be determined by the context of each passage,—or, indeed, there may be no such specific reference at all, but they may be used in their fullest general sense. Now the words have occurred before in this very passage, ver. 10, where Christ is exalted as the κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς κ. ἐξουσίας: and it is hardly possible to avoid connecting our present expression with that, seeing that in τὸς ἀρχάς κ. τὰς ἐξουσίας the articles seem to contain a manifest reference to it. Now, what is the context? Is it in any way relevant to the fact of the law being antiquated by God in the great Sacrifice of the atonement, to say that He, in that act (or, according to others, Christ in that act), spoiled and triumphed over the infernal potentates? Or would the following ὠνδὲ deduce any legitimate inference from such a fact? But, suppose the matter to stand in this way. The law was διαταγεὶς δι’ ἀγγέλων (Gal. iii. 19: cf. Acts vii. 53), δι’ ἁγγέλων λαλήθης λόγος (Heb. ii. 2): cf. also Jas. Antt. xv. 3, τα ἁμόν τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν διοικημάτων κ. τὰ διοικήσατα τῶν τούτοις δι’ ἁγγέλων παρὰ τ. θεοῦ μαθητῶν;—they were the promulgators of the χειρόγραφον τούτος δόγμασιν. In that promulgation of theirs, God was pleased to reveal Himself of old. That writing, that investiture, so to speak, of God, was first wiped out, soiled and rendered worthless, and then nailed to the Cross—abrogated and suspended there. Thus God ἀπεκδυσάτο τὸς ἀρχάς κ. τὰς ἐξουσίας—divested Himself of, put off from Himself, that ἁγγέλων διαταγῆ manifesting Himself henceforward without a veil in the exalted Person of Jesus. And the act of triumph, by which God has for ever subjected all principality and power to Christ, and made Him to be the only Head of His people, in whom they are complete, was that sacrifice, whereby all the law was accomplished. In that, the ἀρχαὶ κ. ἐξουσίαι were all subjected to Christ, all plainly declared to be powerless as regards His work and His people, and triumphed over by Him, see Phil. ii. 8, 9: Eph. i. 20, 21. No difficulty need be created, on this explanation, by the objection, that thus more prominence would be given to angelic agency in the law than was really the fact: the answer is, that the prominence which is given, is owing to the errors of the false teachers, who had evidently associated the Jewish observances in some way with the worship of angels: St. Paul’s argument will go only to this, that whatever part the angelic powers may have had, or be supposed to have had, in the previous dispensation, all such interposition was now entirely at an end, that dispensation itself being once for all antiquated and put away. Render then,—putting off (by the absence of a copula, the vigour of the sentence is increased. The participle is con-
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temporary with ἐργαν above, and thus must not be rendered *having put off* the governments and powers (before spoken of, ver. 10, and ch. i. 16: see above) He (God, who is the subject throughout: see also ch. iii. 3: — not Christ, which would awkwardly introduce two subjects into the sentence) exhibited them (as completely subjected to Christ;) — not only put them away from Himself, but showed them as placed under Christ. There seems no reason to attach the sense of putting to shame [παραδειγμασια] to the simple verb. That this sense is involved in Matt. i. 19, is owing to the circumstances of the context) in (element of the δειγμασια) openness (of speech; declaring and revealing by the Cross that there is none other but Christ the Head πατης ἀρχης κ. ξυσιας, triumphing over them (as in 2 Cor. ii. 14, we are said [see note there] to be led captive in Christ's triumph, our real victory being our defeat by Him) — so here the principalities and powers, which are next above us in those ranks of being which are all subjected to and summed up in Him) in Him (Christ: not *in it,* viz. the cross, which gives a very feeble meaning after the ἔγερσις αὐτων, and συνε-ξωσ. σον αὑτῷ above). The ordinary interpretation of this verse has been attempted by some to be engulfed into the context, by understanding the χειροπρ. of a guilty conscience, the ἄρης κ. έλ., as the infernal powers, the accusers of men, and the exhorters against being to dissuade the Colossians from fear or worship of them. So Neander, in a paraphrase (Denkwürdigkeiten, p. 12) quoted by Conyby. and Howson, edn. 2, vol. ii. p. 478 note. But manifestly this is against the whole spirit of the passage. It was ὑπεροικια των ἄγγελων to which they were tempted — and οἱ ἄγγελοι can bear no meaning but the angels of God.

16—23.] More specific warning against false teachers (see summary on ver. 1), and that first (vv. 16, 17) with reference to legal observances and abstinence.

16.] Let no one therefore (because this is so — that ye are complete in Christ, and that God in Him hath put away and dispensed with all that is secondary and intermediate) judge you (pronounce judgment of right or wrong over you, sit in judgment on you) in (reft.) eating (not, in St. Paul's usage, meat [δρομα], see reft.; in John iv. 32; vi. 27, 55, it seems to have this signific.) Mey. quotes II. τ. 210, Od. a. 191, Plat. Legg. vi. p. 783 c, to show that in classical Greek the meanings are sometimes interchanged. The same is true of ποιης and ποιμα (and or or) in drinking (i.e. in the matter of the whole cycle of legal ordinances and prohibitions which regarded eating and drinking: these two words being perhaps taken not separately and literally, — for there does not appear to have been in the law any special prohibition against drinks,—but as forming together a category in ordinary parlance; if however it is desired to press each word, the reference of ποιης must be to the Nazarite vow, Num. vi. 3), or in respect (reft.: Chrys. and Tholdt, give it the extraordinary meaning of *in part,* — *ευρης* ου γαρ δη πατης κατεχον τα προ- τερα: Mey. explains it, *in the category of* — which is much the same as the explanation in the text) of a feast or new-moon or sabbaths (i.e. yearly, monthly, or weekly celebrations; see reft.).

17.] which (if the sing. be read, the relative may refer either to the aggregate of the observances mentioned, or to the last mentioned, i.e. e.
the Sabbath. Or it may be singular by attraction, and refer to all, just as if it were plural, see Matt. xii. 1) is (or as in rec. are: not, ‘was,’ or were: he speaks of them in their nature, abstractedly) a shadow (not, a sketch, σκαέγραφος or -ϕύμα, which meaning is precluded by the term opposed being σῶμα, not the finished picture,—but literally the shadow: see below) of things to come (the blessings of the Christian covenant: these are the substance, and the Jewish ordinances the mere type or resemblance, as the shadow is of the living man. But we must not, as Mey., press the figure so far as to imagine the shadow to be cast back by the τὰ μέλλοντα going before [cf. also Thdt., somewhat differently, προλαμβάνει δὲ τὰ σκιά τῶν ἀνίσχυρων τοῦ φωτός ὑπὲρ εἰσί σκιά μὲν τῶν νόμων, σῶμα δὲ τῶν χρῶν, φως δὲ τῶν διστάτων χριστῶν:] nor with the same Commentator, interpret τῶν μελλ. of the yet future blessings of the state following the παροιμία,—for which ἐστιν [see above] gives no ground. Nor again must we imagine that the obscurity [Suicier, al.] of the Jewish dispensation is alluded to, there being no subjective comparison instituted between the two,—only their objective relation stated); but the body (the substance, of which the other is the shadow) belongs to Christ (i.e. the substantial blessings, which those legal observances typified, are attached to, brought in by, found in unison with, Christ: see on the whole figure Heb. viii. 5; x. 1). We may observe, that if the ordinance of the Sabbath had been, in any form, of lasting obligation on the Christian church, it would have been quite impossible for the Apostle to have spoken thus. The fact of an obligatory rest of one day, whether the seventh or the first, would have been directly in the teeth of his assertion here: the holding of such would have been still to retain the shadow, while we possess the substance. And no answer can be given to this by the transparent special-pleading, that he is speaking only of that which was Jewish in such observances; the whole argument being general, and the axiom of ver. 17 universally applicable.

I cannot see that Ellicott in loc. has at all invalidated this. To hold, as he does, that the sabbath was a σκιά of the Lord's day, is surely to fall into the same error as we find in the title of 1 Cor. x. in our authorized bibles,—‘The Jewish Sacraments were types of ours.’ The antitype is not to be found in another and a higher type, but in the eternal verity which both shadow forth. An extraordinary punctuation of this verse was proposed by some mentioned by Chrys.: τὸ μὲν οὖν τὸν στίχον τοῦ δὲ σώμα, χριστοῦ, ἢ δὲ ἀλήθεια ἐπὶ χριστοῦ γέγονεν οἱ δὲ τὸ σῶμα χριστοῦ μοιᾶς όμας καταβαθευτὼς: and Ang. op. 149 [50]. 27, vol. ii. p. 841 f., has ‘corpus antem Christi nemo vos convictac. Turpe est, inquit . . . ut cum sitis corpus Christi, sedcumani unbris.’ No wonder that the same father should confess of the passage, ‘nee ego sine calcine intelligo.’

18—23.] See above—warning, 2ndly, with reference to angel-worship and asceticism. 18.] Let no one of purpose (such is by far the best rendering of θέλων,—to take it with καταβαθ. and understand it precisely as in ref. 2 Pet. And thus apparently Thl.: θέλων όμας καταβαθευέν στί μανιφερομένων. Mey. pronounces this meaning ‘γαρ ὧν μεταβαθέν,’ and controverts the passages brought to defend it; omitting however ref. 2 Pet. So also does Ellicott, believing it to ‘impute to the false teachers a frightful and indeed suicidal malice, which is neither justified by the context, nor in any way credible.’ But his own ‘desiring to do it’ is hardly distinguishable from that other: nor does it at all escape the imputation of motive which he finds so improbable. But surely it is altogether relevant, imputing to the false teachers not only error, but insidious designs also. Others take θέλων with ἐν ταπ., keeping however its reference as above, and understanding, as Phot. in Ec., τοῦτο ποιεῖν after it. So Thdt., τοῦτο τοῖν διὸ ἐκείνων ἑκατόν τοις παπνοφορούσχ ἢ θέλειν κεκρηρίσετο. Calv., ‘volens id facere,’—Mey., Eadie, al. This latter, after Bengel, assigns as his reason for adopting this view, that the participles θέλων, ἐμματικῶν, φωσιοῦμενος, κρατῶν, form a series. This however is not strictly true—for θέλων would stand in a position of emphasis which does not belong to the next two: rather should we thus expect ἐν ταπ. θέλων κ. θρ. τῶν ἄγγ. I cannot help thinking this rendering flat and spiritless. Others again suppose a harsh Hebrewism, common in the LXX [ref., especially Ps. exlv. 10], but not found in the N. T., by which θέλειν ἐν is put for ἥπετα, ‘to have pleasure in.’ So Q.
Aug., Est., Olish, al. The principal objection to this rendering here is, that it would be irrelevant. Not the delight which the false teacher takes in his παπάς, but the fact of it as operative on the Colossians, and its fleshly sources, are adduced) defraud you of your prize (see reff. Demosth. Mey. points out the difference between καταβρέω, a fraudulent adjudication with hostile intent against the person wronged, and παπαραβραβεύω, which is merely, as Thdrt. explains this, ἀβίως βραβεύω. So Polyb. xxiv. 12, τινὲς δ᾽ εὐγκαλύτεροι τῶν κρισίων, ὧν παπαραβραβεύοντος, διαθεράτῳ τοῦ Φίλαππου τῶν δικαστῶν. Supplying this, which Chrisy. has not marked, we may take his explanation: καταβραβεύοντας γὰρ ἐστιν όταν παρ' ἐτέρων μὲν ἡ νίκη, παρ' ἐτέρων δὲ τὸ βραβείον. Zonaras gives it better, in Suicer i. 49: καταβρ., ἐστι τὸ μὴ τῶν νικήσαντα ἄξιον τοῦ βραβείου, ἀλλ' ἐτέρῳ διδαίναι αὐτῷ, ἀδικουμένου τοῦ νικήσαντος. This deprivation of their prize, and this wrong, they would suffer at the hands of those who would draw them away from Christ the giver of the prize [2 Tim. iv. 8. James i. 12. 1 Pet. v. 4.], and lower them to the worship of intermediate spiritual beings. The various meanings, — 'ne quis brabeate potestatem usurpars atque adeo abutens, vis currucatic moderatur, perpetuamque prescribat quid sequi quid figere debat precipium accepturī' [Beng.], — 'nemo adversum vos rectoris partes sibi ultro sumat' [Besa and similarly Corn. a-Lap.], — 'premiunum, id est libertatem a Christo indultum, exigere' [Grot.], — 'are more or less departures from the meaning of the word' (in) (as the element and sphere of his καταβαθμ.), humility (ἀφέσις ἡν πολαια λεγοντων των ὧν οὐ δει τὸν χριστὸν ἐπικαλεσθαι εἰς βοήθειαν, ἡ εἰς προσοφυγὴν τὴν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, ἀλλ' τοὺς ἀγγέλους ὡς τάχα τὸν τὸν χριστὸν ἐπικαλεσθαι πρὸς τὰ εἰρημένα μεῖονον ὡς τὴν ἡμέτερας ἁγίας, τάτον δὲ τάχα ταπεινοφορόντες εἶλαν. Zonaras in canon 35 of the Council of Laodicea, in Suicer i. p. 45. Similarly Thdrt., λέγοντες ὡς ἀόρατος ὃ τῶν ὑλῶν θεὸς, ἀνεφίκτους τῇ κ. ἀκατάληπτος, κ. προσήκει διὰ τῶν ἀγ-
application of its primary meaning of treading or entering on: but whether it does so mean here, must be determined by the context. And it surely would be a strange and incongruous expression for one who was advocating a religion of faith,—whose very charter is μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἱδότες κ. πεπατευκότες,—to blame a man or a teacher for καὶ ήδρακεν εἱματεύειν, placing the defect of sight in the very emphatic forefront of the charge against him. Far rather should we expect that one who διά πίστεως πεπεμπάτε, διὰ διὰ ἐνθοῦς, would state such of teacher as one of his especial faults, that he καὶ ήδρακεν ἐνεμάτευεν, found his status, his standing-point, in the realm of sight. And to this what follows corresponds. This insisting on his own visual experience is the result of fleshly pride as contrasted with the spiritual mind. Of the other meanings of εἱματεύειν, that of ‘coming into possession of property,’ ‘inheriting,’ might be suitable, but in this sense it is usually constructed with εἰς, cf. Donoseh. 1055. 24, 1086. 19. The ordinary meaning is far the best here: see ref., and cf. Ἀσχ. Pers. 448—νίγος . . . ἥν ἐφιλόχορος Πάν ἐνεματεύειν, Eur. Electr. 595—κακαγιγνον εἱματεύσα τάλα [this view I still maintain as against Elliotc,] vainly (groundlessly. eἰκή must not be joined with εἱματ-, as De W., Conybh., al.,—for thus the emphasis of that clause is destroyed: see above)
puffed up (no inconsistency with the ταπεινοφόρ. above: for as Thdrts. says, τὴν μὲν ἐσχῆταιντο, τοῦ δὲ τούτῳ τὸ πάθος ἀκριβῶς περίεκειτο) by (as the working principle in him) the mind (intent, bent of thought and apprehension) of his own flesh (ὑπὸ σαρκικῆς διανοιας, οὐ πνευματικῆς, Chrty. But as usual, this adjectival rendering misses the point of the expression,—the διάνοια is not only σαρκική, but is τῆς σαρκὸς—the σάρξ, the ordinary sensual principle, is the fons of the νοῦς—which therefore dwells in the region of visions of the man’s own seeing, and does not in true humility hold the Head and in faith receive grace as one of His members. I have marked αὐτῶ γαρ more strongly than by ‘his’ only: its expression conveys certainly some idea of self-will. On the psychological propriety of the expression, see Ellicot’s note). 19.] and not (objective negative source of his error) holding fast (see ref. Cant. The want of firm holding of Christ has set him loose to εἱματεύειν & εὁρακεν) the Head (Christ: see on Eph. i. 22. Each must hold fast the Head for himself, not merely be attached to the other members, however high or eminent in the Body), from whom (better than with Mey., ‘from which,’ viz. the Head,—Christ, according to him, being referred to ‘nidi periλύνθη, ἕνδον λάθος’ but if so, why not εἰς ἓς—what reason would there be for any change of gender? The only cause for such change must be sought in personal reference to Christ, as in ref. 1 Tim.; and this view is confirmed by the τ. αὐξησιν τ. θεοῦ below, shewing that the figure and reality are mingled in the sentence. Beng. gives as his first alternative, ‘εἰς quo, sc. tenendo caput;’ but this would be δὲ οὐ, not εἰς οὐ. The Head itself is the Source of increase: the holding it, the means) all the body (in its every part: not exactly = ‘the whole body,’ in its entirety, which would, if accurately expressed, be τὸ πάν σῶμα, cf. τον πάντα χρῶνον, Acts xx. 18,—δ πάς νόμος, Gal. v. 14. On the whole passage see Eph. iv. 16, an almost exact parallel) by means of the joints (see against Meyer’s meaning, ‘nerves,’ on Eph. 1. c.) and bands (sinews and nerves which bind together, and communicate between, limb and limb) being supplied (the passive of the simple verb is found in 3 Mace, vi. 40, Polyb. iv. 77. 2, πολλαῖς ἀφροιαῖς έκ φύσεως κηραχιμένου πρὸς πραγμάτων κατάκτησιν: ib. iii. 76. 3; vi. 15. 4, al. The εἰς, denoting continual accession, suits the αὔξει below) and compounded (see on Eph. Notice, as there, the present participles, denoting that the process is now going on. Wherewith the body is supplied and compounded, is here left to be inferred, and need not be, as by some Commentators, minutely pursued into detail. It is, as Thl., τὸ γὰρ κ. αὔξειν πνευ-
...and supplanted by that of His Mother.

20. *Warning against asceticism.*

*If ye died* (in your baptism, as detailed above, vv. 11 ff.) *with Christ from* (a pregnant construction: ‘died, and so were set free from’; not found elsewhere in N. T.: cf. Rom. vi. 2; Gal. ii. 19, where we have the dative) the *elements* (cf. ver. 8: the rudimentary lessons, i.e. ritualistic observances) of the *world* (see on ver. 8: Christ Himself was set free from these, when, being made under the law, He at His Death bore the curse of the law, and thus it was antiquated in Him), *why, as living* (emphatic, as though you had not died, see Gal. vi. 11) in the *world,* are ye being prescribed to (the active use of the verb, ‘to decree,’ is common in the later classics, and occurs in the LXX, and Apocrypha. The person to whom the thing is decreed or prescribed is put in the dative [2 Macc. x. 8], so that, according to usage, such person may become the subject of the passive verb: cf. Thuc. i. 82, ἡμῖς ὑπ’ Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ ἔποιευσαν: ἐπὶ ἔπουλον τινι].—Herod. vii. 144, αἱ δὲ νῆς ὑπὸ ἐξής ὑπ’ Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ ἔποιευσαν [ἐπὶ ἔπουλον τινι], and see Kühner, Gram. ii. p. 35. Some, as Bernhardy, p. 316, and Ellicott, prefer considering this form as middle, and give it the sense of “doceri vos sibi.” It seems to be of very little consequence which we call it; the meaning in either case is almost identical: “why is the fact so?” or, “why do you allow it?” To my mind, the passive here carries more keen, because more hidden, rebufc. The ἄλλης κινδυνεῖ and ἀποκατέστησα of 1 Cor. vi. 7 rest on somewhat different ground. There, the voluntary element comes into emphasis, and the middle sense is preferable. See note there. I cannot see, with Meyer, why we should be so anxious to divest the sentence of all appearance of blaming the Colossians, and cast all its blame on the false teachers. The passive [see above] would demand a reason for the fact being so—‘Cur ita siti estis, ut . . .’ which is just as much a reproach as the middle
Cur, sinitis, ut . . . The active renderings,'decrea...tac,' MeIanach. [In Eadie], 'decren...is,' Anbrst. [ib.], are wrong both in grammar and in fact. The reference to δύνασθιν ver. 14 is plain. They were being aga in put under that χειρόφηρ, which was wiped out and taken away) "Handle not, neither taste, nor even touch" (it will be understood that these words follow immediately after δυνατίσθενον without a stop, as δα δυνατίσθενα;—just as the inf. in 2 Macc. x. 8. Then as to the meaning,—I agree with Calv., Beza, Beng., and Meyer in referring all the three to meats,—on account mainly of vv. 22, 23 [see below], but also of γεύερ coming as a defining term between the two less precise ones ἀφρ and δύργς. Others have referred the three to different objects: ἄφρ and δύργς variously to meats, or unclean objects, or women: γεύερ univer- sally to meats. Mey. remarks of the negatives, the relation of the three prohibitions is, that the first μηδε is 'neither,' the second 'ne . . . quidem.' This would not be necessary from the form of the sentence, but seems supported by the word γεύερ introducing a climax. Wetst. and the Commentators illustrate ἀφρ and δύργς as applied to meats, by Xen, Cyr. i. 3. 5, ἦναν μὲν τοῦ ἄρτον ἀφρ., ἤδη εἰς ὁλίγην τὴν χείρα ἀπόφρησαν, ἦναν δὲ τῶν τῶν δύργων, εἰ ὁδὸν ἀποκαθάρθη τὴν χεῖρα εἰς τὰ χειρακατερ —which things (viz. the things forbidden) are set ἐστιν emphatic, 'whose very nature is . . . .) all of them for destruction (by corruption, see ref.) in their consumption (i. e. are appointed by the Creator to be decomposed and oblit- erated with their consumption by us. So Thdrt.—πᾶσα . . . μοιλετε των μεν των ἐδεισαγμένων έννομων; τινα δὲ παράνομα, κ. οὐ σκοτεῖται δι' ὁλιγον τῶν τῶν ὁλιγών; εἰς κόπων γάρ ἀπίσται μεταβάλλεται: and similarly Ec.—φθαρά γάρ, φρόσι, ἐπικεῖται εν τω ἀφρένων—Thl., Erasm., Luth., Beza, Calv., Grot., Wolf, Olsh., Mey., al. The argument in fact is similar to that in Matt. xv. 17, and 1 Cor. vi. 13.

Two other lines of interpretation have been followed: 1) that which carries the sense on from the three verbs, "Handle not &c. things which tend to [moral] corrup- tion in their use." De W., Bann.

Crus., al. But this suits neither the colo- lation of the words, nor ἀπόχρησι, the 'using up,' 'consumption,' which should thus rather be ἁραίρει. 2) which makes a refer to δύργα, and renders 'which δύργα all tend to [everlasting] destruction in their obscureness;' but this is just as much against the sense of ἀπό- χρησις, and would rather require τῆς, if indeed τῇ ἀπόχρησι not super-fluous altogether. See these same objec- tions urged at greater length in Meyer's note)—according to (connects with δυ- νατίσθενον δι . . . . δύργα: the subsequent clause being a parentetical remark; thus defining the general term δύργα to con- sist in human, not divine commands) the commands and systems (διδασκαλία is the wider term comprising many ἐνταλ- ματα. In ref., the wider term is prefixed: here, where examples of separate ἐνταλ- ματα have been given, we rise from them to the system of doctrine of which they are a part) of men (not merely ἀνθρώπων, bringing out the individual authors of them, but τῶν ἄνω, describing them gene- rically as human, not divine. I would press as against Elic., who views the τῶν as the art. of correlation, rendered necessary by τα ἐνταλματα. But even if this usage were to be strictly pressed with such a word as ἀνθρώπων, the substantive near- est to it, διδασκαλία, has no article), such as (ἐστιν brings us from the general objective, human doctrines and systems, to the specific subjective, the particular sort of doctrines and systems which they were following; q. d., 'and that, such sort of ἐντ. κ. διδασκ. as . . .') are possessed of (ἐστιν ἔννομα does not exactly = ἔχει, but betokens more the abiding attribute of these δύργα—'enjoy,' as we say) a re- putation (λόγον ἔχει occurs in various meanings. Absolutely, it may signify 'aroir raison,' as Demost. p. 204, ἐστι δὲ τοῦτο ὁμώος μὲν ἀκόουσα λόγου τιν ἔχω, which meaning is obviously out of place here:—as is also 'to take account of,' Herod. i. 62, Ἀθυραίοι δὲ οι ἐκ τοῦ ἀκτοῦ, ἔως . . . . . . λόγον οὕδην ἔχουν. But the meaning 'to have the repute of,'—found Herod. v. 66, Κλαιόντες . . . . . δίπερ δὲ λόγον ἔχει τὴν Πυδίνη ἀνάπει- σα ['is said to have influenced the
Pythia"), and Plat. Epinomis, p. 987 b, ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐφωφοῖς ἐπιτρέπει τὸ ἀνίσον Ἀφροδίτης εἶναι σχεδὸν ἔχει λόγον ["Veneris esse dicitur," as Ficinus].—manifestly fits the context here, and is adopted by most Commentators indeed (the μὲν solitary leaves the δὲ to be supplied by the reader, or gathered from what follows. It is implied by it, not by the mere phrase λόγον ἔχειν [see the examples above], that they had the repute only without the reality) of wisdom in (element of its repute) voluntary worship (words of this form are not uncommon: so we have ἔθεσπρόξενος, a volunteer or self-constituted proxenus, in Thuc. iii. 70,—ἐθελοκατωφίω, to pretend to be deaf, Strab. i. p. 36,—ἐθελοδουλεία, voluntary slavery, Plat. Symp., p. 184 e, &c., &c.; see Lexx. and Aug., Ep. 149 [59, cited above on ver. 17], says sic et vulgo dicitur which divitem affectat thelodives, et qui sapientem thesasopici, et cetera hujusmodi. "Mey. cites Epiph. Hær. xvi. p. 34, explaining the name Pharisees, διὰ τὸ ἄφωρομενον εἶναι αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐλλογίων διὰ τὴν ἐθελοπερισσοβουλίαν παρ' αὐτῶν νευμαξίμενων. See many more examples in Wests. The δή was mainly that of angels, see above, ver. 18: but the generality of the expression here may take in any of the other voluntary extravagancies of worship also) and humility (see ver. 18) and unsparringness of the body (Plato defines ἐλευθερία, ἀφεδία εἰς χρήσει κ. εἰς κτήσει φοιτάσας, Def. p. 412 D: Thuc. ii. 43 has ἀφεδίεις βλου: Diol. Sic. xii. 60, ἀφεδίας ἐχρώτοι τοῖς ἀδίσοις σώμασι εἰς τὴν κοινὴν εὐσπαθῶσαν, &c. &c., see West.), not in any honour of it (on the interpretations, see below. τιμὴ is used by St. Paul of honour or respect bestowed on the body, in 1 Cor. xii. 23, 24: of honourable conduct in matters relating to the body, 1 Thess. iv. 4 [see note there: cf. also Rom. i. 24]: and such is the meaning I would assign to it here—these δόγματα have the repute of wisdom for (in) &c., and for (in) unsparringness of the body, not in any real honour done to it—its true honour being, dedication to the Lord, 1 Cor. vi. 13),—to the satiating of the flesh? I connect these words not with the preceding clause, but with δογματίζεσθαι above—why are ye suffering yourselves [see on the passive above] to be thus dogmatised [in the strain the μῆ δόξῃ &c. according to &c., which are &c.], and all for the satisfaction of the flesh—for the following out of a διδασκαλία, the ground of which is the φυσιονομία ἀπὸ τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκός, ver. 18? Then after this follow most naturally the explications of the next chapter; they are not to seek the πληρωμή τῆς σαρκος—not τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς φρονεῖν, but νοοῦσα τὰ μὴν τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. The ordinary interpretation of this difficult passage has been, as E. V., 'not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh,' meaning thereby, that such commands do not provide for the honour which we owe to the body in the supply of the proper refreshment to the flesh. But two great objections lie against this, and are in my judgment fatal to the interpretation in every shape: 1) that ἡ σάρκα cannot be used in this indifferent sense as equivalent to τὸ σῶμα, in a sentence where it occurs together with τὸ σῶμα, and where it has before occurred in an ethical sense: 2) that πληρωμή will not bear this meaning of mere ordinary supplying, 'satisfying the wants of;' but must imply satisy, 'satisfying to repel.' The children of Israel were to eat the quails εἰς πληρωμήν, Ex. xvi. 8: cf. also Deut. xxxiii. 23: Lam. v. 6; Hab. ii. 16; also διὰ τὰς ἀλάγους οἰνοφυλάγεις κ. πληρωμάς, Polyb. ii. 19. 4. Meyer renders—'these commands have a repute for wisdom, &c.,—not for any thing which is really honourable (i.e. which may prove that repute to be grounded in truth), but in order thereby to the satisfaction of men's sensual nature,' and so, nearly, Ellicott. The objections to this are, 1) the strained meaning of τιμὴ τις, —2) the insertion of 'but' before ἐπὶς, or as in Ellic. 'only' after it, which both are wholly gratuitous. This same latter objection applies to the rendering of Beza, al., 'nec tamen ullius sunt pretii, quam ad ea spectant quibus faretur caro,'—besides that this latter paraphrase is unwarranted. See other renderings still
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among these I fear must be reckoned that of Conygh., 'are of no value to check (ʔ) the indulgence of fleshly passions,' and that of Bahr and Eadie, regarding γινάγεσθαι, των as participial, and joining εἰστιν with πρὸς—a harshness of construction wholly unexampled and improbable. The interpretation above given seems to me, after long consideration, the simplest, and most in accord with the context. It is no objection to it that the antithesis presented by ὅπων ἐν τῷ πάσῳ τῷ is thus not to ἐν εὐδοκίᾳ, κ.τ.λ., but merely to διὰ εἰσίν ἂν αὐτῶν: for if the Apostle wished to bring out a negative antithesis to these last words only, he hardly could do so without repeating the preposition, the sense of which is carried on to διὰ εἰσίν.

CHAP. III. 1—IV. 6.] Second Part of the Epistle. Direct exhortations to the duties of the Christian life—founded on their union with their risen Saviour.

1—4.] Transition to the new subject, and grounding of the coming exhortations. 1. If then (as above asserted, ch. ii. 12, 20: the εἰ implies no doubt of the fact, but lays it down as ground for an inference, see ch. ii. 20, and cf.-Xen. Mem. i. 5. 1) ye were raised up together with Christ (not as E. V. 'are risen': the allusion, as above, ch. ii. 12—13, is to a definite time, your baptism. And it is important to keep this in view, that we may not make the mistake so commonly made, of interpreting ὑπερβολήν in an ethical sense, and thereby stultifying the sentence—for if the participation were an ethical one, what need to exhort them to its ethical realization? The participation is an objective one, brought about by that faith which was the condition of their baptismal admission into Him. This faith the Apostle exhorts them to energize in the ethical realization of this resurrection state, seek the things above (heavenly, spiritual things: cf. Matt. vi. 33; Gal. iv. 26; Phil. iii. 20) where Christ is ('se trouve,' not merely the copula. If you are united to Him, you will be tending to Him; and He is in heaven),—seated on the right hand of God (see Eph. i. 20. Here, as everywhere, when the present state of Christ is spoken of, the Ascension is taken for granted): care for the things above (φρονεῖτε, wider than γινάγεσθαι, extending to the whole region of their thought and desire), not the things on the earth (cf. οἱ τα ἐν τῷ γίνεσθαι, Phil. iii. 19: i. e. matters belonging to this present mortal state—earthly pleasure, self, and pride. There is no reason, with Thl., Calv., Schrad., Huther, to suppose him still ailing at the false teachers, and meaning by τά ἐπί τῆς γῆς, τά περὶ βρομάτων κ. ἡμερῶν [Thl.]: in this part of the Epistle he has dropped the controversial and taken the purely ethical tone). For ye died (ch. ii. 12: 'are dead,' though allowable, is not so good, as merely asserting a state, whereas the other recalls the fact of that state having been entered on. That being made partakers with Christ's death, cut you loose from the τά ἐπί τῆς γῆς: see Rom. vi. 4—7), and your life (that resurrection life [which is "your real and true life," as Ellic., objecting to this explanation. The only real life of the Christian is his resurrection life in and with Christ. The fact is, Ellic. has mistaken my meaning in this term: see my remarks on it below], which you now have only in its first fruits, in possession indeed, but not in full possession, see below, and cf. Rom. viii. 19—23 is hidden (οὐκ ἐφανερωθήν) 1 John iii. 2: is laid up, to be manifested hereafter: that such is the sense, the next verse seems plainly to shew) with Christ (who is also Himself hidden at present from us, who wait for His ἀποκάλυψις [1 Cor. i. 7. 2 Thess. i. 7. 1 Pet. i. 7, 13; iv. 13], which shall be also ours, see ver. 4, and Rom. viii. 19) in God (with Christ who is εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦ Πατρός—it is in Him, as in a great depth, that all things concealed are hidden, and He
4. for ημών, ημῶν (see note) CD38 k 17 latt goth gr-lat-f: txt BD3-34 KL rel syr

5. τοῦτον ins ημών, with AC34DKLS3 rel latt syr copth Clem, Damase, Iren-int Cyril Hil: om BC31 17, 672 Clem, Orig5 En5 Damase-comm(appy) Sing-cler.

brings them out as seems good to Him. Notice the solemnity of the repetition of the articles: and so all through these verses. When Christ shall be manifested (shall emerge from his present state of hiddenness, and be personally revealed), who is our (no emphasis—ημῶν applies to Christians generally—see on ημών below) life (not as Eadie, 'shall appear in the character of our life') [ἐκχ. χρ. ἡ ζωή ἡμῶν. φανερῶθη]: Christ is personally Himself that life, and we possess it only by union with Him and His resurrection: see John xiv. 19), then shall ye also (καὶ takes out the special from the general—ye, as well as, and among, other Christians: with the reading ἡ ζ. θ. ο. ημῶν, the καὶ would mean, 'as well as Christ') with Him be manifested in glory (see on the whole, the parallel 1 John iii. 2. Though the completed life of the resurrection seems so plainly pointed out by this last verse as the sense to be given to ἡ ζωή, this has not been seen by any Commentators, who hold it to be ethical: hidden, inasmuch as inward and spiritual—ἐν τῷ κρυστῷ, Rom. ii. 29 [De W.], and ideal: or, inasmuch as it is unseen by the world [Beng., similarly Storr, Flatt, Bisping, al.]. The root of the mistake has been the want of a sufficiently comprehensive view of that resurrection life of ours which is now hidden with Christ. It includes in itself both spiritual, ethical, and corporeal: and the realization of it as far as possible, here, is the sum of the Christian's most earnest endeavours: but the life itself, in its full manifestation, is that perfection of body, soul, and spirit, in which we shall be manifested with Him at His appearing. Cf. Thdt.: ἐκένουν γὰρ ἀναστάτους πάντας γέρωνθήμεν ἡλίῳ ὀδύων δρῶν τῶν πραγμάτων τῆς ἐκβασίας. κεκρυφταί δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ τῆς ἡμιτέρας ἀναστάσεως τὸ μυσ-τήριον.

5—17.] General exhortations: and

herein (5—11)—to laying aside of the vice of the old man, (12—17) to realizing the new life in its practical details. Put to death therefore (the οὖν connects with the ἀπεθάνετε of ver. 3): follow out, realize this state of death to things on earth—νεκρώσατε—notice the norist implying a definite act: cf. ἐσταύρωσαν (Gal. v. 24, ἀναστάτευσε των. Rom. viii. 13, in the same reference) your members which are on the earth (literally, as to τὰ μέλη: your feet, hands, &c.: reduce these to a state of death as regards their actions and desires below specified—as regards, in other words, their denizenship of this earth. With this you have no concern—they are members of Christ, partakers of His resurrection, renewed after His image. The metaphorical sense of μέλη, regarding πορπ. &c., as 'membra quibus vetus homo, i. e. ratio ac voluntas hominis depravata perinde utitur ac corpus membri.' Beza, 'naturam nostran quasi massam ex diversis vitius confitatum imaginatur.' Calv., seems unnecessary. And the understanding of φρονούντα with τὰ ἐν τῇ γης, as Grot., after Thdt. [τυπεστι τῇ ἐπὶ τὰ χειρω τον φρονήματος βαπτίζει], is certainly a mistake: cf. τὰ ἐν τῇ γης above, ver. 2),—formication (these which follow, are the carnal functions of the earthly members. It is one instance of that form of the double accusative, where the first denotes the whole, the second a part of it, as τῶν ὄντων πληθυνα ἄξιαν, λυόντων γιαν. Πλ. λ. 240, ποιον σε ἐπὸς φύτειν ἔρκος ὄντων; Od. a. 64. See Kühner, ii. p. 230, impurity (refl.), lustfulness (see Rom. i. 26, whence it would appear that the absolute word need not be understood of unnatural lust, the specifying genitive ἄτυχις giving it there that meaning. We may understand it generally as in Plat. Phædr. p. 265 b, τὸ ἐστάτικον πάθος, 'morbum libidinis,' Beng.), shameful desire (more general than πάθος: as Mey. remarks, π. is
always εκαθισταται, but not vice versa. The relation is the same as between πορεια and ἀκαδαμία, and convetousness (Ἰωνεία) of a publican, et totum genus vitii a genere enumeratarum modo specierum diversum complectitur. On πλεονεξία, see on Eph. iv. 19, and Trench, N. T. Synonyms, § xxiv.), for it is ('quiique quae sit') idolatry (the πλεονεκτησις has set up self in his heart — and to serve self, whether by accumulation of goods or by satiety in pleasure, is his object in life. He is therefore an idolater, in the deepest and worst name, namely in the practical significance. τὸ μαμοῦνα, κύριον ἐκ οὐσίας προστείχει, διδακτὼς ἢς τὸ πάθει τῆς πλεονεξίας δουλεύων, ὡς θεον τὸν πλούτον τιμᾷ, Thurt.), on which account (on account of the πλεονεξία, which amounts to idolatry, the all-comprehending and crowning sin, which is a negation of God and brings down IIIs especial anger) cometh (down on earth, in present and visible examples) the wrath of God: in which (vices. Mey.'s remark that the reading δι' αυτὸς makes this ἐν οἷς necessarily refer to the ἐπὶ τοὺς νοῦς τ. ἀπειθερικοὺς, which he reads after θεόν, does not apply if δι' αυτὸς be interpreted as above to refer to πλεονεξία. There does not seem to occur in St. Paul any instance of εἰς, after περιπατεῖν absolute, referring to persons. Cf. 2 Thess. iii. 11 [περιπ. ἀπάτασις], John xi. 54, Eph. ii. 3, which last, if the clause εἰς τ. τιν. τ. ἀπατ. were inserted here, would certainly go far to decide the matter) ye also walked once, when ye lived (before your death with Christ to the world) in these things (the assertion is not tautological: cf. Gal. v. 25, εἰ δὲ ἵνα πνευματικοί, πνευματικοί καὶ στοιχεῖα. When ye were alive to these things, ye regulated your course by them, walked in them. "Vivere et ambulare inter se different, quemadmodum potentia et actus: vivere praeedit, ambulare sequitur." Calv.): 8] but now (that ye are no longer living in them: opposed to ποτὲ ὑπάρχοντα) do ye also (as well as other believers) put away the whole (τα πάντα seems to have a backward and a forward reference—"the whole, —both those things which I have enumerated, and those which are to follow." The mistake of rendering ἀπόδοθεθε, 'have put off,' which one would hardly look for in a Commentator, occurs in Eadie here—cf. Eph. iv. 22), —anger, wrath (see on Eph. iv. 31), malice (ib.), evil speaking (ib.), abusive conversation (the context makes this more probable here, than 'filthy conversation' [so E. V.]. Clen. Alex., περι αἰσχρολογίας, Pald. ii. 6, p. 198 P.; he however himself uses αἰσχρολογεῖν for to abuse in words, Pald. iii. 11, p. 296 P.; Chrys., who calls it ἄγνωστα πορείας], for these four regard want of charity, of kindness in thought and word, rather than sins of uncleanness, which were before enumerated. And the occasional usage of the word itself bears this out, cf. Plat. Rep. iii. p. 393 end, κακογονούντας τε καὶ κομοδούντας ἄλλως κ. αἰσχρολογούντας: Polyb. viii. 13, 8, ἢ κατὰ τῶν φιλῶν αἰσχρολογεῖα out of your mouth (these words most naturally belong to the two last specified sins, and must be constructed either with ἀπόδοθεθε, which seems best,
or with 'proceeding,' implied in αἰσχρολογίας,—lie not towards (eis the indifferent general preposition of direction: so κατά with ψεύδωμα in a hostile sense, James iii. 14. Plat. Enylth. p. 254 a, ὀδέθη κατά σον ψεύδηται. We have πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ψευδάμενον, Xen. Anab. i. 3. 5.)

one another,—having put off (the participles contain the motive for all the preceding, from ἀπόθεσθαι—so Thdr. [σήμεν οὐκ ἀπεκδοσάθη εἰς τῇ βασιλείᾳ], Calv. [postquam exististis], Mey., al. Vulg. [exententes], Luth., Calov., Beng., Olsh., De W., Cony., al., understand them as contemporary with ἄποθεσθαι, —putting off,—or, and put off. But surely this is very flat, and besides, would it be to answer to the foregoing, contain a superfluous member, the ἐνδυσάμην. κ.τ.λ. there being no exhortation to graces in the former sentence, only dehoration from vices. Besides, as Mey. remarks, the objective description in ver. 11 belongs to an assignment of motive, not to a hortative sentence: and the hortative figure begins ver. 12) the old man (i.e. as Mey., 'να χαράδριτα ἄνθρωποι,' the nature which they had before their conversion: see on reff.) with his deeds (habits, ways of acting: see reff., and cf. Demosth. 126. 21, ἐπιταττον ὅπως ἡ πόλις λαχθῆση, καὶ κατεσκευασθον τὴν πάλιν), and having put on the new (the other was the negative ground: this is the positive. See on Eph. iv. 23, and ii. 15), who (the two are personal: not 'which,'—except in its old personal sense) is continually being renewed (notice the present participle.

"The new man is not any thing ready at once and complete, but ever in a state of development [by the Holy Spirit, Tit. iii. 5], by which a new state and nature is brought about in it, specifically different from that of the old man." Mey.) towards perfect knowledge (which excludes all falsehood, and indeed all the vices mentioned above) according to the image of Him that created him (the new creation of the spirit unto fulness of knowledge and truth, the highest form of which would be the perfect knowledge of God, is regarded by the Apostle as analogous to man's first creation. As he was then made in the image of God, so now: but it was then his naturally, now spiritually in ἐπίγνωσις. Some join κατ' εἰκ. with ἀνακαίνω, some with ἐπίγνωσ. The sense will be the same; but grammatically it is far better to join it with ἀνακαίνω. Thus the norm and method of the renewal is, κατ' εἰκ. τ. κτίσαντος αὐτὸν [the new man],—i.e. God, who is ever the Creator, not as Chrys., al., Christ. To understand the whole passage as referring to a restoration of the image of God in the first creation, as Calov., Est., and De W., is to fall far short of the glorious truth. It is not to restore the old, but to create the new, that redemption has been brought about. Whatever may have been God's image in which the first Adam was created, it is certain that the image of God, in which Christ's Spirit re-creates us, will be as much more glorious than that, as the second man is more glorious than the first: where (viz. in the realm or sphere of the new man) there is not (on ἐν see Gal. iii. 28) Greek and Jew (difference of nation; with special allusion also to the antiquation of the Abrahamic privilege as regarded his natural seed), circumcision and uncircumcision (difference of legal ceremonial standing)—barbarian (having as yet specified by pairs, he now brings forward a few single categories, which in the new man were non-existent as marks of distinction; see below. The proper contrast to Βαρβαρος would
have been "Ελληνες, which has been already expressed), Scythian (the citations in Wetst. sufficiently show, that the Σκύθαι were esteemed, as Beng., 'barbaris barbariores.' It is remarkable that in one of those citations, from Polyb., they are classed with the Galatians; εἰρήνης οὖσας παραπάντησαν, Σκύθαι τρία γραμμάτια, bond, free (he perhaps does not say 'bond and free,' because these relations actually subsisted: but the persons do not say it, were not thus regarded in Christ—no man is, quoad a Christian, Βούλος, nor [see also Gal. iii. 28] (εὐθείας); but Christ (emphatically closes the sentence) is all (every distinctive category of humanity is done away as to worth or privilege, and all have been absorbed into and centre in this one, χριστός είναι, για χριστός είναι—His members, in vital union with Him) and in all (equally sprinkled on, living in, working through and by every class of mankind).

12.] Put on therefore (as a consequence of having put on the new man, to whom these belong) as the elect of God (see ref. and 1 Thess. i. 4), holy and beloved (it seems best to take, as Mey., ἐκλεκτοὶ for the subject, and ἄγιος, and ἡγίας for predicates,—1) because ἐκλεκτοὶ is a word which must find its ground independently of us, in the absolute will of God, and therefore cannot be an adjunctive attribute of ἄγιος (καὶ ἡγίας,—and 2) because ἐκλεκτοὶ θεου is used in ref. and ἐκλεκτοὶ in several other places, as a substantive), bowels of compassion (see ref., and Luke i. 78. The expression is a Hebraism: and the account of it to be found in the literal use of ἐπιστάσεια as the seat of the sympathetic feelings: cf. Gen. xlii. 30), kindness (see on Gal. v. 22), lowliness (towards one another—see on Eph. iv. 2), meekness (Eph. ib.; but here it is primarily towards one another; not however excluding but rather implying meekness towards God as its ground), long-suffering (ib.), forbearing one another (see ib.) and forgiving each other (ταυτός is not ἀλληλος, as De W., al. but the mutual forgiveness of the Christian body is put in marked correspondence to that great act of forgiveness which has passed upon the whole body, in Christ. 'Forgiving yourselves,' did it not convey to our ears a wrong idea, would be the best rendering: doing as a body for yourselves, that which God did once for you all), if any have cause of blame (the phrase is a classical one—cf. Eur. Orest. 1068, ἐν μὲν πρατά σου μωμφὴν ἔχω—Phoc. 781; Soph. Aj. 180, and other examples in Wetst.): as also (καὶ; besides, and more eminent than, the examples which I am exhorting you to shew of this grace) the Lord (Christ: in Eph. iv. 32, the forgiveness is traced to its source, δ θεός ε ἐν χριστῷ. Mey. compares the expression ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν forgave (see on Eph. iv. 32) you, so also ye (scil. χαρίζουμεν) do not supply an imperative, by which the construction is unnecessarily broken. Chrys. carries this χαρίζεσθαι to an exaggerated extent, when he says that it extends not only to τὴν ψυχήν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν θειάσατο;—τὸ γὰρ 'καθὼς ταῖται ἀπαίτεται—καὶ ὠδὲ μέχρι υπνού, καὶ οὐκ ἔτη ληφθέντα και μετὰ ταῦτα: thinking perhaps on Rom. ix. 3): 14.] but (the contrast lies between
14. (ree for δ) ήτις (grammatical emendation), with D\(\text{KL}^3\) rel.: txt ABCF 17 sic latt Clem\(_2\) Ambest, or D\(\text{KL}^3\) for τελειον, ευφαντος D\(\text{KL}^3\) Ambest.

15. om ν Φ. ree (for χριστον) θεου (cf Phil iv. 7), with C\(\text{D}^2\)KL\(\text{N}^3\) rel. goth Chr Ambest: txt ABCD\(\text{D}^1\)F\(\text{N}^3\) m 17 latt syrr coptt æth arm Clem\(_2\) Damasc Ang Pelag. om ενι B 67\(\text{b}\) sah (om εν ενι σ. 33-5). 

γένεθε δι'

taïta pánta, which have been individually mentioned, and ēpì pási toûtois, which must over-include them as a whole) over (carrying on the image ἐνδύσασθε—see below. Calvins’ propter omnia hæc is every way wrong:—‘in addition to,’ as Eadie, al., falls short of the fitness and beauty of the passage, weakening what is really the literal sense into a metaphorical one. The E. V., ‘above all these things,’ looks ambiguous, but by repeating ‘put on,’ it seems as if our translators meant ‘above’ to be taken locally and literally) all these things (put on) love (the article gives a fine and delicate sense here, which we cannot express—ἡ ἀγάπη is not merely love, but the [well-known] love which becomes Christians’—the nearest rendering would perhaps be ‘Christian love,’ but it expresses too much), which thing (reef: there is a slight causal force,—for it is) is the bond of perfectness (the idea of an upper garment, or perhaps of a girdle, as Calv., supposed, seems to have been before the Apostle’s mind. This completes and keeps together all the rest, which, without it, are but the scattered elements of completeness: πάντα ἐκεῖνα, ἕσεως, αὕτη συσφίγγει παράσυρα ἀπούσις δὲ διὰ διαλύει τὰ εὐλέγχονται ὑπόκρις ὡσα κ. οὐδέν, Thl. Wetst. cites from Simplex, in Epictet., p. 208, καλῶς οἱ Πυθαγόρεια περισσοὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρτῶν τῆς φιλίας ἄτιμως, χ. σύνδεσις αὕτη πασῶν τῶν ἄρτων ἔλεγ.

The genitive after σύνδεσμος is not the genitive of apposition, as in Eph iv. 3, but of that which is held together by the σύνδεσμος, as in Plat. Rep. x. p. 616 c, εἶναι γὰρ τὸ τὸ φῶς ἐξουσιοῦ τοῦ σποραν, οὐ τὰ στοιχεῖα τῶν τρίτων, οὕτω πάσαι ἄνευ καὶ τοῦ προφανος. Those who, as some of the Roman Catholic expositors (not Bising), find here justification by works, must be very hard put to discover support for that doctrine. The whole passage proceeds upon the ground of previous justification by faith: see ch. ii. 12, and our ver. 12. ὅς ἐκλ. τ. θ. Some render σύνδεσμος ‘the sum total,’ or inclusive idea, ‘Συνδεσμος’ so Bengel, Usteri, De W., Ohsh., al.: and it appears to bear this sense in Herodian iv. 12. 11, πάντα τῶν σύνδεσμων τῶν ἑπτακολων,—but not in the N. T.; and besides, the sense would be logically inconsistent with ἤτις πάσιν τούτοις, implying that Love does not include, but covers and supplements all the former. Still worse is the wretched adjectival rendering of τῆς τελ. as τελειω, ‘the perfect band,’ as Grot., Erasm.-par., Est., al.: and (simply an additional exhortation, not an inference, ‘and so,’ as Beng.; compare Eph iv. 3, where peace is the σύνδεσμος. It is exceedingly interesting to observe the same word occurring in the same trains of thought in the two Epistles, but frequently with different application. See the Prolegg. to this Epistle, §iv.7) let Christ’s peace (the peace which He brings about, which He left as his legacy to us [ref. John], which is empli- cally and solely 113s. This peace, though its immediate and lower reference here is to mutual concord, yet must not on account of the context be limited to that lower side. Its reference is evidently wider, as ἄραβενέτοα shews: see below. It is the whole of Christ’s Peace in All its blessed character and effects) rule (sit un- pire—be enthroned as decider of every thing. Cf. Demosth. 3. 6, 7, ἐξω ἤμας τα ἡμετερ αὐτῶν ἄφαβελ ἐχει κ. τα τῶν ἰδιαι δικαια βραβευεν. ib. 1231. 19, τον τον τρόπον ὄμα τοιτα βραβευντων: and in the later sense of simply to rule, Polyb. ii. 25. 3, ἀπαν τα γεγονόμενα ὑπ’ τῶν Γαλατων βομφί μᾶλλον ἡ λογισμος βραβευεται, al., in Schweig. Lex. Polyb., also in Jos. and Philo. It is forcing the passage, to intro- duce the idea of a combat and a price, as Chrys., &c.: and philosophically wrong to render, as Calv., ‘palmam feral,’ explaining it ‘superior sit omnibus carnis affectio- bus.’ As much beside the purpose is Grot.’s ‘djudicet, nemen si quid est inter nos controversum,’ similarly Kypke and
Hammond ("componat omnia vestra cum aliis dissidiat") against this is εν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, which makes the office of the peace spoken of not adjudicature, but prævenire lites in your hearts,—to which (with a view to which, as your blessed state of Christian perfection in God—see Is. xxvi. 3; Ivi. 19; Eph. ii. 14—17) ye were also (the καὶ marks the introduction of an additional motive—to which, besides my exhortation, ye have this motive: that, &c.) called (refr.) in one body (as members of one body—one-ness of body being the sphere and element in which that peace of Christ was to be carried on and realized. This reminiscence refers to the whole context from ver. 8, in which the exhortations had been to mutual Christian graces. ἐκ τῆς γὰρ ἄλλος ἐσμέν ἐν σώμα, ἦν ὡς μὲν ὑπὲρ ἄλλη-λων ταύτην παρόμοιαν, κ. ϑή διαστιμώθη; Thil.) and be thankful (to God, who called you: so the context before and after certainly demands: not 'one to another,' as Conygh., which though an allowable sense of εὐχάριστος, breaks the connexion here, which is as Chrys. on ver. 16—παρακάτω εὐχάριστος εἶναι, καὶ τὴν ὅδον δείκνυς. The ἐκλήθησε was the word which introduced the exhortation—all conduct inconsistent with the 'calling in one body' being in fact unhankfulness to God, who called us. Jer., Erasm.-not., Calv., al., render it 'amiable,' 'friendly,' against which the same objection lies. See Eph. v. 4; and ib. 19, 20: where the same class of exhortations occurs. 16.] See the connexion in Chrys. above. This thankfulness to God will shew itself in the rich indwelling in you and outflowing from you of the word of Christ, be it in mutual edifying converse, or in actual songs of praise. Let Christ's word (the Gospel: genitive subjective; the word which is His—He spoke it, inspired it, and gives it power) dwell in you (not 'among you,' as Luther, De W., al.: which does not suit εὐνοοῦν. As Ellie. observes, St. Paul's usage [refr., remembering that ref. 2 Cor. is a quotation] seems to require that the indwelling should be individual and personal. Still we may say with Mey. that the ὑμεῖς need not be restricted to individual Christians: it may well mean the whole community—you, as a church. The word dwelling in them richly, many would arise to speak it to edification, and many would be moved to the utterance of praise. And to this collective sense of ὑμῖν, εὐα-τοὺς below seems to correspond; see above on ver. 13) richly (i.e. in abundance and fulness, so as to lead to the following results), in all wisdom (these words seem to be better taken with the following than with the foregoing. For 1) ch. i. 28 already gives us νοοῦν... κ. διὰ... ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ. 2) εὐνοικία has already its qualifying adverb πλουσίως emphatically placed at the end of the sentence. 3) The two following clauses will thus correspond—ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ διάδοκσιν... ἐν τῇ χάριτι ἀδοκιμα. And so Beng., Olsh., De W., Mey., al.: the usual arrangement has been with E. V., all. [not Chrys.,] to join them with the preceding) teaching and warning (see on ch. i. 28) each other (see on ver. 13) in psalms, hymns, spiritual songs (on the meaning of the words, see notes, Eph. v. 19. The arrangement here adopted may be thus vindicated: ὑμ. φῦν. ὡς. πν. must be joined with the preceding, not with the following, because 1) the instrumental dative is much more naturally taken after διὰ. κ. νοοῦν. ἑαυτ., from the analogy of Eph. v. 19, καλοῦντες ἑαυτοῦς ψ. κ. ὑμ. κ. φῦν. (πν.), ἀδοκιμασθῆναι κ.τ.λ. 2) ἀδοκιμα here has already two qualifying clauses, one before and one after, ἐν τῇ χάριτι and ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν. *Meyer's note here is important: "Notice moreover that Paul here also [see on Eph. ut supra] is not speaking of 'divine service' properly so called, for this teaching and admonishing is required of his readers generally and mutually, and as a proof of their rich possession of the word of Christ:—but of the communication of the religious life among one another (e.g. at meals, at the Agape, and other meetings, in their family circles, &c.), wherein spiritual influence caused the mouth to overflow with the fulness of the heart, and gave utterance to brotherly instruction and reproof in the higher form of psalms, &c.; perhaps in songs already known,—or extemporized, according to the peculiarity and productivity of each man's spiritual gift: perhaps sung by individuals alone [which would especially be the case when they
were extemporized], or in chorus, or in the form of antiphonal song [†Phin. Ep. x. 97]." How common religious singing was in the ancient church, independently of 'divine service' properly so called, see in Sulcker, Thes. ii. p. 1568 f. Euseb., H. E. ii. 17, v. 28, testifies to the existence of a collection of rhythmical songs which were composed ἀπαρχής by Christians [φαλαγια δὲ ὦσοι κ. φιλα, ἀξιλφάν ἀπαρχής ὧν πιστῶν γραφεῖσα, τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν χριστὸν ὑμῶνος θεολογοῦντες, v. 28].

On singing at the Agape, see Tert. Apol. 39, vol. i. p. 477: "post aquam mammam et lumina, ut quisque de scripturis sanctis vel proprio ingenio potest, provocatur in medium Deo canare"); in grace (the grace of Christ—see reff. for the absolute use of ἡ χάρις)—ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ πνευμάτος φυσιν ἐξοντες, Chrys.: so Ἰεσ., diá τῆς παρὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνευμάτος δοθείας χάριτος: not as Erasmus, Luther, Melanchth., Calv. ["pro dexteritate que grata sit"], and indeed Chrys. [altern. ταῖς ἐν χάριτι φαίδαι], Beza, Corn.-a-lap., al., "gracefully,"—which would be irrelevant as applied to the singing of the heart: see below—nor as Anselm, and De W., Cony., al., "thankfully," which would be a flat and unmeaning anticipation of εὐχαριστοῦντες below. The article marks 'the grace,' which is yours by God's indwelling Spirit) singing in your hearts to God (this clause has generally been understood as qualifying the former. But such a view is manifestly wrong. That former spoke of their teaching and warning one another in effusions of the spirit which took the form of psalms, &c.: in other words, dealt with their intercourse with one another; this on the other hand deals with their own private intercourse with God. The second participle is coordinate with the former, not subordinate to it. The mistake has partly arisen from imagining that the former clause related to public worship, in its external form: and then this one was understood to enforce the genuine heartfelt expression of the same. But this not being so, that which is founded on it falls with it. The singing τῷ θεῷ is an analogous expression to that in 1 Cor. xiv. 25,—ἐν δὲ τῷ ἡ διερμηνευτικεῖν, ἢ εὐνοοῖ, καὶ λαλεῖτε κ. τ. θεῷ. So the ἐν ταῖς καρδίς, ὑμῶν, describes the method of uttering this praise, viz. by the thoughts only: τῷ θεῷ designates to whom it is to be addressed, not, as before, to one another, but to God:

17.] general exhortation, comprehending all the preceding spiritual ones. And every thing whatsoever ye do in word or work (so far is a 'noninative penedens'), all things (do) in the name of the Lord Jesus (not as Chr., Ec., Thil., &c., τουτεστιν αὐτὸν καλὸν βιοῦ, nor as Thrdrt., who treats it as a dehortation from the worship of angels, which they were to exclude by their always τὰ ἔργα κομίσαι τῷ μισήμῳ τοῦ δεσποτὸν χρισ-

18. om. αἰ. F. rec ins ίδιοι bef ανδρασίων (from Eph v. 22), with D'L rel Thdrt: om ABCD-3FKN c d e k 17 vulg arm Clem Thl Ambrst Pelag. aft ανδρ. ins ίθων D'L syn-r-w-ast Thl Pelag. ins τα bef κυρίω F.
20. rec εστίν bef ευάρεστον (after Eph vi. 1), with FKL rel Chr Thdrt Damasc: txt ABCDN m 17 latt. rec (for εὺ) τω, with rel spec syn-cop-Clem: txt ABCDFKLN e f g i l m 17. 67: latt goth Chr Thdrt Damasc.
21. for ἐρεύζετε, παροργίζετε (from Eph vi. 4) ACD-FLN m 17 Thdrt-ns Thl: txt BD-3K rel Clem.

τοῦ:—but much as the common ἐν χριστῷ —so that the name of Christ is the element in which all is done—which furnishes a motive and gives a character to the whole) giving thanks to God the Father (where ἡμῶν is not expressed, the words θέος πατήρ must be taken as approximating in sense to that more technical meaning which they now bear, without exclusive reference to either our Lord or ourselves,—and should be rendered 'God the Father') through Him (as the one channel of all communication between God and ourselves, whether of grace coming to us, or of thanks coming from us. Cf. His own saying, οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ δι’ ἐμοῦ).

18—IV.1.] SPECIAL EXHORTATIONS TO RELATIVE SOCIAL DUTIES: 18, 19, to the married: 20, 21, to children and masters: 22—IV.1, to slaves and masters: seeing that such exhortations occur in Epistles also in terms so very similar, we are not justified, with Chrys., al., in assuming that there was any thing in the peculiar circumstances of the Colossian church, which required more than common exhortation of this kind. It has been said, that it is only in Epistles addressed to the Asiatic churches, that such exhortations are found: but in this remark the entirely general character of the Epistle to the Ephesians is forgotten. Besides, the exhortations of the Epistle to Titus cannot be so completely severed from these as to be set down in another category, as Eadie has endeavoured to do. See throughout the section, for such matters as are not remarked on, the notes to Eph. v. 22—vii. 9.

18. ὡς ἀνήκων] The verb is in the imperfect—as ἐδει and χρῆν, con-veying always in its form a slight degree of blame, as implying the non-realization of the duty pointed out—just as when we say, 'It was your duty to,' &c. See Winer, § 41. 3, end. The words ἐν κυρίῳ belong to ἀνήκων, not to ὑποτάσσεσθε; as is shown by the parallel expression in ver. 20: was fitting, in that element of life designated by ἐν κυρίῳ. 19.] See the glorious expan-sion of this in Eph. v. 25—33. πικραῖνεσθαί occurs in the same sense in Demosth. 1464. 18: also in Plut. Legg. p. 731 al. —τὸ θυμόν πράαει κ. μὴ ἀκραχολούντα, γυναικεῖω πικραῖνομενον, διατελεῖν, Kyprke illustrates the word from Plutarch, de ira cohinda, p. 457, 'nibi dicit, animi prodere imbecillitatem quum viri πρὸς γύναια διαπικραῖνονται: ' and from Eurip. Helen, 303: ἀλλ’ ὅταν τὸ πόσιν πικρὸν | ἔμψυ τῆν γυναικί, κ. τὸ δώμ ἐστί (lege σώζεσθαι) πικρόν, βανείν κρατιστον. 20.] See Eph. vi. 1. κατὰ πάντα, the exceptions not being taken into account: St. Paul's usual way of stating a general rule. It is best to take εὐάρεστον, as Mey. absolutely, as προσφιλέθη, Phil. iv. 8: the Christian qualification being given by the ἐν κυρίῳ: De W., al., understand τῷ θεῷ, which would render that qualification meaningless. 21.] See on Eph. vi. 4, for πατέρες.
22. ins ὥς bef 1st ev C1. οὐφαλμοδουλείας (the sing occurs in the similar passage Eph vi. 5) ABDF Damasc Thl: οὐφαλμοδουλείας (as Eph vi. 5) Chr(txt and comm.): ttt CKLN rel Clem Chr-comm, Thdrt Ec.—for τειια, Λια CDF b ᾰ f l 17. 

αλλὰ Β. rec (for κυρίων) θεοῦ, with D3 KN3 rel D-lat copt goth Thdrt: ttt ABCD'FLN 17 am(with [besides F-lat] harl) syrr arm Clem Ambrost.

23. rec (for ο έαν) καὶ παν ο τι έαν (from ver 17), with D3-KL rel (av a d l f m) Syr gr-lat-f; παν ο τιν παν 67: παν ο ν 67: παν ο έαν 88: ttt ABCD'FR 17 latt copt goth Thl ms lat-f. αφτ κυρίων ins δουλευόντες Α ο 8-re (cope) Clem. om και B.

24. for απολ. άφησεν Α씨'LN3 a b c f g h k m n (? ) Chr Thdrt.—(Αμφ. Α c ?) αφτ κληρονομιάς ins νικῶν C 2 in 80. 116 arm Chr-comm Thdrt. rec aft τω ins γαρ, with D3-KL rel syrr goth Clem; om ABCD'K 17 vulg copt Pelag Bede.—τον κυρίων ήπιου χριστον δουλευεις F, and, ong ημ. ιησ. D-lat Ambrost.

here: ‘ἀδύμηλη, fructus animis, pestis juventutis.’ Westet. quotes from Ένεας Τακτίκες, ὄμη ἦ μηδένα μετείπται τῶν τυχόντων ἀνάρθρων ἀδυματεροί γάρ εἰπέν τύν. 22. See on Eph. vi. 5 ff.
The ὀφαλμοδουλεία here are the concrete acts of the -εία of Eph. vi. 6, the abstract spirit. τὸν κυρίων, Him who is absolutely, and not merely κατὰ σάρκα, your master. τοῦτο ἐστι φιλοσαφεῖα τῶν θεῶν, ὅταν, μηδενὸς δύνατος, μηδεν πράττωνν πονηρόν. ἄν δὲ πράττωνν, οὐχὶ τῶν θεῶν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀνάρθρων φοβοβιμοῦσα, Chrys.

23. ἐκ ψυχῆς, as Chrys., μετ' εἰνοὺς, μη μετὰ δουλικῆς ἀνάγκης, ἀλλὰ μετ' ἐλευθερίας κ. κοινωνίας. The datives may be taken as of reference, or commodi. In Eph. vi. 7 the construction is filled up by δουλεύεται. Meye. observes against De W., that ὅς is an absolute not a mere relative negative: 'doing things unto men' is to be laid aside altogether, not merely less practised than the other: ‘as workers to the Lord and non-workers to men,' Ellie. 24.) = Eph. vi. 8, but more specific as to the Christian reward. εἰδότες, knowing as ye do.—The ἀπὸ κυρίου is emphatically prefixed —'that it is from the Lord that you shall ...' ἀπό, as Winer, § 47. b, is distinguished from παρά, as indicating not immediate bestowal, but that the Lord is the ultimate source and conferer of the inheritance—from the Lord—not 'at the hands of the Lord.' You must look to Him, not to men, as the source of all Christian reward. [Eadie, p. 265, has represented Winer as saying the contrary of that which he does say.] ἀνταπόδοσις occurs in Thuc. iv. 21, in the sense of a mutual exchange of places taken in war: in Polyb. vi. 5, 3, in that of a compensation, τοῦτο ἰκανὸν ἀνταπόδοσιν ποιεῖται ἐκείνον,—and xx. 7. 2, ἢπεῖρον ἐπηρείη ἀνταπόδοσιν ποιομένη ἢ τύχη: and hence in that of 'an opposite turn,' xxvii. 2. 4, ἀνταπόδοσις λαμβάνει τὰ πράγματα.—iv. 43. 5, ἀνταπόδοσιν ποιεῖται ὁ δοῦς prós, &c. Here the sense would appear to be, with a marked reference to their present state of slavery, the compensation. κληρ., genitive of apposition (refl.). The very word κληρονομία should have kept the Roman Catholic expositors from introducing the merit of good works here. The last clause, without the γὰρ, is best taken imperfectly, as a general comprehension of the course of action prescribed in the former part of the verse: serve ye the Lord Christ. So Vulg. ‘domino Christo servete.’ 25.) This verse seems best to be taken as addressed to the slaves by way of encouragement to regard Christ as their Master and serve Him—seeing that all their wrongs in this world, if they leave them in His hands, will be in due time righted by Him, the just judge,
with whom there is no respect of persons. For he that doeth wrong shall receive (see, as on the whole, Eph. vi. 8) that which he did wrongfully (the sense is changed because in δίκαιων he is speaking of present practice—in δικαίσεσα, he has transferred the scene to the day of the Lord, and the wrong is one of past time), and there is not respect of persons (ἐστε δικαιωμένης διότι δόλου συν δικαιούντος διοφωρά, ἄλλα δικαιών εἰσφέρει τὴν ἡμέραν, Θαρτ. Some, as Thi., Beng., al., suppose the verse spoken with reference to the slaves; but οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολογία is against this, unless we accept Bengel's far-fetched explanation of it: "tenues sepe putant, sibi propter tentitatum ipsorum esse parcum."

Ch. [IV. 1.] Meyer contends for the strict meaning of 'equality' for ἴσωτα, and that it never has the signification of 'fairness.' But (see examples in West.) the common conjunction of ἴσων κ. δικαίων would naturally lead to assigning to ἴσων the same transferred meaning which 'aquinus' has in Latin, and to ἴσωτα the same which 'equitas' has. I would render then, equity,—fairness: understanding by that, an extension of τὸ δικαίωμα to matters not admitting of the application of strict rules—a large and liberal interpretation of justice in ordinary matters. In every place cited by Meyer where the word is used ethically and not materially, this rendering is better than his. In Polyb. ii. 58. 8, the case is different: it there imports absolute political equality. Erasm., Corn.-a-lap., al., understand impartiality, not preferring one above another: but this does not seem to be in question here. Calv. says: 'Non dubito quin Paulus ἴσωτα hie posuerit pro jure analogio aut distributivo: quemadmodum ad Ephesios τὰ σωτῆρα. Neque enim sic habent dominii obnoxios sibi servos, quin viressim aliud ipsis debant: quemadmodum jus analogum valere debet inter omnes ordines.' Thadr.: ἴσωτα ὅτι τὴν ἴσωτιμαν ἐκδίκασα, ἄλλα τὴν προσκυνήματα ἐπιμελείαν, ἥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν δεσπότων ἀπολαύσεων ἥρως οἱ σώζεται. Chrys.: τι δέ ἐστιν ἰσότης; πάντων ἐν αὐθανασίᾳ καθιστάντας, κ. μ. ἐν ἐκείνων δεισίναι, ἀλλ' ἀμείβοντας τῶν πόρων. Cf. Philen. 16. παρέ-}

25. rec (for γαρ) δε (conseq of former), with D\textsuperscript{3}KL rel synr gr-if: ttx ABC\textsuperscript{2}FN 17 latt coop Cth Clem lat-if. κοινωνικαί B\textsuperscript{3}KL\textsuperscript{3} d m Clem Chr-comm Thadt Thil; κοινωνικά: F: ttx ACD\textsuperscript{1}N\textsuperscript{1} rel Damasc (see on Eph vi. 8). at end add para τον θεον F vulg (not) arm Chr lat-if.

CHAP. IV. 1. παρεξετε C b\textsuperscript{1} f 72. 114 Clem Chr Thil-ms. rec οὐσιώδεις (from Eph vi. 9), with D\textsuperscript{3}KL\textsuperscript{3} rel Chr Thadt: ttx ABC\textsuperscript{2}FN m 17 Clem Orig Damasc. (Cl illegible.)
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χ. ιι. 7. εὐχ. ἐπικ. v. 3. ref. εὐχ. ch. 1. 3. t Phil. i. 9 ref. u Acts xiv. 27. 1 Cor. xvi. 6. 2 Cor. ii. 12. Isa. xiv. 1. v inf. of object, ch. i. 27. w Eph. i. 9 ref. x = 2 Cor. xi. x. ch. i. 36. y Eph. vi. 30. z = Acts iii. 11. Ν. (Sir. prol.) e ch. iii. 18. f Matt. v. 13 bis. Mark ix. 50 bis (v. 46, 40, 50). Luke xiv. 34 bis only. Lev. ii. 13.

2. om en autw N; ins N-corr. om en εὐχαριστία D1 Cyril. Ambra. om ον εὐχαριστία D1 Cyril. Ambra. om τον θεον Λογου D1. aft Λογου ins επαρφοσ Α. for χριστος, θεου B 3. 41. 238 att. for θ, δν ΒΦ: txt ACDKLN rel vulg (and F-lat) Clem Cyr.

εὐχαριστεῖν, κ. ὑπὲρ τῶν φανερῶν κ. ὕπ. τῶν αἰσθητῶν, κ. ὑπὲρ ἑκάστων ἑαυτοῦ εὐ. κ. ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας, κ. ὑπὲρ γεγονός, κ. ὑπὲρ θλίψεως, κ. ὑπὲρ ἀδικίας, ὑπὸ πόρον τοῦ αἰώνος εὐχεθαι, κ. ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν εὐρέθαι εὐχαριστεῖν. Χρυσ. 3. ἡμῶν, not 'ενα, see ch. i. 1, 3. This is plainly shewn here by the singular following after. ονα see on 1 Cor. xiv. 13. Here, the idea of final result is prominent: but the purport is also included. θυμάω τ. Λόγου] Not as Calv., al., oris apertioneum, Eph. vi. 19; but as in ref., objective, an opening of opportunity for the extension of the Gospel by the word. This would, seeing that the Apostle was a prisoner, naturally be given first and most chiefly, as far as he was concerned, by his liberation: cf. Philen. 22. Αλήθεια inf. of purpose—so that we may speak. 6. § k. 8. for (on account of) which (mystery) ἰαμ (not only a minister but) also bound. 4. The second ἰαμ gives the purpose of the previous verse, not the purpose of δέδεμαι, as Chrys. [τὰ δὲ σπάκλα φανεροὶ αὐτῶν, οὐ σωσίας], Bengel [τὸν vinetus sum ut patefaciam: paradoxon],—nor to be joined with προσευξόμενοι, as Deza, De W., al. If that might be so, the door opened, &c.,—then he would make it known as he ought to do—then he would be fulfilling the requirements of that apostolic calling, from which now in his imprisonment he was laid aside. Certainly this is the meaning,—and not, as ordinarily understood, cf. Chrys., al., that he might boldly declare the Gospel in his imprisonment. 5, 6] Exhortations as to their behaviour in the world.

5. ἐν σοφίᾳ] in (as an element) wisdom (the practical wisdom of Christian prudence and sound sense). πρὸς, as in οὔδεν πρὸς Διάνυσον,—ἐλ τον δέοιτο πρὸς Τιμόθεον πράξεις, Demosth. p. 1185, signifying simply in relation to, in the intercourse of life. Ellic. refers to a good discussion of this preposition in Rost and Palm's Lex. vol. ii. p. 1157. On οἱ έξω, see ref. They are those outside the Christian brotherhood. πρὸς τά μέλη τά οἴκεια οὐ τοπατητά ἡμι τε ἀφολείας, ἢσις πρὸς τοὺς έξω ενθά γὰρ ἀδιάφορα, εἰκό σ. συγγενώματα πολλακά κ. γιάμα. Χρυσ. τ. καρφ. έξαγορ.] see on Eph. v. 16. The opportunity for what, will be understood in each case from the circumstances, and our acknowledged Christian position as watching for the cause of the Lord. The thought in Eph., θατ ημερας πανηγυρι εἰσι, lies in the background of the word έξαγοράζομεν.

6] Let your speech (πρὸς τοὺς έξω still) be always in (as its characteristic element) grace (i.e. gracious, and winning favour: cf. Luke iv. 22), seasoned with salt (not insipid and void of point, which can do no man any good; we must not forget that both these words have their spiritual meaning: χάρις, so common an one as to have almost passed out of its ordinary acceptation into that other,—the grace which is conferred on us from above, and which our words and actions should reflect,—and άλας, as used by our Saviour in ref. [see note on Mark], as symbolizing the uction, freshness, and vital briskness which characterizes the Spirit's presence and work in a man. So that we must beware here of supposing that mere Attic 'sales' are meant, or any vivacity of outward expression only, and keep in mind the Christian import. Of the Commentators, Thdt. comes the nearest,—πνευματικὴ συνεχείς κοινωνία. There seems to be no allusion here to the conservative power of salt: the matter in hand at present is not avoiding corrupt conversation. Still less does the meaning of έπὶ belong to this place. A
3—10. ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΛΑΣΣΑΕΙΣ.

..." Nevertheless, the one who is weak is not to be despised, but the strong ought to bear the weak. 7 When the strong want to eat, they eat; and the weak are nourished. But if the weak are not to be nourished, let the strong eat alone. 8 But if the strong will not eat unless the weak are nourished, let the strong eat alone. 9 Each one should give whatever he has to the one who needs. 10 For to this end Christ Jesus came into the world, to save sinners, of whom I am the first. 11 Now I do it willingly, and I do not regard it as a loss but as a gain for me to do it. 12 No, I consider it nothing, for whoever is his own master will be a slave to himself. 13 Better to suffer a little and be free from sin, rather than to suffer a lot and be a slave to sin. 14 For if you live according to the flesh, you will die; but if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body, you will live. 15 For anyone who is living according to the flesh is setting his heart on the things of the flesh, but anyone who is living according to the Spirit is setting his heart on the things of the Spirit. 16 But the mind set on the flesh is hostile to God; it does not submit to God's law, because it is unable to do so. 17 Those who are in the flesh do not please the Spirit, and those who are in the Spirit do not please the flesh. 18 What counts for nothing in the flesh counts for everything in the Spirit, and what counts for nothing in the Spirit counts for nothing in the flesh. 19 In the same way, those who live according to the flesh cannot please the Spirit, and those who live according to the Spirit cannot please the flesh. 20 For you have been called to live as servants of Christ, not as servants of sin. 21 If you follow the ways of sin, you will die; if you follow the ways of God, you will live. 22 For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord. 23 For those who belong to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh, but those who belong to the Spirit set their minds on the things of the Spirit. 24 The mind that is set on the flesh is mortal, but the mind that is set on the Spirit is eternal. 25 For we do not live for ourselves, but for Jesus Christ, who died for us. 26 So set your minds on the things above, not on the things of the earth. 27 For the world is passing away, but those who do the will of God remain forever. 28 So let us live in the light.
Apostle’s friends may have voluntarily shared his imprisonment by turns; and that Aristarchus may have been his fellow-prisoner when he wrote this Epistle, Ephaphras when he wrote that to Philemon. 

The meaning of ἵνα ἔρχεται εὐτολάς (James 1:22) is discussed. The phrase was used to denote an image or representation of something, but not necessarily of a physical object.

10. διὰ παρεκκλησίας ἐν οἴκῳ Θείῳ... Entirely unknown to us. A Justus is mentioned Acts xviii. 7, as an inhabitant of Corinth, and a proselyte; but there is no further reason to identify the two. The surname Justus (γάμος) was common among the Jews: cf. Acts i. 23, and Jos. Vit. 9, 65, 76.

These alone who are of the circumcision (the construction is of the nature of an anacolouthon, οἱ ὑπότες εκ π. being equivalent to that of those of the circumcision.

We have a similar construction frequently in the classics: e.g. ἀκαμφά έξ ἑμνῶν γερανοπολτέων ἦν ὁ Ὀδυσσέας, Π. η. 211: ὥρια πιστὰ παμπότες δ ἐν ἰματυς αἰεί, Od. w. 483. See many more examples in Kühner, ii. § 678. 2. This seems far better, with Meyer and Lachmann, than with rec. Ellic. al. to place the stop at περιτομής and attach the clause to the three preceding names. For thus we lose [in spite of the assertion by Ellic. that the mονον naturally refers the thought to the category last mentioned] the fact that there were other συνεργοὶ not of the circumcision who had been a comfort to him. The judaistic teachers were for the most part in opposition to St. Paul: cf. his complaint, Phil. i. 15, 17) are my fellow-workers towards the kingdom of God (the rest would not be called by this name—so that De W.’s objection to the construction does not apply, that the opponents would not be called συνεργοί, for they are not so called), men that proved (the passive meaning of ἐγενήθησαν is not safely to be pressed: see notes on Eph. iii. 7; 1 Thess. i. 5, 6; 1 Pet. i. 15. The aor. alludes to some event recently passed; to what precisely, we cannot say) a comfort to me (they are my συνερ-γοῖ ‘quippe qui . . .’ Hierocles, de nuptiis, apud Stob. [Kypke], has the same phrase: ζηγν-ext paroixia megabha γίνεται κ. πρὸς τοῦτα παραργοια: so Plutarch, de auditione, p. 13 [id.], νόστιμα παραργοια . . . δεόμενον). 12] On Ephaphras, see ch. i. 7 note. The sentence
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is better without a comma at ἡμῶν, both as giving more spirit to the δοῦλος Χ. χ., and setting the εἰς ὑμῖν in antithesis to the ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν below. On ἀγὼν. besides reff., see Rom. xv. 30. By mentioning Ephraim's anxious prayers for them, he works further on their affections, giving them an additional motive for steadfastness, in that one of themselves was thus striving in prayer for them. ἵνα here gives the direct aim of ἀγὼν. See above on ver. 3—that you may stand,—perfect and fully persuaded (see reff.),—in (be firmly settled in, without danger of vacillating or falling) all the (lit. 'in every') but we cannot thus express it in English) will of God. This connexion, of στήτη with ἐν, as Mey., seems better than, as ordinarily (so also De W. and Ellic.), to join ἐν with the participles. Eadie characterizes it as needless refinement in Mey. to assert that thus not only a μεταβεβλήμμα but a local-βεβλήμμα is attached to στήτη: but the use of στήτη ἐν in the reff. seems to justify it.

13.] πόνος,—an unusual word in the N. T., hence the var. read.,—is usual in the toil of conflict in war, thus answering to ἄγων ὑμῖν. above: so Herod. vi. 114. ἐν πολλῷ τῷ πόνῳ ὁ πολέμαρχος Καλλιμαχὸς διαβρεῖται: similarly viii. 80. Plat. Phaedr. 217 b, ἐνάθα δὴ πόνος τῇ κ. ἄγων ἐσχάτου ψυχῆ πρόκειται: Demosth. 637. 18. εἰ ὁ ἐκεῖνος ἀθέωσθερα ἢ τῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς ὑμείς πόνων.

On account of mention of Laodicea and Hierapolis, some have thought that Epaphras was the founder of the three churches. See Prolegg. § ii. 2, 7.

Laodiceia] Laodicea was a city of Phyrgia Magna (Strabo xii. 8, Plin. v. 29): according to the subscription [rec.] of 1 Tim., the chief city of Phrygia Pacatiana, large (ἡ τῆς χώρας ἀριθ. τοῦ πολιτῶν τιμωρίας εὐτυχισμένη, μεγάλη ἐπιφάνεια αὐτής, Strab.) and rich (Rev. xii. 11, and Prolegg. to Rev. § ii. 11. 13. Tac. Ann. xiv. 27: 'Laodicea, tremore terra prolapsa, nullo a nobis remedio, propriis oppibus revanuit: ὄνταστε τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάττα, Philosop. Soph. p. 25), on the river Lycaeus (hence called ἦ ἐν Λαόκω or πᾶς τῷ Λαόκω, see Strabo, ib.), formerly called Diospolis, and afterwards Rhoa; its subsequent name was from Laodicean queen of Antiochus II. (Steph. Byz.) In A.D. 62, Laodicea, with Hierapolis and Colossæ, was destroyed by an earthquake (Tacit. c. c.) to which visitsations the neighbourhood was very subject (εἴ γὰρ τῆς ἁλύν κ. ἦ Λαοδικεία εὐθύνετο, κ. τῆς πλησιασώματος πλοῦν, Plin. ib.). There is now on the spot a desolate village called Eski-hissar, with some ancient ruins (Arundel, Seven Churches). Winer, RBW.

14.] Ιεραπότομοι] Six Roman miles north from Laodicea: famed for many mineral springs (Strabo, xiii. 4), describes them at length, also the caverns which exhale noxious vapour. See also Plin. ii. 95), which are still flowing (Scuibert, i. 283). Winer, RBW.

This Λούκας has ever been taken for the Evangelist: see Iren. iii. 14. 1, p. 201, and Prolegg. to St. Luke, § i. In ὁ λατρῶς ὁ ἀγαπητός there may be a trace of what has been supposed, that it was in a professional capacity that he first became attached to St. Paul, who evidently laboured under grievous sickness during the earlier part of the journey where Luke first appears in his company. Compare Gal. iv. 13 note, with Acts xvi. 6, 10. But this is too uncertain to be more than an interesting conjecture.
Δημας. 15 ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐν Δαοδεκαίᾳ ἀδελφοὺς καὶ

ΑΒΔΕΥΖ

ς ἐκκλησίαν 16 καὶ

ης παροικών αὐτῶν ὑμὸν ἐκκλησίαν.

οί τῶν ἐκ Δαοδεκαίᾳ ἤσσωσθῇ, καὶ ἐκ τῆς...

ἡ ἐπιστολή, τὸ ποιότητα ἡ ἑαυτὸν ἡν ἐρωτάτος" καὶ 

ὁ ἐκ 

εἰς 

Λαοδεκαίᾳ ἤσσωσθῇ καὶ ἐκτὸς ἡ εἰς 

καὶ ἐκτὸς ἡ ἐκκλησίας. 17 καὶ εἴπατε 

Ἀρχιπρέπον ἡ Βλέπε τὴν ἀδιακόνιον ἣν εἰρηναῖοι 

ἐν κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληρώσω. 18 ὁ ἀσπασμὸς ἐκ τῆς ἡμῖν 

χειρὶ Παύλου. μιμονευτεί μοι τῶν καθεμῶν. 

χάρις ἕμνον ὑμῶν.

ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΛΑΣΣΑΙΣ.

15. rec autō (see note), with DFKL rel Chr Thirt Damasc: autēs (reading ἁπάν-, as B2 accents, as a woman) B 672*: txt ACSN 17.

16. om ἡ εἰσπολέη B. om last καὶ D1 o Ambrst: καὶ βεβαίως F.

18. rec at end ins ἐμφν, with DKL3 rel vss εἰ: om ABCFKN 17. 662* with-rom Ambrst.

SUBSCRIPTION. rec adds ἐγγράφη απὸ ῥωμῆς δίᾳ τύχικον καὶ οὐσιον, with KL rel (of which, b h k m o om πρ. κολ.: αἱ τυχ. ins καὶ τιμοθεοῦ m): om 1: A adds ἀπὸ ῥωμῆς (sic): B2 adds ἐγγράφη απὸ ῥωμῆς: ἡ πρὸς κολ. a: txt B1'C 17 ath, and D(adding επιλαμβανω) F(prefixing κτελεσθή) Χ(adding στίχων τ.)

Δημας [one of Paul's suvregos, Philen. 24, who however afterwards deserted him, from love to the world, 2 Tim. iv. 10. The absence of any honourable or endeavoring mention here may be owing to the commencement of this apostasy, or some unfavourable indication in his character.

15—17.] Salutations to friends.

15. καὶ, before ὕμας, as so often, selects one out of a number previously mentioned: Nymphas was one of these Laodician brethren. The var. readings, αὐτόν, αὐτῆς, appear to have arisen from this construction (see below) not being understood, and the alteration thus having been made to the singular, but in various genders. αὐτῶν refers to τῶν περὶ ὕμας: cf. Xen. Mem. i. 2. 62, ἵνα τις φανερῶς γένηται κλέπτων — τούτοις θάνατος ἐστὶν ἡ ζωή: and see Bernhardy, p. 288; Kühner ii. § 419 b. On the ἐκκλησία spokε of, see note, Rom. xvi. 5.

16. ἡ ἐπιστ., the present letter, reff. ποιήσει εἰς ἑαυτοῦ ὅσοι... Herod. i. 8. 209,—ὁσα σαφιστάτα γὰν εἰσεῖν... ἔποικον, Xen. Cyr. vi. 3. 18. 

τὴν ἐκ Λαοδ. On this Epistle, see Prolegg. to Eph. ii. 17, 19; and Philen. § iii. 2. 3. I will only indicate here the right rendering of the words. They cannot be well taken, as, περὶ in Chrys., to mean ὤν την τῆς π. πρὸς αὐτῶν ἀπεταλήμενης, ἀλλὰ τῆς παραπτώματος (so also Syr., Thurt., Phot. in Ec., Erasm., Beza, Calv., Wolf, Est., Corn-a-Lap., al.), both on account of the awkwardness of the sense commanding them to read an Epistle sent from Laodicea, and not found there, and on account of the phrase τὴν ἐκ so commonly having the pregnant meaning of 'which is there and must be sought from there;' cf. Kühner, ii. § 623 a. Herod. iii. 6. Thucyd. ii. 34; iii. 22; vi. 32; vii. 70, and other examples there. We may safely say that a letter not from, but to the Laodicians is meant. For the construction of this latter sentence, ποιήσατε again is of course to be supplied.

17. Archippus is mentioned Phil. 2, and called the Apostle's συντραπ. οὐσίας. I have treated on the inference to be drawn from this passage as to his abode, in the Prolegg. to Philenon, § iii. 1. He was evidently some officer of the church, but what, in the wideness of διακονία, we cannot say: and conjectures are profitless (see also Est. and Corn-a-Lap.). Meyer well remarks, that the authority hereby implied on the part of the congregation to exercise reproof and discipline over their teachers is remark-
able: and that the hierarchical turn given to the passage by Thl. and Ec. (να ηηαν ἑπιτιμᾷ ἂρχ. αὐτοῖς, μὴ ἔχωσιν ἐγκαλεῖν ἐκεῖνο ὡς πικρῷ, ἐπὶ ἄλλως ἠτόπων τοῖς μαθηταῖς περὶ τοῦ διδασκάλου δια-λέγεσθαι, Thl.) belongs to a later age. As to the words themselves,—Take heed to the ministry which thou receivedst in the Lord (the sphere of the reception of the ministry; in which the recipient lived and moved and promised at his ordination: not, of the ministry itself [τὴν ἐν κυρ.],—nor is ἐν to be diverted from its simple local meaning), that (aim and end of the βλέπε,—in order that) thou fulfil it (refl.).

18. Autograph salutation.

ὁ . . . . Παύλου] See ref. 1 Cor., where the same words occur. μνημ. . . . δισμ.] These words extend further than to mere pecuniary support, or even mere prayers: they were ever to keep before them the fact that one who so deeply cared for them, and loved them, and to whom their perils of false doctrine occasioned such anxiety, was a prisoner in chains: and that remembrance was to work and produce its various fruits—of prayer for him, of affectionate remembrance of his wants, of deep regard for his words. When we read of 'his chains,' we should not forget that they moved over the paper as he wrote. His right hand was chained to the soldier that kept him. See Smith's Dict. of Antiq. under 'Catena.' ἡ χάρις—cf. refl. and ch. iii. 16. 'The grace' in which we stand (Rom. v. 2): it seems (refl.) to be a form of valediction belonging to the later period of the Epistles of St. Paul.
I. 1 Παῦλος καὶ Σιλουανὸς καὶ Τιμόθεος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ΡΩΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΩΝ ὑπὲρ εὐθείας πατρὸς καὶ κυρίων Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.

Τίτλος. rec. παῦλον τον αποστόλον ἡ προσ θεσσ. εἰστολὴ πρωτὴ: Steph. ἡ τοῦ ἀγίου παῦλου πρ. θεσ. πρωτὴ ἐπ.: τοῦ αγ. απ. π. επ. πρ. θ. πρωτὴ 1: αρχεται πρ. Θεσσαλονικιον Γ: ἐπ. παῦλου πρ. θεσ. π. ὠ. Θεσαλονικιοι πολίται ταῦτα κηρύξανται εἰς τόπον ἐκκλησίας: εἰστολὴ πρ. τ. θεσ. a. 1: πρ. θεσ. επ. a. h k : txt ABKN b n 17, and (prefixing αρχεται) D.

CHAP. I. 1. ins καὶ bef πατρὶ K syr: add ἡμῶν Ἄν 116. 8-pe vulg-sixt basm ηθικόν arm-marq Did Ambst Pslag. καὶ κυρίων ἵσου χριστοῦ Ἀ. (d) 17 (copt.). rec. eīρην ins ἀπὸ θέου πατρός ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίων ἵσου χριστοῦ (from later epistles, e.g. 1 Cor i. 3, 2 Cor i. 2, &c.), with ADKLKN rel fuld(with tol) syr-w-ast (copt): om BF vulg fri Syr basm ηθικόν arm Chr-comm Thl Orig-intexptr (“..., par. Et nihil ulter”) Ambrst Pslag. (C defective.)

CHAP. I. 1.] ADDRESS AND GREETING. The Apostle names Silvanus and Timotheus with himself, as having with him founded the church at Thessalonica, see Acts xvi. 1: xvi. 14. Silvanus is placed before Timotheus, then a youth (Acts xvi. 1 f.), see further in Prolegg. to 1 Tim. § 3, 4), as being one ἡγομένων ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς (Acts xv. 22, 32; xviii. 5), and a προφήτης (ib. xv. 32, see also 2 Cor. i. 19; 1 Pet. v. 12). He does not name himself an Apostle, probably for (an amplification of) the reason given by De Wette,—because his Apostleship needed not any substantiation to the Thessalonians. For the same reason he omits the designation in the Epistle to the Philippians. This last fact precludes the reasons given,—by Pelt, al., 'id ei tum non jam moris fruisse,' by Chrys.,—διὰ τὸ νοεσκατηχήτου εἶναι τοὺς ἀνδρας, κ. μηδέπω αὐτῶν πείραν εἰληφθῆναι, —by Estius, Pelt (alter.), and Zwingl., out of modesty, not to distinguish himself from Silvanus and Timotheus,—by Jowett, “probably the name ‘Apostle,’ which in its general sense was used of many, was gradually, and at no definite period, applied to him with the same special meaning as to the Apostles at Jerusalem.” τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ]. So in 2 Thess., Gal., Cor., in the other Epistles, viz. Rom., Eph., Col., Phil., more generally, e. g., —πᾶσιν τοῖς ὁσίοις ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἄγαντοις θεοῦ, κλητοίς ἁγίοις. This is most probably accounted for by the circumstances of the various Epistles. We may notice that the gen. plur. of the persons constituting the church occurs only in the addresses of these two Epistles. We may render ‘of Thessalonians,’ or ‘of the Thessalonians’: better the former. εἰς τῷ πατρὶ. The construction need not be filled up by τῷ or τῇ θεῷ, as Chr., al.: nor with Schott, by understanding χάριν λέγουσιν, which would be unnecessary, seeing that the apostolic greeting follows. The words form a (‘tertiary,” Ellir.) predication respecting τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, οἱ Θεσσαλονικιοι, which requires no supplementing. See Winer, edn. 6,
2. On 1st υμων C fri: ηπερι π. υμων bef παντοτε a 17. 74. 120. om 2nd υμων (because υμων preceded? See Eph i. 16 var readed) ABN1 17. 672 am(with harP): ins CDKLN9 relat cott syrr gr-lat-fl. (om from μειναι to end of ver m.) παομενος C1 d 17. faciens D-lat. (corr by C1, appy.) for υμων, υμων Α. (so also ch ii. 18 for ημας, υμας Α.)

3. του εργει τις πιστη οι οι ημων (transposed from misunderstanding) DF lat Syr athenist. (το εργον F, των εργων Syr)

§ 20. 2. εν θευ πατρι marks them as not being heathens,—κ. κυριω ιησου χριστου, as not being Jews. So De W., after Chrys.: but perhaps the πατρι already marks them as Christians. The εν, as usual, denotes communion and participation in, as the element of spiritual life. χαρις υμιν κ. ειρηνη “Gratia et pax a Deo sit vobis, ut, qui humana gratia et secundari pace privati estis, apud Deum gratiam et pacem habeatis.” Anselm (in Pelt). The words which follow in the rec. are not yet added in this his first Epistle. Afterwards they became a common formula with him.

2—III. 13.] First portion of the Epistle, in which he pours out his heart to the Thessalonians respecting all the circumstances of their reception of and adhesion to the faith. 2—10.] Jowett remarks, that few passages are more characteristic of the style of St. Paul than this one: both as being the overflowing of his love in thankfulness for his converts, about whom he can never say too much: and as to the very form and structure of the sentences, which seem to grow under his hand, gaining force in each successive clause by the repetition and expansion of the preceding. See this exemplified in detail in his note.

2.] εικαριστουμεν, coming so immediately after the mention of Paul, Silvanus, and Timotheus, can hardly be here understood of the Apostle alone, as Pelt, Conyb. and Hows., Jowett, al. For undoubted as it is that he often, e. g. ch. iii. 1. 2, where see note, uses the plural of himself alone, yet it is as undoubted that he uses it also of himself and his fellow-labourers—e. g., 2 Cor. i. 18, 19. And so De W., Linemann, al., take it here.

παντοτε περι παντων? We have the same alliteration Eph. v. 20. These words belong to εικαριστην, not to μειναι ποι. On these latter words see Rom. i. 9 f. 

διακλητισιον seems by the nearly parallel place, Rom. i. 9, to belong to μειναι ημων. ηπερι, not to μειναι υμων, as Lün., Pelt, al. Such a formula would naturally repeat itself, as far as specifications of this kind are concerned. Still it must be borne in mind, that the order there is slightly different. 3.] μεγαλον is not intransitive, as Erasm.-Schmid, al.: but as in ref.: ‘commemorantes,’ Beza. υμων is by Oecum., Calv., al. regarded as the genitive after μεγαλον. Standing alone, and ενεκα supplied before the other genitives. But such a construction may be doubted, and at all events it is much simpler here to regard υμων as the genitive governed by το εργον, τοις κοινωνιας, and prefixed, as belonging to all three. πιστεις, άγαπη, έλατις, are the three great Christian graces of 1 Cor. xiii. See also ch. v. 8; Col. i. 4, 5; and Usteri, paulinisch. Lehrbegriff, p. 236 ff. του εργου της πιστεως] Simple as these words are, all sorts of strange meanings have been given to them. Koppe and Rosenmiller hold τ. εργου to be pleonastic: Calv., Calov., al., render (ungrammatical) ‘your faith wrought by God.’ Kyper, ‘the reality (εργον, as contrasted with λογον) of your faith.’ Chrys., Thl., Thdrt., Ec., al., ‘the endurance of your faith in suffering.’ &c. Comparing the words with the following genitives, they seem to mean, ‘that work (energetic activity) which faith brings forth’ (as Chrys. εν πιστει δια των εργων δεινουται: the gen. as also those following, being thus a possessive one: see Ellicott here): q. d. ‘the activity of your faith.’ See 2 Thess. i. 11: or perhaps, as Jowett (but not so well), ‘your work of faith,’ i.e. the Christian life, which springs from faith;” thus making the gen. one of origin. του κοινου probably towards the sick and needy strangers, cf. Acts xx. 35;
Rom. vi. 12—not in the word and ministry (De W.), cf. ch. v. 12: which is irrelevan here. τῆς ἀγάπης, not as springing from, but as belonging to, love,—characterizing it (L üm.): see above.

t. ὑπομ. τῆς ἀπόδοσις] your endurance of hope—i.e. endurance (in trials) which belongs to (see above), characterizes, your hope; and also nourishes it, in turn; cf. Rom. xv. 4, ίνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς, κ. διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γράφων τὴν ἀπόδοτα ἔχουμεν. τοῦ κυρ. ἡμ. Χ. [x.] specifies the hope—that it is a hope of the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ (cf. ver. 10). Ols. refers the words to all three preceding substantives—but this seems alien from St. Paul's style. On all three Jowett says well, 'your faith, hope, and love; a faith that had its outward effect on your lives: a love that spent itself in the service of others: a hope that was no mere transient feeling, but was content to wait for the things unseen when Christ should be revealed.' (ἐμπρ. τ. θ. κ. πατρ. ἡμ.) belongs most naturally to μημονενοποιησις—making mention . . . before God: not to the gentile precedings (see Rom. iv. 17; xiv. 22), as Thdr., al.

4.] εἴδοτες refers back to μημονενοποιησις; in that we know—or for we know. Thdr., Erasm., Grot., al., take it for εἴδοτες, or εἴδοται ἐστι, wrongly referring it to the Thessalonians: Pelt joins it with μηιεν ποιόθενοι: but the construction as above seems the best. ὑπὸ θεοῦ belongs to ἡγαπημένου, as in 2 Thess. ii. 13, see also Rom. i. 7: not to εἴδοτες, as Est. thinks possible (ὑπὸ for παρὰ?), nor to ἐκλογήν—either as E. V., 'your election of God,' which is ungrammatical (requiring τὴν ὑπ. θ. ἐκ), or as ἔκλογη, Thl., all., ὑπὸ θ. τὴν ἐκλ. ᾿ θ. (εἰς), which would introduce an irrelevant emphasis on ὑπὸ θεοῦ. ἐκλογή must not be softened down: it is the election unto life of individual believers by God, so commonly adduced by St. Paul (reft.): and 1 Cor. i. 27: '2 Thess. i. 13). ὑμῶν, objective genitive after ἐκλογήν—knowing that God εἰς ἔκλογα ἤμας. 5.] ὑπάτι has been taken to mean 'videlicet, ut,' and the verse to be an epexegesis of ἐκλογήν: but as Luin. remarks, evidently verses 5, 6 ff. are meant not to explain wherein their election consisted, but to give reasons in matter of fact for concluding (εἴδοτες) the existence of that election. ὑπάτι must then be because, and a colon be placed at ὑμῶν. These reasons are (1) the power and confidence with which he and Silvanus and Timotheus preached among them (ver. 5), and (2) the earnest and joyful manner in which the Thessalonians received it (vv. 6 ff.). Both these were signs of God's grace to them—tokens of their election consecrated by Him. τοῦ εὐαγγ. ἡμ., the gospel which we preached. ἐγενήθη εἰς] See reft. especially Gal.: came to you is perhaps the nearest: εἰς betokens the direction. πρὸς, with ἐγέρν., would give nearly the same sense, or perhaps that of ἀπὸμεδ., see ref. 1 Cor. &c. We must not take ἐγένεθη εἰς ὑμ. for a constr. pragm. (ὡς εἰς καὶ ἐγέρν., which with ὑ it might be: for ἐγένεθη εἰς carries motion in itself without any thing supplied. On the 'passive form ἐγένεθη, alien to the Attic, and originally Dorte, but common in the koivw' (L üm.), see note on Eph. iii. 7; Lobeck on Phryn. p. 108 ff.; Kühner, i. 193; Winer, § 13. It was attempted in my earlier editions to press the passive sense in the frequent occurrences of this form in this Epistle. But wider acquaintance with the usage has since convinced me that this is not possible, and that we must regard it as equivalent in meaning to the more usual ἐγένετο. The propositions &c following indicate the form and manner in which the preaching was carried on, not (as Pelt, al.) that in which the Thessalonians received it, which is not treated till ver. 6. Δυνάμει is not 'miracles;' as Thdr., &c., all, nor efficacia et
vis agens in cordibus fidetibus (Bullinger) (see above), but power, viz. of utterance and of energy.  
πν. ἀγὼ: beware again of the supposed figure of εν δια δυνα, by which all character of style and all logical exactness is lost. Even Conygh. here has fallen into this error, and rendered "power of the Holy Ghost." It is a predicate advancing beyond εν δυνα—
not only in force and energy, but in the Holy Ghost—in a manner which could only be ascribed to the operation of the Holy Spirit. πληροφορία πολλῇ much confidence (of faith), see ref. Many irrelevant meanings have been given: fullness of spiritual gifts, which the Thessalonians had received (Lomb., Corn.—a-lap., Turrerion): certainty of the truth, felt by them (Macknight, Benson, al.): 'fulfilment of the apostolic office' (Estius). The confidence (see above) was that in which Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus preached to them. καθὼς κ.π.λ. Appeal to their knowledge that the fact was so. These words restrict the foregoing to the preachers, as explained above: καὶ τῇ, φησὶ, μακρυγροφῷ; αὐτῷ ἡμῖν ἐμφανίζετε ἡπτε, ἡπτε, ἐγενήθην πρὸς ἡμᾶς. (Ec. This interpretation is fixed by καθὼς, referring back to the whole previous description. The sense has been variously given: Conygh., 'And you, likewise know—but 'likewise' surely confounds the connexion: Pelt, even further from the mark, . . . its acclimatis, ut Apostolum exemplimum Thessalonicensibus imitandum mutatis. -- 6. οἷς ἐγενήθη.) what manner of men we proved, as Ellic: not 'quales facti simus,' see above on this note; nor as vulg., 'quales fuerimus;' the point of the fact appealed to is, the proof given, what manner of men they were, by the manner of their preaching. "The ποιήσις was evinced in the power and confidence with which they delivered their message." Ellic: the proof given by the manner of their preaching. εν ἡμῖν] local merely: among you.  
Συν ἡμῖν] for your sakes—conveying the purpose of the Apostle and his colleagues, and in the background also the purpose of God—'you know what God enabled us to be,—how mighty in preaching the word—for your sakes—thereby proving that he loved you, and had chosen you for His own.' 6. Further proof of the same, that ye are έκκλησία, by the method in which you received the Gospel thus preached by us, καὶ ἡμῖν corresponds with τῇ εὐ. ἡμῖν above. It is somewhat difficult here to fix exactly the point of comparison, in which they imitated their ministers and Christ. Certainly it is not merely, in receiving the word—for to omit other objections, this would not apply at all to Him:—and therefore, not in any qualifying detail of their method of reception of the word—not in δύναμις, nor in πν. ἀγώ, nor in παραπληκτικά. So far being clear, we have but the particular left, and that respects the circumstances under which, and the spirit with which: and here we find a point of comparison even with Christ Himself: viz. joyful endurance in spirit under sufferings. This it was in which they imitated the Apostles, and their divine Master, and which made them patterns to other churches (see below). 7. Further proof of which, they εὐάγγελον τῷ λόγῳ κ.τ.λ. Acts xvii. 5—10; ch. ii. 14; iii. 2, 3, 5.  
Συνεμένοι] in that ye received. χαρὰ πνεύματος ἀγίου (ref.), joy wrought by the Holy Spirit. On the gen. of origin, see Ellic's note here.
νιανις' Christian character. Τύπον, of the whole church as one: see Bernhardy, p. 60. τάον τοίς πιστεύοντες] to the whole of the believers. οἱ πιστεύοντες, like δὲ περικλήν, designates the kind. Chrys. understands this participle as if it were πιστεύοντως:—καὶ μὴν ἐν ὀστέρῳ ἔλθε πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀλλ' οὕτως ἐλάμφασε, φρον., ἀκ. τῶν πρωτολαβῶν γενναίως διδάσκαλον.... οὐ γὰρ εἶσεν, οὕτως τούως γενναίως πρὸς τὸ πιστεύειν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἴδιοι πιστεύοντο τότε ἐγένετο. But it was not so: for the only church in Europe which was in Christ before the Thessalonian, was the Philippian (Acts xvi. 16—xvii. 1, see ch. ii. 2). Μακ κ. Ἀχ.] Cf. Rom. xv. 26; Acts xix. 21: the two Roman provinces, comprehending Northern and Southern Greece. There is no reference, as Thdrt., to the Greeks being ἐθνον μεγάτα κ. ἕπι σοφία θαυμασιόμενα, and so their praise being the greater: these are mentioned simply because the Apostle had been, since their conversion, in Macedonia, and had left Silvanus and Timotheus there,—and was now in Achaia.

8. Proof of the praise in ver. 7. ἀφ' ὑμῶν is merely local, from you, as in ref.; not 'by you' (as preachers) (ἀφ' ὑμῶν), as Rückert, 'locorum Paulinorum 1 Thess. i. 8 et 1 Thess. iii. 1—3 explicatio:' nor 'by your means,' viz. in saving Silas and myself from danger of our lives and so enabling us to preach (δι' ὑμῶν), as Storr, and Flatt. ἐξίχνιασα] ἥδην ὅτι ἰσιν σάλπιγγος λαμπρὸν ἴκνεύσες ὁ πλησιόν ἄπας πληρωθήτω τῶτος, οὕτω τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ ἀνδρείας ἡ φήμη καθάπερ ἐκεῖνη σαλπίσουσα ἵκνη τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐμπλήσα. Chrys. ὁ λόγος, τ. κυρίου, cannot be as De W. 'the fame of the reception of the Gospel by you:' the sense seems to be that your ready reception and faith as it were sounded forth the λόγον τοῦ κυρίου, the word of the Lord, the Gospel message, loudly and clearly, through all parts. The logical construction of this verse is somewhat difficult. After the οὐ μόνον ἐν τ. Μακ. κ. Ἀχ., we expect merely ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ: but these words appear, followed by a new subject and a new predicate. Either then we must regard this new subject and predicate as merely an exeqygesis of the former, ἐξίχνιασα τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ κυρίου, and, with Lünemann, we must place a colon at κυρίου, and begin a new sentence with οὐ μόνον. This last is very objectionable, for it leaves ἀπ' ὑμ. .... κυρίου standing alone in the most rapid and spiritless manner, with the strong rhetorical word ἐξίχνιασα unaccounted for and unemphatic. The other way then must be our refuge, and I cannot see those objections to it which Lün. has found. It is quite according to the versatil style of St. Paul, half to lose sight of the οὐ μόνον ἀλλ' and to go on after ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ with a new sentence; and especially as that new sentence explains the somewhat startling one preceding. πρὸς, towards, directed towards God as its object (and here, as contrasted with idols, see next verse)—not = the more usual εἰς, to and into, as Ellie, correcting my previous on (τῇ). De Wette, al., suppose with some probability that the report of the Thessalonians' faith may have been spread by Christian travelling merchants, such as Aquila and Prisella. ἔστε μη ...]
The report being already rife, we found no occasion to speak of your faith, or in your praise. 9. to, the people ev τ. Max. k. ἄρει, κ. ἐν παντὶ τῷ πόσῳ: see ref., and Bernhardy, p. 238.

Regarding concerning us, Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus; not as Lün., 'us both,' including the Thessalonians. This he does, to square the following clauses, which otherwise are not correspondent: but there are two objections to his view: (1) the emphatic position of περὶ ἡμῶν, which seems to necessitate its keeping its strict meaning: (2) that it would in this ease have been much more naturally ὑμῖν than ἡμῶν, as the second person has prevailed throughout, and our εἰσόδος to γενομένην, was as much a matter happening to you as to us. That καὶ περὶ ὑμῶν, πῶς should be abbreviated as we find it, will surely not surprise anyone any one familiar with the irregularities, in point of symmetry, of St. Paul's style. The ἀπαγγελλωσα of here correspond to the two members of the above proof, verses 5 and 6. ὅποιαν has no reference to danger, as Chrys., al. εἰσόδος, merely access, in the way of coming to them: see ch. ii. 1: not of itself faciatis admirati, as Pelt. πῶς, merely how that, introducing matter of fact, not how, 'in what manner,' how joyfully and energetically, as Lünem. if so, the long specification (πρὸς . . . εἰροκένα), which follows the (thus) unemphatic verb, drags wearily: whereas, regarded as indicating matter of fact only, the πῶς is unemphatic, and the matter of fact itself, carrying the emphasis, justifies the full statement which is made of it.

καὶ ἀληθινον] [ὡντα μὲν αὐτῶν ἀναμμασθεὶς, ὡς εἰκένω γένειν ἤλθην. ἀληθινον δὲ, ὡς εἰκένων φεύων θεῶν καλομενων.

The Apostle was delivering not" altogether less as E. V., 'who delivered,' but descriptive of His office, 'our Deliverer,' as δ περιδίκων, &c. ἡ προσφορα,—which is coming: cf. Eph. v. 6; Col. iii. 6. Ch. II. 1-16.] He reminds the Thessalonians of his manner of preaching among them (1-12, answering to ch. i. 9 a): praises them for their reception of the Gospel, and firmness in persecution (13-16, answering to ch. i. 9 b).

H of the faith of the Thessalonians was hope: hope of the return of the Son of God from heaven: a hope, indeed, common to them with all Christians in all ages, but evidently entertained by them as pointing to an event more immediate than the church has subsequently believed it to be. Certainly these words would give them an idea of the nearness of the coming of Christ: and perhaps the misunderstanding of them may have contributed to the notion which the Apostle corrects. 2 Thess. ii. 1 ff.: see note there. By δὴ ἡγ. ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, that whereby (Rom. i. 4) Jesus was declared to be the Son of God with power, is emphatically prefixed to His name. τὸν ρυμοῦνον who delivereth: not τ. φυσισμονον,—still less as E. V., 'who delivered,' but descriptive of His office, 'our Deliverer,' as δ περιδίκων, &c. τῆς ἐποξ. which is coming: cf. Eph. v. 6; Col. iii. 6. Ch. II. 1-16.] He reminds the Thessalonians of his manner of preaching among them (1-12, answering to ch. i. 9 a): praises them for their reception of the Gospel, and firmness in persecution (13-16, answering to ch. i. 9 b). 1. γὰρ refers back to ὅποιαν, ch. i. 9: 'not only do strangers report it, but you know it to be true.' He makes use now of that knowledge to carry out the description of his preaching among them, with a view, by recapitulating these details, to confirm them, who were as yet but novices, in the faith.

κεντρόν] It is evident from v. 2 ff., that this does not here apply to the fruits, but to the character of his preaching: the resul does not appear till ver. 13. And within this limitation, we may observe that the verb is γένειν, not
γένετο; to be understood therefore not of any mere intent of the Apostle at the time of his coming among them, but of some abiding character of his preaching. It cannot then be understood as Koppe, — 'καί ἐν τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ στόχου, διὸ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἑξετάζοντας τὰς ἁπατήτας.' and nearly so Rosenm. It probably expresses, that his στόχος was and continued 'no empty scheme' (no light matter,' as we say; οὐκ ἢ τινοσθά, Chrys.), but an earnest, bold, self-denying endeavour for their good. This he proceeds to prove.

2.] προσανάθλιται, having previously suffered: ref. On the fact, see Acts xvi. έπαρθησιάς.] Lünemann seems to be right (against De W.) in rendering it we were confident, not 'we were free of speech.' See however, on the other side, Ellic.'s note.

τῆς, because all true confidence is in God as our Lord. This word this feeling with which Paul and Silas opened their ministry among them: διὰ τῶν ἐγνωμονών θεοῦ τοῦτο ποιήσας τεθαλάσσας. Ecum. άλλησα is informative of the object after έπαρθησιάς. we had the confidence to speak: as E. V., were bold to speak. This seems more probable than with De W., Mey. on Eph. vi. 20, and Ellic., to regard it as the epekegetical inf. "defining still more clearly the oral nature of the boldness." Chrys., can hardly be quoted on that side, as Ellic. doubtfully, τοῦ θεοῦ, for solemnity, to add to the weight of their στόχος. ἐν πολλῷ ὑψώ.] in (amidst) much conflict, viz. under outward circumstances conflicting much with our work; and therefore that work could be no κενὸν, which was thus maintained.

3. 4.] Reasons why he ἐπαρθησιάσατο άλλησα... ἐν πολλῷ ἑγών:—viz. the true and single-minded character of his ministry, and his duty to God as the steward of the Gospel. 3. τὰ παράκλησις] exhortation to you, viz. our whole course of preaching. Supply is, not 'vobis' cf. λαλοῦμεν below. "The two senses of παράκλησις, exhortation and consolation, so easily passing into one another (compare ver. 11), are suggestive of the external state of the early church, sorrowing amid the evils of the world, and needing as its first lesson to be comforted; and not less suggestive of the first lesson of the Gospel to the individual soul, of peace in believing." Jowett. ἕκ] having its source in. πλάνης] here probably error. "The word is used transitively and intransitively. In the former case, it is 'imposhure' (Matt. xxvii. 64) or 'seduction' (Eph. iv. 14) in the latter and more usual, error.' Lünemann. ἀκαθαρσίας] hardly, as Chrys., υπὸ μισοῦν παράγων οὖν γονίων κ. μάγων, —though such a reference is certainly possible, considering the vile degradation of that class at the period,—but here apparently of the impure desire of gain, cf. ver. 5, where ἐν προφατί ἐπελευθερασίας seems to correspond with ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας. Still such a meaning seems to want example. If it be correct, this represents (Lün.) the subjective side, the motive, as ἐκ πλάνης the objective side, the ground. ἐν δόλῳ] this of the manner, or perhaps, as Ellic., the ethical sphere, in which: 'nor did we make use of deceit to win our way with our παράκλησις.' See 2 Cor. ii. 17. 4.] καθως, according as, in proportion as.

εὐδοκιμ. see ref., we have been approved, —thought fit: cf. παραγων ἐγγέγραστο, 1 Tim. i. 12. Lünemann cites Plut. Thes. 12: ἐλάβον όνον ὁ Θεσσαλ. εἰ τὸ άρσην, όν άκοπάσια φράσεις αὐτῶν δεῖς εἰς. We must not introduce any ascertained fitness of them in themselves into the idea (οἷς ἐν εὐλαβείᾳ, εἰ μὴ ἐξίσους εὐνοικος Θελ.: so Chr., (Ec., Olsb.); it is only the free choice of God which is spoken of. On πιστεύω τὸ εὐάγγ. see ref., and Winer, edn. 6, § 32. 9. οὕτωs
answers not to the following ως, but to the preceding καθως, and is emphatic—‘even so.’ ἀρέσκοντες, in the strict sense of the present tense,—going about to please,—strengthening to please. ως belongs to the whole sentence, not merely to ἀρέσκοντες. (as Lünemann:) for in that case the second member would involve almost too harsh an ellipsis. ἡμών, of us,—not said generally, of all men: but of us, Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus. As Lünemann justly observes against De W., τὰς καρδίας here and τὰς εαυτ. ψυχὰς below, are conclusive against imagining that St. Paul in this place is speaking of himself alone. Yet Conyb, renders it, ‘my heart,’ and τὰς ε. ψ., ‘my own life.’

5 ff.] Proofs again of the assertion of vv. 3, 4. For neither did we become conversant (see ref. γενεσία ἐν τιν, in re quidam versari: so οἱ μὲν ἐν τοῦτοι τοῖς λόγοι ἤσαν, Xen. Cyr. iv. 3, 23. On the impracticability of maintaining a passive sense in the form ἐγενέθηκας, see above, on ch. i. 5) in speech of (consisting of) flattery (not ‘incurring repute of flattery,’ as Harnack, Le Clerc, Michaelis, [similarly as to meaning, Pelt]), which would be irrelevant, as he is not speaking of what others thought of their ministry, but of their own behaviour in it. On καλάκ. Lünemann, quotes Theophrastus, Charr. 2,—τὴν δὲ κολακείαν ὑπολαβὸν ἄν τις μιμήν αἰσχρῶν εἴη, συμφέρουσαν δὲ τῇ κολακεύουσα,—and Ellis remarks, “It seems more specifically to illustrate the ἐν δὲ λόγῳ of ver. 3, and forms a natural transition to the next words, the essence of κολακεία being self-interest: ὅ δὲ ὅπως ῥηθεία τις αὐτῷ γίγνεται εἰς χρήσιν καὶ δόσι διὰ χρημάτων, κάλακ. Aristot. Eth. Nic. iv. 12 ad fin.” “As ye know, nor (ἐγενέθηκας) in pretest (employed in that which was meant to be a pretext, not ‘in occasione avaritiae,’ as vulg. and Le Clerc; nor is πρᾶσας ‘species,’ as Wolf) of (serving to conceal) avarice; God is witness (ἡς μὲν κολακείας αὐτοῦ ἐκάλεσε μάρτυρας, δίδα γὰρ τοῖς ἀκούσει τῶν κολακῶν τὰ πρᾶσα τῆς δὲ πλεονεξίας ὕπεκαί ἀυτοῦ, ἄλλων τῶν δὲ ἀπό τὴν. Thdrt., and similarly Chrys. But perhaps it is simpler, seeing that no ὑμῖν is expressed with ἀστεῖο, to refer θεοὶ μάρτυρι, to the whole.”

6.] ἔγενεθήκας belongs to ἔγενεθήκας above. ἐς ἀνθρώπων, emphatic: τὴν γὰρ ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ εἰρήμων κ. ἀλάμβανον, ἢς. The real distinction here between ἐκ and ἀπὸ seems to be, that ἐκ belongs more to the abstract ground of the δόσα, ἀπὸ to the concrete object from which it was in each case to accrue. This is strictly correct, not, as Ellissen, who has misunderstood my distinction, ‘artificial and precarious’: nor is it ever safe to assume identity of meaning, in St. Paul’s style, of different prepositions, except where the form of the sentence absolutely requires it. The glory which they sought was not at all to come out of human sources, whether actually from the Thessalonians or from any others.

Συνάντομοι] though we had the power. ἐν βάρει εἶναι] Thdrt., Est., Grot., Caliv., all, refer this to πλεονεξία mentioned above, and understand it of using the power of living by the gospel, which St. Paul, &c. might have done, but did not: so ἐπιβαρεῖν, ver. 9: 2 Thess. iii. 8; καταβαρεῖν, 2 Cor. xii. 16; ἀβαρεῖν ἐμαντὸν ἐφησά, ib. xi. 9. But the words are separated from the πλεονεξία by the new idea beginning at ζητοῦτες, to which, and not to the former clause, this is subordinated. I therefore take them with Chrys., (Ec., Thl., undecided), Ambros., Erasm., Caliv., &c., Olsh., De W., Lünemann,—as equivalent to ἐν τιμίῳ εἶναι—ἐξὸς γὰρ τοὺς παρὰ θεοῦ πρὸς ἀνθρώποις ἀποσταλέσατας, ἀσαντί ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ νῦν
7. **alma BN.**

* νηπιον (prob from attaching the ν of the preceding word to ηπιον. In such a case, it is almost as likely that the ν of νηπιον may have been overlooked, and the evidence, on this view is, so divided, the sense may fairly be taken as our guide: see note) BC²ΔFKN⁴ a m latt copt aeth Clem (from context) Orig. exp. Cyr. mas.-in-Thl Orig.-int Ambrost Pelag Aug: ηνηπιον ΔC¹DKL³ rel syrr sub Clem, Origí, Chr.-comm Óε-comm Thrdt-comm Damasc Thl-comm(alt,—) kal νηπιον. εμμονας Ακ 17. rec αυ, with AD² K(e' sil) LN¹ rel Origí, Thrt: txt BCDFN³. θαλκει KL d f k m.

8. rec μειρομενοι, with rel Cyr: txt ABCDFKLN d e (f k) m Chrai Damasc-μας Thl improbable ιερομονας: ουκ ἐστι δε. (17 def.) μοιρομενοι B: ευδοκησας 17, trolebamaul vulg.(and F-lat) syrr coptt Pelag: cupidinos old-lat

Our converse with you; but with an allusion to our not lifting ourselves above you: — ὃς εἰς ἔνα μήδαν, Ὀμ. It is best to retain the commona after μήδα, not as Lüm., to place a colon: for though there is a break in the construction, it is one occasioned by the peculiar style of the Apostle, which should not be amended by punctuation. The emphasis on ευνίς should not be lost sight of as when a nurse (a suckling mother) cherishes (refl.) her own children. See (Gal. iv. 19, for the same figure. 8.] οὖτως belongs to ευδοκοῦμεν, and is the apodosis to ὅσ above. μειρομενοι διερεσθαὶ is found in refl. only (and in both, the MSS. differ), except in the glossaries. Hesych., Phavor., and Phot. explain it by ἐπιδιωχεῖν. Thl. says, ταυτὸς, προσδεδεμένος ὑμῖ, κ. ἐχόμενοι ὑμῖ, παρὰ τὸ ὁμοῦ κ. τ. εἰρ, τὸ συμπληκτικ.: and Phot. gives ὁμοῦ ἤμοιος as its meaning. But as Lümém. observes after Winer, edn. 6, § 16. n., "This is suspicious, 1) because the verb here governs a genitive and not a dative, 2) because there is no instance of a similar verb compounded with ὁμοῦ or ὁμός. Now as in Nicander (Theriaca, ver. 402) the simple form μειρεσθαὶ occurs in the sense of μειρεσθαὶ, it can hardly be doubted that μειρεσθαὶ is the original root, to which μειρεσθαὶ and διερεσθαὶ (having the same meaning) are related, having a syllable prefixed for euphony. Cf. the analogous forms κέκλω and ὄκκλω, —διόραμα and ὄδρομα, —φλέω and ὀφλέω,—ἀκείνω κ. τ. ἀκεῖνω, etc., and see Kühner, i. p. 27." It will thus perhaps be best rendered by loving you, earnestly desiring you. εὐδοκ. not present, but imperfect, without an augment, as is also generally the aorist εὐδόκησα in N. T.; see Winer, § 12. 3 a: we delighted; 'it was my joy to . . .'}
Jer.

10. aft mäpît. ins easte DIF vss lat-aff.

Conyb. τὰς εὐαγγελίαν ἐφημερίδας, as remarked above, shows beyond doubt that he is including here Silas and Timotheus with himself. χαίρεται will not strictly apply to τὰς εὐαγγελίας, but we must borrow from the compound verb the idea of giving, or offering. The comparison is exceedingly tender and beautiful: as the nursing-mother, cherishing her children, joys to give not only her milk, but her life, for them,—so we, bringing up you as spiritual children, delighted in giving, not only the milk of the word, but even (and here was matter of fact) our own lives, for your nourishment in Christ. And that, because ye became (the passive form εγένετε must not be pressed to a passive meaning, as in my earlier editions: see on ch. i. 5) very dear to us.

9. Proof of the dearness of the Thessalonians to Paul and his companions: not of εὐαγγελίαν, ἡμῶν, to which it would be irrelevant,—nor of their readiness to give their lives, &c. (as Ellic.), for this verse does not refer to dangers undergone, but to labour, in order not to trouble any. It is no objection to this (Ellic.) that διὸτι κ.τ.λ. is a subordinate causal member of the preceding sentence, seeing that it is precisely St. Paul's habit to break the tenor of his style by inserting confirmations of such clauses.

2 Tim. iii. 8 only. _1 Chron. xiv. 12._ h see below (l). _2 Chron. xxvi. 10._ 2 Cor. vi. 5 al. Deu. i. 12. 1 (in N. T. always w. κόσμος) 2 Cor. xi. 27. _2 Thess. iii. 8 only._ Num. xxxii. 21.

1 Mark v. 5. ch. ili. 10. _2 Tim. i. 3._ Isa. xxxiv. 10. 1 = 2 Cor. iii. 18. _5 Thess. ii. 5._ 2 Thess. iii. 8 only t. o ver. 5 reff. p here only. _Wis. vi. 10 only._ li. 12. 1 Pet. ii. 23 only. _Prov. xxxvii. 18._ s constr. (see ch. i. 5) appear here only. t Paul (Rom. iv. 6. _xiv. 4_ only) except Heb. iv. 2. Lev. xxvii. 8 see Heb. v. 4.

Jer. rec (for εγένετε) εγένεσθαι (corr. in error, from imagining ειδοκαυμεν to be present), with K rel Chr, Thdrt: txt ABCDF LN a m 17 Bas Chr.

9. rec aft νυκτος add γαρ, with DRL rol syr-marg Chr-txt Thdrt: om ABDFN d k for εἰς ως, εἰμι N1: txt N-corr1: om.

so reckoned it, but for emphasis, being the most noteworthy, and the day following as matter of course. See besides reff. Acts xx. 31. ἐργαλεῖον (reff.) in its strict meaning of mnamal labour,—viz., at tent-cloth making, Acts xviii. 3.

πρ. τὸ μή ἐπάθημι. in order not to burden any of you, viz. by accepting from you the means of sustenance. One can hardly say with Chr., ἐν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ἡμῶν ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἀδικῶν: for we know St. Paul's strong feeling on this point, 2 Cor. xi. 9, 10. εἰς ως, to you—not quite οὕτως: the latter represents the preaching more as a thing imparted, this as a thing diffused. On the supposed inconsistency of the statement here with the narrative in Acts xvii., see Prolegomena, § ii. 3, and note.

10–12.] General summary of their behaviour and teaching among the Thessalonians. 10. υἱοί μαρτυρεῖς, of the outward appearance. οἱ θεοὶ, of the heart. ὀσίους κ. δικ. Cf. Plat. Gorg. p. 507 Α. Β.,—καὶ τὸν μὴ ἐκπεμοντός τὰ προδοτικά πράξεως ἐκ κατοικίαν ἀν πράξεως, περὶ δὲ θεοποιών εἰς α.—and Polyb. xxii. 10. 8, παραβιάζω τὰ πρὸς κακοὺς πράξεως πιστεύειν κατὰ πρὸς τ. θεοὶ δικαιο. This distinction, perhaps "precarious" (Ellic.) because the words occur separately, or seem to require no very precise application, is requisite here where both divine and human testimony is appealed to. ὑμῖν τ. πιστ.] not the dat. commodi (Ellic.), nor 'towards you believers,' nor it is governed by ἀμετάμετρως, but as Ec., Thl., Lumen, dat. of the judgment, as in 2 Pet. iii. 14.
11. for Ist ws, πας F (qualiter latt, but in ver 10 quam): εἰς o. om ως N.

12. rec μαρτυρομένου, with D F a h 1 m Thdrf Thzl: txt BD3KL rel Chr Damage Ec.—om καὶ μαρτ. A 114 Ambrst-ed. rec περιπατησαι (aor more usual), with DKL rel: txt ABFKN m 17. καλεσάντως ΑΝ 73 vulg coptt ath Chr-txt Thdrf Ambrst-Vig Pelag.

13. rec om 1st καὶ, with DKL rel latt Chr Aug: ins ABN syr copt Thdrf-ms Ambrst.

σπούδασαι ἄσπιλοι κ. ἀμορφοὶ αὐτῷ εἰρηθήναι. For otherwise we lose the force of the slight emphasis on ὑπὸ τοὺς πισταίς. q. d. "whatever we may have seemed to the unbelieving?" "tametsi allis non ista videremur," Bengel. See Bernhardy, p. 337 ff. The charge of want of point, brought by Jowett against the words τῶν πιστεύων, hence appears to be unfounded. The former verse having referred to external occupation, in which he must have consorted with unbelievers, he here narrows the circle, to speak of his behaviour among the brethren themselves.

11, 12.] Appeal to the detailed judgment of each one, that this was so. This λέγεις κ. δικαίως κ. ἀμέμπτως in their judgment is substantiated by the fact, that ὁ περὶ τῶν Παύλου busied themselves in establishing every one of them in the faith.

11.] καθάπερ refers what follows to what has gone before, as co-ordinate with it. ὡς ἕνα ἐκαστὸ. ἡ ὑμᾶς] The construction is that of nouns in apposition, in cases where the one designates the individuals of whom the other is the aggregate. In this case the noun of larger designation generally comes first. The simplest instance that can be given is πάντα πάντα, where πάντα is the aggregate, πάντα the individualizing noun (whereas in πάντα πάντα, πάντα is the individuals, and πάντα merely the adjective designation of their completeness): so here ἕνα ἐκαστὸν ὑμῶν ... ὑμᾶς differs very little from πάντα ὑμᾶς. As regards the participles, the simplest way of constructing them is to supply ἐγενήθησα, which has just preceded. Eliocott would rather regard them as an instance of St. Paul’s common participial anacolutha, which may also be: but here the construction is simple without such a supposition. Both παρακλ. and παραμεθ' seem here best taken, with Lüem., as applying to exhortation, but in a sense nearly allied to consolation: see note on ver. 3. The subject of the exhortation follows, εἰς τὸ κ. τ. λ.: and this would be closely connected with their bearing up under trouble and persecution: cf. vv. 14 ff.

13.] διὰ τοῦτο is best and most simply referred, with Lüem., to the fact announced in the preceding words—viz. that God καὶ ὑμᾶς εἰς, &c. Seeing that He is thus calling you, your thorough reception of His word is to us a cause of thanksgiving to Him. That διὰ τοῦτο is made thus "to refer to a mere appended clause" (Ellic.) is no objection: see above on ver. 9. It is surely not possible with Jowett, to refer διὰ τοῦτο 'to the verses both before and after.' καὶ ἡμεῖς We also, i. e. as well as πάντες οἱ πιστεύοντες εἰς τ. Μακεδ. κ. εἰς τ. Ἀχ. ch. 17. παρακαλοῦντες ... ἐξάγαθε] The former verb denotes only the hearing, as
objective matter of fact: the latter, the receiving into their minds as subjective matter of belief: see reff. 'άκοής παρ' ἡμῶν is perhaps to be taken together with "hearing" (genitive of apposition) from us—i.e. 'which you hear from us.' So Est., Pelt, Olsch., L ü n e m., all. Or παραλ. παρ' ἡμῶν may be taken together, as De W., strongly objectioning to the construction 'άκοής παρ' ἡμῶν, and understanding by λόγος 'άκοῆς the preached word (W e r t der Kunde). L ü n e m. answers,—that the construction 'άκοής παρ' ἡμῶν is unobjectionable, as 'άκοηεν παρά τινος occurs John i. 41, al., and substantives and adjectives often retain in construction the force of the verbs from which they are derived (K ü h n e r, ii. 217, cités from Plat. Alcib. ii. p. 141, όμως δέ οὐκ ἰδος ἡμῶν εἰναι εὐνα γε χύδα τε καὶ πρώτα γεγένησαν):—that De W.'s rendering is objectionable, because thus no reason is given for separating παρ' ἡμῶν from παραλ. and because 'άκοης is superfluous and vapid if the same is already expressed by παραλαβ. παρ' ἡμῶν. On the other rendering which is adopted and defended also by Ellicott, there is a significant contrast, St. Paul distinguishing himself and his companions, as mere publishers, from God, the great Source of the Gospel.

τ. θεοῦ of (i.e. 'belonging to,' 'coming from,' not 'speaking of;' as Grot., al., see below) God (i.e. which is God's. But we must not supply 'as,' with J o w e t t: no subjective view of theirs being implied in these words, but simply the objective fact of their reception of the word from Paul, Silvanus, and T i m o t h e u s). 'έλεγ.] See above on παραλ. 'Τε received it (being not (no 'as' must be inserted: he is not speaking of the Thessalonians' estimate of the word, but [see above] of the fact of their receiving it as it really was) the word of men (having man for its author), but as it is in reality, the word of God, which (Bengel, al., take 'δι' as referring to 'θεοῦ: but the Apostle uses always the active εὐγενεῖν of God, cf. 1 Cor. xii. 6: Gal. ii. 8; iii. 5: Eph. i. 11: Phil. ii. 13, al—and [reff.] the middle [not passive] of things) is also (besides being merely heard) active in you that believe. 14.] Proof of this "εὐγενεῖται,"—that they had imitated in endurance the Judean churches. 'ύμισ' γάρ resumes 'ὑμῖν above. 'μυθητα not in intention, but in fact. (Ον 'εγενήθη, see on ch. i. 5.) Calvin suggests the following reason for his here introducing the conflict of the Judean churches with the Jews: ' Poterat illis hoc venire in mentem: Si hec vera est religio, cur eam tamen infestissima animis oppugnant Judaei, qui sunt saec Dei populus? Ut hoc officidium tollat, primum admonet, hoc eos commune habere cum primis Ecclesiis, quae in Judaeam erant: postea Judaeos dicit obstinatos esse Dei et omnis sacra doctrine hostes.' But manifestly this is very far-fetched, and does not naturally lie in the context: as neither does Olsch.'s view, that he wishes to mark out the Judaizing Christians, as persons likely to cause mischief in the Thessalian church. The reason for introducing this character of the Jews here was because (Acts xvii. 5 if) they had been the stirrers up of the persecution against himself and Silas at Thessalonica, to which circumstance he refers below. By the mention of them as the adversaries of the Gospel in Judea he is carried on to say that there, as well as at Thessalonica, they had ever been its chief enemies. And this is a remarkable coincidence with the history in the Acts, where we find him at this time, in Corinth, in more than usual conflict with the Jews (Acts xviii. 5, 6, 12). On ον Χριστῷ 'Ἱσοῦ (Ec. remarks, εὐφόρως δίδεικεν ἑπείθη γάρ και αι συναγωγαῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐν θεῷ εἶναι δοκοῦσι, τάς τῶν πιστῶν ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἐν τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ νῷ αὐτοῦ λέγει

12—14. ΠΡΩΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ Α. 259

the words from θεοῦ (ver 13) to θεοῦ (ver 14) are written twice by Ν': the second copy is marked for erasure by Ε-corr. Ν': ins. (1st time) bef. Ε-corr. Ν: ins (1st time) bef. Ε-corr. 14. rec (for τα αυτα ταῦτα, with A: txt for 1st νπο, apd DΠ Orig-ed. for 2nd νπο, apd F. BDKFLN rel Orig. om και μησ D1. 2nd pers., Luke vi. 41. 1 Pet. iii. 1. q here only t. (Aos, Zech. xiii. 7 Λq.)
15 τῶν καὶ τῶν κύριων ἀποκτεινόντων Ἰησοῦν καὶ τοὺς προφήτας, καὶ ἡμᾶς ἔκτισαν, καὶ θεί νη προφήτας, καὶ ἐρεσιατῶν, F.

elvai. συμφυλέτης, ὁμοεθνής, Ησυχ. Herodian says, πολίτης, στρατής, φυλήτης, ἀνευ τῶν σών, συνεφήβος δὲ καὶ συνθυσατός. κ. συμφυλέτης μετά τὰς σών ὑπὶ καὶ πρόκαρυιον αὐτῶν ἥ κοινωνία, ἵπτε δὲ τῶν προτέρων ὅνω διώκων. And this criticism seems just: the Latins also using eicius mens not concivis, of the enduring relation of fellow-citizen,—but commililo mens, not miles mens, of the temporary relation of fellow-soldier. See Scaliger, in Lobeck on Phrynichus, p. 471 (also p. 172). Ellicott would regard these words merely as supererogatory compounds belonging to later Greek. These συμφυλέται were not Jews wholly nor in part, but Gentiles only. For they are set in distinct contrast here to οἱ ἵπτενειοί. τά αὐτά . . . καθὼς, The proper apodosis to τά αὐτά would be ἄ, or ἀπερ. But such inaccuracy are found in the classics: Kithner (ii. 571) cites from Plat. Phaed. p. 86 ά, εὶ τις διαγραφεὶστο τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ ἄντερ σὺ: so also Lecx, p. 671 c; Xen. An. i. 10. 10. αὐτοί, not ‘we ourselves,’ as Erasm., al.; but the members of the Judean churches mentioned above. The same construction occurs in Gal. i. 22, 23. 15, 16.] Characterization of the Jews as enemies of the Gospel and of mankind. Jowett’s note is worth quoting: “Wherever the Apostle had gone on his second journey, he had been persecuted by the Jews: and the longer he travelled about among Gentile cities, the more he must have been sensible of the feeling with which his countrymen were regarded. Isolated as they were from the rest of the world in every city, a people within a people, it was impossible that they should not be united for their own self-defence, and regarded with suspicion by the rest of mankind. But their inner nature was not less repugnant to the nobler as well as the baser feelings of Greece and Rome. Their fierce nationalitv had outlived itself: though worshippers of the true God, they knew Him not to be the God of all the nations of the earth: hated and despised by others, they could but cherish in return an insatiable contempt and hatred of other men. What wonder that, for an instant (on all this see below), the Apostle should have felt that this Gentile feeling was not wholly groundless? or that he should use words which recall the expression of Tacitus: ‘Adversus omnes aliis hostile odium?’ Hist. v. 5.” 16. τῶν καὶ τῶν, The repeated καὶ serves for enumeration. τῶν κύριων. Ἰησοῦν, is thus arranged to give prominence to τῶν κύριων, and thus enhance the enormity of the deed: it should be rendered who killed Jesus the Lord, τῶν κύριων being in a position of emphasis. κ. τῶν προφήτων] belongs to ἀποκτεινόντων (see Matt. xxiii. 31–37; Acts vii. 52), not to ἔκτισαν, as De W. His objection, that all the prophets were not killed, is irrelevant: neither were they all persecuted. The ἡμᾶς of rec. appears to have been an early insertion: Tert. arranges it to Marcion. ἐκδοξός.] drote out by persecution, viz. from among you, Acts xvii. 5 ff.,—not for the simple verb διακόνει. (De W.), nor does the preposition merely strengthen the verb (Lūnem).—but it retains its proper meaning (ὁ δύναμις αὐτῶν ἐξεδόξασθαι τοὺς δυνάτους, οἱ δὲ ἀπελθόντες . . . Thuc. i. 24), and the aorist refers it to a definite event, as in the case of ἀποκτεινόντων: when their habit is spoken of, the participles are present, e. g. ἄρεσκόντων and καλοῦντων below. ημᾶς refers to Paul and Silas. θεί νη ἄρεσκ.] The μὴ gives a subjective sense: not exactly that of Bengel, al., ‘Deo placere non querentium.’ For in strictness, as Ellicott, the shade of subjectivity is only to be found in the aspect in which the subject and the participle is presented to the reader: and therefore can hardly be reproduced in English. Compare on the usage, Winer, cdm. 6, § 55, g, β, and Ellicott’s note here. In τάσιν ἀγράφων ἕναντιων, most Commentators, and recently Jowett (see above), have seen the odium humani generis ascribed to the Jews by Tacitus (Hist. v. 5), and by several other classic authors (Juov. Sat. xiv. 103 ff. Diod. Sic. xxxiv. p. 524, &c.), But it is hardly possible that St. Paul, himself a Jew, should have blamed an exclusiveness which arose from the strict monotheism and legal purity of the Jew: and besides this, the construction having been hitherto carried on by copula, but now dropping them, most naturally goes on from ἄναντιων to καλοῦντων, in that they prevent, and thus καλ. specifies
κατάνων καὶ πάσιν ἀνθρώπως ἐναντίων, 16 κεκαλυμμένων ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἑθεσιν λαλῆσαι ἢν σωδῆσαι, εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρώσαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας πάντοτε. ἦς ἐφθασεν δὲ ἐπὶ αὐτούς η ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος.

17 Ὡμεῖς δὲ, ἀδελφοί, ἀπορφανισθέντες ἵνα ἤμοι πρὸς καιόνων ὥς καὶ προσώπων οὐ καρδία, διὸ πεισμο—

w Gal. vi. 2 refl. Gen. xv. 16.
12. 2 Cor. x. 17.
x ch. i. 10 refl. xviii. 5. John xiii. i. Amos ix. 2.
1 Cor. vii. 5. 2 Cor. vii. 8. Gal. ii. 5.

16. ὁσφύσοντας ἦν τὰς ἁμαρτίας B. ἐφακεῖς BD: τὸν ἄγετον ¼FRKL
rel Orig. Eus., Chr Thurt. Damasc. ἦν ὀργὴ bef κατ' αὐτοὺς B vulg.(and F-lat) Orig., ἄφιε δὲ ὁ ἄγιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπὶ νᾶ ἁττ. ff.

wherein the ἐναντίωτης consists, viz. in opposing the salvation of mankind by the Gospel. So that the other seems to be irrelevant (so nearly Lūmen).

16. εἰς τὸ] not of the result merely, 'so that',—but of the intention, not of the Jews themselves, but of their course of conduct, viewed as having an intent in the divine purposes: as so often in St. Paul. ἀναπλ.] to bring up the measure of their sins to the prescribed point.

πάντοτε] ταῦτα δὲ καὶ πάλαι ἐπὶ τῶν προφητῶν κ. νῦν ἐπὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ κ. ἐρ γῆς ἠνεργάζετο, ἵνα πάντοτε ἀναπληρώθηντοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῶν. (Ecum. The idea is, not of a new measure having to be filled πάντοτε, but of their being πάντοτε employed in filling up the measure.

But (this their opposition to God and men shall not avail them: for) the (predestinal, or predicted, or merited) wrath (of God) came upon them (he looks back on the fact in the divine counsels as a thing in past time, q. d. 'was appointed to come': not 'has come.' No sense of anticipation need be sought in ἐφθασεν in later Greek, except when it governs an accusative of the person, as ch. iv. 15; see ref.) to the utmost (to the end of it, i.e. the wrath: so that it shall exhaust all its force on them: not 'at last' Wahl, al.: nor to be taken with ἦν ὀργὴ, the wrath which shall endure to the end [ἐν εἰς τ. ?], as Thl., Eec., al.: nor to be referred to the Jews, 'so as to make an end of them,' De W.).

17—111. 13.] He relates to them how he desired to return after his separation from them: and when that was impracticable, how he sent Timotheus: at whose good intelligence of them he was cheered, thanks God for them, and prays for their continuance in love and confirmation in the faith.

17. ἦμεις δὲ resumes the subject broken off at ver. 13: the δὲ introducing a contrast to the description of the Jews in vv. 15, 16. ἀπορφανισθέντες]

ὅρφανος is properly used, as with us, of children who have lost their parents. But it is found in a wider sense, c. g. John xiv. 8.—Paul., Isthm. vii. 16, ὅρφανον μωρῶν ἔταρχον.—Olymp. ix. 32, ὅρφανος γενεᾶς (ὁφφ. τέκνων, Dion. Hal. Antt. i. p. 63, Κυρκέ): Hesych.: ὅρφανος, ὁ γονέων ἔστημεν καὶ τέκνων (compare the similitude, ver. 7). The word ἀπορφανισθένω occurs Ἀσχ. Chœph. 217, of the eagles' brood deprived of their parents. Here it is used in deep affection, the proposition giving the sense of local severance, which is further specified by ἵνα ἤμοι following. There is no occasion to press the metaphor, as Chrys., al.

πρὸς καιόνων ὥρας; for the space of an hour, i. e. for a very short time: it is a combination of the expressions πρὸς καιόνων and πρὸς ὥραν, see ref. It refers, not to his present impression that the time of separation would still be short (as Flatt and De W.), for this the past participle ἀπορφανισθέντες forbids, but to the time alluded to in that past participle—that when we had been separated from you for the space of an hour.

προσώπ. οὐ εἰς:] dating of the manner in which (i. e. as Eic., 'marking, with the true limiting power of the case, the metaphorical place,' which in the interpretation of the metaphor would be manner or form, 'to which the sense is restricted')—no separation in heart took place.

πειραστ. ἐπὶ:] the more abundantly (because our separation was so short. Lūmen. says well: "Universal experience testifies, that the pain of separation from friends and the desire of return to them are more vivid, the more freshly the remembrance of the parting works in the spirit, i. e. the less time has elapsed since the parting." Therefore the explanation of Ec. and Thl, after Chrys., is unsympathetical: πειραστέρως ἐσπούδασας, ἦς εἰς ἅν τοὺς πρὸς ὥραν ἀπολειπθέν—
18. rec διο, with DKL rel Chr Thsd Thdam: tex ABDFN m 17. 67, anektevov F 121.

19. for καυξ., σαπιασάως A; exultationes Tert. om 3rd η πόλη, rec aft ησευνιν ρισχθσου, with FL rel vulg-ed(with full1 κε) cpoth gth Chr Thsd Thsd al: om ABDKN d e h l 17. 67 φυς (and full2) syrr Thsd Thdam Ec Ambrst-ed.

20. on 2nd η πόλη 109.

τας. Luth., Bretschn., De W., and Ellic, understand it ‘the more,’ i.e. than if I had been separated from you in heart: but the above seems both simpler and more delicate in feeling) endeavoured (implies actual setting on foot of measures to effect it) in much desire (i.e. very earnestly) to see your face. 18. Wherefore (as following up this earnest endeavour) we would have come (had a plan to come: “not ἔσπουλασθα, which would indicate merely the disposition: see Philem. 13, 14 [Lâm.] to you, even I Paul (the introduction of these words here, where he is about to speak of himself alone, is a strong confirmation of the view upheld above [on ch. i. 9] that he has hitherto been speaking of himself and his companions. The μὲν answers to a suppressed δε, q. d. μηλὶ δὲ τὰν ἄλλων ὑμῶν ὁ λόγος, or the like. Grot., al., think the suppressed δὲ refers to the rest having intended it once only, but the Apostle more times, taking κ. άπρ. κ. δισι, not once only but twice (literally, ‘both once and twice’: not used widely [άπρ. κ. δισ], but meaning that on two special occasions he had such a plan: see ref. The words refer to ἐσπουδάσθα, not to ἔσπου δ. Π.,—see above), and (not ‘but’) the simple copula, as in Rom. i. 13, gives the matter of fact, without raising the contrast between the intention and the hindrance) Satan (i. e. the devil: not any human adversary or set of adversaries, as De W., al.; whether Satan acted by the Thessalonian Jews or not, is unknown to us, but by whoseover acting, the agency was his) hindered us (refl.). 19. accounts for this his earnest desire to see them, by the esteem in which he held them. The words ἐμπρ. τ. κυρ. ἡμᾶς κ. τ.λ. must not be transposed in the rendering (“construi hæc sic debent, τίς γ. ἡμᾶς ἐπαν. . . ἐμπρ. τ. κυρ. . . παρουσιάσεται,” etc.) for the Apostle, after having asked and answered the question τίς γάρ κ. τ.λ. breaks off, and specifies that wherein this hope and joy mainly consisted, viz. the glorious prospect of their being found in the Lord at His appearing. But he does not look forward to this as anticipating a reward for the conversion of the Thessalonians (Est., al.), or that their conversion will compensate for his having persecuted the Church before, but from generous desire to be found at that day with the fruits of his labour, and that they might be his boast and he theirs before the Lord: see 2 Cor. i. 14; Phil. ii. 16. On τής ἐκκλησίας καὶ τ. λ. see ref. and Soph. Aj. 460. η ὑπερήφανος καὶ μεῖος The η, as Ellic., ‘introduces a second and negative interrogation, explanatory and confirmatory, of what is implied in the first:’ see Winer, edn. 6, § 57. 1. b. καὶ, ‘as well as others my converts,’ τής ἐκκλησίας καὶ τ. λ. further specifies the ἐμπρ. τ. κυρ. 20. γάρ sometimes serves to render a reason for a foregoing assertion, by asserting it even more strongly, q. d. ‘it must be so, for the fact is certain.’ So Soph. Philoct. 7.10, “δείκνυτε γε τούτος σαμαραίας τοῦ νοσημάτως . . . δείκνυτε γάρ, οἴδετε ρητῶν;” see Hartung, Partikell. i. p. 474. I should be inclined to ascribe to ver. 20, on this very account, a wider range than ver. 19 embraces: q. d. you will be our joy in the day of the Lord: for ye are (at all times, ye are, abstractedly) our glory and joy. This seems to me far better than,
with Ellicott, to regard the γαρ as only "confirmatory and explicative."

III. 1.] δια, because of our affection for him you just expressed; ınde narratione quae sequitur, desiderii illius sibi fieri factum, Calvin.

μηκ. στέγοντες no longer being able to μετά�αστι gives the subjective feeling as distinguished from συνάντη, which would describe the more objective matter of fact) bear (refl.); (our continual absence from you), we (I Paul, from above, ch. ii. 18) determined (ενδοκήσαμεν does not carry with it any expression of pleasure ['promptam animi inclinationem designat,' Calv.]; except in so far as we say 'it was our pleasure,'—referring merely to the resolution of the will) to be left behind (see Acts xvii. 15, 16) in Athens alone, 2. and sent Timotheus our brother and fellow-worker with God (ref. and Ellice's note here) (in the field of his working) the Gospel of Christ (there does not appear to be any special reason for this honourable mention of Timotheus [as Chrys., τούτο οὖν τῶν Τιμόθεου ἐπίσκοπον φησίν, ἂλλ' αὐτοῦς τιμῶν], further than the disposition to speak thus highly of him on the part of the Apostle. Such is the more natural view, when we take into account the fervid and affectionate heart of the writer. See, however, note on 1 Tim. v. 23; with which timid character of Timotheus such designations as this may be connected), in order to confirm you, and exhort on behalf of (in order for the furtherance of) your faith. 3. that no one might be disquieted (ref.: Soph. Antig. 1214, παντὸς μὲ σαίνει φόβοις: Eur. Rhes. 53, σαίνει μὲ ἐνικοσ φροντίδα, &c. In these places σάινει is a vox media, conveying the meaning of agitation, disquieting, which the context must interpret for better or worse) in (in the midst of) these tribulations (which are happening to us both). The construction of τὸ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι is doubted. Lünemann enters into the matter, as usual, at length and thoroughly. He first deals with the rec. τὸ μηδ. σ., and exposes as ungrammatical the view which would regard it as a dativus commodi, as = eis τὸ . . . , rejecting also Rückert's more grammatical view, that it indicates "unde nascituram τὴν παράκλησιν sparerat, quan Timothenum misit, apostolum?" Then as to τὸ μ. σ.—we may take it either 1) with Matthai, supplying a second eis from the former eis τὸ στήρι. But then why is not the second eis expressed, as in Rom. iv. 11? Or, 2) with Schott, as a pendent accusative, in the sense 'quod aliun, ad.' But this is a very rare construction, which has been often assumed without reason (see Berkhay, pp. 132 ff.), and therefore should only be resorted to when no other supposition will help the construction: 3) Winer, edn. 3 (not in edn. 6), § 45, 3 ann., whom De W. and Ellicott follow, makes it dependent on παρακαλεῖσθαι, and treats it as a further explanation of ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως—viz. 'to exhort, that none should become unstable.' But if τὸ μηδ. σ. saīn depend on παρακαλεῖσθαι, then παρακαλεῖν, in the sense of 'to exhort,' would be followed by a simple accusative of the thing, which though perhaps possible, see 1 Tim. vi. 2, is very harsh. [Consult however Ellicott's note, as to the mere mediate dependence of such clauses on the governing verb in comparison with the immediate dependence of substantives.] Besides, if τὸ μ. σ.
4. ἐπισλημογενέων D1: ἐλευγομένοι τοιν 73. μιας ἐπιστίθεν B in 73.
6. ins ἔμας βεβεβιστήν Ν. μειναί beβ ἐκεύτε DF: ἡμῶν beβ ἐκεύτε 17, mem. nosir. lab. D-lat vul(g) and (F-lat).

were a further specification of οἱ πόροι ἡμῶν, it would not be accusative but genitive. 4) It only remains that we should take τὸ μ. σ. as in apposition with the whole foregoing sentence, εἰς τὸ στ. ὑπ. τ. ποστ. ὑμ. —so that τὸ μηδ. καίν serves only to repeat the same thought, which was before positively expressed, in a negative but better defined form: τὸ being nearly = τοῦτο.

Therefore so the sense is: to confirm you and exhort you on behalf of your faith, that is, that no one may be shaken in these troubles: τὸ μηδ. being dependent, not on a second εἰς understood, as in (1), but on the first εἰς, which is expressed. With this view I entirely agree, only adding, that instead of making τὸ τοῦτοτι, I would rather say that τοῦτοτι might have been inserted before τὸ μηδέα. αὐτοὶ γὰρ ...

Reason why no one should be shaken. Grieβ., al., parenthesize αὐτοὶ — ὁδιάτε το ρετ. 4: but wrongly, for διὰ τοῦτο το ρετ. 5, connects with this sentence immediately. ὁδιάτε: probably not for Theodoret's reason: ἄνθεθεν ἡμᾶς τοῦτα προηγούεσθαι τὸ δεσπότης χριστός,—but for that given in ver. 4. εἰς τοῦτο, viz. ἐπὶ τῆς ἁλέσθαι, contained in ἀλέθεις above: the subject to κειμένα being 'we Christians.' 4.] reason for ὁδιάτε. πρὸς ὑπ., see reff.

ἥλιομένον may be taken either as the recit. present, or better as representing the counsel of God, as in δ ἐφήμερος and the like. The subject to ἡλίολιν, as above, being 'we Christians.' ὁδιάτε, viz. by experience. 5.] διὰ τοῦτο, because tribulation had verily begun among you (καίων καὶ ἐγένετο). καίων seems to convey a delicate hint that Timotheus also was anxious regarding them: or it may have the same reference as καὶ ἥμεν, ch. ii. 13, —viz. to the other Christians who had heard of their tribulation. De W. would render, not, 'therefore I also ἔσε'. —but 'therefore also, I ἔσε'. But this would require (as Lün.) διὰ καὶ τοῦτο — καὶ διὰ τ. εἰς τὸ γνάθ. that I (not he') might know (be informed about): belongs to the subject of the verb ἐπεμβα. μὴ πῶς k.τ.λ. lest perchance the tempter (ref.) have tempted (not, as Whitley, al., 'seduced') you (indicative betokening the fact absolute), and our labour might be (subjunctive, betokening the fact conditional) to no purpose (reff.). Fritz. and De W. rather hastily take μὴ πῶς, in two different meanings,—with the first clause as 'on force,' and with the second as 'ne force.' 6—8.] Of the good news brought by Timotheus. 6.] ἀρτι δὲ is by Lünem. (and De W. hesitatingly) separated by a comma from ἑλθότοις, and joined to παρ' ἐκλήσιμοι ver. 7. But the direct connexion of ἀρτι with an aorist verb is harsher than with an aorist participle, and παρ' ἐκλήσιμοι has already its διὰ τοῦτο, which refers back to the whole preceding clause as contained in the τοῦτο. I would therefore join ἀρτι with ἑλθότοις. But Timotheus having just now come &c. ἔσαγγειλε, having brought good news of: see reff. οὐκ εἶπεν ἀγαύληντες, ἀλλὰ ἐναγάλησαν τοῦτον ἀγαθόν ἡγητίον τὴν ἑκείνην βεβαιον κ. τ.ν ἡγήτην. Chrys. First their Christian state comforted him,—then, their constant remembrance of himself. Thdt. remarks: τρία τεθείκειν ἀξιοπρεπα, τὴν πίστιν, κ. τ. ἀγάπην, κ. τ. τοῦ διαισκέλου τὴν μηνήν. δηλοὶ ἢ μὲν πίστεις τῆς εὐσεβείας τὸ βεβαιον ἡ δὲ
19. 7. paraekklēmeva A 3. 23. 57.

for έπι, εν F 109 vulg goth Pelag.

rec θαυμ. και αναγκ., with KL rel Chr Thrdrt Damase: txt ABDFN in 17 latt syr copt arm
Ambst Pelag.

for ημων, ημων AB ἐναντείων bef ημων A fuld.

8. rec στὴκητε, with DN1 (l2 c e h 17, e sil): txt A B (ita cod). FKLN1 rel Chr-ms.

9. for θεω, κυριω D1FN1 copt.

for ημων, ημων B1.

η έχαιρομεν D1.

άγαθη την πρακτικήν ἄρετήν ή δὲ του διδασκάλου μυμήν, κ. Ο περὶ αὐτοῦ πόδος, μαρτυρεί την περὶ την διδασκαλίαν στοργή.

πάντωτο beleges more naturally to the foregoing: see 1 Cor. i. 4; xc 58; Gal. iv. 18; Eph. v. 20.

(ἀπειποθείν τι (huc etiam redire structuram ἐπιποθεὶν sq. infinitivo nemo nescit) idem valet quod ποῦν ἔχειν ἐπι τι, desiderium ferre in aliquid versus, cf. LXX. Ps. xiii. (xii.) 1, ὁ τρόπον ἐπιποθεῖ ἢ ἐλαφοῖ ἐπι ταῖς πυγάς των ὑδάτων. Fritz. in Rom. i. 11. So that direction, not intensify (which as Fritz, also remarks, after the analogy of περιποθέως, should be expressed by περι-, not ἐπιποθεῖν) is the force of the preposition.

ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς] scil. ἰδίων ἐπιποθοῦμεν. 7. διὰ τοῦτο, viz. on account of what has just been mentioned, from ἀπό ... ; τοῦτο combining the whole of the good news in one.

ἐφ' ὑμῖν, with reference to you: as we say, over you. You were the object of our consolation: the faith which you shewed was the means whereby that object was applied to our minds.

ἐπί πάσα τῇ ἁγαγ. κ. θλ. ἡμ.] in (ref. i.e. in the midst of, in spite of) all our necessity and tribulation: what necessity and tribulation does not appear;—but clearly some external trouble, not, as De W., care and anxiety for you, for this would be removed by the message of Timotheus. We may well imagine such external trouble, from Acts xviii. 5—10.

8. for now (not so much an adverb of time here, as implying the fulfilment of the condition [ἐπί] which follows: see Eur. Iph. in Anl. 611: "συνετὰ λέγουσα μάλα

λον εἰς οὐκ Μυ Αγεῖς"; "ἄσωτοι νῦν ἐντομοὶ, εἰ σε γ' εὐφρανω." See more examples in Hartung, Partiell. ii. p. 25; Kühner. ii. p. 185) we live (the ἁγαγ. and

αλλάζει being conceived as a death: but not to be referred to everlasting life, as Chrys. [ὁ ἱερός λέγει τον οἰκείους τόπων], nor weakened to "vivit qui felix est," [Polt], but with direct reference to the infringement of the powers of life by ἁγαγ. κ. θλ., as Lüken... "we are in full strength and freshness of life, we do not feel the sorrow and tribulations with which the outer world surrounds us") if ye stand fast in the Lord.

The conditional form of this last sentence, with ἐδώ, not ἔπι, carries it forward as an exhortation for the future also; while the solenece indicative gives the Apostle's confident expectation that such would be the case. The reading must not be dismissed, as Ellic., by taking refuge in Scrivener's assertion that permutations of similar vowels are occasionally found even in the best MS's. I have examined the Vatican Codex through the greater part of the N. T., and can safely say that these permuations are found only in such cases as H, I, and E, and O and Ω in doubtful inclusions, as ἐφραξ. and ἐφακ.: not in cases like the present, nor in any ordinary occurrences of long and short vowels. See remarks on Rom. v. 1; and prolegg. to Vol. i. ch. vi. § 1. 36. 37. There were (ver. 10) ἐστερήμασα in their faith, requiring καταρτίσωσιν.

9. And this vigour of life shows itself in the earnest desire of abundant Thanksgiving: so the ήμεροι accounts for, and specifies the action of the ἐπί just mentioned.

πινα, what? i.e. what sufficient? ἀνταπ. reff.: thanks is itself a return for God's favours: see especially ref. Ps. ἐπί, may be taken as above (ref.f.), or as (in return for: the two meanings in fact run up into one.

πάσα τῇ χαρᾷ, all the joy: i.e. not the joy from so many different
11. for θεον, κύριον Ν.1, om κατά. D1, rec aft ηπανος ins χριστως, with D2 F K L N a b c e d e f g h k l m n o 17
12. for κύριος, θεος A 73: κυρ. ηπανος D1 F(not F-lat): om am1 Syr. τῆς αγάπης F.

sources, but joy in its largeness and depth: q. d. τῇ χαρᾷ τῇ μεγάλῃ, η attr. for ηπανος, see Matt. ii. 10: not as John iii. 29: see note there.

αὐτός τ. θεον ἡμών, shews the joy to be of the very highest kind, or of personal pride, but one which will bear, and does bear, the searching eye of God, and is His joy (John xv. 11).

10. ηπανος, belongs to the question of ver. 9—q. d., 'what thanks can we render, &c., proportioned to the earnestness of our prayers, &c.?' So that δέδημεν would best be rendered praying as we do. εἰς τό—direction, or aim, of the prayers. καταρτάτα τα υπότα τα ἐλειστών πληρώσας, Thdr.t.: cf. 2 Cor. ix. 12. These υπερτήρια were consequences of their being as yet novices in the faith: partly theoretical, e. g. their want of stability respecting the παρωσία, and of fixed ideas respecting those who had fallen asleep in Christ,—partly practical, ch. iv. 1. One can hardly conceive a greater perverseness than that of Baur, who takes this passage for a proof that the Thessalonian church had been long in the faith. 11—13.

Good wishes, with respect to this his earnest desire, and to their continued progress in love and holiness. 11. αὐτός. Not as De W. in contrast with the δεδημεν just spoken of,—but as Chrys., αὐτός δέ ὁ θεὸς ἐκκαθαι τοὺς πειραμαθοὺς τῶν πανταχοῦ περιλαμβαντὸς ἡμᾶς, ἓπε καθήνει δόλων πρὸς ἡμᾶς,—i. e. it exalts the absolute power of God and the Lord Jesus,—if He expedites the way, it will be accomplished. αὐτός then is in contrast with ourselues, who have once and again tried to come to you, but have been hindered by Satan. Líman.

reminds that ὁ θεὸς is best taken absolute, and ἡμῶν referred to πατὴρ only. More majesty is thus given to the αὐτός ὁ θεὸς, although αὐτός refers to the whole. Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17. κατευθύναν] not infinitive, but third person singular optative aorist. It certainly cannot be passed without remark, that the two nominatives should thus be followed, here and in 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17, by a singular verb. It would be hardly possible that this should be so, unless some reason existed in the subjects of the verb. Mere unity of will between the Father and the Son (Líman.) would not be enough, unless absolute unity were also in the writer's mind. Athanasins therefore seems to be right in drawing from this construction an argument for the unity of the Father and the Son. πρὸς ἡμᾶς more naturally belongs to κατευθύνασι than to τῷ ὄντω ἡμῶν, in which case it should be τῷ ὄντω ἡμῶν, τῇ ἡμῶν. 12. ἡμᾶς δὲ —emphatic,—'sive nos veniuntus sive minus,' Bengel. ὁ κύριος may refer either to the Father, or to Christ. It is no objection to the former, that τ. θεος κ. πατρ. ἡμῶν is repeated below, any more than it is to the latter that τ. κυρ. ἡμων. 1. is so repeated. I should rather understand [still, notwithstanding Ellie's note] it of the Father: see 2 Cor. ix. 8. πλιονάσασαι (refl.) make you to abound. εἰς πάντας toward all men, not, as Thdr,t., πάντας τῶν ὁμοίων, but as Est., 'ελιαν ἔλεοιδες et vestrem salutis iuniores.' καθ. κ. ἡμείς, viz, περισσεύομεν τῇ ἀγάπῃ—ἐχεῖτε γὰρ μέτρων κ.
IV. 1. ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ Α. 267

13 η εἰς τὸν στηρίζαι ὑμᾶς τὰς καρδίας σοις ἀμέμπτως εἰν. τὸν στηρίζάι ὑμᾶς τὰς καρδίας σοις ἀμέμπτως εἰν. τὸν στηρίζαι ὑμᾶς τὰς καρδίας σοις ἀμέμπτως εἰν. τὸν στηρίζαι ὑμᾶς τὰς καρδίας σοις ἀμέμπτως εἰν.

14 αὐτοῦ. εἰς τὸν στηρίζαι ὑμᾶς τὰς καρδίας σοις ἀμέμπτως εἰν. τὸν στηρίζάι ὑμᾶς τὰς καρδίας σοις ἀμέμπτως εἰν. τὸν στηρίζαι ὑμᾶς τὰς καρδίας σοις ἀμέμπτως εἰν. τὸν στηρίζαι ὑμᾶς τὰς καρδίας σοις ἀμέμπτως εἰν.

IV. 1 ὁ Λοιπὸν οὖν, ἄδελφοι, εἰρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, ὥστε καθὼς παρέλαβετε παρ' ἑαυτῶν τὸ πόσος ἐδει ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖτε καὶ άνέσειν ὅτι θεοῦ καὶ περιπατεῖτε ἵνα καὶ περισσεύσητε μᾶλλον.

Theod. Jude 14. b Cor. i. 13. iv. 2. Cor. xiii. i. (2 Thess. iii. 1.) c Phil. iv. 1. ref. d = Eph. iv. 1 ref.

13. τας καρδιας βεβ άμφ το διαθ. μεμπτως τυπ. Πς. Αθην. αγιοσην Β’ DF: δικαιοσυνη Λ 23. 57. rec af τον ισχρονον, with IL ref vulg s Cyr. goth ch. 4 al. fr. &c. of κυριον και περιπατεται, is και περισσευσητε και.

CHAP. IV. 1. rec ισιον η σ τον Λοιπον, with B 2 α γ κ η κ η Κρή Θαρτ, but introduces this second portion, thus dividing it from the first, and implying the close of the Epistle. St. Paul uses it towards the end of his Epistles: see in addition to refp, Eph. vi. 10; Phil. iv. 8. οὕτων, in furtherance of the wish of ch. iii. 12, 13: τούτῳ κεκρεμένων τῷ σκότῳ προσφέρομεν ὅτι τὴν παραίειαν, εἰρωτομένον in the classics, only used of asking a question: but in N. T. (as the Heb. 38; Lūn, which however, in the sense of requesting, is rendered in the LXX by αἰτεῖν) it has both meanings of our verb ‘to ask’ (ref.).

παρακ. ἐν κυρι. 1ης. ἡς ἡς οὕτως, in our element of exhortation; in whom we do all things pertaining to the ministry [see Rom. ix. 1]: Eph. iv. 17—not ‘by,’ as a formula jurandi, which is contrary to N. T. usage, see Fritzche on Rom. ix. 1) the Lord Jesus, that as ye received (see on ch. ii. 13) from us how (το is not superfluous: it collects and specifies what follows, q. d.—the manner of your,’ &c.) ye ought to walk and to please God (i. e., to please God in your walk and conduct: to—walk, and thereby to please God), as also ye are walking (this addition, says Lūn, is required as well [see var. readd.] by internal considerations. For ἐν περισσοτεροι requires the assumption of a prior commencement [see ver. 10]: and such a commencement would not be implied in the preceding text, without καθὼς καί.
2. παραγγελιάς ἐδόκαμεν ύμῖν m διὰ τοῦ ABDF
κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. 3 n τούτῳ γὰρ ἐστιν n θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ó Klaub
ἀγιασμὸς ύμῶν, p ἀπέχεσθαι ύμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς q πονείας,
r ἐνέια ἐκαστῶν ύμῶν τὸ εἰαυτὸν σκέυος κτάσεως ἐν

περὶπατεῖτε. Evidently the Apostle would
have originally written ἦνα, καθό παρρ.
παρ' ἡμ. το πῶς κ.τ.λ. . . . , όπως καὶ
περὶπατήσει, but while writing, altered
this his intended expression, that he might
not say too little, wishing to notice the
good beginning already made by the Thes-
salonians. The repetition of ἦνα after so
long an intervening clause is too natural
to have given rise [as De W. thinks] to the
insertion) that ye abound yet more,
viz. in το ὁπώς περιπατεῖν; not, as
Chrys., ἦνα ἐκ πλεονος περιουσίας, μη
μεχρὶ τῶν εὐνόμων ἵστασθε, ἀλλ' ἦνα καὶ
υπερβαίνετε.
2. takes up the
καθος παρελάβετε of the former verse,
and appeals to their memory in its
confirmation. See similar appeals in Gal.
iv. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 1. παραγγ. commands, see ref. The stress is on
τῶν, to which τοῦτο answers, verse 3.
3. διὰ τ. κ. ἴησον. by, i. e. coming from,
παραγγελθεῖσα διὰ. So τάς διὰ τῶν
ἀλίγων πολιτείας, Demosth. p. 489: δὲ
ἐαυτοῦ, of himself, Xen. Cyr. viii. 1. 43: see
Bernhardy, p. 236. 3. further
specification (γάρ) of the παραγγελθεῖα: see
above. τοὐτο is the subject,
not the predicate (as De W.): see Rom.
x. 8: Gal. iii. 7: not superfluous, as
Pelt, but emphatically prefixed (so Lū-
num.).

θέλημα τ. θεοῦ serves to
take up again the διὰ τ. κυρ. ἴησον.
The article may be omitted, because the
predicate θέλημα τ. θ. is not distributed
(?): but in this case, το θελ. would be
equally applicable, there being no danger of
το θελ. being mistaken for 'the whole
will,' but rather specifying 'that which
forms part of the will.' This explanation
is not to be abandoned, as Ellic., on ac-
count of the merely occasional omission
of the article after a noun substantive,
mentioned by Middleton and Ellic.: for
the reason of that omission is to be sought
rather in logic than in idiom. Rather
perhaps should we say that there is in
Greek a tendency to omit articles before
predicates, even where such an omission
cannot be logically pressed. . . ὅ γαρ
ὑμ. is in apposition with θελ. τ. θ. as a
'locus communis,' the will of God respect-
ing us known to be, our sanctification,
and then this sanctification being
afterwards specified as consisting in ἀπ-
εχεσθαι, &c. Therefore ἀγιασμὸς must
be taken in the most general sense, and that
which is afterwards introduced, ἀπέχεσθαι,
&c., as a part of our ἀγιασμὸς.

ὑμῶν is the objective genitive, of you.

ἀπέχεσθαι and εἰδεναι are not the
negative and positive sides of ὅ γαρ. ὑμ. as
Lūnum. and Ellic.,—for the negative comes
in again in verses 5, 6—but the latter
(εἰδεναι to διειμαρτυρεῖτα, ver. 6) fur-
ther specifies and ensures the former.

4. εἰδεναι, know how (reft.). On
the meaning of τὸ σκέυος, there has been
much difference. Very many Comment-
ators understand it of 'the body.' (So,
among others, Chrys. [see below], Thdr.,
Gec., Thl. Tert., Pelag., Calv., Corn.-a-Lap.,
Beza, Grot., Calv., Ham., Beng., Mac-
Knight, Pelt, Olsb., Baung.-Crus.) But
it is fatal to this interpretation, (1) that it
must force an untenable meaning on
κτάσεως, which can only mean 'to acquire,'
not 'to possess.' Chrys., whose sense of
Greek usage led him to feel this, tries to
fit the meaning 'to acquire' into the
sense: ἠμείς ἀντὶ κτάμεθα, ὅταν μὲν
καθαρὰν κ. ἐστὶν ἐν ἀγιασμῷ ὅταν δὲ
ἀκάθαρτον, ἀμαρτία—(so Olsb. also); but
this is lame enough, and would not, as
De W. remarks, answer for the other
member of the sentence, μὴ ἐν πάθει ἐπί-
θυμίαις. (2) that the mere use of σκέυος,
without any explanation, could hardly
phor is further explained by the context:
—e. g., Barnab., ep. 7, 11, pp. 744, 760, τὸ
σκέυος τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτῶν,—Philo, quod
det. pot. insid. § 46, vol. i. p. 223,
bef to e. sikeus DF goth. ins ev bef tyme N1 d.

τὰς ψυχὰς ἄγγελων τὸ σῶμα.—de migr. Abr. § 36, vol. i. p. 467, τοῖς ἄγγελοις τῆς ψυχῆς σῶματι κ. αἰσθήσει,—Cic. disp. Tusc. i. 22: 'corpus quidem quasi vas est aut aliquod animi receptaculum,'—Laceret. iii. 411: 'corpus, quod vas quasi constituit ejus (sc. animae).' 2 Cor. iv. 7 is evidently no case in point, ἀπαρακτικῶς being there added, and the body being simply compared to an earthen vessel. (3) that the order of the words is against it. In τὸ ἐαυτοῦ σκεύος, the emphasis must lie on ἐαυτῷ—cf. 1 Cor. vii. 2, ἐκατόστος τῆς ἐαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχετός. Had the body been meant, this would be without import, and it would more naturally have been τὸ σκεύος ἐαυτοῦ (or αὐτοῦ). (4) But a more fatal objection than any of the former is, that the context is entirely against the meaning. The ἁγιασμὸς has been explained to consist in ἀπέγενθαι ἀπὸ τῆς πορνείας. And now this πορνεία comes to be specified, where-in it consists, and how it may be guarded against: viz. in carrying on the divinely-appointed commerce of the sexes in holiness and honour. In fact, the thought is exactly as in 1 Cor. vii. 2, διὰ τὰς πορνεῖας ἐκατόστος τῆς ἐαυτοῦ γυναίκα ἐχετός, κ. ἐκάστη τῶν ζῶν ἐνδρα ἐχετός. Many have therefore understood σκεύος in its literal meaning as applied to τὸ πρόμαχον,—i. e. the woman (or indeed the ὅπως, on the other side, inasmuch as the woman has ἐνδρα over his body, see 1 Cor. vii. 4. So that thus it would be an exhortation to the woman also: so De Wette). Thus the context would be satisfied, and the emphatic position of ἐαυτοῦ (as in 1 Cor. vii. 2);—and κτάσαθαi would retain its proper meaning: that each of you should know how to acquire his own vessel (for this purpose) in sanctification (κτάσαθαι εἰς ἄγι. belong together) and honour. This sense of σκεύος is found in the Jewish books (Megill, Esth. i. 11: "In convivio dixerunt aliqui: mulieres Medicce sunt pulcheriores: aliis, Persicae sunt pulcheriores. Dixit Ahasuerus: Vas meum, quo ego uto, nec Persicum est nec Medicum, sed Chaldaicum"). And the expression κτάσαθαι γυναίκα is common: cf. Xen. Symp. ii. 10: ταύτην (Σαλατίνης) κέκτητα: Ruth iv. 10; Sir. xxxvi. 24. And so Thdr. Mops. (σκεύος τῆν ἴδιαν ἐκαστὸν γαμετὴν ὄνομαζεί, some in Thdrt.
in ver. 7, he mentions merely impurity, without the slightest allusion to the other. To say that more than one kind of sin must be mentioned because of περὶ πάντων τῶν τούτων, is mere trifling: the πάντα πάντα (not ταύτα πάντα, which would collect many individuals into a whole) generalizes from the sin mentioned to a wider range. The interpretation which I impugn, is also that of Zwingle, Calv., Grot., Calov., Le Clerc, Wolf, Koppe, Platt. I understand the verse, with Chrys., Thilt., (Ec., Thil., Jer., Erasm., Est., Corn.-a-Lap., Heins., Whithy, Wetst., Kypke, Beng., Michaelis, Pelt, Olsh., all., to refer to the sins of uncleanness, and continue vv. 4, 5:—that he should not (viz. τινά, contained in the aorist following: so that τό μη ... is a further specification of ὅ ἀγαθὸς, rather than parallel with εἰδείαν) set at nought (the order of the sentence requires that ὑπερβ. should not stand absolutely, as De W., Lin., al., for ‘transgress’ [ἐκ μον ὑπερβαίνει, ἀλλ’ ἐναντίων φιέρε, Eur. Al. 1077: υπερβε η εν αμάρτη, II. i. 497], but transitively: otherwise τινά would have occurred after ὑπερβαίνει to mark the distinction of construction: and ὑπερβ. with an accusative of person signifies either ‘to pass by’ or ‘take no notice,’ ‘posthumpere,’ as Hierod. iii. 83, ὑπερβαίνως τῶν προσεχέως: or ‘to go beyond’ or ‘surpass,’ as Plat. Tim. 21 d, πάγη πάντας ἀνήθαπας ὑπερβεβαίκετε ἄρετή. Of these, the former seems most applicable here: see below) or overreach his brother in the matter (viz. of τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκέψεως κτάδει—there should be among you none of those-strifes on account of the πάθη ἐπιθύμίας, the ‘tertium bellum causa’ in the heathen world. As Jowett rightly observes, “It is not necessary to suppose that any idea of unchastity is conveyed by the term πλεονεκτεῖν, any more than in the tenth commandment, ‘Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife.’ The meaning exclusively arises from the connexion and application of the word.” How τοῦ πράγματι can ever signify τοῦτο πράγματος, ‘business affairs’ (De W., alt.), I cannot imagine; and it is equally futile [with E. V. arm.] to take τῷ for τῷ τοι ὀνειρ. in the N. T. “It is probable that the obscurity of the passage arises partly from the decency in which the Apostle clothes it.” Jowett, because God is the avenger (‘righter,’ in such cases of setting at nought and overreaching) of all these things (viz. cases of ὑπερβασία and πλεονεκτεῖα, and by inference, lustful sins like them) as also (see on ver. 5) we before told you and constantly testified. 7] This verse (see above) is in my view decisive for the above rendering of ver. 6. There is no mention here of avarice: nor is it possible to understand ἀκαθαρσία, when ver. 3 has gone before, of any thing but carnal impurity. Chap. ii. 3, which is adduced to show that it may here represent covetousness, is a very doubtful ex-
9. for εἰςτε, εἴκοσι Δ'ΚΝ b 672 latt syr goth Chth Thal-lat'tf: εἴκοσι B am(with hal harl) Pelaq (corr on acc of the harsh constr: for which reason also c 43. 671. 73. SO coph have γραφεσθα as in ch v. 1): txt AD3KL3 rel Syr coph Thdrt Damasc.

10. on γαρ F, ins και bef εἰς B, on 2nd τους AD1 Chr-ms: for τοὺς, νμων Ν': txt BD2-3KL3 rel. for αἰδέλφοι, αγαπητοί A.

ample: see there. ἐνὶ, for the purpose of,—on condition of—ἐν, ὁ, 'in the element of,' not = εἰς, the aim: but ἄγασιμος is the whole sphere of our Christian life.

8.] Hence, the sin of (rejecting) setting at nought such limitations and a rules is a fearful one—no less than that of setting at nought God the giver of the Holy Spirit. In ἄνθρωπον ἀντεῖαι there is an obvious allusion to ἐπερεαίνεις κ. πλευρεκέται τ. ἀδέλφων above. There is no need to supply any thing after ἀθε-τον—ὁ ἀδετόν simply describes him who commits the act of rejecting; q. d. the rejecter—what he rejects, is not to be supplied in the construction, but is clear from the context—viz. τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. The distinction between ἄνθρωπον (unarithrous) and τὸν θεόν, seems to be, that the former is indefinite; not (any) man, but (definite) God. τὸν [καὶ] δόντα. q. d. who also is the Author of our sanctification.

[καὶ—'novum hic additum momentum,' Bengel. It introduces a climax, whereby the sin is intensified.]

δόντα, as being one great definite act of God by His Son. τὸ τυ. αὐτοῦ τὸ ὅγι.] This form of expression (q. d. 'His own [αὐτοῦ emphatic] Spirit, the Holy One') is probably chosen, and not τὸ ὅγιαν, τυ. αὐτοῦ, for precision, to bring out τὸ ὅγιαν as connected with ἄγασιμος preceding.

εἰς ὕμας is not = ὑμῖν, but gives the idea of direction: see Gal. iv. 6; ch. ii. 9. 9—12.] Exhortations to brotherly love (9, 10 a), to honest diligent lives (10 b—12). 9.] ἐς is transitional, the implied contrast being to the sin last spoken of. φιλαδέλφεια (relf.) here refers more immediately (cf. παύετε αὐτό below) to deeds of kindness by way of relief to poor brethren. οὗ ἄρειαν εἴχετε] This is not a usual touch of delicate rhetoric with St. Paul (cf. 2 Cor. ix. 1: Philom. 19: ch. v. 1). It conveys tact but gentle reproof. The knowledge and the practice already exist: but the latter is not quite in proportion to the former. τὸ εἰςτε, οὗ ἁρεία εἰσί, μεῖωσι ὢντεστον ἢ εὶ ἔπεσεν. Chrys. The construction εἰς τε γραφείς and εἴχετε γράφεσθαι. He therefore reads ἔχομεν. But with so many corrections (see var. readd.), and with the known irregularities of St. Paul's style in such constructions, it surely is not safe to speak so positively. I should constr the construction, not as analogous with χώρον ὁδὸν ἁγίων πατέρων, Soph. (Ed. Col. 37): ἄξιος βασιλάς, Thuc. i. 38, and the like—but as a mixed one between ἔχομεν γράφεις and εἶχε γράφεσθαι. αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς, in opposition to ἡμᾶς, the subject to be supplied from γράφεις: but αὐτοὶ is not sponde, which would not agree with θεοδίδακτοι. The stress of the sentence is on αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς, not on the θεο- in θεοδίδακτοι, as Olsh—'where God teaches, there, the Apostle says, he may be silent;' but as Lün. observes, the θεο- comes in over and above as it were; διδάκ- to would convey the fact: θεοδίδακτοι = διδάκτοι, κ. ταῦτα παρά θεοῦ. And this teaching is practical—its tendency and object being εἰς τὸ ὅγια, ἀλλα,—to produce mutual love. 10.] follows up the θεοδίδακτοι ἐστε by a matter of fact, shew- ing: the teaching to have been in some measure effectual.

καὶ γάρ] the καὶ belongs to παύετε—'besides being taught it, ye do it,'—παύετε carrying the em- phasis of the sentence. αὐτό, scil. τὸ ἅγιαν ἀλ. περισσευεῖν, viz. in this ἅγιαν. (But there does not seem any reason, with Jowett, to ascribe this ἄγαλα to their uneasiness about the state of the dead: much rather [as he also
11. rec ins idias before χερσων (gloss, to suit τα idia preceding), with ABDFKLN\textsuperscript{1} rel Thirtb Damase (Ec: om BD\textsuperscript{1}FN\textsuperscript{3} k 67\textsuperscript{2} vss Bas Clr Damase Thimb Amst Pelag. \textit{parry.}

12. \textit{Purpose of ver. 11.} εὐφυχγμάνων] honourably: ἀτάκτως, 2 Thess. iii. 6, 11, is the opposite. πρὸς, with regard to: as in the proverb οὐδὲν πρὸς Διόνυσον,—πρὸς Τιμόθεον πράξαι, Demosth., p. 1185. See Bernhardy, p. 265. τοὺς ἐξω] the unbelieving world (reft.). μηδενὸς (subjective, as ruled by the χρείαν ἔχειτε) is much better taken neunter than masculine; for as Lün. observes, to stand in need of no man, is for man an impossibility.

13.—CH. V. 11.] \textit{Instructions and exhortations concerning the time of the end:} and herein 13–18 \textit{instructions respecting the resurrection of the departed at the Lord's coming.} We can hardly help suspecting some connexion between what has just preceded, and this section. It would certainly seem as if the preaching of the kingdom of Jesus at Thessalonica had been partially misunderstood, and been perverted into a cause why they should not quietly follow active life, and why they should be uneasy about those who fell asleep before that kingdom was brought in, imagining that they would have no part in its glories. Cf. Acts xvii. 7.

13.] \textit{Those who are sleeping:} so the present is used in the well-known epitaph, ἑσθὲ ὑπὸν καὶ 
κοιμᾶτε 
θηρσκεῖν μη 
λέγε 
τοὺς 
ἀγάθονς. Or we may understand it, \textit{those who (from time to time) fall asleep [among you]}, as suggested in the Journal of Sacred Lit. for April, 1856, p. 15: but the other seems simpler. It was an ex-
pression (reft.) conveying definite meaning to the Thessalonians as importing the dead in Christ (ver. 16). No inference must therefore be drawn from the Apostle's use of this word, as to the intermediate state (as De W. after Weizель, for the sleep of the soul,— and Zwingle, Calvin, al., against it): for the word is a mere common term. [ να μὴ λ.] object of my not wishing you to be ignorant.

μὴ λυπ. is absolute, that ye mourn not:— not (as Thdrt., Calvin, al.) μὴ λυπ. καθώς . . . , 'that ye may not mourn (so much) as others &c.' He forbids λυπεῖσθαι altogether. But we must remember, what sort of λυπεῖσθαι it was. Surely not absolutely the mourning for our loss in their absence, but for theirs (see above), and in so far, for ours also. See Chrysostom's very beautiful appeal in loc. οἱ λοιποὶ viz. the heathen, and those Jews who did not believe a resurrection. οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα viz., in the resurrection. Lm. cites,—Theoc. Idyll. iv. 42, ἐπιδές ἐν ζωίσι, ἄνεπλαστοὶ δὲ θανάτωτες: — Esch. Eum. 638, ἀπὰ βαθύντων ὀστίς ἐστ' ἀνάσσατοι: Catull. v. 4 ff, 'Soles occidere et redire possunt: nobis quam semel occidit brevis lux nox est perpetua una dormienda.' Lucret. iii. 942 ι, 'nee quisquam expergit ussit castrum quem sequel est vitae panas secura.' Jovett adds 'the sad complaints of Cicero and Quintilian of the loss of their children, and the dreary hope of an immortality of fame in Tacitus and Thucydidès.' [But when he goes on to say that the language of the O. T., though more religious, is in many passages hardly more cheering, and substantiates this by Isa. xxxviii. 18, 19, it is surely hardly fair to give the dark side, without balancing it with such passages as Ps. lxiii. 23—26; Prov. xiv. 32. In the great upward struggle of the ancient church under the dawn of the revelation of life and immortality, we find, much indeed of the αἰώνων αἰῶνων εἰπ— but the τὸ δ' εἴv κατ' ἔχει has its abundant testimonies also.]

Vol. III.

This shews of what kind their άντί was: viz. a grief whose ground was unbelief in a resurrection: which regarded the dead as altogether cut off from Christ's heavenly kingdom. 14.] Substantiation (γάρ) of that implied in last verse, that further knowledge will remove this their grief: and that knowledge, grounded on the resurrection of our Lord. εἰ] not 'seeing that' but hypothetical: 'pósito, that we, &c.' ἀπέθ. κ. ἀνάστησιν go together,— forming the same process through which οἱ κοιμηθέντες are passing. "The Apostle here, as always, uses the direct term ἀνέπλασεν in reference to our Lord, to obviate all possible misconception: in reference to the faithful he appropriately uses the consolatory term κοιμᾶσθαι: see Thdrt. in loc."

Ellicott, οὔτος] The two clauses do not accurately correspond. We should expect καὶ πιστεύομεν ὅτι οὔτος καὶ οἱ ἔν ἰησοῦ κοιμηθέντες ἀναστήσονται, or the like. Still the οὔτος betokens identity of lot for the two parties concerned, viz., death, and resurrection. In this they resemble: but in the expressed particulars here, they differ. Christ's, was simply ἀνέπλασται: theirs shall be a resurrection through Him, at His coming. διὰ τ. ἰησοῦ] I feel compelled to differ from the majority of modern scholars (not Ellicott), in adhering to the old connexion of these words with τ. κοιμηθέντες. I am quite aware of the grammatical difficulty: but as I hope to shew, it is not insuperable. But if we join διὰ τ. ἰησοῦ with ἀξιέω, we obtain a clause which I am persuaded the Apostle could never have written,— flat and dragging in the extreme— διὰ τοῦ ἰησοῦ ἀξιέω σὺν αὐτῷ— αὐτώ referring to ἰησοῦ already mentioned in the same clause. Whereas, on the other connexion, we have ἰησοῦς and οἱ κοιμηθέντες διὰ τοῦ ἰησοῦ set over against one another, the very article, and the unemphatic position of the words, shewing the reference back,— and we have Τ
elfthly, and forcibly referring back to 'I'soivs and dia tòv 'I'soiv, in the preceding clauses. In other words, the logical construction of the sentence seems to me so plainly to point to the connexion of dia tòv 'I'soiv with koumævntas, that it must be a grammatical impossibility only, which can break that connexion. But let us see whether there be such an impossibility present. oi koumævntes are confessedly the Christian dead, and none else. They are distinguished by the Apostle's use of and adhesion to the word, from the merely eanvntes. What makes this distinction? Why are they asleep, and not dead? By whom have they been thus privileged? Certainly, dia tòv 'I'soiv. We are said πi-o-téuv di' aútov (Acts iii. 16), εύ'xaristev di' aútov (Rom. i. 8), ειρήν an' évexi di' aútov (ib. v. 1), καύσασα di' aútov (ib. 11), παρα- καλεσα di' aútov (2 Cor. i. 5). Why not also κοιμασα di' aútov? And when Lüken, objects, that the extent of the idea oi koumævntes is understood from the former part of the sentence, ei πιστεύμεν κ.τ.λ.,—this very reason seems to me the most natural one for the specification—If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, then even thus also those, of whom we say that they sleep, just because of Jesus, will God, &c.: the emphasis being on the dia. Jowett keeps this connexion, merely saying however, 'nor will the order of the words allow us to connect them with έξεi,' a reason surely sufficient for it. He is certainly in error when he continues, 'The only remaining mode is to take dia for εν (§), 'those that are asleep in Christ.' ' έξεi σιν αύτo] will bring (back to us) with Him (Jesus): i.e. when Jesus shall appear, they also shall appear with Him, being (as below) raised at His coming. Of their disembodied souls there is here no mention; nor is the meaning, as often understood, that God will bring them (their disembodied souls, to be joined to their raised bodies) with Him: but the bringing them with Jesus = their being raised when Jesus appears.

15.] Confirmation of last verse by direct revelation from the Lord. τóu-tó—this which follows: taken up, by δt.

en λόγῳ kuv., in (virtue of: an assertion made within the sphere and element of that certainty, which the word of the Lord gives) the word of the Lord,—i.e. by direct revelation from Him made to me. τούτοτιν, οὐκ ἀρπα ἐαυτῶν, ἀλλὰ πάρα τοῦ χριστοῦ μαθόντες λέγομεν, Chr.: έκ θείας ἡμῖν ἀποκαλύφθεις ἡ διδασκαλία γεγένηται, Thdrt. That St. Paul had many special revelations made to him, we know from 2 Cor. xii. 4. Cf. also Gal. i. 12; Eph. iii. 3; 1 Cor. xi. 23; xv. 3, and notes. ήμεις οἱ κώντες] Then beyond question, he himself expected to be alive, together with the majority of these to whom he was writing, at the Lord's coming. For we cannot for a moment accept the evasion of Theodoret (cf. also Chrys. and the majority of ancient Commentators, down to Bengal, and even some of the best of the moderns, warped by their subjectivities: cf. Ellicott here), —οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐαυτοῦ προσάπτων τέτεικεν, ἀλ' ἐπὶ τῶν κατ' ἐκείνον τῶν καιρῶν περιήγητον ἀνθρώπων: nor the ungrammatical rendering of Turrettin and Pelt—'we, if we live and remain' (ἡμεῖς κώντες, περιελεπτόμενοι):—nor the idea of Ec., al., that oi κώντες are the souls, oi koumævntes the bodies:—but must take the words in their only plain grammatical meaning, that oi κώντες οἱ περιλ. are a class distinguished from oi koumævntes, by being yet in the flesh when Christ comes, in which class, by prefixing ήμεις, he includes his readers and himself. That this was his expectation, we know from other passages, especially from 2 Cor. v. 1—10, where see notes. It does not seem to have been so strong towards the end of his course; see e.g. Phil. i. 20—26. Nor need it surprise any Christian, that the Apostles should in this matter of detail have found their personal expectations liable to disappointment, respecting a day of which it is so solemnly said, that no man kneweth his appointed time, not the angels in heaven, nor the Son (Mark xiii. 32), but the Father only. At the same time it must be borne in mind, that this inclusion of himself and his hearers among the κώντες and περιελεπτόμενοι, does not in any way enter into the fact revealed and here announced, which is respecting that class of persons only as they
are, and must be, one portion of the faithful at the Lord's coming; not respecting the question, who shall, and who shall not be among them in that day.

Dr. Burton, doubting whether περιλαμβάνοντας εἰς τ. π. can mean 'left to the coming' (but what not? εἰς as defining the terminus temporis is surely common enough, cf. Phil. i. 10; Acts iv. 3, εἰς τόν κόσμονν τοῦ κυρίου), puts a comma at περιλαμβάνοντας, and takes εἰς τ. π. with οί̂ μη̂ φθασάμενοι, rendering, those who are alive at the last day will not enter into the presence of the Lord before those who have died.

But 1) τὸ παρόν τοῦ κυρίου is never used locally, of the presence of the Lord, but always temporally, of His coming; and 2) the arrangement of the sentence would in that case be οί̂ μη̂ φθασάμενοι εἰς τ. π. τοῦ κυρ. οὐ̂ μη̂ φθάσαμεν] shall not (emphatic — there is no reason to fear, that ...) prevent (get before, so that they be left behind, and fail of the prize).

A reason of the foregoing assertion, by detailing the method of the resurrection. Because (not 'that,' so as to be parallel with οί̂ μη̂ μω̂τέρως, before, as Koch) the Lord Himself (not, as Do W., Ἰησοῦς, the Lord — which would be to the last degree flat and meaningless; — nor as Olsh., 'the Lord Himself; in contrast to any other kind of revelation — nor as Lünem., as the chief Person and actor in that day, emphatically opposed to His faithful ones as acted on, — but said for solemnity's sake, and to show that it will not be a mere gathering to Him, but ΙΗΣΟΥΣ will descend, and we all shall be summoned before Him) with (ιδίως, as the element, — the accompanying circumstance) a signal-shout (ἐκείνοις, not only 'the shout of battle,' as Conyb, — but is used of any signal given by the voice, whether of a captain to his runners, Thuc. ii. 92: of a man shouting to another at a distance, Herod. iv. 141: of a huntsman to his dogs, Xen. Cynegetic. vi. 20. Here it seems to include in it the two which follow and explain it), viz. with the voice of an archangel (Christ shall be surrounded with His angels, Matt. xxv. 31 al. To enquire, which archangel, is futile: to understand the word of Christ Himself [Ambrost., Olsh.], or the Holy Spirit [al.], impossible), and with the trumpet of God (θεός as in ref., the trumpet especially belonging to and used in the heavenly state of God; not commanded by God [Pelt., Olsh., al.— nor does θεός import size or loudness [Bengel, al.], although these qualities of course are understood. On the trumpet as summoning assemblies, cf. Num. x. 2; xxxi. 6; Joel ii. 1: — as accompanying the divine appearances, Ex. xix. 16; Ps. xlvii. 5; Isa. xxvii. 13; Zech. ix. 14; Matt. xxiv. 31; 1 Cor. xiv. 52) shall descend from heaven (cf. Acts i. 11): and the dead in Christ (ἐν Χρ. must not, as Pelt, Schott, be joined with ἀναστήσονται: for apart from the question whether this would give any admissible meaning, it would bring ἐν χριστῷ into an emphatic position of prominence, which would confuse the whole sentence) shall first rise (πρῶτος has no reference whatever to the first resurrection [Rev. xx. 5, 6], here, for only the Lord's people are here in question: but answers to εἰσῆλθε below: first, the dead in Christ shall rise: then, we, &c.) then we who are living, who remain (as above) shall be caught up (ref., the great change spoken of 1 Cor. xv. 52, having first suddenly taken place) all together (see Rom. iii. 12, ch. v. 10 note: ἡμι does not belong to σὺν αὐτοῖς with them (the raised of ver. 16) in the clouds (ἐξείλετο τὸ μέγεθος τῆς τιμῆς ὡσπέρ γὰρ αὐτός ὁ δεσπότης ἐπὶ νεφελῶν φωτει- νῆς ἀνελθόντος, ὡστε καὶ οἱ εἰς αὐτὸν πεπιστευκότες ... ἐπὶ νεφελῶν ὀχυρωμένοι ἀπαντήσουσι τῷ τῶν ἅλων κρήτῃ ... T 2
Thdr.t.) to meet the Lord (as He descends: so Aug. de civit. Dei xx. 20. 2, vol. vii. p. 688: 'non sice accipendum est quia non in aere nos dixerit semper cum Domino manibus tuae quia nec a gente usque ibi manebit quia venientes transistur est, venienti quippe itur obviam, non a mente.' Christ is on His way to this earth: and when De W. says that there is no plain trace in St. Paul of Christ's kingdom on earth,—and Lahn., that the words show that the Apostle did not think of Christ as descending down to the earth, surely they cannot suppose him to have been so ignorant of O. T. prophecy, as to have allowed this, its plain testimony, to escape him. **eis ἀπαντησιν** occurs [reff.] twice more in the N. T., and each time implies meeting one who was approaching—not merely 'meeting with a person' into the air (belongs to ἀπαντησις, not to εἰς ἀπ. τοῦ κυρ. as in E. V.), and thus we (i. e. we and they united, ἡμεῖς ἡμία, σὺν ἀνδροί, who were the subject of the last sentence) **shall be always with the Lord.** That he advances no further in the prophetical description, but breaks off at our union in Christ's presence, is accounted for, by his purpose being accomplished, in having shown that they who have died in Christ, shall not be thereby deprived of any advantage at His coming. The rest of the great events of that time—His advent on this earth, His judgment of it, assisted by His saints (1 Cor. vi. 2, 3).—His reign upon earth,—His final glorification with Him redeemed in heaven,—are not treated here, but to be thereby conceived of as alien from the Apostle's teaching. **18.** ζωτε, so then: reff. **παρακ., comfort:** cf. ἲνα μὴ λυπηθε, ver. 13. **λάγοις, not things**, here or any where: but words: **these words**, which I have by inspiration delivered to you. It will be manifest to the plain, as well as to the scholar-like reader, that attempts like that of Mr. Jowett, to interpret such a passage as this by the rules of mere figurative language, are entirely beside the purpose. The Apostle's declarations here are made in the practical tone of strict matter of fact, and are given as literal details, to console men's minds under an existing difficulty. Never was a place where the analogy of symbolical apocalyptic language was less applicable. Either these details must be received by us as matter of practical expectation, or we must set aside the Apostle as one divinely empowered to teach the Church. It is a fair opportunity for an experimentum crucis: and such test cannot be evaded by Mr. Jowett's intermediate expedient of figurative language.
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ii.16. It is both the suddenness, and the terribleness (which we cannot with Elicit. omit this element, in the presence of the image in the next verse) of the Day's coming, which is here dwelt on: cf. next verse.

outwos fills up the comparison—as a thief in the night (comes), so... it comes (not for future, but expressing, as so often by the present, the absolute truth and certainty of that predicted—it is its attribute, to come).

3.] Following out of the comparison of as kl. ev yuikt into detail.

leousin, viz. men in general—the children of the world, as opposed to the people of God: cf. Olethes below. The vivid description dispenses with any copula.

eip. k. daph., scil. estw, see ref. Ezek. alfle8, has the emphasis, becoming a kind of predicate. iofstatai, generally used of any sudden unexpected appearance: see reff., and Acts iv. 1.

It is pressing too close the comparison eyter hat avin k.t.λ., when De W. says that it assumes the day to be near,—for that such a woman, though she does not know the day and the hour, yet has a definite knowledge of the period." for it is not the woman, nor her condition, that is the subject of comparison, but the unexpected pang of labour which comes on her.

4. But the Thessalonians, and Christians in general, are not to be thus overtaken by it. In skotei refers back to ev yuikt above—in the ignorance and moral slumber of the world which knows not God. tv pαραβαλικά επέμενε σχήματι, k. skotei μην καλεί την κρύον, yepa de την γνῶσιν, Thlrdt. των σκοτων κ. άκαθαρτων βίων φασι, Chrys. Both combined give the right meaning.

In] not 'so that,' here or any where else: but that, in order that: it gives the purpose in the divine arrangement: for with God all results are purpose.

H yepa not, 'that day,' but the day—the meaning of yepa as distinguished from skotos being brought out, and yepa being put in the place of emphasis accordingly. This not having been seen, its situation was altered, to throw the first stress on yepa, which properly has the second. That this is so, is plain from what follows, ver. 5.

5.] You (a) and all we Christians (b) have no reason to fear, and no excuse for being surprised by, the DAY of the Lord; for we are sons of light and the day (Hebraisms, see reff.: signifying that we belong to, having our origin from, the light and the day), and are not of (do not supply 'sons'—the genitives are in regular construction after tomu, signifying possession— we belong not to) night nor darkness. See, on the day of the Lord as connected.
with darkness and light, Amos v. 18 ff. There, its aspect to the mудгьo is treated of: here, its aspect to Christians.

6–8.] Exhortation to behave as such: i.e. to watch and be sober—επίτασις έγγραφής τω νόμων. Εις γάρ και εγγραφήσαι καὶ μεθύνη διαφέρειν καθέδρας, (Ec. (after Chrys.).

6.] οἶοι λοιποὶ—i.e. the carelessless.

7.] Explanation of the assession regarding οἶοι λοιποὶ above from the common practice of men. There is no distinction, as Macknight pretends, between μεθυσκόμενοι and μεθύνων ("the former denoting the act of getting drunk, the latter the state of being so"), but they are synonymous, answering to καθέδρας and καθυσσόμενοι. Nor are the expressions to be taken in a spiritual sense, as Chrys., al. (μεθύνει ενταίθα φήσιν, οὐ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κακῶν: Spiritual sleep and intoxication belong to the state of darkness," Bamm.-Crmn.): the repetition of the same verbs as subjects and predicates (Linn.) shows that νυκτὸς is merely a designation of time, and to be taken literally.

8.] Contrast (δέ) of our course, who are of the day. And this not only in being awake and sober, but in being armed—not only watchful, but as sentinels, on our guard, and guarded ourselves. Notice, that these arms are defensive only, as against a sudden attack—and belong therefore not so much to the Christian’s conflict with evil, as (from the context) to his guard against being surprised by the day of the Lord as a thief in the night. The best defences against such a surprise are the three great Christian graces, Faith, Hope, Love—which are accordingly here enumerated: see ch. i, 3, and 1 Cor. xiii, 13. In Eph. vi. 13 – 17, we have offensive as well as defensive weapons, and the symbolism is somewhat varied, the θώραξ being διακο- σύνη, πίστις being the υπόσθη; while the helmet remains the same. See on the figure, Isa. xiii, 17; Wisd. v. 17 ff. We must not perhaps press minutely the meaning of each part of the armour, in the presence of such variation in the two passages.

9.] Exegeis of ἀπίθανον σωτηρίας—"and we may with confidence put such an hope as our helmet"—for God set us not (appointed us not" (reff.); keep the aorist meaning,−−referring to the time when He made the appointment) to ("with a view to"−−so as to issue in, become a prey to) wrath, but to acquisition (περιποίησιν, to make to remain over and above; hence 'to keep safe;' opp. to διαφέρω, Herod. i. 110; vii. 52, &c. Thuc. iii. 102 [L. and S.]. Hence περιποίησις, 'a keeping safe;' Plat. Def. 415 c, σωτηρία, περιποίησις ἀδέλθαις. If this last remarkable coincidence be taken as a key to our passage, σωτηρία will be a genitive of apposition, 'a keeping safe, consisting in salvation.' (But [reff.]): it seems more according to the construction to understand περιποίησιν, simply as acquisition, as it undoubtedly is in ref. 2 Thess. Jowett's note, "περιποίησιν, to make any thing over: hence περιποίησις, possession," if I understand it rightly, alleges a meaning of the verb which has no existence. 'To make to remain over' is as different as possible from 'to make over [to another person] of salvation through (διὰ . . . refers to περιπ. σωτ. not to ἔθετο) our Lord Jesus Christ, 10.] who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep (in what sense? surely not in an ethical sense, as above: for they who sleep will be overtaken by Him as a thief, and His day will be to them darkness, not light. If not in an ethical sense, it must be in that of living or dying, and the sense as Rom. xiv. 8. [For we cannot adopt the trifling sense given by Whitby, al.,−−whether He come in the night, and
10. *περὶ Βιβλίων 17: υπὲρ ADFKLNS3 red. καθευδομέν Κλ b d e f g h k l m o Chr Thil (in ver 6 KL have -δομέν). ζησομεν Λ17 lect-1: ζωμεν D1 75.

12. προστασιανομενον Λος. νοσθευτετος Λ.

13. for και, ὡστε Ὑ; ut latt. ἤγεισθε B b d e f g k l m syr cop t goth.

so find us taking our natural rest, or in the day when we are waking."

Thus understood however, it will be at the sacrifice of perspicuity, seeing that γρηγορεῖν and καθευδεῖν have been used ethically throughout the passage. If we wish to preserve the uniformity of metaphor, we may [though I am not satisfied with this] interpret in this sense: that our Lord died for us, that whether we watch [are of the number of the watchful, i.e. already Christians] or sleep [are of the number of the sleeping, i.e. unconverted] we should live, &c. Thus it would be 'who died that all men might be saved.' Who came, not to call the righteous only, but sinners to life. There is to this interpretation the great objection that it confounds with the λαοῦ, the ἤμια who are definitely spoken of as set by God not to wrath but to περιτρίψαντας σωτηρίας. So that the sense live or die, must, I think, be accepted, and the want of perspicuity with it. The construction of a subjunctive with εἴτε...εἴτε is not classical: an optative is found in such cases, e.g. Xen. Anab. ii. 11. 14, καὶ εἴτε δάλλος τε-θέλων χρήσαται εἴτε ἐπι Αχιμνον στρατεύου... See Winer, edn. 6, § 41, p. 263, Engl. transl. 310, note, ἀυτα all together: not to be taken with σῶν, see ref. 11. [Conclusion from the whole—διό, 'quia cum ida sint'—since all this is so or perhaps in literal strictness, as Elici, quamobrem: which however is exceedingly close to the above meaning. παρακαλεῖτε, more naturally comfort, as in ch. iv. 18, than 'exhort.' For as Lün, remarks, the exhortation began ver. 6 has passed into consolation in vv. 9, 10. οἱκ. εἰς τὸν ἔνα] edify the other: see ref.: and cf. (Kypko) Theoc. Idyl. xxi. 65. εἰς ἐνι χεῖρας δειπνου—Lucian, Asn. p. 160, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν ἐνδὸ έπιτρέπχων—Arrian, Epict. i. 10, ἐν ἐνδὸ εἰσπέσεσά. Whithby, Rückert, al., would read εἰς τὸν ἔνα, and render 'edify yourselves into one body' (Whithb. εἰς ἐν) or 'so as to shew the One, Christ, as your foundation, on whom the building should be raised' (Rückert: but this should be εἰς τῷ ἔνα). The only allowable meaning of εἰς τὸν ἔνα would be, 'into the One,' viz., Christ, as in Eph. iv. 13. But the use of τὸν ἔνα for Christ, without any further designation, would be harsh and unprecedented. 12—22. Miscellaneous exhortations, ending with a solemn wish for their perfection in the day of Christ. 12, 13.] In reference to their duties to the rulers of the church among them. The connexion (δὲ, a slight contrast with that which has just passed) is perhaps as Chrys., but somewhat too strongly—ἐπιθεῖ εἰπὲν οἰκοδομεῖτε εἰς τὸν ἔνα, ἵνα μὴ νομίσωμεν ὅτι εἰς τὸ τῶν διδασκαλίων ἡξίωμα αὐτοῦ ἀνήγαγεν, τοῦτο ἐπήγαγεν, μονονοικε λέγων, ὅτι κ. ὡς εἰπέτρεψα οἰκοδομεῖν ἀνάλλολον ὀδ γὰρ δυνάτων πάντα τῶν διδασκαλίων εἰπέν. Rather, as the duty of comforting and building up one another has just been mentioned, the transition to those whose especial work this is, is easy, and one part of forwarding the work is the recognition and encouragement of them by the church. 12.] εἴδοναι in this sense is perhaps a Hebraism: the LXX (in ref. Prov.) express γάρ by ἐπιγνώσκειν. The persons indicated by κοιπῶνας, προστασιανομενον, and νοσθευτετος, are the same, viz. the προσβοτιροι or ἐπίσκοποι: see note on Acts xx. 17, 28. ἐν ύμι. is among you, not as Pelt, al. 'hosting labour' ou ύμι. 'ἐν κυρίῳ, as the element in which, the matter with regard to which, their presidencies take place: = 'in divine
things': ὦν ἐν τῷ κοσμίῳ, ἀλλὰ ἐν τοῖς κατὰ κύριον. Θελ. 13.] ἡγεσία ἐν ἀγάπῃ is an unusual expression for to esteem in love; for such seems to be its meaning. Lün. compares ἔχειν τινα ἐν ὀφθαλμῳ (Thue. ii. 18). We have περὶ πολλοῦ ἡγεσίαν, Herod. ii. 115 (Job xxxv. 2 does not apply). ὑπερεξερείσος is best taken with ἐν ἀγάπῃ: it will not form a suitable qualification for ἡγεσίαν, which is merely a verbum medium. And so Chrys., all. διὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ: may mean, because of the nature of their work, viz. that it is the Lord's work, for your souls: or, on account of their activity in their office, as a recompense for their work. Both these motives are combined in Heb. xiii. 17. The rendering εἰρηνεύετε ἐν αὐτοῖς (see var. read.) can hardly mean, as Chrys., al.,—μην ἀντιλη-γενεῖ τοὺς παρ' αὐτῶν λεγομένους (Thublt.),—but is probably, as De W., a mistaken correction from imagining that this exhortation must refer to the presbyters as well as the preceding: whereas it seems only to be suggested by the foregoing, as enforcing peaceful and loving subordination without party strife: cf. ἀπάτεως below. ἀπάτεως not = ἀλλήλων (see ref. Col. and note there, and cf. Mark ix. 50).  14—22.] General exhortations with regard to Christian duties. There appears no reason for regarding these verses as addressed to the presbyters, as Conybeare in his translation (after Chrys., Ec., Thl., Est., al.) They are for all: for each to interpret according to the sphere of his own duties. By the ἀδελφοὶ, he continues the same address as above. The attempt to give a stress to ὑμᾶς ('you, brethren, I exhort,' Conyb.) is objectionable: (1) because in that case the order of the words would be different (ὥστε ἐκ, ἀλλὰ, παρ᾽, or ὡς ἐκ, ἀπαρ᾽), (2) because the attention has been drawn off from ὁ προστάτημας by εἰρηνεύετε ἐν αὐτοῖς intervening. 15 ἀπάτεως] This as ch. iv. 11, 2 Thess. iii. 6, 11, certainly implies that there was reason to complain of this ἀπάτεια in the Thessalonian church. "ἀπάτης is especially said of the soldier who does not remain in his rank: so inordinatus in Livy." Linn.: hence disorderly, ἀλγοφόνους] such e. g. as needed the comfort of ch. iv. 13. ἀντικρινεῖ keep hold of (refl.)— i. e. support. οἱ ἀδελφοὶ must be understood of the spiritually weak, not the literally sick: see ref. πρὸς πάντας, not, 'all the foregoing' (ἀπάτεως, ἀλγοφόνους, ἀδελφοῖς), but all men: cf. next verse. 15.] ὅρατε μή gives a slight warning that the practice might creep on them unawares. It is not addressed to any particular section of the church, but to all, to each for himself, and the church for each. 16.] Chrys. refers this to ver. 15; ὅταν γὰρ τοιαύτην ἔχομεν ψυχῷ ἐστε μηδένα ἀλληλεπε-θείναι, ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰρηνεύετε, πόθεν, εἰπέ μοι, τοῦ τῆς λύπης κέντρον παρεισβάλ-θείς δυνάσθετε; ὁ γὰρ οὕτω χάρων τῷ
παθείν κακός, ὡς κ. εὐνευρείας ἀμύνει·

τὸν πέντε. οὐκ ἐπικείμενον κακός, πάντα διήγειται

τινὰ λατρείαν: But perhaps this is somewhat far-fetched. The connexion seems however to be justified as he proceeds: καὶ τὰς ὅπλα τὸν τούτο, φησιν; ἐν ἑλέονου, δυνάμαιν. ἐν στρατεύων, ἡμέρῃ. ἐν τῇ πάντων ἑβείσιν. ἀδιαλείπτως προσευχέσθε κτλ. 

Aem Thl. ὁ γὰρ ἐκθεῖται ὡμίλων τῷ θεῷ κ. εὐχαριστεῖν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ πάντων ὑπὸ συμφορίαν συμβαίνουσαν, προβλῆσθαι ὅτι ἑρείν ἐξελεγμεν. 

17. See Chrys. and Thl. above. 

προσευχεῖσθαι, not of the mere spirit of prayer, as Jowett; but, as in parallel, Eph. vi. 18, of direct supplications to God. These may be unceasing, in the heart which is full of his presence and evermore communing with Him.

18. εν πάντι] in every thing.—every circumstance: see reff., and cf. ὑπὲρ πάνων, Eph. v. 20: κατὰ πάντα, Col. iii. 22. 23. Chrys., al., explain it 'on every occasion' (κατὰ); but 2 Cor. ix. 5, εν πάντι πάντως precludes this. τοῦτο perhaps refers back to the three—χαρά, προσευχή, εὐχαρία, or perhaps, as Ellie. and most modern expositors, to εὐχαρία alone. 

After γὰρ, supply ἑτερα, and understand θελεία, not 'decree,' but will, in its practical reference to your conduct. 

ἐφ' ἵνα] as its medium; Christ being the Mediator.

19. Chrys. Thl. [Ec., understand this ethically: σέβεσθαι δ' αὐτὸν ὑπὸ ἄκαθαρτον. But there can be no doubt that the supernatural agency of the Spirit is here alluded to,—the speaking in tongues, &c., as in 1 Cor. xii. 7 ff. It is conceived of as a flame, which may be checked and quenched: hence the ζων τῷ πνεύματι of Acts xviii. 25, Rom. xii. 11. The word is a common one with the later classics applied to wind: e.g. Plut. de Is. and Osir. p. 366 e,—τὰ βόρεια πνεύματα κατασβείνομενα κομιδὴ τῶν νυμφῶν ἐπικρατεύοντων. Galen. de Theriac a. 17, uses the expression of the spirit of life in children: speaking of poison, he says, τὸ ἐμφυτὸν πνεῦμα μάϊλος σβήνων. See more examples in Wetst. 20.] On προφητείας, see 1 Cor. xii. 10, note. They were liable to be despised in comparison with the more evidently miraculous gift of tongues: and hence in 1 Cor. xiv. 5, &c., he takes pains to shew that prophecy was in reality the greater gift. 

21. πάντα δὲ δοκιμάζεται refers back to the foregoing: but try all (such χαρείματα): see 1 Cor. xii. 10; xiv. 29; 1 John iv. 1. 

τὸ καλὸν καταξεῖται is best regarded as beginning a new sentence, and opposed to ἀπὸ παιτ. εἰδ. κ.τ.λ. which follows: not however as disconnected from the preceding, but suggested by it. In this, and in all things, hold fast the good. 

22. ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰδ. παν. ἀπειθεῖται. These words cannot by any possibility be rendered as in E. V., 'abstain from all appearance of evil.' For (1) εἰδὸς never signifies 'appearance' in this sense: (2) the two members of the sentence would thus not be logically correspondent, but a new idea would be introduced in the second which has no place in the context: for it is not against being deceived by false appearance, nor against giving occasion by behaviour which appears like evil, that he is cautioning them, but merely to distinguish and hold fast that which is good, and reject that which is evil. 

εἰδὸς is the species, as subordinated to the genus. So Porphyry. (in Lúmene.) isagoge de quinque vocibus 2: λέγεται δὲ εἰδὸς καὶ τὸ ἰδού τὸ ἄποδοθέν γένος καθ' ὅ eἰδαμεν λέγειν τὸν μὲν ἄπρωτον εἰδὸς τοῦ ζου, γένος οὐτοῦ τοῦ ζου τὸ δὲ λεκυνι τοῦ χρώματος εἰδὸς τὸ δὲ τρίγωνον τοῦ σχῆ-
23. ἀγαςεις F copt. τηρηθεὶν D1: om (leaving a space) F-gr G-lat.
24. ins ο βεκ πιστὸς F (not G), fidelis deus F-lat. ημᾶς A εἰ. τοιοῦθα F. (not G.)
25. aft προσευχῆσθαι ins καὶ BD1 m syr goth Damase. for perι, υπερ F Damase.
27. rec (for enoρχ.) ὄρκησι, with D2=FKLN red: txt ABDF E 17 Synops Damase.

ματὸς ἐίδος. And ποιητῶν is not an adjectival, but a substantive:—from every species (or form) of evil. The objection which Bengel brings against this, ‘species mali esset ἐίδος τοῦ ποιητῶν,’ is null, as such articles in construction are continually omitted, and especially when the genitive of construction is an abstract noun. Lün. quotes πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε κ. κακοῦ, Heb. v. 14: πάν ἐίδος ποιητῶν, Jos. Antt. x. 3. 1. 23, 24. αὐτὸς δὲ—contrast to all these fecile endeavours on your own part. ἐφην here most probably in its wider sense, as the accomplishment of all these Christian graces, and result of the avoidance of all evil. It seems rather far-fetched to refer it back to ver. 13. ὀλοτελεῖς seems to refer to the entireness of sanctification, which is presently expressed in detail. Jerome, who treats at length of this passage, ad Hedibiam (cp. exx.) quest. xii., vol. i. p. 1004, explains it, “per omnia vel in omnibus, sive plenos et perfectos;” and so Pelt, “ut sitatis integrei;” and the reviewer of Mr. Jowett in the Journal of S. Lit., April, 1856: ‘sancify you [to be] entire.’ But I prefer the other interpretation: in which case it = ἄλογος. καὶ introduces the detailed expression of the same wish from the lower side—its effects. ὀλοκληρων] emphatic predicate, as its position before the article shows: entire—refers to all three following substantives, though agreeing in gender with πνεῦμα, the nearest. Cf. besides refl., Levit. xxiii. 15, ἐὰν ἐβδομᾶς ὀλοκληρων. τὸ πν. κ. ἡ ψυχή κ. τ. σῶμα] τὸ πνεῦμα is the spirit, the highest and distinctive part of man, the immortal and responsible soul, in our common parlance: ἡ ψυχή is the lower or animal soul, containing the passions and desires (αιτία κυνηγεῖως ζωῆς ζωῶν, Plato, Deff. p. 111), which we have in common with the brutes, but which in us is ennobled and drawn up by the πνεῦμα. That St. Paul had these distinctions in mind, is plain (against Jowett) from such places as 1 Cor. ii. 14. The spirit, that part whereby we are receptive of the Holy Spirit of God, is, in the unspiritual man, crushed down and subordinated to the animal soul (ψυχῆ): he therefore is called ψυχικός πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχων, Jude 19: see also note on 1 Cor. as above.

ἀμεμπτῶς defines and fixes ὀλοκληρων τηρηθῆ: that, as Ellic, regarding quantity, this defining quality. εν, for it will be in that day that the result will be seen,—that the ὀλοκληρων τηρηθῆραι will be accomplished. 24. Assur- ance from God’s faithfulness, that it will be so. πιστὸς (refl.)—true to His word and calling: ἀντι τοῦ ἀλήθης, Thidrt. ὅ καλὸν, not ὅ καλέσας, but bringing out God’s office, as the Celler of his people: cf. Gal. v. 8. ποιήσει, viz. that which was specified in the last verse. 25–28. Conclusion. 25. Cf. Rom. xv. 30; Eph. vi. 19; Col. iv. 3; 2 Thess. iii. 1. περί is not so definite as ὑπερ—pray concerning us—make us the subject of your prayers—our person—our circumstances—our apostolic work. Ellic, however remarks, that this distinction is precarious; and hardly appreciable. 23. From this verse and the following, it would appear that that letter was given into the hands of the elders. εν, simply ‘in’—the kiss being the vehicle of the salutation: in our idiom, ‘with.’ 27. The meaning of this conjunction is, that an assembly of all the brethren should be held, and the
 unnecessarily

Prophesying, referring to a single act, shows this (but consult Ellic's note). On the construction τον κυριον, see reif. Jowett offers various solutions for the Apostle's vehemence of language. I should account for it, not by supposing any distrust of the elders, nor by the other hypotheses which he suggests, but by the earnestness of spirit incidental to the solemn conclusion of an Epistle of which he is conscious that it conveys to them the will and special word of the Lord. πᾶσιν] i.e. in Thessalonica, assembled together. 28.] See on 2 Cor. xiii. 13.
ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ Β.

I. 1 Παύλος καί Σιλουανός καί Τιμόθεος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικήων εν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίῳ ἤσσοῦ ἁγιωτάτῳ. 2 Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ διὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου ἤσσου ἁγιωτάτου.

3 εὐχαριστεῖν δὲ ὑψίλομεν τῷ θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀδελφῷ, καθὼς ἐξίον ἐστίν, ὅτι ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καὶ πλεονάζει ἡ ἀγάπη ἑαυτῶς ἐκάστου πάντων ὑμῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους, ὥστε αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν δικαίωσιν καὶ ἀμώμῳ πεπληρωμένους πάντες ἀληθείαν ἐν καθαρία καὶ ἀνευρέσει σώματος σώματι εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν.
καυχάσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ υπὲρ τῆς μουνής καὶ πάσιν τοῖς ἐν διωγμοῖς μουν καὶ ταῖς ὑλίσεισιν ἀιδ. ἀνέχεσθε, ἵνα ἡ δικαίας κρίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ καταζητῆμα νόμος τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, υπὲρ ἡς καὶ πᾶσχετε, εἴπερ δικαιοῦν ἀπαθεσθαντοί τοῖς θλίβουσιν νόμος θλίψεως. ἦν καὶ μουν τοῖς θλιβομένοις αἰνείσθης οὕς γινής ἐν εὐθ. εἰς τοῖς καθηκότισιν, εἰς τοῖς εὐνοούσις, εἰς τοῖς ἀνεύσθης καὶ πιστεὺσας.

καυχάσθαι (more usual word), with DKL rel, καυχάσθαι F: τοῖς θλιβομένοις F vulg D-lat.

you,—see 1 Thess. i. 8. There is ample reason (against Joyett) for the emphasis on αὐτοῦ ἡμᾶς. The fact of an Apostle making honourable mention of them in other churches was one which deserved this marking out, to their credit and encouragement. ἐν ἡμῖν, as the object of our ἔγχυσις. ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ, i. e. at Corinth and in Achaia. ὑπομονής καὶ πιστεύσεως. No ἐν διὰ δοσιν (Grot., Pelt.)—nor is there the slightest necessity, with Lunae., to take πιστεύσεως here in a different sense from that in ver. 3. The same faith which was receiving so rich increase, was manifesting itself by its fruit in the midst of persecutions and afflictions. πάσιν belongs only to τοῖς διωγμοῖς (ἡμῶν), as is shown by the article before θλίψεις, and by αἱ ἀνέχεσθε, which is parallel with ἡμῖν. αἱ ἀνέχεσθαι, attr. for ὡν ἀνέχεσθε, not for ὅς ἀνέχεσθε, as De W., al., for ἀνέχομαι always governs a generic in the N. T. ἀνέχεσθαι ye are enduring: the persecutions continued at the time of the Epistle being written. 5—10. Comfort under these afflictions, to think that they were only part of God's carrying out his justice towards them and their persecutors. 5. The sentence, in construction, is in apposition with the preceding τῆς ὑπομονῆς (ἡμῶν). 6. In the nominative: δὲ(το) εὐστὶν or the like having to be supplied. In Phil. i. 28 we have the like sentiment, with ἠγὼ εὐστίν supplied. There is a similar construction in Rom. viii. 3. ἐνδιάλεγομαι cf. ἐνδιάλεγομαι in ref.—a proof: manifested in you being called on and enabled to suffer for Christ, and your adversaries filling up the measure of their opposition to God. The δικαία κρίσις is, that just judgment which will be completed at the Lord's coming, but is even now preparing—this being an earnest and token of it. εἰς τὸ κτ. ἡμᾶς, in order to (belongs to the implied assertion of the foregoing clause)—which judgment is even now bringing about &c. εἰς τὸ is not merely of the result, as Lunae.: nor is it of the purpose of your endurance, αἱ ἀνέχεσθαι εἰς τὸ κτ. τῶν, as Estius characteristically, to bring in the Romanish doctrine of merit—but of the purpose of God's dispensation of δικαία κρίσις, by which you will be ripened and fitted for his kingdom. [Ellie, denies this, and would take εἰς τὸ of the object to which the δικαία κρίσις tended. But surely when we are speaking of the divine proceedings, the tendency involves the purpose, and there is no need for a semi-teleic force] your being counted worthy of the kingdom of God, on behalf of which (for this meaning of ἐπέρ, see Acts v. 41; ix. 16; Rom. i. 5; xv. 8; 2 Cor. xii. 10; xiii. 8, al.) ye also (καὶ, as in ref., points out the connexion—q. d. 'ye accordingly') are suffering. 6. If at least (ref.): it refers back to δικαίας above, and introduces a substantiation of it by an appeal to our ideas of strict justice: it is just with (in the esteem of, ref.) God to require to those who trouble you, tribulation (according to the strict jus tationis), and to you who are troubled, rest (ref.), literally, relaxation: 'the glory of the kingdom of God on its negative side, as liberation from earthly affliction.' Lün. with us (viz. the writers, Paul, Silvanus, and Timotheus, who are troubled like yourselves: not 'with us [all] Christians,' as De W., al.—for all Christians were not θλιβομένοι, which is the condition of this ἐνεστὶ in our sentence: still less,
8. for ποιο φλογος, φλαγι πυρος (alteration to sense, see reff.) BDF latt syr copt with atho writers-in-writer Mae Thdrth-comm(appy) Thl-marg [Ec Tert Aug Pelaq: txt AKLNN rel syr-marg Chr Thdrt-txxt Damasch Thl Amsbrst. διδους DIF: dare G-lat Iren Int. ins των bef θεου ΙΗΛ a b c g. rec aft ισιου ins χριστων, with AFR rel latt Syr Christ Iren-int: om BDKL b d e k l n o 17 syr copt with Chr-ms Damasch Thl Damasc Thl Chr.

9. ολεθρων Α 17, 73 Ephr Chr-ms Tert. om του ΤΟΥ DIF 672 Chr, Thl.
10. ενθαμαθησαν DIF: rec πιστεουσαι (with a f 17, e sil), credentibus G-lat copt goth Iren-int: txt ABDFKLN rel Ephr Chr Thdrt, qui crediderunt vulg syr Iren-int, Amsbrst.

"with us Jews," you being Gentiles [Bengel, al.,] at the revelation (manifestation in His appearing, reff.) of the Lord Jesus from heaven (cf. 1 Thess. iv. 16) with the angels of His power (no heandilady—not as E. V., 'his mighty angels,' which as usual, obscures and stultifies the sense: for the might of the angels is no element here, but His might, of which they are the angels—serving His power and proclaiming His might) in (the) fire of flame (further specification of the ἀποκάλυψις above: does not belong to the following. On the analogy, see Exod. iii. 2; xix. 18; Dan. vii. 9, 10) allotting (distributing as their portion: reff.) vengeance to those who know not God (the Gentiles, see reff.), and to those (the τοις repeated indicates a new class of persons who obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus (the unbelieving Jews, see Rom. x. 3, 16), which persons (οἰκτικος, generic and classifying, refers back to their characteristics just mentioned, thus containing in itself the reason for τίσανων &c. following [against Ellic]. See διτις discussed by Herrmann, Pref. ad Soph. [Ed. Tyr. pp. vii—xv]) shall pay the penalty of everlasting destruction from (local, as in Matt. vii. 23, ἀποκαλύπτει αὐτῷ ἡμῶν καὶ ἔφαγαν τῷ αὐτῷ, —apart from, see reff. [so Pisc., Beza, Schott, Olsh., Lincoln, al.]) It has been interpreted of time,—'from the time of the appearing &c.' [Chr., Ec., Thl., &c.], but ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου will not bear this:—also of the cause, which would make ver. 9 a mere repetition of εν τῷ ἄτοκε. to διδόντως ἐκδικάσατο above [so Grot., Bengel., Pelt, De W., Baung.-Crus., al.] the face of the Lord and the glory of his Power (i. e. from the manifestation of his power in the glorification of his saints [see ref. Isa.,]. De W. makes these words, ἀπὸ δοξῆς κ.τ.λ., an objection to the local sense of ἄτοκε. But it is not so: —the δοξα being the visible localized result of the ισχύς; see next verse) when He shall have come (follows on διανύσειν &c. above. On the aor. subj. with ἁρπαξ, see Winer, edn. 6, § 12. 5) to be glorified (aor.: by the great manifestation at His coming) in (not 'through' [τοῦτοτα, θα, Chrys., so [Ec., Thl., Pelt, al.], nor 'emong': but they will be the element of His glorification: He will be glorified in them, just as the Sun is reflected in a mirror) his saints (not angels, but holy men), and to be wondered at in (see above) all them that believed (aor. participle, looking back from that day on the past).—because our testimony to you (ref., not τὸ ἐφ᾽ ὑμῖν, as ὑπό belongs immediately to μαρτύρων) was believed (parenthesis, serving to include the Thessalonians among the πιστευόντες). —in that day (of which we all know: to be joined with βαμμαθείᾳ, &c. not with ἡμῖν ἐπιστεύθη, &c., as Syr., Ambr., Grot.,}
al., who also take ἔποιει as a future, 'for in that day our testimony with regard to you will be substantiated.' Most unwar- rantable—requiring also ἐπιστάθη instead of «εὐθύς. Calvin says, 'repetit in die illa ... ideo autem repetit, ut fidicium vota colibeat, ne ultra modum festinat.' I should rather say, to give more fixity and definiteness to the foregoing). We may observe, as against Jowett's view of the arguments here being merely "they suffer now; therefore their enemies will suffer hereafter;—their enemies will suffer hereafter; therefore they will be comforted hereafter,"—that the arguments are nothing of the kind, resting entirely on the word δικαιον, bringing in as it does all the relations of the Christian covenant, of them to God, and God to them,—and by con- trast, of God to their enemies and persecutors.

11.] With a view to which (consummation, the ἐνδοξάσθαιναι, &c., above, in your case, as is shewn below: not 'wherefore,' as E. V., Grot., Pelt, &c,) we pray also (as well as wish: had the καὶ imported [as Lün.] that the prayer of the Apostle was added on behalf of the Thessalonians to the fact (?) of the ἐν- δοξάσθαιναι, it would have been καὶ ἡμις προς.) always concerning you, that (see note on 1 Cor. xiv. 13) our God may count you (emphatic) worthy (not—'make you worthy,' as Luth., Grot., Olsh., al., which the word cannot mean). The verb has the secondary emphasis: see below) of your calling (just as we are exhorted to walk ἁγιός τῆς κλησίου ἡς ἐκληθήσεαι, Eph. iv. 1—the calling being taken not merely as the first act of God, but as the enduring state produced by that act [see especially 1 Cor. vii. 20], the normal ter-

mination of which is, glory. So that κλησίς is not 'the good thing to which we are called,' as Lün.: which besides would re- quire τῶν κλησίων ἀξιόντος: now that τῶν κλησίων is sheltered behind the verb, it is taken as a matter of course, 'your calling,' an acknowledged fact, and may fulfil (complete,—bring to its fulness in you) all (possible) right purpose of good- ness (it is quite impossible, with many ancient Commentators, E. V., &c., to refer εὐδοκίαν to God—'His good pleasure.' In that case we must at least have τῆν εὐδοκίαν—and ἄγαθον will not refer with any propriety either to God, of whom the word is never used [occurring Rom. xv. 14: Gal. v. 22; Eph. v. 9 only, and always of μαν], or to the Thessalonians [π. ἄγαθο- σύνην εὐδοκίας]. It [εὐδοκία] must then apply to the Thessalonians, as it does to human agents in Phil. i. 15. And then ἄγαθοσύνη may be either a gen. ob- jecti, 'approval of that which is good,'— or a gen. appositionis, a εὐδοκία consist- ing in ἄγαθοσύνην. The latter I own seems to me [agst Ellic.] far the best: as ἄγαθοσύνη is in all the above citations a subjective quality, and the approval of that which is good would introduce an element here which seems irrelevant) and (all) work of faith (activity of faith; see ref. 1 Thess. note. The genitive is again one of apposition), in power (belongs to πληρωσί, q. d. mightily),—that &c. On ὅνομα, cf. Phil. ii. 9 f. Linemann refers ἐν αὐτῷ to ὅνομα, 'and ye in it:' but surely the expression is one too appro- priated in sacred diction, for it to refer to any but our Lord Himself: cf. 1 Cor. i. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; Eph. i. 4; iv. 21; Col. ii. 10, al.
II. 1 k Ἐφωτὸμεν δὲ ὡμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ἵνα τῆς μαρτυρίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ λόγου καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπιστολῆς ἡ γεγόνη ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, 2 διότι τοῦ μὴ ἔμαχες οὐκ αλευροθήναι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νοὸς. μὴ δὲ ἐρωτᾶσθαι, μήτε διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος μήτε διὰ τοῦ λόγου μήτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δι' ἡμῶν, ἦς ἡ ἡμερὰ τοῦ κυρίου, μὴ τις, μὴ τε ἐνεστηκέν ἡ ἡμερὰ τοῦ κυρίου.

CHAP. II. 1. om 1st ἡμῶν B syr.

2. a.ντ νοῶν D vulg Syr syr-w-ast sah ath Ambrost Jer Pelag. rec for μηδὲ, μητὲ (to suit μητὲ thrice folly: but the sense is diff.), with DKL rec: μητὲ 17: txt ABD\*F\*M Orig.—μητὲ δια λογ. D*: μηδὲ 4 times F, but μητὲ δια λογ. F*

om D*. on last τοῦ F Damasc Thi. rec for (κυρίου) (χριστου, with D\*K rec goth: txt ABD\*FL\*M 67} last syr capt ath arm Orig Hippol Chr Thdrt Damasc Thc Gt Tert Jer Ang Ambrst Pelag, κυρίου ἦσσοι 17.

CH. II. 1—12.] Dogmatical portion of the Epistle. Information (by way of correction) concerning the approach of the day of the Lord: its presentment and accompanying circumstances. This passage has given rise to many separate treatises: the principal of which I have enumerated in the Prolegomena, § v. 1.] But (passing from those things which he prays for them, to those which he prays of them) we entreat (reff.) you, brethren (to win their affectionate attention), in regard of (the Vulg., E. V., and many ancient Commentators, render ὑπὲρ, 'per', 'by,' and understand it as introducing a formula jurandi, as in II. ω. 406, καὶ μν ὑπὲρ πατρὸς ... Ἀιστεο. But this construction is not found in the N. T.; and it is most unnatural that the Apostle should thus conjure them by that, concerning which he was about to teach them. It is best therefore to take ὑπὲρ, as so often, not quite = περὶ, but very nearly so, the meaning 'on behalf of' being slightly hinted—for the subject had been misrepresented, and justice is done to it by the Apostle; and so Chrys. περὶ τῆς παρουσίας τ. χριστοῦ ἐνεστήθαντο διὰ λογίας κ. περὶ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς. ἡμῶν al. see ref.) the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together (i.e. the gathering together of us, announced in 1 Thess. iv. 17) to Him (Lui. condemns to, and would render 'up to' as 1 Thess. iv. 17: but so much does not seem to lie in the proposition), 2. in order that (aim of ἐφωτῶμεν) ye should not be lightly (soon and with small reason) shaken (properly of the waves agitated by a storm) from (see ref.) your mind (νοῦς here in its general sense—your mental apprehension of the subject—not 'your former more correct sentiment,' as Est., Cornu.-lap., Grot., al.) nor yet troubled (reft.), neither (on μηδὲ, which is disjunctive [δὲ], and separates negative from negative, — and μητὲ, which is adjunctive [τε], and connects the separate parts of the same negation, see Winer, Gr. edn. 6, § 55. 6; and cf. Luke ix. 3) by spirit (by means of spiritual gift of prophecy or the like, assumed to substantiate such a view) nor by word (of month): belongs closely to μητὲ δι' ἐπιστ. following, as is shewn by ver. 15, where they again appear together) nor by epistle as by (agency of us) (pretending to be from us. Let no pretended saying, no pretended epistle of mine, shake you in this matter. That there were such, is shewn by this parallel position of the clauses with διὰ πνεύματος, which last agency certainly was among them. Sayings, and an epistle, to this effect, were ascribed to the Apostle. So Chrys.: ἐνταῦθα δοκεῖ μοι αἰστεθεῖαι περιέχει τινάς ἐπιστολήν παλαστὰς δοθέν ἀπὸ τοῦ Παλαῦ, κ. ταύτην ἐπιδεικνύεις λέγεις ὡς ἢρα ἐφιστηκέν η· ἡμιρὰ του κυρίου, ἵνα πολλούς ἐντεῦθεν πλησίουσαι. However improbable this may seem, our expression would seem hardly to bear legitimately any other meaning. Cf. also ch. iii. 17, and note. It is impossible to understand the ἐπιστολή ὡς δ'. ἡμῶν of the first Epistle, wrongly understood, which certainly would have been more plainly expressed, and the Epistle not as here disposed, but explained. Jowett says, 'The most probable hypothesis is, that the Apos-
tis is not referring definitely to any particular speech or epistle, but to the possibility only of some one or other being used among them. But this seems hardly definite enough) to the effect that (‘as if,’ or ‘as that.’) Lümmen is quite wrong in saying that ἐστιν is a matter indicated by ὅτι is groundless,—see 2 Cor. v. 19, and note) the day of the Lord is present (not, ‘is at hand?’ ἐστιν occurs six times besides [ref.1] in the N. T., and always in the sense of being present: in two of those places, Rom. viii. 38, 1 Cor. iii. 22, τὰ ἐννόμωσις are distinguished expressly from τὰ μέλλοντα. Besides which, St. Paul could not have so written, nor could the Spirit have so spoken by him. The teaching of the Apostles was, and of the Holy Spirit in all ages has been, that the day of the Lord is at hand. But those Thessalonians imagined it to be already come, and accordingly were deserting their pursuits in life, and falling into other irresponsibilities, as if the day of grace were closed. So Chrys.,—ὁ διάβολος …. ἐπεδίωκα ὅπως πέσαι ὅπως ἔρευν τὰ μέλλοντα, ἔτρεχαν ἄδειοι δόντα καὶ καταπέλτης τινὰς λυμένας, ἐπετίθειται τοῖς πεισθέντος ἀπάσταξι, ὅτι τὰ μέγαλα ἐκέει καὶ λαμπρά τέλος εἴρησε, τότε μὲν ὅπως ἔλεγον ἐκεῖνοι τὴν ἁνάσαταν ἡδίν γενωμενάν νῦν δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι ἐνσάκτην ὁ κρίσις καὶ ἡ παρουσία τοῦ χριστοῦ, ἢ τὸν χριστὸν ἅγεις ὑποθάλω, καὶ πείπαστε ὅσῳ ὅστε λοιπὸν ἀντίδοσοι οὐδὲ ἡμικαταφέρσι καὶ κόλλωσι καὶ τιμωρία τοῖς κακῶς πεποιηκαίνησι, ἐκεῖνοι το δεδομένου τοπίον τρόπων, πεπείραντο, καὶ τὸ δὴ πάντων χαλασμένων, ἐπετίθειται οἱ μὲν ἄπλοι δημιστά ἄγγελλες ὃς παρὰ τῶν Παύλου πάντα λεγομενα, οἱ δὲ καὶ ἐπιτάλων πράττετε ὅς παρὰ ἐκεῖνον γραφομεν. Hom. in 2 Thess. i. 1, vol. xii. p. 469).

3.] Let no man deceive you in any manner (not only in either of the foregoing, but in any whatever): for (that day shall not come) (so E. V. supplies, rightly. There does not seem to have been any intension on the part of the Apostle to fill up the ellipsis: it supplies itself in the reader’s mind. Knatchbull connects διὸ with ἐξαπαθησθήναι, and supplies ἐνέστηκαν after it: but this is very harsh) unless there have come the apostasy first (of which he had told them when present, see ver. 5.) and probably with a further reference still to our Lord’s prophecy in Matt. xxiv. 10—12. There is no need, with Chrys., Thdrt., Thl., Aug., to suppose ἀποστασία to mean Antichrist himself (ιἰς ἐστιν ἡ ἀποστασία; αὐτὸν καλεῖ τὸν ἀντίχριστον ἀποστασίαν, Chr.), nor to regard him as its only cause: rather is he the chief fruit and topstone of the apostasy), and there have been revealed (ref. ch. i. As Christ in his time, so Antichrist in his time, is ‘revealed’—brought out into light: he too is a μυστήριον, to be unfolded and displayed: see vv. 8, 9) the man of sin (in whom sin is as it were personified, as righteousness in Christ. The gen. is called by Ellicott that of the pre-dominating quality), the son of perdition (see ref. John, where our Lord uses the expression of Judas. It seems merely to refer to Antichrist himself, whose essence and inheritance is ἀπάλεια,—not to his influence over others, as Thdrt.[Both: ὃς κ. αὐτῶν ἀπολλυμένον, κ. ἐπιτόσι πρόξενοι τούτοις γενόμενον], Ec., Pelt, al.), be that withstands (the construction is not to be carried on by ζυγούμα, as it εἰς πάντα κ.τ.λ. belonged to ἀντικείμενος: as well as to ὑπεραρπόμενον [the omission of the second article is no proof of this, as Pelt supposes, but both predicates belong to one and the same subject], but ἀντικείμενος is absolute, ‘he that withstands CHRIST,’ the ἀντίχριστος, 1 John ii. 18), and exalts himself above (in a hostile sense, ref.1) every one that is called God (cf. θεόνοις θεοὶ, 1 Cor. viii. 5. ‘The expression includes the true God, as well as the false ones of the heathen—but λεγόμενον is a natural addition from Christian canton, as πάντα θεόν would have U
been a senseless and indeed blasphemous expression for a Christian." Lüdem.) or an object of adoration (λατειν., and is a generalization of θεόν. Cf. the close parallel in Dan. xi. 36, 37 [Theod. and similarly LXX]: κ.δ. βασιλεὺς ὑφυβούσαι κ. μεγαλύνθησαι ἐπὶ πάντα θεόν, κ.τ.λ.), so that he sits (not αὐτόν . . . , καθίσαι, as Grot., Pelt, al., but καθίσαι, insinuative, as in refil) in (constr. praegnans—') enters into and sits in.' The nor. unusually denotes that one definite act and not a series of acts is spoken of: but here, from the peculiar nature of the verb, that one act is the setting himself down, and the session remains after it: cf. Matt. v. 1; xix. 28, &c.) the temple of God (this, say De W. and Lüdemann after Irenæus, Helv. v. 30. 4, p. 330 [cited in Prolegg. § v. 3 note].)—cannot be any other than the temple at Jerusalem: on account of the definiteness of the expression, οὐ δὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, and on account of καθίσαι. But there is now no force in this, δος τοῦ θεοῦ is used metaphorically by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xii. 13: and why not here? see also 1 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 21. From these passages it is plain that such figurative sense was familiar to the Apostle. And if so, καθίσαι makes no difficulty. Its figurative sense, as holding a place of power, sitting as judge or ruler, is more frequent still: see in St. Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 4: and Matt. xxiii. 2: Rev. xx. 4: to which indeed we might add the many places where our Lord is said καθίσαι on the right hand of God, e.g. Heb. i. 3; viii. 1; x. 12; xii. 2; Rev. iii. 21. Respecting the interpretation, see Prolegomena, § v.) shewing himself (περιέβηκεν ἀποκάλυψις, Chrys. Hardly that, but the sense of the present, as in δεινασαι—it is his habit and office to exhibit himself as God) that he is God (not 'a god,' nor is it equivalent to θεόν—but designates the divine dignity which he predicates of himself. The construction is an attraction, for θεόν, δι' αὐτόν . . . ; and the emphasis is on θεόν, 'that he be God'). 5.] conveys a reproach—they would not have been so lightly moved, if they had remembered this. 6.] And now (not temporal, but as νῦν δὲ in 1 Cor. xiii. 13, 'rebus sic stantibus?'—'now' in our argument. We must not for a moment think of the ungrammatical rendering of Whitby, Masker, Heydenr., Schrader, Olsber., B.-Crus., and Wieseler, 'that which at present hinderst' which must be τῶν κατεχόν: and for which ver. 7, Rom. xii. 3, 1 Cor. vii. 17, are no precedent whatever, not presenting any case of inversion of an adverb from its emphatic place between an article and a participle. νῦν is a mere adverb of passage, and the stress is on τῶν κατεχόν: we know that which hinderst (viz. 'his')—the man of sin: not, the Apostle from speaking freely, as Heimsius,—nor the coming of Christ) in order that (the aim of κατέχον [in God's purposes]—q. d. 'that which keeps him back, that he may not be revealed before his,' &c.) he may be revealed (see on ver. 3) in his own time (the time appointed him by God): refil. 7.] For (explanation of last verse) the mystery (as opposed to the ἀποκάλυψις of the man of sin) already (as opposed to εν τῷ ἑαυτῷ καιρῷ above) is working (not 'is being wrought,' passive, as Est., Grot., all. I retain the inversion of the words, to mark better the primary and secondary emphasis: see below) of lawlessness (i.e. ungodliness—refusal to
recognize God's law—see reff. The
genitive is one of apposition: the 
*ἀνομία* is that wherein the 
*μοισχόριον* consists—not 
a genitive of the working cause, as Thdt. 
*καθισκομένην ἐχόστα τῆς ἀνομίας 
tὴν πάγνα*],—nor must we understand by 
the words, Antichrist himself, as Oshl., 
comparing *τὸ εὐσεβείας μοισχόριον, 
1 Tim. iii. 16,*—nor the *unexamined depths 
of ungodliness,* as Krebs, al., from Joseph. 
B. J. in reff. As to the order of the 
words, cf. Arrian, exp. Alex. i. 17. 6, κ. 
ἐξήθεια συγγνώμην ὑπὲρ θῶν τῶν 
*Θεῖων ἕποντας, Λέον.* only until 
he that now hinder (ὁ κατέχων is placed 
before ἔως for emphasis, as in ref. Gal., 
μονον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μη ἤγενεμοι) be removed 
(the phrase is used of any person 
or thing which is taken out of the 
way, whether by death or other removal. 
So in reff: and Phit. Timol. p. 238. 3 
[Wetst.] : ἐγὼ γὰρ καθ' ἐαυτόν ἐκ μέσου 
γενόμενος, —Ter. Phorm. v. 9. 40, ἐν 
*εἰρήνης ὑπὲρ, εἰρήνης ὑπέρ.* See also 
Herod. viil. 22: and for the opposite, ἐν 
*μέσω εἰς, Xen. Cyr. v. 2. 26.* Various 
erroneous arrangements and renderings of 
this sentence have been current: of which 
the principal have arisen from fancying 
that the participle *κατέχων* requires some 
verb to be supplied after it. So Vulg. 
*tantum ut qui tecum nune, tecent, donec 
de medio fiat* : so *Syr., Erasm., Est., all,* 
and E. V. *only he who now letteth, will 
let,* so Beza, Whitby, al., —κατέχει [so 
Bengel, Pelt, al.]:—εἰσίν [so Knatchb., 
Barton, al.]:— 8. and then (when 
he that hinders shall have been removed; 
the emphasis is on *τῶτε* shall be revealed 
the lawless one (the same as the *αὐτὸν* of 
ver. 6: viz. the *ἀνδρωτος τῆς ἀμαρτίας,* 
whom (by this relative clause is introduced 
his ultimate fate at the coming of the Lord. 
To this the Apostle is carried on by the 
fervency of his spirit, and has to return 
again below to describe the working of 
Antichrist previously) *the Lord Jesus will 
destroy by the breath of His mouth* 
(‘from Isa. xi. 4—πατάξει γῆν τῷ ὕπό 
tοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, κ. ἐν πνεύμα 
τίναν ἀνέλει ἀσθενείαν. It is better to 
keep the expression in its simple majesty, 
than to interpret it, as Thdt,—φθέγξε 
ται μονον, κ. πανωλεθή παραθέων τον 
ἀληθηρόν. —Thdr-mops,— μονον ἐπιβο 
ς. Chrys. on this is fine: καθάπερ γὰρ 
πίστει ἁπλός τὰ μικρα ἡ μορφή καὶ 
πρὸ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ ἡ ὁμοσώμων ὑπὸ 
νομίκων ποιεῖ κ. ἀναλίπους ὑπὸ 
κ. ἡ χριστί τω ἐπιστάμενοι μονὸν 
(.but see above) κ. τῇ παρουσίᾳ τῆς 
ἀντίχριστου ἀναλώσει. ἀρκεῖ παρεῖναι αὐτῶν, καὶ 
ταῖτε πάντα ἀπόλλων) and annihilitate (not, as 
Oshl., *deprive of his influence,* nor can 
Rev. xix. 19 be brought to bear here) 
by the appearance of His coming (not 
*the brightness of his coming,* as very 
many Commentators, and E. V.; but as 
Beng.: ‘apparitio adventus ipso adventu 
praeior est, vel certe prima ipsius adventus 
eminenti, uti εὐφανείας τῆς ἡμέρας:’ the 
mere outburst of His presence shall bring 
the adversary to nought. Cf. the sublime 
expression of Milton,— ‘far off His coming 
shone?’):— 9, 10.] whose (refers back to 
the ὅν above—going back in time, to 
describe the character of his agency) 
coming is (the present is not used for 
the future, nor is the Apostle setting himself 
at the time prophesied of,—but it describes 
the essential attribute, as so often) according 
to (such as might be expected from,—
correspondent to) the working of Satan
(Satan being the agent who works in the
wonders) (manifested in, consisting in)
all (kinds of) power and signs and
wonders of falsehood (power and signs
both belong to all three substantives: the
varicities of his manifested power, and signs
and wonders, all have falsehood for their
base, and essence, and aim. Cf. ref. John),
and in all (manner of) deceit (not, as
E. V. ‘deceivableness,’ for it is the agency
of the man of sin—active deceit, of which
the word is used) of unrighteousness
(by belonging, consisting in, leading to,
advices) for the (dativus incommodi)
those who are persisting (on their way to
perdition), (why) not by God’s absolute
decree, but) because (in requisit for this,
that) they did not (when it was offered to
them) receive the love of the truth (the
opposite of the falsehood which characterizes
all the working of the man of sin: see as
before, John viii. 44) in order to their
being saved. 11. And on this account
(because they did not receive, &c.) God is
sending to them (not, as E. V., following rec.,
‘shall send’: the word is present, because
the mystery of iniquity is already working.
πεμα must not for a moment be understood
of permissiveness only on God’s part

—He is the judicial sender and doer—it
is He who hardens the heart which has
closed the evil way. All such distinctions
are the merest folly: whatever God per-
mits, He ordains) the working of error
(is causing these seducing influences to work
among them. The E. V. has weakened,
indeed almost stylitized the sentence, by
rendering ενεργεία παναίσχυν, (a strong
delusion,’ i.e. the passive state resulting,
instead of the active cause), in order that
they should believe the falsehood (which
the mystery of sin is working among them.
It is better here to take ενεργεία definite, re-
fering to what has gone before, than ab-
stract)—that (the higher or ultimate pur-
pose of God) all might be judged (i.e.
here ‘condemned,’ by the context) who did
not (looking back over their time of proba-
tion) believe the truth, but found plea-
sure in iniquity. I have above given
the rendering of this important passage.
For the history and criticism of its inter-
pretation, see the Prolegomena, § v.

10. rec ins ταυ σε b d, with DK13 ε ν 3 nd Hippol Chr Thdtl: om ABF17 Orig.
Cy-rjer (prob το τα ἐπὶ ταῦτα gave occasion for the insu), rec ins ev bef τοὐς
απολλυμένους, with D1K3 rel syr Orig.: ob ABFD17 17t cott cppt ath Orig.
Cy-rjer Damas, Iren-int Tert Aug Ambtst. απολλυμένος ἐν χριστῶν D1
τιθέαντος G. (τιθεν, to σωφριν, exc 1st ε and σωφριν, written by a recent hand in A.)

11. om καὶ D1 νυγνον Συρ κοπτ ath Chr Charm (Ecp Pelag. rec πεματεί
se notes), with D1K3 rel D-lat (and G-lat) νυγνον-εν (and F-lat) syr cppt Hippol (Orig.;?)
Thdor-mops Cy-rjer Iren-int Cypr: txt ABFD17 νυγνον (with fuld) Orig. Bas Cy-rjer
Damas, Iren-int-insu. om autors F.

12. [απαντες, so AΓΝ 17 Orig., Cy-rjer] ἀλλὰ Ν. om ev (prob to balance
the two members of the sentence) BD1FN3 d h m 17 lateb sal Orig. Hippol Cy-rjer
Cy-rjer Iren-int-alig Tert: ins AD1K3 rel syr cppt Orig., Chr Thdtl, Damas, Cy-pr Jer.

13. τοιν κυριον, θεον D1 νυγνον lat-fl; ins τοιν κυριον ΑΡ: ἀπο τοι κω F.
and Timotheus, with whose names he has been recently speaking. 

See Luke xvi. 11, 12.

for μασ, μασ AB1 Vig.

for ἡμων, ἡμων N1: text K-corr3.
as ensuring the efficacy of the wish—q. d. 'and then you are safe.' Our Lord Jesus Christ is placed first, not merely because he is the mediator between men and God (Lūn.), but because the sentence is a climax. ὁ ἀγάπησα ἡμῖν. κ. τ. ἐκλ. probably refers to ὁ Θεὸς κ. ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν: and yet when we consider how impossible it would have been for the Apostle to have written oi ἀγάπησαντες, and that the singular verb following undoubtedly refers to both, I would not too hastily pronounce this. See note on 1 Thess. iii. 11.

ἀγάπησα—who loved us—refers to a single fact—the love of the Father in sending his Son—or the love of the Father and Son in our Accomplished Redemption. κ. δοῦς—and gave—that by act of love. παράκλησις, aion.] consolation, under all trials, and that eternal,—not transitory, as this world's consolations: sufficient in life, and in death, and for ever: cf. Rom. viii. 38 f. This for all time present: and then ἐκπ. ἀγ. for the future. ἐν χάριτι belongs, not to ἐκπ. ἀγ., but to δοῦς, and is the medium through, or element in which, the gift is made. Better thus than to refer it to both the participles ἀγάπησα and applied to God (or the Lord Jesus) usually stands absolute, cf. Rom. viii. 37; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 2. παρακαλέσαν] as in 1 Thess. iii. 11, 3 pers. sing. opt. aor. comfort, with reference to your disquiet respecting the παρευρίσκεται. After στηρ., understand ὑμᾶς, which has been supplied—see var. read.,—better than τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἤμων, which are not the agents in ἔργον and λόγος. This latter is not 'doctrina,' as Chrys., Calv. ('tum in pace et sancta vita cursu, quam in sana doctrina'),—for ἔργον (work) and λόγος (word), seeing that παράτητι applies to both, must be correlative, and both apply to matters in which the man is an agent. Still less must we understand εἰς as = διά (Chrys., Thl. ii. Beng., al.) : the sphere, and not the instruments, of the consolation and confirmation, is spoken of.

CH. III. 1—5. Exhortation to pray for him and his colleagues (1, 2). His confidence that the Lord will keep them (3)—and that they will obey his commands (4). Prayer for them (5).

1.] On τὸ λ. (ὁ λόγον), see 1 Thess. iv. 1. ἰνα] On the use of telic conjunctions with verbs like προσευχάμαι, see note on 1 Cor. xiv. 13. ὁ λ. τ. κ. [the Lord's word]—i. e. the Gospel: see ref. τέχνη] Contrast to 'being bound': see 2 Tim. ii. 9—may spread rapidly. διό] See ref. The word of the Lord is then glorified, when it becomes the power of God to salvation to the believer—see Rom. i. 16.

καθὼς καὶ πρὸς ωμᾶς for they had thus received it: 1 Thess. i. 6. πρὸς ωμᾶς among you (ref.). 2.] And in order for that to be the case,—that we may be free to preach it. On ἀπόστολος, Lūnem, say, 'it is properly used of that which is not in its right place. When of persons, it designates one who
III. 1–5. ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ Β.

καὶ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων. οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις,
ποιήσεις ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐνεχθῆ ἐπὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ. 4 κεκοιμασθήμεν ἐν κυρίω ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, ὥστε ἂν παραγγέλλωμεν καὶ ποιήσετε ἐν κυρίω.

3. (Matt. xxv, 41.) See Gal. v. 10. ili. ii. only. 
4. Prov. xxii. 5. v. 6. ili. 10 al. fr.

3. om. estin F, but insd bef. ἡ πίστις ver 2 in F vulg. D-lat. for κυρίως, θεὸς (corrum, see 1 Cor. 9, 10, 13. 2 Cor. i. 13) ἈΔΙΕ'F latt (not am demid) arm-marg. Ambrst: τοῦ BD'KLN rel syr. Cyt Jer.—οὐ κυρίως bef. estin Ν. aft os ins καί Λ. 37 syr-w-ast Vocat: prep m. στηρίζει B: τηρήσει. F.

4. rec aft παραγγέλλομεν ins μιαν (corrum, see ver 6), with ΑΔΙΕ'ΚLN rel demid: om BD'KLN 17, 677 vulg (with am fuld) Chr.—comm Ambrst Polag Bode. aft παραγγ. ins καί ετοιμαστε BF. om καί οἵ to pòsia AD'KLN. for ποιήσετε, ποιήσατε D1: ποιήστε 17: om καί ποιήσετε. F.

5. τὰς καρδίας bef μιαν D vss. rec om 2nd τὴν (with none of our mss): ins ΑΒΔΙΕ'ΚLN rel.

does or says that which is inappropriate under the circumstances. Thus it answers to ineptus in Latin (Cic. de Orat. ii. 4). From ‘aptitude,’ it passes to its wider ethical meaning, and is used of men who act contrary to divine or human laws. Thus it gets the general signification of bad or ungodly. See examples in Kyпke, Obs. ii. p. 115,—in Lösner and Wetst.” Who are these men? It is obvious that the key to the answer will be found in Acts xviii. They were the Jews at Corinth, who were at that time the especial adversaries of the Apostle and his preaching. And this is confirmed by the clause which he has added to account for their ἀποσία καὶ πονηρία: οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις—for to all men the (Christian) faith does not belong—all men do not receive it; have no receptivity for it—obviously pointing at Jews by this description. It is more natural to understand the article here as definite, the faith, than as abstract: for faith, as such, would not bear much meaning here.

3.] Calvin says, “Ceterum de aliis magis quam de se anxium fuisset Paulum, ostendunt hanc ipsa verba. In eum maligni homines improbitatis suae aculeus dirigebat, in eum totus inuenetus irrucbat: curam interea suam ad Thessalonicenses convertit, nequid hec illis tentatio noccat.” πιστὸς seems to be chosen in allusion to πιστίς which has just preceded; but the allusion cannot be more than that of sound, as the things spoken of are wholly different. ὁ κύριος is our Lord: see ch. ii. 16, and ver. 5. ἢ εἰς, in contrast with the men just mentioned. στηρίζει in refer-

cence to his wish, ch. ii. 17. τοῦ πο-

ηροῦ may mean ‘the evil one,’ as in Matt. xiii. 19: Eph. vi. 16, al.: and so Ellic. But here the assurance seems, as before said, to correspond to the wish ch. ii. 17: and thus στηρίζει ἐν παντὶ ἑργῷ κ. λόγῳ ἀγαθῷ = στηρίζει κ. φυλάζῃ ἄπο τοῦ πονηροῦ: in which case τ. πον. is neuter. We may observe that the words are nearly a citation from the Lord’s prayer. 4] forms a transition to the exhortations which are to follow, vv. 6 ff.

ἐκ κυρίωσ (refl.), with reference to you—the direction of his confidence. καὶ ποιήσει κ. ποιήσατε is all the apodosis—not ὅτι ἃ παραγγ. κ. ποιήσει, καὶ ποιήσατε, as Erasm.

5.] There does not appear to be any distrust of the Thessalonians implied by this repeated wish for them, as De W. supposes. Rather is it an enlargement, taken up by the δὲ (not only so, but) of the ἃ παραγγ. ελλημεν κ. ποιήσετε κ. ποιήσατε. ὁ κύριος is our Lord, as before. Ἠ ἀγάπη τ. θεοῦ here, from the fact of his wishing that their hearts may be directed into it, must be subjective, the love of man to God. The objective meaning, God’s love, is out of the question. The other subjective meanings, the love which God works (Pelt), . . . which God commands (Le Clerc), are far-fetched. Ἠ ὑπομονὴ τ. χριστοῦ has very generally been understood as in E. V., ‘the patient waiting for
rec aft κυρίαν ins ημῶν, with AD'TKΛX rel: om BDI Cyprv(elsw om kuv.)

6. rec parelae (corr of plur. The less usual form in txt is the preferable one), with (none of our ms) Syr: parelabeste BF syr goth Anton Thdrth, Ambrost Sing-cler: parelabon D*KLX rel gr-f (most vss and lat-f have the plur, but which form, is of course uncertain) : txt ADK! 17 Bas, ελαβοσαν D!.

8. ουτε F. αλλά Ν. ελαβοσ κ. ημερας BFΝ 17 Chr-mus Damaso; : txt ADKL rel.

Christ! So Ἡε, Ambr., Erasm., Corn.-alap., Beza, all. But ὑπομονή will not bear this meaning. It occurs thirty-four times in the Ν. Τ., and always in the sense of endurance,—patience. Nor again can the expression mean 'endurance for Christ's sake,' which the simple genitive will not convey: but it must be, as Chrys. (1) ὑπασπάζομεν, ἡς ξείνοις ὑπέμενεν, the patience of Christ (gen. possess),—which Christ shewed. 6—15.] Dehortation from disorderly, idle habits of life. He had given a hint in this direction before, in the first Epistle (v. 14, 15): he now speaks more plainly, doubtless because their restlessness and excitement concerning the παροιμία had been accompanied by an increase of such habits. His dissuading them from associating with such persons, seems to shew that the core of the Church (as Lmn) was as yet sound in this respect. 6.] παραγγέλλων δὲ takes up the assurance of ver. 4, and does not belong to the following. στελεχαῖον: lit. 'to take in, or shorten sail;' ἵσταται μὲν στελεχάων, θίσατι δὲ εἰς ἑλέσθαι, II. a. 433: hence, to draw in or shorten, generally: πόσερα σοι παραμερία | φράσει τά κείσθαι, ἢ λόγῳ στελεχάωθα, Eur. Bicech. 625:—to conceal: ἐβιβαζότοι μὲν στελεχάωθαι, οὐ μὲν ἤδυσατο γε κρύπτειν τὸ γεγονός, Polyb. Frag. hist. 39 (from Suidas, voc. στελεχάωθαι),—οὐ δυνάμενω τὴν ἢ τῆς συν-θελείας καταφέρσαι στελεχάωθαι (colhhere consetam reverentiam), ib. viii. 22. 4. So here, 'colhhere vos'—to keep your-selves from: see ref. : obviously without allusion as yet to any formal excommunication, but implying merely avoidance in intercourse and fellowship. The accusative is repeated before the infinitive, probably because the clause ἐν ὑπομ., &c., intervenes. The παράδοσις refers to the oral instruction which the Apostle had given them when he was present, and subsequently confirmed by writing (1 Thess. iv. 11, 12). παρελαβόσαν plural, as belonging to the πάντες implied in παντός; so in ἔβαν οἰκεῖοι ἐκατός. On the form -σαν, which is said to have been originally Macedonian, and thence is found in the Alexandrian (ἐκχάσαον, Lycophr. 21), Lobbeck remarks (Phryn. p. 349), "ex modorum et temporum metalmasis, nos conjunctim tractare solent dialectorum scriptores, nullus diutius vixit quo tertia aorist secundae personae plurales ad similitudinem verborum in μι τραδεμτυρ, —εὐδοςαν Νικεφ., εὐφερόσαν Anna Commela, μεταθένσαν Νιετ. (and παρῆλαβοσαν)." We have ἔθαναν ἑθν., Ps. lxxviii. 1; see other examples from LXX in Winer, edn. 6, § 13. 2. f. 7. πῶς δὲ Μι. ημ. is a concise way of expressing 'how ye ought to walk in imitation of us.' ἀτάκτοι also occurs in Lysias κατὰ 'Ἀλκιβ. a. p. 111. 18, in this sense, of 'leading a disorderly life.' 8.] ἄρτον ἐφαγούμεν, a Hebraistic expression for 'got our sustenance:' παρά τίνος, 'at any one's expense,' from any one as a gift: there seems to be an allusion in the construction to the original sense of δωρεάν. ἐφαγοῦμεν belongs to ἄρτον ἐφ. as a contrast to δωρεάν: but by working, &c.
The sentence may also be taken as De W. and Ellic., regarding ἐν κόπῳ κ. μόχ., as the contrast to δωρεάν, and ἔργα, νῦν. κ. ἡμ., as a parallel clause to ἐν κόπῳ κ. μόχ. 9. See 1 Cor. ix. 4 ff., where he treats of his abstinence from this business of his apostolic power. οὐχ ὦτι, my meaning is not, that . . . . . See reff. and Hartung, Part. ii. 153. εἰαντῶς is used in the plural for ἡμᾶς αὐτοῖς and ὑμᾶς αὐτῶς for shortness, but never in the singular for ἐμαυτῶν or σεαυτῶν, where no such reason exists: see Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 272. 10. ἐνεργεία.—and we carried this further: we not only set you an example, but inculcated the duty of diligence by special precept. The γάρ is co-ordinate with that in ver. 7. The καί does not bring out ὅτε ἦμεν ὑμᾶς as a new feature, as Thdrt., for of this period the last three verses have treated— but it brings out τούτῳ, on which the stress lies, as an additional element in the reminiscence. This seems to me clearly to be the force here, and not the merely conjunctive, as Ellic. maintains. τούτῳ, viz. what follows. ὧν τις κ.τ.λ.] Schöttgen and Wetst. quote this saying from several places in the rabbinical books. 11. Ground for reminding them of this saying. περιεργαζόμενοι] being busybodies; or, being active about trifles: ‘busy only with what is not their own business’ (Jowett: who refers to Quintilian’s ‘non agere sed satagero’): see reff. So in the charge against Socrates, Plat. Apol. § 3, Σωκράτης ἀδικεῖ κ. περιεργάζεται ἑτής τά τε ὑπὲρ γῆς κ. τά επορεύσια, κ. τῶν ἁπάντων λόγων κρίσεως ποίων, κ. ἄλογα τούτα ταύτα διδακτάν. 12.] παρακαλοῦμεν, scil. αὐτοῖς, ἐν κύρ. see on ver. 6. μετὰ ἡμῶν may be taken either subjectively, with a quiet mind:—or objectively, with quietness, i. e. in outward peace. The former is most probable, as addressed to the offenders themselves. ἐναντῶν, emphatic—that which they themselves have earned. 13.] ἰερός, sc. who are free from this fault. On ἵεραν, see on notes on 2 Cor. iv. 1 and Gal. vi. 9. καλοποιοῦντες, from the context, cannot mean ‘doing good’ (to others), but doing well, living diligently and uprightly: see also Gal. vi. 9, where the same general sentiment occurs. Chrys.’s meaning is surely far-fetched: στέκεσθαι μέν, φρον. ἀπ’ αὐτῶν κ. ἐπιτιμήσει αὐτοῖς, μή μὴ περιδιήκη λιμὴ διαβαφρεντας. 14.] Many Commentators (Luth., Calv., Grot., etc.)
Calov., Le Clerc, Beng., Pelt, Winer, al.) have joined διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς with what follows, and explained it (usually, see below),—*note that man by an Epistle (to me).* But τῆς is decidedly against this rendering,—unless we suppose that it signifies *your* answer to this. [Bengel and Pelt, taking τῆς εἰς for this Epistle, would render, *notate nota censoria, hane Epist., ejus admonendi causa, adhibentis eique inculcantes* (Beng.),—*Emm hac epistola freti severius tractate* (Pelt): but both these require σημείωσθαι to be diverted from its simple meaning.] The great objection to the above connexion is that St. Paul has already pointed out the manner of treating such an one, ver. 6, and is not likely to enjoin a further reference to himself on the subject. It is far better therefore, with Chrys., (there seems no reason for qualifying this by apparently, as Ellic.), Est., Corn-a-Lap., Beza, Hamm., Whitby, Schott, Olsch., De W., Baum.-Crus., Lün., Ellic, all, to join διὰ τῆς εἰς with the preceding τῷ λόγῳ. ἤμ., and render it our *word by this Epistle*, as ἡ ἐπιστολὴ is undoubtedly used in reff, and the word is that in ver. 12. *σημείωσθε* mark, see ref. Polyb.: the ordinary meaning of put a σημεῖον on him, by noticing him for the sake of avoidance. On what is called the dynamic middle, see Krüger, Sprachlehre, § 52. 8. 4.

15.] *cai* is more delicate than ἀλλὰ or δὲ would be: q. d. *'and I know that it will follow as a consequence of your being Christians, that ye will, &c.' ὡς in the first clause seems superfluous: it is perhaps inserted to correspond with the other clause, or still further to soften the ἐχθρὸν γιγνεῖται. So ἄστερ, Job xix. 11; xxxiii. 10. 16. *Concluding wish.*

On ἀυτὸς δὲ, see on ch. ii. 16. ὁ κύριος τῆς εἰρήνης As the Apostle constantly uses ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρ. for the God of Peace (see Rom. xv. 33; xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 11, al.), we here must understand our Lord Jesus Christ. ἡ εἰρήνη must not be understood only of peace with one another: for there has been no special mention of mutual disagreement in this Epistle: but of *peace in general*, outward and inward, here and hereafter, as in Rom. xiv. 17. See Fritz. on Romans, vol. i. p. 22.

The stress is on ἑαυτῷ—*May the Lord of Peace give you (that) Peace always in every way* (whether it be outward or inward, for time or for eternity). *μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν,* therefore with the ἅπαστος περιπατοῦντες also (Lün.): not as Jowett, plenastic. The man who was to be admonished as an ἄδελφος, would hardly be excluded from the Apostle’s parting blessing. 17. 18.] Conclusion.

17.] *Autographic salutation.* The Epistle, as it follows from this, was not written with the Apostle’s own hand, but dictated. So with other Epistles; see Rom. xvi. 22: 1 Cor. xvi. 21: Col. iv. 18. 5] *which circumstance: not attraction for ὑμῖν.* The whole of vv. 17, 18, not merely the benediction, are included. By the words ὑμῶν γράψω, we must not conceive that any thing was added, such as his signature,—or as Ec., oν ὑμῖν ἅπαστος περιπατεῖτε also (Lün.): not as Jowett, plenastic. They are said of that which he is writing at the time. His reason for this caution evidently was, the ἐπιστολὴ ὑμῖν, spoken of ch. ii. 2. And the words ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ must not, with Lün., be limited to any future Epistles which he might send to the Thessalonians, but understood of a caution which he intended to practise in future with all his Epistles: or at least with such as required, from circumstances, this identification. Thus we have (1 Thess. being manifestly an exception, as written before the rule was established) Gal. written with his own hand (see note on Gal.
ο σημείων ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ. οὕτως γράφω. 18 ἡ ἐπίστολα ἡ ἕκαστη
tοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ μετά πάντων ὑμῶν.

ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ Β.

18. om μηνον F: om τ. κυρ. ημ. Syr. rec at end ins αμην, with ADFKL83 rel: om BN1 17. 672 fulld(with harl tol) Ambrst.

SUBSCRIPTION. rec adds ἄπο αὐθηνων, with AB2KL rel: ἀπο ρωμης f g h: ἀπο ρω. η ἀπο αθ. b: no subser in 1 o: προς θεσσ. β’ επιθεσθη αρχεται προς τειμωθεν α’ D: ετελεσθη προς θ. β’ αρχεται προς τιμ. α’ F: txt B’(N) 17 goth ath.—(om β’ N, but adds στιχων ρπ.) [After this in ABKN 5. 9. 16. 137. 189. 196 the Ep to Heb follows: so also, apparently, in C, see Tischdf. Cod. Eph. proleg. p. 15.]

vi. 11); 1 Cor. authenticated (xvi. 21); 2 Cor. sent by Titus and therefore perhaps not needing it (but it may have existed in xiii. 12, 13 without being specified); Rom. not requiring it as not insisting on his personal authority (but here again the concluding doxology may have been autographic); Col. authenticated (iv. 18); Eph. apparently without it (but possibly vi. 24 may have been autographic): Phil. from its character and its bearer Epaphroditus not requiring it (but here again iv. 23 may be autographic): and the Epistles to individuals would not require such authentication, not to mention that they are probably all autographic—that to Philemon certainly is, see ver. 19 there. (So for the most part De Wette.)
ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΝ Α.

I. 1 Παύλους ἀπόστολος χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, κατ' ἑπταγύν, θεοῦ, σωτήρος ἡμῶν, καὶ χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῆς ελπίδος ἡμῶν, 2 Τιμοθέου γυνησίω, τέκνω ἐν πίστει ADPK

Titel. cf. paulou tou apost. η πρ. τιμ. επιστολη πρωτη: Steph η πρ. τιμ. επ. πρω: πρ. τιμ. πρωτης επιστολης σεις παυλου L: txt ΑΔΚ h m n o 17, and (prefg αρχηται) DF.

Chap. I. 1, rec ἰση. bef χριστου, with AKL rel: txt DFN 17 syr copt goth Damase Ambstr. for επισταγην, επαγγελιαν Ν. ins του bef σωτηρος D1 43.—του σωτ. ημ. θε 70 in 80. 116, 213. rec και κυριου εση. χρ., with D2KLN rel Thdrt Damase: txt AD1F 17 latt syrr sah Chr-comm Ambstr Ambr Cass. (Cursives vary in the similar phrase in ver 2.)

Chap. I. 1, 2.] Address and Greeting. 1. κατ' ἑπτατ. See ref; especially Tit.: a usual expression of St. Paul, and remarkably enough occurring in the dekoy at the end of the Epistle to the Romans, which there is every reason to think was written long after the Epistle itself. It is a more direct predication of divine command than διὰ βεβήλατος θεοῦ in the earlier Epistles. θεοῦ σωτήρος ἡμ.] Apparently an expression belonging to the later apostolic period,—one characteristic of which seems to have been the gradual dropping of the article from certain well-known theological terms, and treating them almost as proper names (see, however, Ellicity's note). Thus in Luke i. 47 it is ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῆς σωτηρίας μου: and indeed in almost every place in the pastoral Epistles except this, σωτηρ has the article. In ref. Jude, the expression is the same as here. καὶ χρ. Ἰησου.] See a similar repetition after δοῦλος χρ. Ἰησου in Rom. i. 4 & 6. The Apostle loves them in his more solemn and formal passages—and the whole style of these Epistles partakes more of this character, as was natural in the decline of life. τῆς ελπίδος ἡμῶν] It is not easy to point out the exact reference of this word here, any further than we may say that it gives utterance to the fulness of an old man's heart in the near prospect of that on which it naturally was ever dwelling. It is the ripening and familiarization of χριστος ἐν ἡμῖν ἡ ελπὶς τῆς δόξης of ref. Col. See also Tit. i. 2. I am persuaded that in many such expressions in these Epistles, we are to seek rather a psychological than a pragmatical explanation. Thedoret notices the similar occurrence of words in Ps. lxiv. (lxv.) 6, ἐπάκουσαν ἡμῶν ὁ θεός ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, ἡ ελπὶς πάντων τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς—which is interesting, as it might have suggested the expression here, familiar as the Apostle was with O. T. dictation. Ellie, refers, for the same expression, to Ignat. Trall. § 2, p. 676. γυνησίω τ.] Cf. Acts xvi. 1: 1 Cor. iv. 14—17; and Prolegg. to this Epistle, § i. 1 ff. γυνησίω, true, genuine—cf. Plat. Politic. p. 293, οὕ γυνησίας οδὴ ὄντως ὀβασ
2. rec. aft patros ins ημων, with D3KLN3 rel. syr. sah: om AD3FYN1 17 latt copt goth
Orig-int Amburc-ed Pelag.

. . . . . άλλα μεμιμαμένας ταύτην. en πίστει? When Conybe, says, "in faith, not 'in the faith,' which would require τῇ?" (so Ellic., without the protest),—he forgets (1) the constant usage by which the article is omitted after prepositions in cases where it is beyond doubt in the mind of the writer and must be expressed in translation: (2) the almost uniform anarthrous-ness of these Epistles. He himself translates the parallel expression in Tit. i. 4, 'mine own son according to our common faith,' which is in fact supplying the article. Render therefore in the faith: joining it with γνωσιν τέκνοι: and compare reff. έλεος and ειρήνη are found joined in Gal. vi. 16, in which Epistle are so many similarities to these (see Prolegg. to these Epistles, § i. 32, note). The expression θεός πατήρ, absolute, is found in St. Paul, in Gal. i. 1, 3: Eph. vi. 23: Phil. ii. 11: Col. iii. 17 (τῷ θ. π.): 1 Thess. i. 1: 2 Thess. i. 1: 2 Tim. i. 2: Tit. i. 4. So that it belongs to all periods of his writing, but chiefly to the later.

3—20.] From specifying the object for which Timotheus was left at Ephesus (vv. 3, 1), and characterizing the false teachers (5—7), he digresses to the true use of the law which they pretended to teach (8—10), and its agreement with the gospel with which he was entrusted (11): thence to his own conversion, for the mercies of which he expresses his thankfulness in glowing terms (12—17). Thence he returns to his exhortations to Timotheus (18—20). On these repeated digressions, and the inferences from them, see Prolegg. ch. vii. § i. 36 f. 3. The sentence begins As I exhorted thee, &c., but in his negligence of writing, the Apostle does not finish the construction: neither verse 5, nor 12, nor 18, will form the apodosis without unnatural forcing.

παρεκάλεσα] Chr. lays stress on the word, as implying great mildness—

ἀκούοι τὸ προσκυνεῖ, πῶς οὐ διδασκαλοῦ κέχρηται βοή, άλλ' οικέτων σχέδου, οὐ γὰρ εἰπεν ἐπίταξε οὐδέ ἐκέλευεν, οὐδέ παράγεσα, άλλα τί; παρεκάλεσα τῇ.

This has been met (Huther, al.), by remarking that he says διεταξάμενον to Titus, Tit. i. 5. The present word however was the usual one to his fellow-helpers, see reff.: and διετάξαμεν there refers rather to a matter of detail—as I prescribed to thee. The sense of προσμεῖναι, to tarry, or stay at a place, is sufficiently clear from ref. Acts. The προσ—implies a fixity when the word is absolutely used, which altogether forbids the joining προσμεῖναι with πορεύμενοι understood of Timotheos, as some have attempted to do. The aorist προσμιείναι refers to the act of remaining behind when the Apostle departed: the present would have marked an endurance of stay. Various endeavours have been made to escape from the difficulties of the fact implied. Schneckenburger would read προσμεῖναι: others would take προσμεῖναι as imperative, most unnaturally. No one can doubt, that the straightforward rendering is, As I besought thee to tarry in Ephesus, when I was going to Macedonia . . . . And on this straightforward rendering we must build our chronological considerations. See the whole subject discussed in the Prolegomena, ch. vii. § ii.: and cf. Ellicott's note here.

πορεύμενος, present, when I was on my way. ίνα, &c. object of his tarrying. παραγγελις, see reff. τις] so constantly (reff.) in these Epistles: sometimes οἱ ἀντίλαγοντες Tit. i. 9, or πολλοί ib. 10. Huther infers from τις, that the number at this time was not considerable: but this is hardly safe. "The indefinite pronoun is more probably slightly contemptuous: 'le mot times a quelque chose de méprisant," see Arnaud, on Jude 4, compare Gal. ii. 12: Ellicott. ἑπεροδίδισκαι] There seems to be in ετερο, as in ετερογούντες
2 Cor. vi. 14, the idea of strange, or incongruous, not merely of different: cf. also ἑτέρογλωσσος, I. xiv. 21. The compound -διδασκαλία, not -διδασκει, brings in the sense of 'acting as a teacher.'—not to be teachers of strange things. Ensehins has the substantive, H. E. iii. 32—διὰ τῆς τῶν ἑτέροδιδασκάλων ἀπάτης,—in the sense of heretical teachers—which however is too fixed and developed a meaning to give here. We have καλοδιδάσκαλος, Tit. ii. 3. The meanings of 'other teaching' and 'false teaching,' when we remember that the faith which St. Paul preached was incapable (Gal. i. 8, 9) of any the least compromise with the errors subsequently described, lie very close to one another. προσέχειν, to give attention to: see ref.: 'as it were, a mean term between ἄκοινες and πιστευεῖν, compare Polyb. iv. 84. 6, διακούωτες οὖν προσέχουν; Jos. B. J. vii. 5. 3, οὔτε προσέχουν οὔτε ἐπιστέυον.' Ellicott.

μυθοί] We can only judge from the other passages in these Epistles where the word occurs, what kind of fables are alluded to. In Tit. i. 14, we have μὴ προσέχουτε ἵναιδακοίς μυθοῖς. In our ch. iv. 7, they are designated as βηβήλαι καὶ γρααδεῖς. In 2 Tim. iv. 4, they are spoken of absolutely, as here. If we are justified in identifying the 'fables' in Tit. with these, they had a Jewish origin: but merely to take them, as Thdrt., for the Jewish traditional comments on the law (μύθοι δὲ οὐ τήν τοῦ νόμου διδασκαλίαν ἐκάλεσεν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἰουδαϊκὴν ἐρμηνείαν τὴν ὑπ' αὐτῶν καλουμένην δευτεράσιμην [προς, mischufa], does not seem to satisfy the βηβήλαι καὶ γρααδεῖς. And consequently others have interpreted them of the gnostic mythology of the Jews. So Tert. adv. Valentinianos, ch. 3, vol. ii. p. 545: 'qui ex alia conscientia veuerit sibi, si statim inventiat tot nomina annum, tot cominig, tot genuina, tot exitus, tot eventus, felicitates, infelicitates dispersae atque concisas divinitatis, dubitabatur ibidem prouentiare, has esse fabulas et genealogias indeterminatas, quas apostoli spiritus his iam tum pullulabant seminibus hereticis damnare praeverint?' And Iren., in his pref., p. 1, assumes these words in the very outset, almost as his motto— ἐπεὶ τῶν ἀλλάξων παρατεινόμενοι τινες ἐπιστέγοντι λόγους ψευδόν τ. γενεαλογίας ματαιας αἰτίνες εὐχήσεις μᾶλλον παρέχοντι, καθὼς ὁ ἀπόστολος φησιν, ἢ οἰκειομένη θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστε.. . . .

Others again (as Suidas's definition, μύθος, λόγος ψευδῆς, εἰκόνος τὴν ἀλήθειαν) would give an entirely general meaning to the word,—'false teaching' of any kind. But this is manifestly too lax; for the descriptions here (ver. 7, e. g.) point at a Jewish origin, and a development in the direction of γενεαλογίας ἀπεριτων. It does not seem easy to define any further these μύθοι, but it is plain that any transitional state from Judaism to gnosticism will satisfy the conditions here propounded, without inferring that the full-blown gnosticism of the second century must be meant, and thus calling in question the genuineness of the Epistle. On the whole subject, see Prolegg. ch. vii. § i. 8 ff. [gen. al. ἀπερ.]

De W. in his note on Tit. i. 14, marks out well the references which have been assigned to this expression: "γενεαλογία cannot be 1) properly genealogical registers,—either for a pure genealogico-historical end (Chr., Ec., Thl., Amb., Est., Calv., Schöttg., Wolf), or for a dogmatico-historical one, to foster the religious national pride of Jews against Gentiles, cf. Phil. iii. 4 f. (Storr, Flatt, Wegsch., Leo), or to ascertain the descent of the Messiah (Thdrt., Jer., Wegsch.; according to Nicol. Lyrr., to shew that Jesus was not the Messiah), least of all genealogies of Timothoes himself (Wests.),—for all this does not touch, or too little touches religious interests: nor are they 2) gentile theogonies (Chr. gives this as well as the former interpretation: also Ec., Thl., Elsn.); nor again 3) pedigrees of the cabalistic sephiroth (Vitr. Obs. 1, v. 13: see Wolf), which will hardly suit γενεαλ. nor 4) Essenian genealogies of angels (Mich., Heinr., al.), of the existence of which we have no proof; nor 5) allegorizing genealogies, applications of psychological and historical considerations to the genealogies contained in the books of Moses; as in Philo (Dahne, Stud. u. Krit. 1853, 1008),—a practice too peculiar to Philo and his view: but most probably 6) lists of gnostic emanations (Tert. contr. Val. 3,—prasser. 33, Iren. pref. [see above], Grof., Hamm., Chr., Mosh., Mack, Baur, al., &c.)." But again, inasmuch as γενεαλογία is coupled in Tit. iii. 9 with μάχαι νουκάλ, it seems as if we must hardly understand the ripened fruits of gnosticism, but rather
the first beginnings of those genealogies in the abuse of Judaism. See Proleg.

"It is curious that Polyzinus uses both terms in similarly close connection. Hist. ix. 2. 1. Ellicott.

απερατώται may be used merely in popular hyperbole to signify the tedious length of such genealogies. The meaning 'profusest' (Chr., ἴτοι πόρας μακρὰν ἔχουσα, ή δὲν χρησιμον, ή δυσκαλήπτων ήμιν, and so Thdrt.; see below) would be a natural deduction from the other, and is therefore hardly to be so summarily set aside as it has been by De W., al.

αἰτίνες, of the kind which ζητήσεως] objective, questions: not subjective, 'questionings;' see reff. in these Epistles, in which ζητήσεις are not themselves, but lead to, ἐρεῖς, μάχας, &c. παρεράγουσιν minister, as E. V., is the best rendering: 'afford,' 'give rise to,' 'furnish;' see below. μᾶλλον ἢ is a mild way of saying καὶ ὅ; see reff. οἰκονομών θεοῦ . . . This has been taken two ways: 1) objectively: the dispensation (reff.) of God (towards man) which is (consists) in (the) faith: in which case παρεραγον must bear something of a transferred meaning—zeugmatic, as the grammarians call it,—as applied to οἰκονομῶν, implying, "rather than they set forth." &c. And to this there can be no objection, as the instances of it are so common. This meaning also suits that of οἰκονομία in the reff., even 1 Cor. ix. 17, where the οἰκονομία is the objective matter wherewith the Apostle was entrusted, not his own subjective fulfilment of it. 2) subjectively:—'the exercising of the stewardship of God in faith;' so Conyb.; or as paraphrased by Storr (in Huther) γρηγορίας αὐτοῦ ποιήσαι, μᾶλλον ἢ οἰκονομῶν θεοῦ παρέχοι. But to this there is the serious objection, that οἰκονομία in this subjective sense, 'the fulfilment of the duty of an οἰκονόμος,' wants example: and even could this be substantiated, οἰκονομῶν παρέχει, in the sense required, would seem again questionable. I would therefore agree with Huther and Wiesinger (and Ellicott) in the objective sense—the dispensation of God. Then τῆς εἰ πίστει has also been variously taken. Chrys. says, καλῶς κτίσθην, οἰκονομῶν θεοῦ μεγάλα γὰρ Ἰμών δοῦναι ἡθέλησεν ὁ θεός, άλλ' οὗ δέχεται ἡ λογισμός τῷ μέγιστον αὐτῶν τῶν οἰκονομῶν. Τὰ πιστεύων οὖν τούτο γίνεται δέ. And Thdrt.: αι μὲν περίτας ζητήσεις ἀφάντος, ή δὲ πίστις φωτίζει τοὺς νους, καὶ έπιδεικνύει τὰς θείας οἰκονομίας. But the words will hardly bear either of these. The only legitimate meaning seems to be—which is in faith, i.e. finds its sphere, and element, and development among men, in faith. Thus εἰ πίστει stands in contrast to ζητήσεις, in which the οἰκονομία θεοῦ does not consist; and the way for the next sentence is prepared, which speaks of πιστεύων οὖν τούτο γίνεται δέ. And 5. But (contrast to the practice of these pretended teachers of the law) the end (purpose, aim: Chrys. ψηφικός τέλος ἱερατικῆς ἐργείας) of the commandment (viz. of the law of God in [ver. 11] the gospel: not, although in the word there may be a slight allusion to it,—of that which Timothy was παραγέλλειν, ver. 3. This commandment is understood from the οἰκονομία just mentioned, of which it forms a part) is Love (as Rom. xiii. 10. We recognize, in the restating of former axiomatic positions, without immediate reference to the subject in hand, the characteristic of a later style of the Apostle) out of (arising, springing from, as its place of birth—the heart being the central point of life; see especially ref. 1 Pet.) a pure heart (pure from all selfish views and leanings; see Acts xv. 9: on the psychology, see Ellicott's note; and Delitzsch, Biblische Psychologie, iv. 12, p. 204) and good conscience (is this συνείδησις ἀγάθη, 1) a conscience good by being freed from guilt by the application of Christ's blood,—or is it 2) a conscience pure in motive, antecedent to the act of
5. on ἀγάθης F.

love? This must be decided by the usage of these expressions in these Epistles, where they occur several times [ref. and 1 Tim. iii. 9. 2 Tim. i. 3. 1 Tim. iv. 2. Tit. i. 15]. From those examples it would appear, as De W., that in the language of the pastoral Epistles a good conscience is joined with soundness in the faith, a bad conscience with unsoundness. So that we can hardly help introducing the element of freedom from guilt by the effect of that faith on the conscience. And the earlier usage of St. Paul in Acts xxiii. 1, compared with the very similar one in 2 Tim. i. 3, goes to substantiate this) and faith unfeigned (this connects with τὸν ἐν πίστει; above; it is faith, not the presence of faith, the mere ἐπιθυμία of the hypocrisie, which, as in Acts xv. 9, καθαρίζει τὰς καρδίας, and as in Gal. v. 6, δι' ἀγάθης ἐνεργεῖται: Wiesinga well remarks that we see from this, that the general character of these false teachers, as of those against whom Titus is warned, was not so much error in doctrine, as leading men away from the earnestness of the loving Christian life, to useless and vain questionings, ministering only strife: 6.] (the connexion is— it was by declining from these qualities that men entered on their paths of error) of which (the καθαρὰ καρδία, ὑπονοϊκότερον—ἀψιδήθησις ἀγάθη, and πίστεως ἄνυποκρίτως—the sources of ἀγάθη, which last they have therefore missed by losing them) some having failed (refl. : ' missed his mark' 1. let this seems hardly precise enough: it is too much to miss a thing at which a man is aiming, as to leave unregarded one at which he ought to be aiming: as Schweigg. Lex. Polyb., ' ῥάτονοι ἁλχέμοι φείς ἄναμα χαίρειν, τῆς δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιτρεπτὰς, πολλακασίας ὑπατώ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς, διοσκορίς ἡτοχόχησαν: v. 107. 2, πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρὸν ἐνδεχόμενος ἑθολείηστα, τοῦ δὲ μέλλοντος ἡτοχόχησα: see also vii. 11. 3) turned aside to (ἐξ, away from the path leading to the τέλος, ver. 5, in which they should have been walking: the idiom is often found in the examples cited by Wetst.: e. g. Plat. Phaedr., δὲν ἐκτραπόμενος κατὰ τὸν ἑαυτὸν ἵμαρ,—Thuc. v. 65, τὸ ἔδραρ ἐξεταστε κατὰ τὴν Μαγνησίαν,—and in Polyb., ἐκτραπόμενοι εἰς διαλογισμοῖς, vi. 4. 9,—εἰς τὴν συμφορὰ κακίας, ib. 10. 2 and 7: and in Hippocr. de temp. morbi, even nearer to our present phrase,—εἰς μακρολογίαν ἐξεταστόντων foolish speaking (of what kind, is explained ver. 7, and Tit. iii. 9, which place connects this expression with our ver. 4. It is the vain questions arising out of the law which he thus characterizes. Herod. [ii. 118] uses μάταοι λόγον of an idle tale, an empty fable:—εἰρήμενον δὲ μειόν τοὺς ἱέρας, εἰς μάταοι λόγον λέγοντι οὗ Ἑλληνες τὰ τερέ τοῖς γενέσθαι, wishing to be (giving themselves out as, without really being: so Paus. i. 4. 6, αὐτοὶ δὲ 'Αρκαδες ἐδεύοντο εἰναι τῶν δομῶν ἡπεδοσὶ διαστοις ἐκ τῆς Ἀσκλ. Cf. Palm and Rost's Lex. sub vocet) teachers of the law (of what law? and in what sense? To the former question, but one answer can be given. The law is that of Moses; the law, always so known. The usage of νομοδιάδασκαλος (refl.) forbids our giving the word, as coming from a Jew, any other meaning. That this is so, is also borne out by Tit. i. 11. Then as to the sense in which these men professed themselves teachers of the law. (1) Clearly not, as Barr, by their very antinomianism,—teachers of the law by setting it aside: this would at best be an unnatural sense to extract from the word, and it is not in any way countenanced by vv. 8 ff. as Barr thinks: see below. (2) Hardly, in the usual position of those Judaizing antagonists of St. Paul against whom he directs his arguments in Rom., Gal., and Col. Of these he would hardly have predicament ματαολογία, nor would he have said μὴ νομοθέτες κ. τ. λ. Their offence was not either of these things, promulgating of idle fables, or ignorance
8. for χρησταί, χρηστηταί Α 73 Clem.

cal τι δεσται αυτοίς ἐκ τῶν λόγων τούτων, οὐδὲ καταβαρχεῖς πεφροντικαίοι.

8 [i.] On the other hand the law has its right use:—not that to which they put it, but to testify against sins in practice: the catalogue of which seems to be here introduced, on account of the lax moral practice of these very men who were, or were in danger of, falling into them: not, as Baur imagines, because they were antinomians and set aside the (moral) law. They did not set it aside, but perverted it, and practised the very sins against which it was directed. Now (slight contrast to last verse, taking up the matter on general grounds) we know (see ref.: especially Rom. vii. 14: a thoroughly pauline expression) that the law is good (Rom. vii. 16: not only, as Thdt., ἀφέλεμον, but in a far higher sense, as in Rom. vii. 12, 14: good abstractedly, — in accordance with the divine holiness and justice and truth; see ver. 18, ch. iv. 4) if a man (undoubtedly, in the first place, and mainly, a teacher: but not [as Bengel, De W., and Ellic.] to be confined to that meaning: all that is here said might apply just as well to a private Christian’s thoughts and use of the law, as to the use of it by teachers themselves) use it lawfully (i.e. not, as most expositors, according to its intention as law [ἐὰν τις ἄκολουθῇ αὐτοῦ τῷ σκότῳ, Thdt.], and as directed against the following sins in Christians: but clearly, from what follows, as De W. insists [see also Ellic.], and as Chrys. obscurely notices amongst other interpretations, νομιμος in the Gospel sense: i.e. as not binding on, nor relevant to Christian believers, but only a means of awakening repentance in the ungodly and profane. Ch.’s words are: τις δὲ αὐτῷ νομιμος χρηστηταί; οἱ δὲ εἰδοὺς ότι οὐ δεῖται αὐτοῦ. His further references of νομιμος, ‘as leading us to Christ,’—as ‘inducing to piety not by its injunctions but by purer motives,’ &c., are not in place here), being aware of this (belongs to τις, the teacher, or former of a judgment on the matter. εἰδοὺ implies both the possession and the application of the knowledge: ‘heeding,’ or ‘being aware of’), that for a just man (in what sense? in the mere sense of virtuous, ‘righteous,’ in the world’s acceptance of the term? X
in Chrys.’s third alternative, δικαιον ἐνταῦθα καλεῖ τὴν καταρθωκότα τὴν ἀρετὴν; or as Thl., δι᾽ αὐτὸ τὸ καλὸν τὴν της πονηρίαν μισεῖ καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν περιπτŪσεται; All such meanings are clearly excluded by ver. 11, which sets the whole sentence in the full light of Gospel doctrine, and necessitates a corresponding interpretation for every term used in it.

δίκαιος therefore can only mean, righteous, in the Christian sense, viz. by justifying faith and sanctification of the Spirit,—‘justitia per sanctificationem,’ as De Wette from Croce,—one who is included in the actual righteousness of Christ by having put Him on, and so not forensically amendable to the law,—partaker of the inherent righteousness of Christ, unwrought by the Spirit, which unites him to Him, and so not morally needing it) the law (as before: not, ‘a law’ in general, as will be plain from the preceding remarks: nor does the omission of the article furnish any ground for such a rendering, in the presence of numerous instances where νόμος, anarchoeer, is undeniably ‘the Law’ of Moses. Cf. Rom. ii. 25 bis; ib. 27; iii. 28, 31 bis; v. 20; vii. 1; x. 4: Gal. ii. 19; vi. 13,—to say nothing of the very many examples after prepositions. And of all parts of the N. T. anarchoeers need least surprise us in these Epistles, where many theological terms, having from constant use become technical words, have lost their articles. No such compromise as that of Bishop Middleton’s, that the Mosiac law is comprehended in νόμος, will answer the requirements of the passage, which strictly deals with the Mosiac law and with nothing else: cf. on the catalogue of sins below.

As De Wette remarks, this assertion is that in Rom. vi. 14, οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ὑπὸ νόμον, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν,—Gal. v. 18, εἰ πνεύματι ἐγέρθη, οὐκ ἐστὶν ὑπὸ νόμον) is not enacted (see very numerous instances of νόμος κείται in Wettf. The following are some: Eur. Ion 1046, 7, ὅταν δὲ παλαιόν δράσαι κακῶς ἃθλη τις, ὁδέλεσ εμποδῶν κείται νόμος: Thucyd. ii. 37, νόμοι... ὅσοι τε ἐπὶ ὀφθέλει τῶν ἀδικουμένων κείνται: Galen. a. Julian. (Wetst.), νόμος οὐδέσ πείραται κατὰ τῶν φευρᾶς ἐγκαλοῦντων, but for lawlesses (refl.: not as in 1 Cor. ix. 21) and insubordinate (refl. Tt.; it very nearly = ἄπετῆς, see Tit. i. 16; iii. 3,—this latter being more subjective, whereas ἀνυποτάκτη, points to the objective fact. This first pair of adjectives expresses opposition to the law, and so stands foremost as designating those for whom it is enacted), for impious and sinful (see especially ref. 1 Pet. This second pair expresses opposition to God, whose law it is — ἄδειφῆς being, the man who does not reverence Him, ἀμαρτωλός the man who lives in defiance of Him), for unholy and profane (this last pair betokens separation and alienation from God and His law alike—those who have no share in His holiness, no relation to things sacred. “The ἄδειφης is unholy through his lack of reverence: the ἄνδισος, through his lack of inner purity,” Ellic.), for father-slayers and mother-slayers (or it may be taken in the wider sense, as Ellic, ‘smelters of fathers:’ so Hesych.: ὁ τῶν πατέρων ἅτιμων, τῶν τῶν ἡ κτείνων. In Demostr. kata Timokratous, p. 732. 14, the word is used of ὧ τῶν γονῶν κάκως: cf. the law cited immediately after. And Plato, Phad. 114 a, apparently uses it in the same wide sense, as he distinguishes πατράλωια and μητράλωια from ἄνδροφοιν.

Hitherto the classes have been general, and [see above] arranged according to their opposition to the law, or to God, or to both: now he takes the second table of the decalogue and goes through its commands, to the ninth inclusive, in order. πατράλωια kal μητράλωια are the transgressors of the fifth, for man-slayers. (the sixth), for fornicators, for sodomites (sins of abomination against both sexes: the seventh), for slave-dealers (εὑρητεῖ ἄνθρωπον ἃ χαίρετ τῷ ἄνδρᾳ ἀποδίδοσθαι, τούτοις παλέων, Schol.
10. \( \text{πόνοις}, \text{αρσενοκόταις}, \text{ανδραποδιστάς}, \) \( \text{s} \) \( \text{μεστάς}, \) \( \text{ἐπίροκοις}, \text{καὶ ἐὰς τῇ ὑγιασμός ἑδα-καλία \( \text{o} \) \( \text{ἀντικεῖται}, \) \( \text{κατά τὸ} \text{σφαγής \( \text{ṭ} \) \( \text{δόξες} \text{τῷ} \text{μακαρίῳ θεῷ}, \) \( \text{ὁ} \) \( \text{ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ}. \) 12. \( \text{χάριν} \text{ἐχω} \text{ἐξ} \text{τούτῳ} \text{τινί}. \) John (vili. 44 sq.). only. Prov. xxix. 22. 1 & const. 2 Cor. v. 17. Eph. iv. 28. Phil. ii. 1. 3. Tit. i. 9. ii. 1. see ch. vi. 3. \( \text{h here only}. \) (-σειν, Matt. v. 33. -σκα, Wisd. xiv. 25.) -c Cor. vi. 9. only \( \text{t. see} \text{Levit. xviii. 22.} \) -en only. \( \text{t. here only}. \) Paul, Rom. iii. 4. Tit. i. 12 only. otherwise, A. Rom. viii. 30. xii. 8. 10. \( \text{ἐφοριας} \text{D}. \) om \( \text{ἀντικεῖται} \text{A}. \) at end add \( \text{τη D} \text{vulg arm Bas lat-Sv.} \) 12. see at beg ins κατι, with DKL rel syrr goth Damasc (Ee-text Lucif Ambros: om Aristoph. Plut. ver. 521. The etymology is wrong, but the meaning as he states: cf. Xen. Mem. i. 2. 6, \( \text{τόν} \text{λαμβάνοντας} \text{τῆς} \) \( \text{οὐσίας} \text{μεθον} \) \( \text{ἀνδραποδιστώς} \) \( \text{ἑυτών} \) \( \text{άπτεκαλε}: \) and Pollux, Onomast. iii. 78, \( \text{ἀνδραποδιστής}, \) \( \text{ὁ} \) \( \text{ἐλεύθερον} \text{κατα-} \) \( \text{δυνόμενος} \) \( \text{ὡς} \) \( \text{τὸν} \) \( \text{αὐτῶν} \text{οἰκεῖαν} \) \( \text{ὑπαγόμενος}. \) [Elic.] The Apostle puts the \( \text{ἀνδραποδιστῆς} \) as the most flagrant of all breakers of the eighth commandment. No theft of a man's goods can be compared with that most atrocious act, which steals \( \text{the man himself}, \) and robs him of that free will which is the first gift of his Creator. And of this crime all are guilty, who, whether directly or indirectly, are engaged in, or uphold from whatever pretence, the making or keeping of slaves), for liars, for perjurers (breakers of the ninth commandment. It is remarkable that he does not refer to that very commandment by which the law wrought on him while he was alive without the law and sin was dead in him, viz. the tenth. Possibly this may be on account of its more spiritual nature, as he here wishes to bring out the rougher kinds of sin against which the moral law is pointedly enacted. The subsequent clause however seems as if he had it in his mind, and on that account added a concluding general and inclusive description), and if any thing else (he passes to sins themselves from the committers of sins) is opposed (ref.) to the healthy teaching (i. e. that moral teaching which is spiritually sound: \( = \text{ἡ κατ' ὑπόθεσιν δια-} \) \( \text{διακαλία}, \) ch. vi. 3, where it is parallel with \( \text{ὑπερνόστες} \text{ἄγους} \text{ὁ} \text{τῶν} \) \( \text{κυρ.} \) \( \text{ἡ} \) \( \text{τῆς} \) \( \text{χριστοῦ}. \) "The formula ... stands in clear and suggestive contrast to the sickly [ch. vi. 4] and morbid [2 Tim. ii. 17] teaching of Jewish gnosis," Elic.)—according to (belongs, not to \( \text{ἀντικεῖται}, \) which would make the following words a mere flat repetition of \( \text{τῇ} \) \( \text{ὕγιαι} \text{διασκ.} \) [see ch. vi. 1. 3]—nor to \( \text{διαδιακαλία}, \) \( \) \( \text{Thi.}, \) \( \text{τῇ} \) \( \text{διά} \) \( \text{διά} \) \( \text{ὁς} \text{κατὰ τὸ} \text{ἔγγυ}, \) all. (see D1 in digest),—for certainly in this case the specifying article must have been inserted,—and thus also the above repetition would occur;—but to the whole preceding sentence,—the entire expression which he has been giving of the freedom of Christians from the moral law of the decalogue) the gospel of the glory (not, 'the glorious gospel' see ref. 2 Cor.: all propriety and beauty of expression is here, as always, destroyed by this adjectival rendering. The gospel is the glad tidings of the glory of God, as of Christ in I. e., inasmuch as it reveals to us God in all His glory, which glory would be here that of justifying the sinner without the law by His marvellous provision of redemption in Christ) of the blessed God \( \text{(μακάριος, used of God, is called ἐν-} \) \( \text{παλινιφῶς} \) by De Wette, occurring only in 1 Tim. 1. [ref.]; in other words, one of those expressions which are peculiar to this later date and manner of the Apostle. On such, see Prolegomena), with which I (emphatic) was (orist, indicating simply the past; pointing to the time during which this his commission had been growing into its fullness and importance) entrusted (not these \( \text{τῖνες} \). \( = \) \( \text{ἐπιστεύθην} \) is a construction only and characteristically pauline: see ref. The connexion with the following appears to be this: his mind is full of thankfulness at the thought of the commission which was thus entrusted to him: he does not regret the charge, but overflows with gratitude at the remembrance of Christ's grace to him, especially when he recollects also what he once was; how nearly approaching [for I would not exclude even that thought as having contributed to produce these strong expressions] some of those whom he has just mentioned. So that he now goes off
from the immediate subject, even more completely and suddenly than is his wont in his other writings, as again and again in these pastoral Epistles: shewing thereby, I believe, the tokens of advancing age, and of that faster hold of individual habits of thought and manners, which characterizes the decline of life: (12 ff.) See summary, on ver. 3.) I give thanks (χάριν ἔχειν [refl.] is only used by the Apostle here and in 2 Tim. ref.) to Him who enabled me (viz. for His work: not only as Chr., in one of his finest passages,—φορτὶν ὑπῆλθε μέγα, καὶ πολλὰς ἐδέστη τῆς ἄνωθεν ἡμᾶς. ἐννόησεν γὰρ ὁ ἐπὶ πρὸς καθημερικὰς ὑβρίεις, λοιποῖας, ἐπιβουλὰς, κυδίνων, σκώματα, ἀνόησεν, ἑφαντᾶτο ἠπαθεῖαι, καὶ καθομένων, μηθὲ ὀλισθαίειν, μηθὲ περιρρέισθαι, ἀλλὰ πᾶντον βαλλόμενος μνιοῖς καθ᾽ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν τοὺς βέβαιος, ἀπείχεν ἑκατονταὶ τὸ ὑμῖν ἀνασταὶ καὶ ἀκατάλληλος,—see also Phil. iv. 13,—for he evidently is here treating of the divine enlightening and strengthening which he received for the ministry: cf. Acts ix. 22, where the same word occurs—a coincidence not to be overlooked. So Thdt.: οὐ γὰρ οἰκεῖ δυνάμει χράματι ταῦτα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις προσφέρει τὴν διδασκαλιαν, ἀλλ᾽ ὑπὸ του σεσωκτος μονωμενοι τε και νευομενοι, Christ Jesus our Lord (not to be taken as the dative com- modi after ἐννυμαστάτι, but in apposition with τοῦ ἐννυόν), that (not, 'because it is the main ground of the χάριν ἔχω: the specification of τῶν ἐννυμαστάτι introducing a subordinate ground) He accounted me faithful (cf. the strikingly similar expression, 1 Cor. vii. 25, γνώμιν δίδωμι ὡς ἀληθεύον ὑπὸ κύριον πιστῶς εἰναι;—He knew me to be such an one, in His foresight, as would prove faithful to the great trust), appointing me (cf. ref. 1 Thess. The expression is there used of that appointment of God in His sovereignty, by which our course is marked for a certain aim or end: and so it is best taken here,—not for the act of ‘putting me into’ the ministry, as E. V. But the present sense must be kept: not ‘having appointed,’ θέμενος constituting the external proof of πιστῶν με γιγνης.) to the ministry (what sort of diakonia, is declared, Acts xx. 24, ἡ διακονία ἥν ἔλαβον πάρο τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, διαμαρτύροντι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ, 13.) [and the all more is he thankful, seeing that he was once a direct opponent of the Gospel] being before (the participle is slightly concessive: as Ell. from Justininum, ‘cum tamen esset,’ almost equivalent to ‘though I was’) a blasphemer (see Acts xxvi. 9, 11) and persecutor and in- sulter (one who added insult to persecution. See on ὑβριστῆς, Trench, N. T. Synonymous, p. 112 f.) The facts which justified the use of such a term were known to St. Paul’s conscience: we might well infer, from his own confessions in Acts xxii. 4, 19, and xxvi. 9—12. He describes himself as περισσοῦς ἐμμαυκώνεις αὐτοῦ): howbeit (‘ἀλλὰ has here its full and proper seclusus [‘aliud jam hoc esse, de quo sumus dicturi,’ Klotz., Devar. ii. p. 2,] and thence often antithetical force. God’s mercy and St. Paul’s want of it are put in sharp contrast.” Ell.) I had mercy shown me (redcl., because I did it igno- rantly (so Rom. x. 2, of the Jews, ἡμῶν θεοῦ ἔχουνει, ἀλλ᾽ ὑπὸ κατ᾽ ἐπίγγυσιν. Cf. also as a most important parallel, our Lord’s prayer for His murderers, Luke xxiii. 34) in unbelief (ἀποστασία was his state, of which his ignorance of what he did was a conse- quence. The clause is a very weighty one as applying to others under similar circumstances: and should lead us to form our judgments in all charity respecting even persecutors—and if of them, then surely even with a wider extension of charity to those generally, who lie in the ignorance of
unbelief, whatever be its cause, or its effects, 14. \textit{but} (contrast still to his former state, and epecegetical of ἡλέθην; —not to ἡλέθη,— not only so, but, as Chr., De W., al.) the grace of our Lord (His mercy shewn to me—but not in strengthening me for His work, endowing me with spiritual gifts, &c., as, Chr., al.: for the ἡλέθην is the ruling idea through the whole, and he recurs to it again ver. 16, never having risen above it to that of his higher gifts) superabounded (to be taken not comparatively, but superlatively, see Rom. v. 20, note) with (accompanied by) faith and love (see the same pauline expression, Eph. vi. 23, and note there) which are (ἡς probably improperly used by attraction for τῶν: there is no reason why πίστει as well as ἄγαπη should not be designated as ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in (as their element, and, as it were, home) Christ Jesus (all these three abounded—grace, the objective side of God’s ἔλεος to him:—Christian faith and love—the contrast to his former hatred and unbelief,—God’s gifts, the subjective side. This is much better to regard μετὰ πίστεως καὶ ἄγαπης as giving that wherein the χάρις ὑπερπεπελάνεται: 15.] faithful (worthy of credit: ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἀγενθής καὶ ἀληθῆς, Thdtf. Cf. Rev. xxi. 5, ὅπου οί λόγοι ἀληθινοὶ καὶ πιστοὶ εἰσι: similarly xxii. 6. The formula πιστός ὁ λόγος is peculiar to the pastoral Epistles, and characteristic I believe of their later age, when certain sayings had taken their place as Christian axioms, and were thus designated is the saying, and worthy of all (possible, i. e. universal) reception (see ref. Polyb., and Wetst. and Kykpe, h. 1. A word which, with its adjective ἀπόδεκτος [Ch. ii. 3: v. 4.], is confined to these Epistles. We have the verb, οἱ μὲν οίνῳ ἀποδεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐπιτίθεσαν, Acts ii. 41], that Christ Jesus came into the world (an expression otherwise-otherwise found only in St. John. But in the two ref. in. Matt. and Luke, we have the ἡλέθην to save sinners (to be taken in the most general sense, not limited in any way), of whom (sinners; not, as Wegscheider, σωσιμένων or σωσιωμένων: the aim and extent of the Lord’s mercy intensifies the feeling of his own especial unworthiness) I am (not, ‘eas’) chief (not, ‘one of the chief,’ as Flatt,—nor does πρῶτος refer to time, which would not be the fact [see below]: the expression is one of the deepest humility: αὐτὸν ὑπερβαίνει τῆς ταπεινοφορίας δρόμον, says Thdtf. and indeed it is so, cf. Phil. iii. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 9; Acts xxiii. 1; xxiv. 16; but deep humility ever does so: it is but another form of εἰνέω τῷ ἀμαρτάλῳ, Luke xviii. 13: other men’s crimes seem to sink into nothing in comparison, and a man’s own to be the chief and only ones in his sight): 16.] howbeit (as E. V.: “not resumptive, but as in ver. 13, exclusive and anti-theoretical, marking the contrast between the Apostle’s own judgment on himself, and the mercy which God was pleased to show him.” Ellic.) for this purpose I had mercy shewn me, that in me (as an example: “in my case”: see ref. and cf. eis ὑποτύπωσιν below) first (it can hardly be denied that in πρῶτον here the senses of ‘chief’ and ‘first’ are combined. This latter seems to be necessitated by μελλόντων below. Though he was not in time ‘the first of sinners,’ yet he was the first as the most notable example of such marked long-suffering, held up for the encouragement of the church) Christ Jesus might shew forth (dynamic mddkple: see note on ref. Eph., and Ellicott there) the whole of His (not merely ‘all’ [all possible, πᾶσαν: nor ‘all His’ [Conybh., Ellic. πᾶσα τὴν . . . ,] but ‘the whole,’ the whole mass of μακροθυμία, of which I was an example; δ ἀπας seems to be found here only. If the rec. reading be in question, in all other cases where ὁ πᾶς occurs with a substantive in the N. T., it is one which admits of partition, and may therefore be rendered by ‘all the’ or ‘the
whole: c. Acts xx. 18, ἡς μεθ' ὠνόμ τῶν πατρὸν χρόνων ἐγένετο: see also ref. Wetst. has two examples from Polyb. in which ὡς has the meaning of 'the utmost'; τῆς πάχες ἀλογιστίας οὐσί σημείων,—and τῆς ἀπάθειας (as here) ἀτοπίας εὐαίσησι) long-suffering (not, generosity, magnanimity: nor is the idea of long-suffering here irrelevant, as some have said: Christ's mercy gave him all that time for repentance, during which he was persecuting and opposing Him, —and therefore it was his long-suffering which was so wonderful, for an example (cf. 2 Pet. ii. 6, ὑποδείγμα μελλόντων ἀπειθείων τεθείκα). Wetst. has shown by very copious extracts, that ὑποτύπωσες is used by later writers, beginning with Aristotle, for a sketch, an outline, afterwards to be filled up. This indeed the recorded history of Paul would be,—the filling up taking place in each man's own case: see ref. 2 Tim., note. Or the meaning 'sample,' (example,' as in 2 Tim. i. 13, will suit equally well) of (to, see Ellicott's note, and Donaldson, Gr. Gr. § 450) those who should (the time of μελλόντων is not the time of writing the Epistles, but that of the mercy being shown; so that we must not say "who shall," but "who should") believe on Him (the usual ἐπ' αὐτῷ is easily accounted for, from its occurrence in so very common a quotation as ταῖς ὑπὸ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ κατασχυνθήσεται, see reff. The propriety of the expression here is, that it gives more emphatically the ground of the πιστεύω —brings out more the reliance implied in it—almost q. d., 'to rely on Him for eternal life.' Ellicott has, in his note here, given a full and good classification of the constructions of πιστεύω in the N. T. to (belongs to πιστεύω [see above] as its aim and end [cf. Heb. x. 39]: not to ὑποτύπωσις, as Bengel suggests) life eternal: 17.] but (ὅσι) takes the thought entirely off from himself and every thing else, and makes the following sentence exclusive as applied to God. 'Ex sensu gratiae fluit doxoLogia.' Bengel. Compare by all means the very similar doxology, Rom. xvi. 25 ff. and see, on their similarity, the inferences in the Prolegomena, ch. vii. § 33, and note) to the King (this name, as applied to God, is found, in N. T., only in Matt. v. 33 [not xxv. 34 ff.] and our ch. vi. 15. See below) of the ages (i. e. of eternity: cf. the reff. Tobit, where the same expression occurs, and Sir.—θέω τῶν αἰώνων: also Ps. exil. 13, ἡ βασιλεία σου βασιλεία πάντων τῶν αἰώνων.—ζώντης τῆς καλής. Comparing these with the well-known εἰς τῶν αἰώνων τῶν αἰώνων, εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας, and the like, it is far more likely that of αἰώνως here should mean eternity, than the ages of this world, as many have understood it. The doxology is to the Father, not to the Trinity [Thurt., nor to the Son [Calov., al.]: cf. ἀδρατία], incorruptible (in ref. Rom. only, used of God), invisible (reff.: see also ch. vi. 16: John i. 18. Beware of taking ἀδράτως, ἀδράτω with θεός, as recommended by Bishop Middleton, on the ground of the articles being wanting before these adjectives. It is obvious that no such consideration is of any weight in a passage like the present. The abstract adjectives of attribute are used almost as substantives, and stand by themselves, referring not to βασιλεία immediately, but to Him of whom βασιλεία is a title, as well as they: q. d. 'to Him who is the King of the ages, the Inaccessible, the Invisible, ...'), the only God (σοφός has apparently come from the doxology at the end of Romans, where it is most appro-
priate), be honour and glory to the ages of the ages (the periods which are made up of ages, as these last are of years,—as years are of days: see note, Eph. iii. 21: and Elic. on [Gal. i. 5], Amen. 18 ff.] He now returns to the matter which he dropped in ver. 3, not indeed formally, so as to supply the apodosis there neglected, but virtually: the παραγγελία not being the one there hinted at, for that was one not given to Timotheus, but to be given by him. Nor is it that in ver. 5, for that is introduced as regarding a matter quite different from the present—viz. the aberrations of the false teachers, who do not here appear till the exhortation to Timotheus is over. What this command is, is plain from the following. This command I commit (as a deposit, to be faithfully guarded and kept: see ref. 2 Tim. and ch. vi. 20: Herod. vi. 86, beginning) to thee, son Timotheus (see on ver. 2), according to (in pursuance of: these words belong to παρατίθησαι, not as [Ec., Flatt, al., to the στρατεύει below] the former prophecies concerning thee (the directions, or, prophecies properly so called, of the Holy Spirit, which were spoken concerning Timotheus at his first conversion, or at his admission [cf. ch. iv. 14]) into the ministry, by the προφητικα in the church. We have instances of such prophetic intimations in Acts xii. 1, 2—[xii. 28]—xii. 10, 11. By such intimations, spoken perhaps by Silas, who was with him, and who was a προφήτης [Acts xv. 32], may St. Paul have been first induced to take Timotheus to him as a companion, Acts xvi. 3. All other meanings, which it has been attempted to give to προφητείας, are unwarrented, and beside the purpose here: as e.g. 'the good hopes conceived of thee,' Heinrichs. The επί σε belongs to προφητείας, the proposition of motion being easily accounted for by the reference to a subject implied in the word), that thou mayest (purpose, and at the same time purport, of the παραγγελία: see note, 1 Cor. xiv. 13; and Elicott on Eph. i. 16) war (στρατευόμεναι, of the whole business of the employed soldier; not merely of fighting, properly so called) in them (not as De W., 'by virtue of them,' but as Mack, Matth., and Wies., 'in,' as chad with them, as if they were his defence and confirmation. This is not μιὰ φυσικὰ, as Huther, seeing that the whole expression is figurative) the good warfare (not, as Cony., 'fight the good fight,'—by which same words he renders the very different expression in 2 Tim. iv. 7, τὸν ἄγωνα τὸν καλὸν ἑγώνησαί με. It is the whole campaign, not the fight alone, which is here spoken of), holding fast (more than 'having;' but we must hardly, as Mat., carry on the metaphor and think of the shield of faith Eph. vi. 16, such continuance being rendered unlikely by the unmetaphorical character of τὴν ἄγαθὴν συνείδασιν) faith (subjective: cf. περὶ τὴν πίστιν below) and good conscience (cf. ver. 5)—which (latter, viz. good conscience—not, both) some having thrust from them (there is something in the word implying the violence of the act required, and the importunity of conscience, reluctant to be so extruded. So Bengel: 'recedit invita: semper dict, non me ledere') made shipwreck (the similitude is so common a one, that it is hardly necessary to extend the figure of a shipwreck beyond the word itself, nor to find in ἀπώταται allusions to a rudder, anchor, &c. See examples in Wetst.) concerning (see ref., and cf. Acts xii. 26, οἱ περὶ τὰ τοιαύτα ἐργάτας, also Luke x. 40. The same is elsewhere expressed by ἐν,—so Diog. Laërt. v. 2. 14, ἐν τοῖς οἴδασι μάλα γενασυγκατά,—Phnt. Synpr. i. 4, ἐν οἷς τὰ πλείστα γεναγεία συμπόσια. See other examples in Kypke: Winer, edn. 6, § 49. 1.: and Elicott's note here) the faith (objective): of whom (genitive partitive: among whom) is Hymenæus (there is a Hymenæus mentioned 2 Tim. ii. 17, in conjunction
with Philletus, as an heretical teacher. There is no reason to distinguish him from this one: nor any difficulty occasioned [De W.] by the fact of his being here παραδοθέως πυ σατανα, and there mentioned as overthrowing the faith of many. He would probably go on with his evil teaching in spite of the Apostle's sentence, which could carry weight with those only who were sound in the faith) and Alexander (in all probability identical with Ἀλέξανδρος ὤ χαίκες, 2 Tim. iv. 14. There is nothing against it in what is there said of him (against De Wette). He appears there to have been an adversary of the Apostle, who had withstood and injured him at his late visit to Ephesus; but there is no reason why he should not have been still under this sentence at that time): whom I delivered over to Satan (there does not seem to be, as almost always taken for granted, any necessary assertion of excommunication properly so called. The delivering to Satan, as in 1 Cor. v. 5, seems to have been an apostolic act, for the purpose of active punishment, in order to correction. It might or might not be accompanied by extrusion from the church: it appears to have been thus accompanied in 1 Cor. v. 5 but the two must not be supposed identical. The upholders of such identity alleg the fact of Satan's empire being conceived as including all outside the church [Acts xxvi. 18 al.]: but such expressions are too vague to be adduced as applying to a direct assertion like this. Satan, the adversary, is evidently regarded as the bulwark and tormentor, cf. 2 Cor. xii. 7—ever ready, unless his hand were held, to distress and afflict God's people,—and ready therefore, when thus let loose by one having power over him, to execute punishment with all his malignity. Observe that the verb is not perfect but aorist. It did this when he was last at Ephesus. On the ecclesiastical questions here involved, Ellis has, as usual, some very useful references) that they may be disciplined (the subj. after the aorist indicates that the effect of what was done still abides; the sentence was not yet taken off, nor the παίθεως at an end. παίθεω, as in ref., to instruct by punishment, to discipline) not to blas-

pheme (God, or Christ, whose holy name was brought to shame by these men associating it with unholy and obscene doctrines).

Ch. II. 1—15.] General regulations respecting public intercessory prayers for all men (1—4)—from which he digresses into a proof of the universality of the gospel (4—7)—then returns to the part to be taken by the male sex in public prayer (8): which leads him to treat of the proper place and subjection of women (9—15). I exhort then (παίθεω is without any logical connexion," says De W. Certainly,—with what immediately precedes; but the account to be given of it is, that it takes up the general subject of the Epistle. q. d., "what I have then to say to thee by way of command and regulation, is this:" see 2 Tim. ii. 1. "The particle παίθεω has its proper collective force ['ad en, que anteia positae sunt, lectorum recovat,' Klotz,' 'continuation and retrospect,' Donaldson, Gr. § 604," Ellis), first of all (to be joined with παρακαλώ, not, as Chr. [τε δ' εστι το πρωτον πάντων; τυντατιν, εν τη λατρεια τη καθημερινη, Thl., Calvin., Est., Bengal, Conybe., E. V., and Luther, with poieiθαι, in which case, besides other objections, the verb would certainly have followed all the substantives, and probably would have taken πρωτον πάντων with it. It is, in order and importance, his first exhortation) to make (cf. ref. Phil. It has been usual to take poieiθαι passive: and most Commentators pass over the word without remark. In such a case, the appeal must be to our sense of the propriety of the middle or passive meaning, according to the arrangement of the words, and spirit of the sentence. And thus I think we shall decide for the middle. In the prominent position of poieiθαι, if it were passive, and consequently objective in meaning, 'that prayer, &c. be made,' it can hardly be passed over without an emphasis, which here it manifestly cannot have. If on the other hand it is middle, it is subjective, belonging to the person or persons who are implied in παρακαλάται; and thus serves only as a word of passage to the more important substantives which follow. And in this
way the Greek fathers themselves took it: e.g. Chrys.—πῶς ὑπὲρ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ βασιλέως, κ.τ.λ. ποιοῦμεν τὴν δέσποινα supplications, prayers, intercessions (the two former words, δέσποιναι and προσευχαί, are perhaps best distinguished as in Eph. vi. 18, by taking προσευχή for prayer in general, δέσποινα for supplication or petition, the special content of any particular prayer. See Ellicot's note cited there, and cf. ref. Phil. ἑντεύξεις, judging from the cognate verbs ἐντυγχάνω, and ῥπερευγχάνω (ref. Rom.), should be marked with a reference to 'request concerning others,' i.e. intercessory prayer. [Ellic. denies this primary reference, supporting his view by ch. iv. 5, where, he says, such a meaning would be inappropriate. But is not the meaning in that very place most appropriate? It is not there intercession for a person: but it is by ἑντεύξεις, prayer on its behalf and over it, that πᾶν κρίσμα is hallowed. The meaning in Polybius, copiously illustrated by Raphel, an interview or appointed meeting, compellatio aliqua de re, would in the N. T., where the word and its cognates are always used in reference to prayer, for persons or things, necessarily shade off into that of pleading or intercession.] Very various and minute distinctions between the three have been imagined:—e.g. Theodoret:—δέσποινα μὲν ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ ἀπαλλαγῆς τινῶν λυπηρῶν ἱκετεία προσφερομένη προσευχὴ δέ, ἀντισις ἁγιάσων ἑντεύξεις δέ, κατηγορία τῶν ἀδίκουτῶν:—Origem, περὶ εὐχῆς, § 14 [not 44, as in West., and Huther], vol. i. p. 220,—ὅτι ομοία τοῖν τε, δέσποινα μὲν εἶναι τὴν ἐλεητότας τινὶ μὲν ἱκετείας περὶ τοῦ ἐκείνου τυχεῖν ἀναπεμπομένης εὐχῆς τὴν δὲ προσευχήν, τὴν μετὰ δοξολογίας περὶ μείζονος μεγαλαφιστερον ἀναπεμπομένην ὑπὸ τῶν ἑντεύξεων δὲ, τὴν ὑπὸ παράθεσιν τινὰ πλεῖον ἔχοντος περὶ τίνων ἄξιωσι πρὸς θεὸν κ.τ.λ. The most extraordinary of all is Ang.'s view, that the four words refer to the liturgical form of administration of the Holy Communion—δέσποινα being "precatio... quas facimus in celebratio sacramento runt antiquam illud quod est in Domini mensa incipiat beneficis:—orationes [προσευχαί], cum beneditur et sanctificatur:... interpellationes vel... postulationes [ἐντεύξεις], dunt cum populus benedicitur:... quibus peractis, et participato tanto sacramento, εὐχαριστία, gratiarum actio, cuncta concludit." Ep. cxlix. [lix.] 16, vol. ii. p. 636 f.), thanks-givings, for all men (this gives the intercessory character to all that have preceded. On the wideness of Christian benevolence here inculcated, see the argument below, and Tit. iii. 2; for i.e. (especially for)—this one particular class being mentioned and no other) kings (see Tit. iii. 1; Rom. xiii. 1 ff.; 1 Pet. ii. 13. It was especially important that the Christians should include earthly powers in their formal public prayers, both on account of the object to be gained by such prayer [see next clause], and as an effective answer to those adversaries who accused them of rebellious tendencies. Jos. [B. J. ii. 10. 4] gives the Jews' answer to Petronius, 'ἰουδαίοι περὶ μὲν Καίσαρος καὶ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ρωμαίων δίς τῆς ἱμέρας θύσιν ἔφασαν, and afterwards [ib. 17. 2], he ascribes the origin of the war to their refusing, at the instigation of Eleazar, to continue the sacrifices offered on behalf of their Gentile rulers. See Wetst., who gives other examples: and compare the ancient liturgies—e.g. the bidding prayers, Bingham, book xv. 1. 2: the consecration prayer, ib. 3. 1, and on the general practice, ib. 3. 14. 'Kings' must be taken generally, as it is indeed generalized in the following words: not understood to mean 'Cæsar and his accusers in the supreme power,' as Baur, who deduces thence an argument that the Epistle was written under the Antonines, when such an association was usual) and all that are in eminence (not absolutely in authority, though the context, no less than common sense, shews that it would be so. Cf. Polyb. v. 41. 3,—τοῖς ἐν ὑπέροχαις οἱσι περὶ τῆς αὐλῆς. He, as well as Josephus [e. g. Antt. vi. 4. 3], uses ὑπέροχαι absolutely for authorities: see Schweigh. Lex. Polyb. Thdt. gives a curious reason for the addition of these words: μάλα σφόδρο τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἁθράπων προστεθείκειν, ἢ μὴ τίς κολα-
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κείνω νοµίζω τήν ὑπέρ τῶν Βασίλειων εὐχήν. The succeeding clause furnishes reason enough: the security of Christians would often be more dependent on inferior officers than even on kings themselves), that (aim of the prayer—not, as Hengstenberg and Matthies—subjective, that by such prayer Christian men’s minds may be tranquillized and disposed to obey—but objective, that we may obtain the blessing mentioned, by God’s influencing the hearts of our rulers: or as Chrys., that we may be in security by their being preserved in safety) we may pass (more than ‘lead’ [ἀγείν]: it includes the whole of the period spoken of:—thux Aristoph. Vesp. 1006 [see also Eccles. 210], ἀσθὴ ηδέως διάγεω σε τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον.—Soph. Ed. Col. 1615, τὸ λοιπὸν χρόνον τῆν διὰ τοῦ διαδέητον; see numerous other examples in Wetst.) a quiet (the adjective ἰρέμος is a late word, formed on the classical adverb ἰρέμα, the proper adjective of which is ἰρέμοιος, used by Plat. Rep. p. 307 α, Locr. 734 a &c. Cf. Palm and Rost’s Lex. sub voce) and tranquil life (ἐκείνων γὰρ πρωτακωνόντων εὐχήν, μεταλαχύσαιναι καὶ υμεῖς τὰς γαλάνθας, καὶ εἰς ἑσχύναι τὰς υπεσελπισμοὺς τῶν νόμων, Thdti. On the distinction between ἰρέμοιος, tranquil from trouble without, and ἰασχίας, from trouble within, see Ellicott’s note in all (‘possible, ‘requisite’) piety (I prefer this rendering to ‘godliness,’ as more literal, and because I would reserve that word as the proper one for τριγενήθαι: see ver. 10 below. εὐσεβεία is one of the terms peculiar in this meaning to the pastoral Epistles, the second Epistle of Peter [ref’], and Peter’s speech in Acts iii. 12. See Prolegg., and note on Acts iii. 12) and gravity (so Courn.; and it seems best to express the meaning. For as Chrys.,—εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἐσάξοντα, μὴθε ἐδοκιμάσων ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις, ἀλάγκαι καὶ τὰ ἡμέτερα ἐν ταραχαῖς εἶναι καὶ θωρακίας. ἢ γὰρ καὶ αὐτούς ἡμᾶς στρατεύεσθαι έδει, κατακοτέντων ἐκείνων ἢ ψεύδων πανταχοῦ καὶ πλανάσθαι: and thus the gravity would be broken up). 3. 4.] For this (viz. τοιεσθαί δεί& σεις κ.τ.λ. ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, &c. ver. 1: what has followed since being merely the continuation of this) is good and acceptable (both adjectives are to be taken with ἐνάπτων, &c., not as De W. and Ellis. ‘καλόν, good in and of itself,’ compare ref. 2 Cor., καλά οὖν ἐνάπτων κυρίον, ἀλλ’ ἐνάπτων ἀνθρώπων. I still hold, against Ellicott, to this connexion, shrinking from the rude and ill-balanced form of the sentence which the other would bring in. ἀποδεκτόν, peculiar [cf. ἀποδοχή, ch. i. 15] to these Epistles. See 2 Cor. vi. 2) in the sight of our Savour (a title manifestly chosen as belonging to the matter in hand, cf. next verse. On it, see ch. i. 1) God who (i.e. seeing that He) willeth all men to be saved (see ch. iv. 10: Tit. ii. 11, τάς τάς ἀνθρώπων is repeated from verse 1. Chrys.’s comment is very noble: μοῦ τόν θεόν, εἰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι, εἰκός ὑπὲρ ἀπάντων δει εὐσεβθήναι. εἰ πάντας αὐτοί θήκε σωθῆναι, θέλε καὶ συ. εἰ δέ τελείς εὐχήν, τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἄστι το εὐσεβθήναι. Huther rightly remarks, that Maschlein’s view, “nisi pax in orbe terrarum vigeat, fieri nullo modo posse ut voluntati divinae quae omnium hominum salutem cupit, satisfac,” destroys the true context and train of thought: see more below. Wiesinger remarks σωθῆναι,—not σωάσι, as in Tit. iii. 5, as adapted to the mediatorial effect of prayer, not direct divine agency: but we may go yet further, and say that by θέλει πάντας ἀνθρ. σωθῆναι is expressed human acceptance of offered salvation, on which even God’s predestination is contingent. θέλει σωάσι πάντας could not have been said: if so, He would have saved all, in matter of fact. See the remarks, and references to English and other divines, in Ellicott’s note. Calvin most unworthily shuffles out of the decisive testimony borne by this passage to universal redemption. “Apostolus simpliciter intelligit nummum numd vel populum vel ordinem salutem excludi; quia omnibus sine
exceptione evangelium proponit Deus velit. . . . De hominum generibus, non singulis personis sermo est; nihil enim alium intendit, quam principes et extraneos populorum in hoc numero includere. As if kings and all in eminence were not in each case individual men, and to come to (the) certain knowledge (on epignosis, fuller and more assured than gnosis, see 1 Cor. xiii. 12: Col. i. 11; ii. 2) of (the) truth (the expression is a favourite one in these Epistles, see reff. This realization of the truth is in fact identical with σωτηρία, not only [Huther] as that σωτηρία is a rescue from life in untruth, but in its deepest and widest sense of salvation, here and hereafter: cf. John xvii. 3, αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ αἰώνιος ἡμι, ίνα γνωσκόμεθα σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν . . . . . and 1b. 17, ἀγάλασαν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ).

5. For (further grounding of the acceptability of prayer for all men,—in the unity of God. But this verse is joined by the γὰρ directly to the preceding, not to ver. 1. Chrys. gives it rightly—δεικνύον ὅτι σωθήσαν θέλει πάντας) there is ONE God (He is one in essence and one in purpose—not of different minds to different nations or individuals, but of one mind towards all. Similarly Rom. iii. 30, and, which is important for the understanding of that difficult passage, Gal. iii. 20. The double reference, to the unity in essence and unity of purpose, for which I have contended there, is plain and unmistakable here), one Mediator (see reff. It occurs, besides the places in the Gal., only in the Epistle to the Heb., viii. 6; ix. 15; xii. 2). There is no necessity that the idea should, as De W. and Schlierm., be connected with that of a mutual covenant, and so be here far-fetched as regards the context [borrowed from the places in the Heb., according to De W.]: the word is used as standing alone, and representing the fact of Christ Jesus being the only go-between, in whatever sense also (the el is prefixed to the καὶ for emphasis) (of) (between) God and men (if one only goes between, then that One must be for all), (the) man Christ Jesus (why άνθρωπος? Thdrt. answers, άνθρωπον δὲ τὸν χριστὸν άνθίσας, ἐπειδὴ μεσίτην ἐκάλεσεν ένανθρωπίας γάρ ἐμείσθενεν: and so most Commentators. But it is not here the Apostles' object, to set forth the nature of Christ's mediation as regards its being brought about;—only as regards its unity and universality for mankind. And for this latter reason he calls him here by this name man,—that He gathered up all our human nature into Himself, becoming its second Head. So that the άνθρωπος in fact carries with it the very strongest proof of that which he is maintaining. Notice it is not άνθρωπος, though we are obliged inaccurately thus to express it in personality, our Lord was not a man, but in nature He was man. It might be rendered, “Christ Jesus, Himself man.”

I should object, as against Ellcott, to introduce at all the indefinite article: not individual but generic humanity is predicated; and “a man” unavoidably conveys the idea of human individuality. It is singularly unfortunate that Ellc. should have referred to Augustine, Serm. xxvi, as cited by Wordsworth, in corroboration of the rendering “a man!” the Latin homo being of course as incapable of deciding this as the Greek άνθρωπος, and “a man” being only Dr. Wordsworth's translation of it. Nay, the whole tenor of the passage of Augustine (éd. Migne, vol. v. p. 174) precludes such a rendering. The stupidity of such writers as Baur and the Socinians, who regard such an expression as against the deity of Christ, is beyond all power of mine to characterize. In the face of els θεός, els μεσίτης θεοῦ και άνθρωπῶν, to maintain gravely such a position, shews utter blindness from party bias even to the plainest thoughts expressed in the plainest words), who gave himself (reft., especially Tit.) a ransom (ἀντί, as in ἀντιμοσία, Rom. i. 27; 2 Cor. vi. 13: ἀντάλλαγμα, Matt. xvi. 26, expresses more distinctly the reciprocity which is already implied in the simple word in each case. That the main fact alluded to here is the death of Christ, we know: but it is not brought into prominence, being included in, and superseded by the far greater and more comprehensive
fact, that He gave himself, in all that He undertook for our redemption: see Phil. ii. 5—8 on behalf of all (not of a portion of mankind, but of all men; the point of ver. 1, ἡπερ πάντων ἀνθρώπων). —the testimony ('that which was [to be] testified' so St. John frequently uses μαρτυρία, I John v. 9—11: 'an accusative in apposition with the preceding sentence.' Ellicott. This oneness of the Mediator, involving in itself the universality of Redemption, was the great subject of Christian testimony: see below) in its own seasons (refr.; in the times which God had appointed for it. On the temporal dative, see Ellicott's note), for (towards) which (the μαρτυρίαι) I was placed as a herald (pastoral Epistles and 2 Pet. only; but see 1 Cor. i. 21, 23; ix. 1, xx. 1, 19) and apostle (the proclaiming this universality of the Gospel was the one object towards which my appointment as an apostle and preacher was directed. Those who hold the spuriousness of our Epistle regard this returning to himself and his own case on the part of the writer as an evidence of his being one who was acting the part of Paul. So Schleierm. and De W. They have so far truth on their side, that we must recognize here a characteristic increase of the frequency of these personal vindications on the part of the Apostle, as we so often have occasion to remark during these Epistles: the disposition of one who had been long opposed and worried by adversaries to recur continually to his own claims, the assertion of which had now become with him absolute, so to speak, a matter of stock-phrases. Still, the propriety of the assertion here is evident: it is only in the manner of it that the above habit is discernible. See more on this in the Prolegomena. The same phrase occurs verbatim in ref. 2 Tim., I speak the truth, I lie not—in spite of all that Huther and Wiesinger say of the evident appropriateness of this solemn asseveration here, I own I am unable to regard it as any more than a strong and interesting proof of the growth of a habit in the Apostle's mind, which we already trace in 2 Cor. xi. 31, Rom. ix. 1, till he came to use the phrase with less force and relevance than he had once done. Nothing can be more natural than that one whose life was spent in strong conflict and assertion of his Apostleship, should repeat the fervour of his usual asseveration, even when the occasion of that fervour had passed away. Nor can I consent to abandon such a view because it is designated 'questionable and precarious' by Ellic., who is too apt in cases of difficulty, to evade the real conflict of decision by strong terms of this kind)—a teacher of the Gentiles (it was especially in this latter fact that the ἔπειρα πάντων ἀνθρώπων found its justification. The historical proof of his constitution as a teacher of the Gentiles is to be found in Acts ix. 15, xxii. 21, xxvi. 17; but especially in Gal. ii. 9) in (the) faith and (the) truth (do these words refer subjectively to his own conduct in teaching the Gentiles, or objectively to that in which he was to instruct them? The former view is taken by Thdrt. and most Commentators: μετά τῆς προσκομίσεως πίστεως καὶ ἀληθείας πατὸς πατίς προσφέρω: the latter by Heydenreich, &c. Huther [also Ellic.] takes the words as signifying the sphere in which he was appointed to fulfil his office of διδ. θεων,—πίστεις being faith, the subjective relation, and ἀληθεία the truth, the objective good which is appropriated by faith: Wiesinger, as meaning that he is, in the right faith and in the truth, the διδ. θεων. Bengel regards them merely as another asseveration belonging to the assertion that he is διδ. θεων,—'in faith and truth I say it.' This latter at once discourages itself, from its exceeding flatness: though Chrys. also seems to have held it—ἐν πίστει παλιν ἡλλα μη νομίζετε ἐπεὶ διπλατεί ὑκονασα, ὅτι ἁπάτη τῷ πρόσωπῳ ἐστι. καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ φρον. εἰ δὲ ἀληθεία, ὥστι εστι ψευδ. In judging between these, we must take
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into account the usage of ἀλήθεια above, ver. 4, in a very similar reference, when it was to be matter of teaching to all men. There it undoubtedly is, though amarhons, the truth of God. I would therefore take it similarly here, as Wiesinger,—the sphere in which both his teaching and their learning was to be employed—

the truth of the Gospel. Then, if so, it is surely harsh to make πιστεις subjective, especially as the εν is not repeated before ἀλήθεια. It too will most properly be objective,—and likewise regard that in which, as an element or sphere, he was to teach and they to learn: the faith. This εν π. κ. ἀλ. will be, not the object of διδάσκαλον, but the sphere in which he is the διδάσκαλος.

8.] See summary at beginning of chapter. I will then (in Βαθυλομai the active wish is implied: it is no mere willingness or acquiescence," Ellis. On the distinction between Βαθυλομαι and θέλω, see Donaldson, Cratyli. § 463, p. 650 f. ed. 2; and Ellis, on ch. v. 14) that the men (the E. V. by omitting the article, has entirely obscured this passage for its English readers, not one in a hundred of whom ever dream of a distinction of the sexes being here intended. But again the position of τοις ἄνδρας forbids us from supposing that such distinction was the Apostle’s main object in this verse. Had it been so, we should have read τοις ἄνδρας προσεύχεσθαι. As it now stands, the stress is on προσεύχεσθαι, and τοις ἄνδρας is taken for granted. Thus the main subject of ver. 1 is carried on, the duty of prayer, in general—not [as Schleierm. objects] one portion merely of it, the alloting it to its proper offerers) pray in every place (these words εν παντὶ τόπῳ regard the general duty of praying, not the particular detail implied in τοις ἄνδρας: still less are we to join τοις ἄνδρας [τοις] εν παντὶ τόπῳ. It is a local command respecting prayer, answering to the temporal command ἀδιάλειπτος προσεύχεσθαι, 1 Thess. v. 17. It is far-fetched and irrelevant to the context to find in the words, asChr., Thdrt., al., Pol., Erasmi, Calv., Beza, Grot., al., the Christian’s freedom from prescription of place for prayer—πρὸς τὴν νομικὴν διαχειρέσεων. τεθείκεν ὁ γὰρ [νυγο δὲ γὰρ] τοῖς ἱεροσολύμων περιήγαγε τὴν λατρείαν, Thdrt.: and Chrys., ἄριστος ὅπερ τοῖς 'ιουδαίοις (θέματι χωρὶς τῆς, lifting up holy hands (see LXX, ref. Ps.: also Ps. xxvii. 2, xlii. 20; Clem. Rom. Ep. 1 to Corinthians, ch. 29, p. 269: προσεκλωμεν αὕτη ἐν διστάσει ψυχῆς, ἁγνα καὶ ἀμαντός χειρὰς αἱρεῖται πρὸς ἄντων. These two passages, as Huether observes, testify to the practice in the Christian church. The form ἁγνος with a feminine is unusual: but we must not, as Wincr suggests [edn. 6, § 11, 1], join it to ἐπαίροντας. His own instances, στρατιά φύρανος, Luke ii. 13,—Ἱς δὴ χωρὶς ἀνθρ., Rev. iv. 3, furnish some precedent: and the fact that the ending -ος is common to all three establishes an analogy. “Those hands are holy, which have not surrendered themselves as instruments of evil desire: the contrary are βεβηλωμα χειρες, 2 Macc. v. 16: compare, for the expression, Job xvii. 9, Ps. xxiii. 4, and in the N. T., especially James iv. 8, καθαρίσατε χειρὰς καὶ ἀγνίσατε καρδίας.” Huether. See classical passages in Wetst.) without (separate from, “putting away,” as Conybh.) wrath and disputations (i.e. in tranquillity and mutual peace, so literally, sine disciputatione, as vulg., see note on ref. Phil. Ellis,’ objection, that we should thus import from the context a meaning unconfirmed by good lexical authority, is fully met by the unquestionable usage of the verb διαλογίζομαι in the N. T. for to dispute. At the same time, seeing that the matter treated of is prayer, where disputing hardly seems in place, perhaps doubting is the better sense; which, after all, is a disputatio within one’s self). 9.] So also (ὕσωτος, by the parallel passage, Tit. ii. 3, seems more than a little more than a copula, not
necessarily to refer to the matter which has been last under treatment) I will that women (without the article, the reference to τῶν ἄνδρας above is not so pointed: i.e., we need not imagine that the reference is necessarily to the same matter of detail, but may regard the verse [see below] as being to the general duties and behaviour of women, as not belonging to the category of οἱ προσεύχεσθαι εἰν παντὶ τότῳ adorn themselves (there is no need, as Chrys. and most Commentators, to supply προσεύχεσθαι to complete the sense: indeed if I have apprehended the passage rightly, it would be altogether irrelevant. The ὀφέλεις serving merely as a copula [see above], the προσεύχεσθαι belonging solely and emphatically to τῶν ἄνδρας, — the question, ‘what then are women to do?’ is answered by insisting on modesty of appearance and the ornament of good works, as contrasted [ver. 12] with the man’s part. The public assemblies are doubtless, in ver. 12, still before the Apostle’s mind, but in a very slight degree. It is the general duties of women, rather than any single point in reference to their conduct in public worship, to which he is calling attention; though the subject of public worship led to his thus speaking, and has not altogether disappeared from his thoughts. According to this view, the construction proceeds direct with the infinitive κοσμεῖν, without any supposition of an anacoluthon, as there must be on the other hypothesis) in orderliness (ref.) apparel (cf. Tit. ii. 3, note: “in seemly guise,” Ellic. κατα-
στολή, originally ‘arrangement,’ ‘putting in order,’ followed in its usage that of its verb καταστέλλω. We have in Eur. Baech. 851, ἀπέτευκα TRY Tον πλόκαμον] πάλιν καταστελοῦμεν,—we will re-arrange the dishevelled lock;” then Aristoph. Thesm. 256, 19, 21 καταστέλλω με τὰ περὶ τῷ σχῆμα—cloth, dress me. Thus in Plut. Pericl. 5, we read of Anaxagoras, that his καταστολή περιβαλάς, ‘arrangement of
dress,’ was πρὸς οὖν ἕκαταρμομένη τάξις ἐν τῷ λέγειν. Then in Jos. B. J. ii. 8, 4, of the Essenes, that their κατα-
στολή καὶ σχῆμα σώματος was ὅμοιον τοῖς μετὰ φόβου παίδασωμένοις παισίν, which he proceeds to explain by saying ὅτε δὲ ἐστίνατι, ὅτε ὑπόθεμα ἄμει-
βουσί, πρὶν ἣ διαρθαγίγωι, κ. λ. Σο. That we must take it as meaning ‘the apparel,’ the whole investiture of the person. This he proceeds presently to break up into detail, forbidding πλέγματα, χρυσόν, μαργαρίτας, ἰματισμὸν πολυτελῆ, all which are parts of the καταστολή, This view of the meaning of the word requires ἐν καταστολή κοσμίω to belong to κοσμεῖν, and then to be taken up by the ὑπὸ following, an arrangement, as it seems to me, also required by the natural construction of the sentence itself) with shamefastness (not, as modern reprints of the E. V., ‘shamefacedness,’ which is a mere un-
meaning corruption by the printers of a very expressive and beautiful word: see Trench, N. T. Synonyms, § xx.) and self-
restraint (I adopt Conybeare’s word as, though not wholly satisfactory, bringing out the leading idea of σῳφροσύνη better than any other. Its fault is, that it is a word too indicative of effort, as if the un-
chaste desires were continually breaking bounds, and as continually held in check; whereas in the αὐθεῦς, the self-and-
thought, no such continual struggle has place, but the better nature is esta-
blished in its rule. Trench (ubi supra) has dealt with the two words, setting aside the insufficient distinction of Xe-
phon, Cyr. viii. 1, 31,—where he says of ζυγοῦν, ζυγοῦν, καὶ σῳφρονῶν ἑτέρας, ὅτα μὲν αἰδώς ἐστὶ 
τῶν σῷφρων τῷ ἱερῷ χρを与οντος, τῶν δὲ σῷφρων 
καὶ τῶν τῷ ἁμαρταντος. “II,” Trench concludes, ‘αἰδώς is the ‘shamefastness,’ or tendency which springs from over-
passing the limits of womanly reserve and modesty, as well as from the dishonour which would justly attach thereto, σῳ-
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φροσύνη is that habitual inner self-government, with its constant rein on all the passions and desires, which would hinder the temptation to this from arising, or at all events from arising in such strength as should overbear the checks and hindrances which αἰδὸς opposed to it.” Ellic. gives for it, “sober-mindedness,” and explains it, “the well-balanced state of mind, arising from habitual self-restraint.” See his notes, here, and in his translation), not in plats (of hair: cf. 1 Pet. iii. 3, ἐμφύλησα τριγών, and see Ellcott’s note) and gold (καὶ περιφάσας χρυσάων, 1 Pet. l. c., perhaps, from the καὶ, the gold is supposed to be twined among, or worn with, the plaited hair. See Rev. xvii. 4), or pears, or costly raiment (= εὔδηλως ἤματων, 1 Pet. l. c.),—but, which is becoming for women professing (ἐπαγγέλλασει is ordinarily in N. T. ‘to promise,’ see ref. But the meaning ‘to profess,’ ‘pre se ferre,’ is found in the classics, e.g. Xen. Mem. i. 2. 7, ἑθαμαζέ δὲ, καὶ τι ἀργεῖων ἐπαγγελλόμενοι ἀργύρων πράττοντο: cf. Palm and Rost’s Lex., and the numerous examples in Wetst.) godliness (θεοσέβεια is found in Xen. An. ii. 6, 26, and Plato, Epinomis, pp. 985 d, 989 e. The adjective θεοσέβης is common enough),—by means of good works (not εὖ in again, because the adornment lies in a different sphere and cannot be so expressed. The adorning which results from good works is brought about by [dia] their practice, not displayed by appearing to be invested with them [ἐν]. Huther’s construction, after Thdr., Κο, Luth., Calv., and Mack and Matthias,—ἐπαγγελλ. θεοσέβειαι δη ἐργών ἀγάθων,—is on ground objectionable:—1) the understanding δ as εὖ τοῦτο δ or καθό, which of itself might pass, introduces great harshness into the sentence:—2) the junction of ἐπαγγελλομένως δι is worse than that of κοσμεῖν δι, to which objects:—3) the arrangement of the words is against it, which would thus rather be γυναίκες δι ἐργών ἀγάθων θεοσέβειαι ἐπαγγελλομένως:—4) he does not see that his objection, that the adornment of women has been already specified by εὖ καταστολή κ.τ.λ., and therefore need not be again specified by δι ἐργών ἄγ. applies just as much to his own rendering, taking δ for καθό δ or εὖ τοῦτο δ.

11.] Let a woman learn (in the congregation, and everywhere) in silence in all (possible) subjection (the thought of the public assemblies has evidently given rise to this precept [see 1 Cor. xiv. 31]: but he carries it further than can be applied to them in the next verse): but (the contrast is to a suppressed hypothesis of a claim to do that which is forbidden: cf. a similar δὲ, 1 Cor. xi. 6) to a woman I permit not to teach (in the church [primarily], or, as the context shows, any where else), nor to lord it over (ἀδελφός μενήκτερ χρησις ἐπι τοῦ δεοτάτου, ὥσ περ τὰ δικαστηρία βήτορες, ἀλλ' ἐπι τοῦ ἄνταχοιρος φωνῆς, Phryn. But Euripides thus uses it, Suppl. 412: καὶ μὴν ἀπαν γε δήμοι αἴδηνθα καθόν, ὑπάρχουσα ἀποκεφαλεῖται: the fact is that the word itself is originally a ‘vox media,’ signifying merely ‘one who with his own hand’. . . . and the context fills up the rest, αἰδήνθα φωνῆς, or the like. And in course of time, the meaning of ‘autocrat’ prevailing, the word itself and its derivatives henceforth took this course, and αἰδήνθα, -α, -αι, all of later growth, bore this reference only. Later still we have αἰδὴνθις, from first authority [‘i'δ enim αἰδηνθικας, nuntiabatur,’ Cie. ad Att. x. 9]. It seems quite a mistake to suppose that αἰδήνθης arrived at its meaning of a despot by passing through that of a murderer) the man, but (supply ["βούλωμα, not κελεύω, which St. Paul does not use." Ellic.] ‘I Command her,’ the construction in 1 Cor. xiv. 34 is the same) to be in silence. 13.] Reason of this precept, in the original order of creation. For Adam was first (not of all men, which is not here under consideration, and would stultify the subsequent clause:—but first in comparison
with Eve) made (see ref. Gen., from which the word ἐπάλασθη seems to be taken: cf. 1 Cor. xii. 8, 9, and indeed that whole passage, which throws light on this), then Eve.

14. Second reason—as the woman was last in being, so she was first in sin—indeed the only victim of the Tempter’s deceit. And Adam was not deceived (not to be weakened, as Thdt. τὸ ὑπάρξειν αὐτῆς, αὐτῶν τοῦ, ὑπάρξεις, ἐφορεῖτο: nor, as Matthies, must we supply ὑπὸ τοῦ ὑπάρξεως: nor, with De W., Wiesinger, al., must we press the fact that the woman only was misled by the senses. Bengel and Huther seem to me [but cf. Ellicott] to have apprehended the right reference: ‘serpens mulieriem decept, mulier virum non decept, sed ei persuasit.’ As Huther observes, the ὑπάρξειν, in the original narrative, is used of the man only. We read of no communication between the serpent and the man. The “subllest beast of all the field” knew his course better: she listened to the lower solicitation of sense and expediency: he to the higher one of conjugal love: but the woman (not now Eve, but generic, as the next clause shews: for Eve could not be the subject to σωθήσεται) having been seduced by deceit (stronger than ἀπατηθēσα, as exoro than oro: implying the full success of the ἀπάτη) has become involved (the thought is—the present state of transgression in which the woman [and the man too: but that is not treated here] by sin is constituted, arose [which was not so in the man] from her originally having been seduced by deceit) in transgression (here as always, breach of a positive command: cf. Rom. iv. 15).

15. But (contrast to this her great and original defect) she (general) shall be saved through (brought safely through, but in the higher, which is with St. Paul the only sense of σώζω, see below) her child-bearing (in order to understand the fulness of the meaning of σωθήσεται here, we must bear in mind the history itself, to which is the constant allusion. The curse on the woman for her παράβασις was, ἐν λασίαις τῆς τέκνας [Gen. iii. 16]. Her τεκνογονία is that in which the curse finds its operation. What then is here promised her? Not only exemption from that curse in its worst and heaviest effects: not merely that she shall safely bear children: but the Apostle uses the word σωθήσεται purposely for its higher meaning, and the construction of the sentence is precisely as ref. 1 Cor.—αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, αὐτώς δὲ ἀσ διὰ πυρὸς. Just as that man should be saved through, as passing through, fire which is his trial, his hindrance in his way, in spite of which he escapes,—so she shall be saved, through, as passing through, her child-bearing, which is her trial, her curse, her [not means of salvation, but] hindrance in the way of it. The other renderings which have been given seem to me both irrelevant and ungrammatical. Chrys., Thl., al., for instance, would press τεκνογονία to mean the Christian education of children: Heinrichs, strangely enough, holds that her τεκνογονία is the punishment of her sin, and that being undergone, she shall be saved διὰ τῆς του, i.e. by having paid it. Conyb, gives it ‘women will be saved by the bearing of children,’ i.e. as he explains it in his note, “are to be kept in the path of safety (?) by the performance of the peculiar functions which God has assigned to their sex.” Some, in their anxiety to give διὰ the instrumental meaning, would understand διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας ‘by means of the Child-bearing,’ i.e. ‘the Incarnation;’ a rendering which needs no refutation. I see that Ellicott maintains this latter interpretation: still I find no reason to qualify what I have above written. 1 Cor. iii. 15 seems to me so complete a key of Pauline usage of σώζεις—θαῦμα διὰ, that I cannot abandon the path opened by it, till far stronger reason has
III. 1 w Πιστὸς ὁ λόγος· εἰ τις ἔπισκοπὴς ὑδορέγεται, καλῶν ἔργων ἐπιθυμεῖ. 2 ὅπως ὁ ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ see y, see G-lat, 17, the exegetical, 19, the real-Epicyclopide, and 18, the real-Encylopaédie, and Ellie's note here), he desires a good work (not 'a good thing' but a good employment: see 1 Thess. v. 13: 2 Tim. iv. 5; one of the kalὸν ἔργον and 2 T. T. T., see c. 10, Heb. xi. 10 only. t. (act., Job viii, x ch. vi. 10 only. x—Acts i. 29, from Ps., Acts xx. 28. (Luke xix. 8). c. «A.euoj/Tes but and 2 z see y a in see G-lat he TTOJ I've real-Epicyclopide, 17, the the the same (see before singular) have remained (shall be found in that day to have remained—a further proof of the higher meaning of σωθησέαται in faith and love and holiness (see ref., where the word is used in the same reference, of holy chastity) with self-restraint (see above on ver. 9).

Ch. III. 1—13.] Precepts respecting overseers (presbyters) [8—13]. 1. Faithful is the saying (see on ch. i. 15, from the analogoy of which it appears that the words are to be referred to what follows, not, as Chrys., Thl., Erasm., al., to what has preceded): if any man seeks (it does not seem that he uses ὑφέγεισαι with any reference to an ambitious seeking, as De W. thinks: in Heb. xii. 36 the word is a 'vox media,' and even in ch. vi. 10, the blame rests, not on ὑφεγομένου, but on the thing sought: and in Polyb. ix. 20. 5, the word is used as one merely of passage, in giving directions respecting the office sought: κελευνέται ἀστρολογεῖν κ. ὑφεγομένους αὐτῆς [τῆς στρατηγίας]. So that De W.'s inference respecting ambition for the episcopate betraying the late age of the Epistle, falls to the ground) (the) overseership (or, bishopric; office of an ἐπίσκοπος; but the ἐπίσκοπος of the N. T. have officially nothing in common with our Bishops. See notes on Acts xx. 17, 28. The identity of the ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος in apostolic times is evident from Tit. i. 5—7: see also note on Phil. i. 1, the article Βίβλοι in Herzog's Real-Encylopaédie, and Ellie's note here), he desires a good work (not 'a good
2. rec. υπολογει, with D†Kae f n Damasc: -αισον FLN3 d o:txt AD†K3 rel Orig- see Naz.

this view. Chrys. is the only one who proposes an alternative: - τὴν ἀμετρίαν κολλεῖ, ἐτείξῃ ἐπὶ τῶν Ιουδαίων ἐξήν καὶ δευτέρους ὑμελεῖ γάμους, κ. δύο ἔξειν κατὰ ταῖς γυναίκας. Thdt.: τὸ δὲ μᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνάμφ, εἰ μοι δοκοῦν εἰρρέχει τινὲς, πάλαι γάρ εἰδικοῖς καὶ Ἁληθεῖς κ. Ιουδαίοις κ. δύο κ. τρίτοι κ. πλεῖον γυναικὶ νόμῳ γάμου κατὰ ταῖς συνοικίαις. τινὲς δὲ καὶ νῦν, κατοίκων τῶν βασιλικῶν τῶν δύο κατὰ ταῖς ἀγαθαίς κοινωνίας γυναίκας, καὶ παλαιαίς μίγνωται κ. ἐταίρις. ἐφανε τῶν τῶν θείων ἀπόστολον εἰρρέχει, τὸν μᾶς μόνη γυναικὶ συνοικίαις σωφρόνες, τῆς ἐπισκοπησιτάξης ἠξίων εἶναι χειροτονίας. οὐ γὰρ τοῦ δευτέρου, φαίνεται, ἐξέβλημα γάμων, ὡς παλαιός τοῦ τούτο γενέστερα κελέσσαι. And similarly Thl., Ec., and Jer.

2) For the view that second marriages are prohibited to aspirants after the episcopate,-is, the most probable meaning [see there] of οἷς ἀνθρόπων γύνη in ch. v. 9,—as also the wide prevalence in the early Church of the idea that, although second marriages were not forbidden to Christians, abstinence from them was better than indulgence in them. So Hermas Pastor, ii. 4, 4, p. 921 f., 'Domine, si vir vel mulier absolutum discerserit, et nonper aliquis corum, nunciam peccat? 'Qui multit, non peccat: sed si per se namseret, magnum sibi conquirit honorem apud Dominum:' and Clem. Alex. Strom. iii. 12 [81], p. 518 f., 'ὁ ἀπόστολος [1 Cor. viii. 39, 40] δὲ ἀκρασίαν κ. πάνωσιν κατὰ συγγρῶν δεύτερον μεταδίωσι γάμου, ἐπεὶ κ. οὐσίαν οὐχ ἀμαρτάνει μὲν κατὰ διάθηκην, οὐ γὰρ κεκλώθη κρίτων τοῦ νόμου, οὐ πληροῦ δὲ τῆς κατὰ τὸ πρωτεῖον πολιτεῖα τὴν κατ’ ἐνίκων τελειότητα. And so in Suicer, i. 1, p. 892 f., Chrys., Greg. Naz. [τὸ πρῶτον (συνοικίων) νόμος, τὸ δευτέρου συγχώρησις, τὸ τρίτον παραμορφια, τὸ δὲ ὑπὲρ τουτο, χορόθηθη. Orat. xxxviiii. 8, p. 650], —Κριππίουν [ἐνέτρογοι σοὐ ἐκεῖνον δεξιοῦν ἐν αὐτῷ (τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ) εἰς ἑρμηνεύσει. Doyt. compend. de fide, p. 1104], Orig.—the Apostolical Canon xvii. [ὁ δυοῖς γάμοις συμπλακεῖς μετά τὸ βάπτισμα, ὡς παλαιόν κτητόρον, οὐ δύναται εἶναι εἰπωτευτὸς, ἐπεξετέρως, ἡ διάκονος, ὡς τοῦ καταλογοῦ τοῦ ισερατίκου], δ. c. Huther cites from Athenagoras the ex-

pression εὐπρεπῆς μοιχέλα applied to second marriage. With regard to the Apostle's own command and permissions of this state [see above], they do not come into account here, because they are confessedly (and expressly so in ch. v. 14) for those whom it was not contemplated to admit into ecclesiastical office. 3) There have been some divergent lines of interpretation, but they have not found many advocates. Some [e.g. Wegscheider] deny altogether the formal reference to 1) or 2), and understand the expression only of a chaste life of fidelity to the marriage vow: 'that neither polygamy, nor concubinage, nor any offensive deuterogamy, should be able to be alleged against such a person.' But surely this is very vague, for the precise words μᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνήρ. Bretschneider maintains that μᾶς is here the indefinite article, and that the Apostle means, an ἐπίσκοπος should be the husband of a wife. This hardly needs serious refutation. Winer however has treated it, edn. 6, § 18, 9 note, shewing that by no possibility can the indefinite ἐστι stand where it would as here cause ambiguity, only where unity is taken for granted. Worse still is the Romanist evasion, which understands the μια γυνῃ of the Church. The view then which must I think be adopted, especially in presence of ch. v. 9 [where see note] is, that to candidates for the episcopate [presbytery] St. Paul forbids second marriage. He requires of them pre-eminent chastity, and abstinence from licence which is allowed to other Christians. How far such a prohibition is to be considered binding on us, now that the Christian life has entered into another and totally different phase, is of course an open question for the present Christian church at any time to deal with. It must be as matter of course understood that regulations, in all lawful things, depend, even when made by an Apostle, on circumstances: and the supersitious observance of the letter in such cases is often pregnant with mischief to the people and cause of Christ), sober (probably in the more extended sense of the word [ὑ' vigilantem animo], Beng: διεισήγησθαι, καὶ προσκοπεῖν τὸ πρακτεῖν δουμεῖν, Thdt. toutepî
3. rec. aft. πληκτήν (from Tit. i. 7), with rel.: om ADFKLX n. 17. 672 latt syrr cpott goh-lat-ff. ἀλλὰ ΑΝ.

4. προστάσαιοιοι Ν.

diорατικῶν, μιρίους ἔχοντα πάντων ὀφθαλμοὺς, ὡς ἔβλεποντα, καὶ μὴ ἀκαθάρτητον τὰ τῆς διανοίας ζώμα, κ.τ.λ. Chryst.,] as in 1 Thess. v. 6, 8;—a pattern of active sobriety and watchfulness: for all these adjectives, as far as didaskálov, are descriptive of positive qualities: μὴ πάροινον giving the negative and more restricted opposite, self-restrained (or, discreet; see above on ch. ii. 9), orderly (μονὸς σωφρός is intus, id κόσμος is extra,' Beng.: thus expanded by Theodoret: καὶ φήγωματι καὶ σχήματι καὶ βλέποματι ὧστε καὶ διὰ τοῦ σώματος φαινόμενα τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς σωφροσύνης, hospitable (loving, and entertaining strangers; see reff. and Heb. xiii. 2. This duty in the early days of the Christian church was one of great importance. Brethren in their travels could not resort to the houses of the heathen, and would be subject to insult in the public decessoria, apt in teaching (τὰ θέα πεταδειμένῳ, καὶ παρασκευὴς δυνάμενον τὰ προσόκητα, Thdrt.: so we have τῶν ἵππων βουλομένους γεγενήθην, Xen. Sympos. ii. 10: not merely given to teaching, but able and skilled in it. All wight teach, to whom the Spirit imparted the gift: but skill in teaching was the especial office of the minister, on whom would fall the ordinary duty of instruction of believers and refutation of gainsayers: 3—7.) (His negative qualities are now specified; the positive ones which occur henceforth arising out of and explaining those negative ones):

3. not a brawler (properly, 'one in his cup's, 'a man rendered petulant by much wine;' τὸ τοῦτο παροκομῖον λυτεῖν τους παρόντας, τούτη ἐγὼ κρίνω παροικίαν, Xen. Sympos. vi. 1. And perhaps the literal meaning should not be lost sight of. At the same time the word and its cognates were often used without reference to wine: see παροικίας, —α, —οις, in Palm and Rost's Lex. As πλήκτης answers to πάροινον, it will be best to extend the meaning to signify rather the character, than the mere fact, of παροικία, not a striker (this word also may have a literal and narrower, or a metaphorical and wider sense. In this latter it is taken by Thdrt.: οὐ τὸ εὔπτιμόν εἰς καιρὸν καλλίει· ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ δεόντως

tóτο ποιεῖν. But perhaps the coarser literal sense is better, as setting forth more broadly the opposite to the character of a Christian ἐπίσκοπος, but (this contrast springs out of the two last, and is set off by them) forbearing (reasonable and gentle: πρὸς εἰδότα τὰ πρὸς αὐτῶν πλημμελήματα, Thdrt. See note on Phil. iv. 5, and Trench, N. T. Syn. § xliii.; but correct his derivation, as in that note), not quarrelsome (cf. 2 Tim. ii. 24. Conyb.'s 'peaceable' is objectionable, as losing the negative character), not a lover of money (liberal, Conyb.: but this is still more objectionable: it is not the positive virtue of liberality but the negative one of abstinance from love of money, which, though it may lead to the other in men who have money, is yet a totally distinct thing. Thdrt.'s explanation, while true, is yet characteristic of an ἐπίσκοπος of later days: οὐκ εἰςν ἄκριτωρα σώμα- τα γὰρ νομοθετεῖ ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐρωτᾶ τῆς χρησεως. δυνατον γὰρ κεκτήσατα μὲν, οἰκουμενίκας δὲ ταύτα διεύθυνε καὶ μὴ δο- λεωτῷ τούτους, ἀλλὰ τούτων διευθύνει:

4.) (This positive requisite again seems to spring out of the negative ones which have preceded, and especially out of ἀφλάργυρον. The negatives are again resumed below with μὴ νεφωτον) presiding well over his own house (ἴδιον, as contrasted with the church of God below, οἰκον, in its wide acceptance, 'household,' including all its members), having children (not 'keeping [or having] his children' [ἐχοντα τα τέκνα], as E. V. and Conyb. The emphatic position of τέκνα, besides its anarthrousness, should have prevented this mistake; cf. also Tit. i. 6,—μᾶς γυναῖκας ἀνήρ, τέκνα ἕχων πατότα, κ.τ.λ.,) in subjection (i. e. who are in subjection) with all gravity (reverent modestly; see ch. ii. 2. These words are best applied to the children, not to the head of the house, which acceptance of them rather belongs to the rendering impinged above. It is the σεμνότης of the children, the result of his προστάσαις, which is to prove that he knows how to preside over his own house,—not his own σεμνότης in governing them: the matter of fact, that he has children who are in subjection to him in all gravity,—not
his own keeping or endeavouring to keep them so. Want of success in ruling at home, not want of will to rule, would disqualify him for ruling the church. So that the distinction is an important one: but (contrast, as in ch. ii. 12, to the suppressed but imagined opposite case) if any man knows not (the use of εί ὁδε here is perfectly regular: see Ellicott's note) how to preside over his own house (shews, by his children being insubordinate, that he has no skill in domestic government), how shall he (this future includes 'how can he,' but goes beyond it—appealing, not to the man's power, which conditions his success, but to the resulting matter of fact, which will be sure to substantiate his failure) take charge of (so Plat. Gorg. p. 520 a: οἱ φάκοντες προστάγαν τῆς πόλεως καὶ εὐμελείαν) the church of God (ὡ τὰ σιμικρὰ οἰκονομεῖν οὐκ εἰδὼς, πῶς δύναται τῶν κριτιών καὶ θείων πιστεύειν τὴν εὐμελείαν; Thdtb. See the idea followed out popularly in Chrys. 6.) (the negative characteristics are resumed) not a novice (νεόφυτος τῶν εὐθύων πειστευκότα καλέω εὖ γάρ, φήμην, εὕρωτα. οὐ γάρ, οὐ τινες υπέλαβον, τῶν νεόν τῆς ἡλικίας ἐκβάλλει, Thdtb. So Chl. [νεοκατήχητος], Thl. [νεοβάπτιστος].) An objection has been raised to this precept by Schleierm., that it could hardly find place in the apostolic church, where all were νεόφυτοι. Matthias answers, that in Crete this might be so, and therefore such a precept would be out of place in the Epistle to Titus, but the Ephesian church had been many years established. But De W. rejoins to this, that the precepts are perfectly general, not of particular application. The real reply is to be found, partly by narrowing the range of νεόφυτος, partly in assigning a later date to these Epistles than is commonly held. The case here contemplated is that of one very recently converted. To ordain such a person to the ministry would, for the reason here assigned, be most unadvisable. But we cannot imagine that such period need be extended at the most to more than three or four years, in cases of men of full age who became Christians; and surely such a condition might be fulfilled in any of the Pauline churches, supposing this Epistle to bear any thing like the date which I have assigned to it in the Prolegg. ch. vii. § ii.), lest being besotted with pride (from τῦφος, smoke, steam, and hence metaphorically, the pother which a man's pride raises about him so that he cannot see himself or others as they are. So τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς, ὄνειρος καὶ τῦφος, Marc. Antonin. ii. 17: τὸν τῦφον ἀπεταύρωμα τίνα κατόπιν φιλοσοφίας εἰς τοὺς σοφιατάς ἀπεικόνισε, Plut. Mor. [p. 580 c. Palm. Lex.]: Hence τούφουθεναι, which is used only in this metaphorical sense, to be thus blinded or bewildered with pride or self-conceit. So τετυφωμένοι πάντων εὐνυχίας, Strabo xv. p. 586,—ἐπὶ πλούτους τε καὶ ἀρχαῖας, Lucian, Necyom. 12. See numerous other examples in Palm and Rost's Lex., from whence the above are taken) he fall into the judgment of the devil (these last words are ambiguous. Is τοῦ διαβόλου [1] the genitive objective [as Rom. iii. 8], 'the judgment into which the devil fell,'—or [2] the genitive subjective, 'the judgment which is wrought by the devil' [1] is held by Chrys. [εἰς τὴν καταδικήν τὴν αὐτήν, ἢν ἐκείνος ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνθρωπίας ὑπέμεινε], Thdtb. [τὴν τοῦ διαβόλου τιμωρία περιπεσεῖται], Thl., [Ecc., Pel., Calv. [in eodem enim diabo condemnationem sunt.] See below under (2)]. Beza, Est., Grot. [id est, poema qualsibi diablo eventi, qui de ecele dejectus est, 2 Pet. ii. 4, nempe ob superbiam, Sir. x. 13'], Beng., Wolf ['repræsentato diaboli exemplo'], Heirn, Heydenreich, Mack, De W., Wiesinger, al. : and by Ellicott. [2] by Ambri. [apparently: 'Satanas præcipitatum eum'], Heumann, Matthiæs ['if a Christian church-overseer allowed himself to be involved in a charge of pride, the adversary (in concreto living men, his un-
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al.-, Huther. It is hardly worth while recounting under this head, the views of those who take τοῦ διαβόλου for a slanderer, inasmuch as δὲ διαβόλος never occurs in this sense in the N. T. [on διαβόλος, adjective, in this sense, see below, ver. 11] This is done in both verses 6 and 7, by Luther [ςδιαβόλος], Rosenm., Michaelis, Wegsch., Flatt: in verse 6 and not in verse 7, by Erasm., Mosheim, al. In deciding between the above, one question must first be answered: are we obliged to preserve the same character of the genitive in verses 6 and 7? because, if so, we must manifestly take [2]: for [ἐνειδίσαμον ἐκείνῳ τῷ διαβόλῳ [see below] cannot bear any other meaning than 'the [reproach and] snare which the devil lays.' This question must be answered, not by any mere consideration of uniformity, but by careful enquiry into the import of the substantive κρίμα. I conceive we cannot understand it here otherwise than as a condemnatory sentence. The word is a vox media; ὥσεν ἐκπειστὸν τὸ κρίμα. Exch. Suppl. 392: but the d&d here expressed of falling into it necessarily confines it to its adverse sense. This being so, Bengel's remark is noticeable:—"diabolus potest opprobrium inferre, judicium non potest: non enim judicat, sed judicatur." To this Huther answers, that we must not consider the κρίμα of the devil as necessarily parallel with God's κρίμα, any more than with man's on his neighbour. 'To understand,' he continues, "the κρίμα τοῦ διαβόλου, we must compare Eph. ii. 2, where the devil is called τὸ πνεῦμα τῶν ἐνεργῶν ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας: so that whatever the world does to the reproach [ὑπὸ ἀπειθείας] of Christ's Church, is the doing of the spirit that works in the world, viz. of the devil." But surely this reply is quite inadequate to justify the use of the decisive κρίμα: and Huther himself has, by suggesting 'reproach,' evaded the real question, and taken refuge in the unquestioned meaning of the next verse.

He goes on to say, that only by understanding this of a deed of the Prince of the antichristian world, can we clearly establish a connexion with the following verse, pointed out as it is by δὲ. But this is still more objectionable: δὲ καὶ disjoins the two particulars, and introduces the latter as a separate and additional matter. From the use of the decisive word κρίμα, I infer that it cannot be an act of the adversary which is here spoken of, but an act in which ἐβρακὼν τοῦ κόσμου τοστού κόσμου. Then as to uniformity with ver. 7, I should not be disposed to make much account of it. For one who so loved similarity of external phrase, even where different meanings were to be conveyed, as St. Paul, to use the genitives in κρίμα τοῦ διαβόλου and παγίς τοῦ διαβόλου in these different meanings, is surely nothing which need cause surprise. τοῦ διαβόλου is common to both: the devil's condemnation, and the devil's snare, are both alike alien from the Christian, in whom, as in his divine Master, the adversary should find nothing, and with whom he should have nothing in common. The κρίμα τοῦ διαβόλου is in fact but the consummation of that state into which the παγίς τοῦ διαβόλου is the introduction. I therefore unhesitatingly adopt [1]—the condemnation into which Satan fell through the same blinding effect of pride.

7. Moreover (δὲ, bringing in the contrast of addition; 'more than this,' . . . καὶ, the addition itself of a new particular) he must have a good testimony (reft) from those without (lit. 'those from without,' the usual γνωρίζω, with τὸν [reft] being added as harmonizing with the ἀπό, the testimony coming 'from without'), lest he fall into (a question arises which must be answered before we can render the following words. Does ἐνειδίσμων [1] stand alone, 'into reproach, and the snare of the devil,' or is it [2] to be joined with παγίδα as belonging to διαβόλου? For [1], which is the view of Thl., Est., Wolf, Heyden., Huther, Wiesinger, al. [and Ellic, doubtfully], it is alleged, that ἐνειδίσμων is separated from καὶ παγίδα by ἀπό. But this alone cannot decide the matter. The Apostle
may have intended to write merely eis ὅνειδισμόν ἐμπέση τοῦ διαβόλου. Then in adding καὶ παγίδα, we may well conceive that he would keep eis ὅνειδισμόν, ἐμπέση τοῦ διαβόλου, uniformity with the preceding verse, and also not to throw κ. παγίδα into an unnatural prominence, as would be done by placing it before ἔμπιση. We must then decide on other grounds. Wiesinger, seeing that the ὅνειδισμός τοῦ διαβόλου, if these are to be taken together, must come immediately from οἱ ἐξωθεν, objects, that he doubts whether any where the devil is said face to face to that which he faced per aternum. But surely 1 John iii. 8 is a case in point: ὁ ποιών τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν, ὅτι ἀρχής ὁ διάβολος ἀμαρτάνει. εἰς τοῦτο ἐπαιρεότηθαι ὁ υἱός τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα λάβῃ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου, — and indeed Eph. ii. 2, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ νῦν ἐνεργοῦ ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας. Huther supports this view by ch. v. 14: but I am unable to see how that verse touches the question: for whether the ὅνειδισμός belong to τοῦ διαβ. or not, it clearly must come in case from οἱ ἐξωθεν. One consideration in favour of this view has not been alleged: — that ἡ παγίς τοῦ διαβόλου seems, from 2 Tim. ii. 26, to be a familiar phrase with the Apostle, and therefore less likely to be joined with another governing substantive.

For [2], we have Thdrt. [τῶν ἐξωθέν τῶν ἀπόστων ημεῖς ὁ γόρ καὶ παρ’ ἐκείνους πλεῖστην ἔτρεχαν πρὸ τῆς χειροτονιάς διαβολήν, ἑπονείδιστος ἔσται, καὶ πολλοὶ ὀνείδισι περιβαλεῖ τὸ κοῦν, καὶ εἰς τὴν προτέραν ὅτι τάξιτα παλινδρόμησι παρανομὼν, τοῦ διαβόλου πάντα πρὸ τοῦ μυχανεμένου], al.—Bengel ["diabolus potest antisittii mali testisimoni labarinti plurimum excitare molestia, per se et per homines calumniatores"], De W., al. The chief grounds for this view are, [a] grammatical — that the eis is not repeated before παγίδα. I am not sure, whether we are right in applying such strict rules to these Pastoral Epistles: but the consideration cannot but have some weight. [b] contextual — that the Apostle would hardly have alleged the mere ἐμπέση εἰς ὅνειδισμόν as a matter of sufficient importance to be parallel with εἰς. εἰς παγίδα τοῦ διαβόλου. This latter, I own, inclines me to adopt [2], but I would not by any means speak strongly in repudiation of the other) the reproach and the snare of the devil (ref. This latter is usually taken as meaning, the danger of relapse [cf. Thdrt. cited above]: so Calv.: "ne infamiae expositus, perfricite frontis esse incipit, tandoque magare licentia se prostitut at omnum necipitium: quod est diaboli plagis se irrigit. Quid enim spei restat ubi nullus est peccati pudor?"

Grot. gives it a different turn: 'ne contumelias notatus quaerat se ulcisci.' These, and many other references, may well be contained in the expression, and we need not, I think, be at the pains precisely to specify any one direction which the evil would take. Such an one's steps would be shackled—his freedom hampered—his temper irritated—his character lost—and the natural result would be a fall from his place, to the detriment not of himself only, but of the Church of Christ.

8—13.] Precepts regarding deacons and deaconesses (see below on ver. 11).

8.] The construction continues from the preceding—the δεῖ εἶναι being in the Apostle's mind as governing the accusatives. In like manner (the ὅταν seems introduced by the similarity of character,—not merely to mark an additional particular) the deacons (mentioned as a class, besides here, only Phil. i. 1, where, as here, they follow the ἐκκλησίαν). Phoebe, Rom. xvi. 1, is a διάκονος of the church at Cenchrea. The term or its cognates occur in a vaguer sense, but still indicating a special office, in Rom. xii. 7: 1 Pet. iv. 11. The connexion of the ecclesiastical deacons with the seven appointed in Acts vi. is very doubtful: see Chrysostom's and Gæ's testimony, distinguishing them, in note there. But that the ecclesiastical order sprung out of similar necessities, and had for its field of work similar objects, can hardly be doubted. See Suicer, διάκονοι: Winer, RWB.: Neander, Phil. u. Leit. i. p. 54 note) (must be) grave, not of double speech ( = διγλώσσος, Prov. xi. 13 [Ellie. adds διγλῶσσος. Euriop. Orest. 890], not quite as Thl., ἄλλα φρονούσαν κ. ἄλλα λέγοντας, but rather as Thdrt. [and Thl., additional], ἑτέρα τοῦτο, ἑτέρα δὲ ἐκείνῳ λέγοντας), not addicted (applying themselves, ref.) to much wine ( = µῆν υἱόν πολλή ἐπτυσκαρές, Tit. ii. 3), un
greedy of gain (hardly, as E. V., to be doubly rendered, —'greedy of filthy lucre,' —so also Thdt., δ' ἐκ παραματῶν αἰσχρῶν κ. λ. αὖτως κέρδη συλλέγειν ἀνεχόμενον. It would appear from Tit. i. 11, διάταγματες & μὴ δει αἰσχρὸν κέρδος χάριν, that all κέρδος is αἰσχρὸν which is set before a man as a by-end in his work for God: so likewise in 1 Pet. v. 2,—ἐπισκόποντες μὴ . . . μηδὲ αἰσχροκέρδος . . . . . 'nor with a view to gain,' such gain being necessarily base when thus sought. This particular of the deacons' character assumes special importance, if we connect it with the collecting and distributing alms.

Cyprian, Ep. 54 [12 ad Corn. Pap. § 1, Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. iii. p. 797], stigmatizes the deacon Felicissimus as 'pecunie commissa sibi fraudator'), holding the mystery of the (or their) faith (that great objective truth which man of himself knows not, but which the Spirit of God reveals to the faithful: cf. Rom. xvi. 25 s.: 1 Cor. ii. 7—10: and even Him who in fact is that mystery, the great object of all faith: see note on ver. 16, τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον. That expression makes it probable that τῆς πίστεως is here to be taken subjectively: the, or their, faith: the apprehension which appropriates to them the contents of God's revelation of Christ. That revelation of the Person of Christ, their faith's μυστήριον, they are to hold.

See Ellic.'s note in pure conscience (see ref. and ch. i. 19. From those passages it appears, that we must not give the words a special application to their official life as deacons, but understand them of earnestness and singleness of Christian character: —being in heart persuaded of the truth of that divine mystery which they profess to have apprehended by faith). 10.] And moreover (the δὲ introduces a caution —the slight contrast of a necessary addition to their mere present character. On this force of καὶ . . . τὸ, see Hartung, i. 182: Elic., here. There is no connexion in καὶ . . . τὸ with the former requirements regarding ἐπίσκοποι) let these (who answer, in their candidature for the diaconate, to the above character) be put to the proof first (viz. with regard to their blamelessness of life, cf. ἀνέγκλητον ὄντες below: e. g. by testimonials, and publication of their intention to offer themselves: but no formal way is specified, only the reality insisted on), then let them act as deacons (or, ministère: but more probably here in the narrower technical sense, as in ref.?) 'Not to be made deacons,' as Conyb.: the word is of their act in the office, not of their reception of it, which is of course understood in the background), if they are (found by the δοκιμή to be) irreproachable. 11.] (The) women in like manner (who are these? Are they (1) women who were to serve as deacons,—deaconesses? —or (2) wives of the deacons? —or (3) wives of the deacons and overseers? —or (4) women in general? I conceive we may dismiss (4) at once, for Chrys.'s reason: τί γὰρ ἐβουλευτηκεν τῶν εἰρήναων παρεμβαίνει τί περὶ γυναικῶν; —(3) upheld by Calv., Est., Calov., and Mack, may for the same reason, seeing that he returns to διάκονοι again in ver. 12, be characterized as extremely improbable.—(2) has found many supporters among modern Commentators: Luth., Beza, Beng. [who strangely adds, 'pended ab habentibus ver. 9'], Rosenm., Heinr., Huther, Conyb., al., and E. V. But it has against it (a) the omission of all expressed reference to the deacons, such as might be given by αὐτῶν, or by τὰς: (b) the expression of ὀς τῶν, by which the διάκονοι themselves were introduced, and which seems to mark a new ecclesiastical class: (c) the introduction of the injunction respecting the deacons, ἑστωσαν μᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνδρὲς, as a new particular, which would hardly be if their wives had been mentioned before: (d) the circumstance, connected with the mention of Phoeb as διάκονος of the church at Cenchrea in Rom. xvi. 1, that unless these are deaconesses, there would be among these injunctions no mention of an important class of persons employed as officers of the church. We come thus to consider (1), that these γυναικεῖς are deaconesses,—ministrade, as Pliny calls them in his letter to Trajan [see note on Rom. xvi. 1]. In this view the ancients are, as
far as I know, unanimous. Of the moderns, it is held by Grot., Mosch., Mich., De W., Wiesinger, Elliot. It is alleged against it—(a) that thus the return to the diakonos, verse 12, would be harsh, or, as Conyb. "on that view, the verse is most unnaturally interpolated in the midst of the discussion concerning the deacons." But the ready answer to this is found in Chrys.'s view of verse 12, that under dia- kōnai, and their household duties, he comprehends in fact both sexes under one: ταῦτα καὶ περὶ γυναικῶν διακόνων ἁρμότει εἴρησθαι: (b) that the existence of deaconesses as an order in the ministry is after all not so clear. To this it might be answered, that even were they nowhere else mentioned, the present passage stands on its own grounds; and if it seemed from the context that such persons were indicated here, we should reason from this to the fact of their existence, not from the absence of other mention to their non-indication here. I decide then for (1): that these women are deaconesses (must be) grave, not slan- derers (corresponds to μὴ διάλογος in the males, being the vice to which the female sex is more addicted. Cf. Eurip. Phen. 298 ff., φιλόφοιγον δὲ χρήσι τηκιων ἐφι, [μικρὰ τ' ἄφωρα χ' ἦν λάβωσι τῶν λόγων, [πλεῖον ἐπέσεσθαιν ἤδην δὲ τι] [γναίξι, μηδὲν ύπείς ἀλλαξάς λέγειν. Σδαβδοὺς in this sense [refr.] is peculiar in N. T. to these Epistles), sober (see on ver. 2, corresponding to μὴ οὖν πολλῷ προσέχωντας), faithful in all things (corresponds to μὴ σιαχροκρέπεις: trusty in the distribution of the alms committed to them, and in all other ministrations). 12.] General directions respecting those in the diaconate (of both sexes, the female being included in the male, see Chrys. cited above), with regard to their domestic condition and duties, as above (verses 4, 5) respecting the episcopate. Let the deacons be husbands of one wife (see on this above, ver. 2), ruling well over children (the emphatic position of the anarthrous τέκνα, as above ver. 4, makes it probable that the having children to rule is to be considered as a qualification: see Tit. i. 6, note. Chrys. gives a curious and characteristic reason for the precepect: πανταχοῦ τίθησι τὴν τῶν τέκνων προστασίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἀπὸ τού- τον οἱ λαοὶ σκανδάλιζονται and their own houses. 13.] The importance of true and faithful service in the dia- conate. For those who served well the office of deacon (the aor. participle, not the perf., because the standing-point of the sentence is at first the great day, when their diaconia has passed by. In fact this aor. participle decides between the interpretations: see below) are acquiring (the Apostle having begun by placing himself at the great day of retribution, and consequently used the aor. participle, now shifts, so to speak, the scene, and deals with their present conduct: q. d., 'Those who shall then be found to have served well, &c. . . . are now, &c.' On περισσείως and περιποιοῦσιν, see notes, Eph. i. 14: 1 Thess. v. 9) for themselves (emphatic—besides the service they are rendering to the church) a good standing-place (viz. at the great day: cf. ch. vi. 19, ἀπόστασις ἔτοι τῶν μείων, ἵνα ἐπιλαβωνται τῆς ὑπόπτως (ὡς: —and Dan. xii. 3 [Heb. and E. V.], where however the metaphor is different. The interpretations of βαρβάν, a step, or place, to stand on (in LXX, the threshold, or step, before a door: see ref.), have been very various. (1) Amb. Jer., Pel., Thl., Erasum., Bull., Beza, Corn.-a-Lap., Est., Grot., Lightf., Beng., Wolf, Mosh., Schöttg., Wordsw., al., understand it of a degree of ecclesiastical preferment, sell from the office of deacon to that of presbyter, and take καλὸν for a comparative. Against this is (a) the forcing of καλὸν; (b) the improbability that such a rise upwards through the ecclesiastical offices was known in the Apostle's time: (c) the still greater unlike-lihood, even if it were known, that he would propose as a motive to a deacon to fulfil his office well, the ambitious desire to rise out of it. (2) Mack, Matth., Olsh., Huther, al., following Calvin and Luther, understand by it a high place of honour in the esteem of the church [see on παρηγεσία below]: 'qui proba
that the truth will be found by combining the two views. The δισκόνθαστες, as above stated, is used with reference to their finished course at that day. The περιποιούνται transfers the scene to the present time. The θαῦμα is that which they are now securing for themselves, and will be found standing on at that day, belonging therefore in part to both periods, and not necessarily involving the idea of different degrees of blessedness, though that idea (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 15) is familiar to St. Paul,—but merely predating the soundness of the ground on which these διάκονοι will themselves stand)

and much confidence (this also is variously understood, according as θαῦμα is interpreted.

Those who think of ecclesiastical preferment, render παρθένα 'freedom of speech as regards the faith [obj.], i.e. in teaching ['majore fiducia aliae Evangeliorum predicacionem, Grot.'], or in resisting error,—or, 'libertas ingenii agendi,' as Est.; or 'a wide field for spiritual action,' as Matthaeus. To these there might be no objection, but for the adjunct to παρθένα, εἰς πίστει τῇ ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Thus defined, παρθένα must necessarily have a subjective reference, i.e. to the confidence towards God possessed by those who have made good advance in faith in Christ, as in ref. And so Thirl. [above], Ambr., Croc., Cocc., Flatt, Calv., Beza [these two understand it more generally, of the confidence wrought by a good conscience], Bengel, Wies, De W., Ellic, al.) in [the faith (subjective, from what follows) which is in (see ref. εἰ δὲ denotes more the repose of faith in, εἰς the reliance of faith on, Christ) Christ Jesus.

15.—16.] Close of the above directions by a solemn statement of their object and its glorious import. These things (the foregoing precepts, most naturally, hardly, as Bengel, 'totam epistolam') I write (expressed in the epistolary aorist, Philem. 19, 21: but in the present, 1 Cor. xiv. 37: 2 Cor. i. 13; xiii. 10: Gal. i. 20: [1 John i. 4; ii. 1, &c.] to thee, hoping ('though I hope,' 'part. ἐκ τέκνων καίτερ σου similia particularim esse resolventum, nexus orationis docet,' Leo, cited by Huther) to come to thee sooner
for τάχιον, εν ταχεί ΑCD 17: τάχειον o: txt D²FKLN rel Chr Thurt Damasc. 15. ἰδὸς A(appy) D¹F, αὔτῷ δὲ ins σε D¹ vulg arm Orig lat-ff. eitis (iliacism) C.

(than may seem) (on the comparative,— which must not be broken down into a positive, as it is by almost all the Commentators,—see John xiii. 27 note, and Winer, edn. 6, § 35. 4. Also Acts xvii. 21; xxv. 10; xxvii. 13: Heb. xiii. 19, 23, which last is exactly parallel with this. Some supply it,—before this Epistle come to thee: or, before thou shalt have need to put these precepts into practice: but the above seems simpler, and suits better the usage elsewhere): but if I should delay (coming) (from ἐκλίπουν to βραδύνω may be regarded as parenthetical, the ἰδαν belonging immediately to γράφω), that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to conduct thyself (ref'f. Huther would take τῶν δεὶ ἀπαστρέφεσθαι generally,—how men ought to behave themselves;’ alleging, that in the preceding, there is no direct prescription how Timotheus is himself to act, and that if we supply σε [as D¹ in digest], we confine the reference of ὅσοι θεού to the Ephesian church. The latter objection need not detain us long. If the church in general is the house of God, then any portion of it may clearly partake of the title and the dignity. To the former, we may reply, that in fact, the whole of what has preceded does regard Timotheus’s own behaviour. He was to see to all these things—to take care that all these precepts were observed) in the house of God (see ref'f. also Heb. ii. 2, 5, 6, and notes: 1 Cor. iii. 16: 2 Cor. vi. 16: Eph. ii. 22:—that congregation among whom God dwells, by His Spirit);—for such (the house of God: the ἵσις brings out into prominence the appository explanation, and specially applies it to the antecedent) is the congregation (ἐκκλησία oւ τῶν οἴκων λέγει τῶν εὐκαίριων, κατὰ τὴν τῶν πολλῶν συνήθειαν, ἀλλὰ τῶν πιστῶν τῶν συλλόγων. Therod.-mops.) of the living God (thus designated for solemnity, and to shew His personal and active presence among them), the pillar (see below) and basement (= θεόλης, 2 Tim. ii. 19: ’firmamentum.’ It is a climax, not as Bengel, “instar unius vocatali solidissimum quidam expressimt;” the στῦλος is the intermediate, the ἐδραίωμα the final support of the building: as Wahl,—“omne id, cui ut primario et praeterer insigni immittitur aliqoud”) of the truth (these latter words are variously referred: being (1) by Camero, Erschmidt, Limborch, Le Clerc, Schöttg., Beng. Mossh., Rosenm., Heinus, Wegsch., Heydenr., Flatt, al. [see in Wolf. Not Chillingworth, as stated in Bloomf: see below], joined with the following sentence, putting a period at (ὡςτος, and proceeding στῶς καὶ ἐδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ὁμολογομένως μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ μυστ. κ.π.λ. To this I can only say, that if any one imagines St. Paul, or any other person capable of writing this Epistle, able to have indicted such a sentence, I fear there is but little chance in arguing with him on the point in question. To say nothing of its abruptness and harshness, beyond all example even in these Epistles, how palpably does it betray the botching of modern conjectural arrangement in the wretched anti-climax—στῶς καὶ ἐδραίωμα [rising in solemnity] τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ [what grander idea, after the basement of the whole building, does the reader suppose about to follow?] ὁμολογομένως μέγα! These two last words, which have [see below] their appropriate majesty and grandeur in their literal use at the emphatic opening of such a sentence as the next, are thus robbed of it all, and sink into the very lowest baths; the metaphor being dropped, and the lofty imagery ending with a vague generality. If a sentence like this occurred in the Epistle, I should feel it a weightier argument against its genuineness than any which its opponents have yet adduced. (2) by Gregory of Nyssa | de vita Mosis: vol. i. p. 385, οὐ μόνον Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβως καὶ Ἰωάννης στῦλοι τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἰσὶ . . . ὅ δειος ἀπόστολος . . . καὶ τὸν Τιμοθέον στῦλον καλὸν ἐτήκηται, ποίησαι αὐτῶν, καθὼς φησί τῇ ἱδίᾳ φωνῇ, στῦλον καὶ ἐδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας, Chillingworth [Religion of Protestants, &c., ch. iii. 76: but he allows as possible, the reference to the Church: “if you will needs have St. Paul refer this not to Timothy, but to the Church, I will not contend about it any further, than to say, Possibly it may be otherwise”).—by others
mentioned in Wolf, and in our own days by Conybeare, it is taken as referring to
Timothæus:—"that thou mayest know how to conduct thyself in the house of God, which is &c. ... as a pillar and basement of the truth." In the very elaborate dis-
cussion of this passage by Suicer [s. v. στυλός], he cites those fathers who seem
more or less to have favoured this idea. Of these we must manifestly not claim for it
those who have merely used the word στυλός or columna of an Apostle or teacher,
or individual Christian,—as that is jus-
tified, independently of our passage, by Gal. ii. 9: Rev. iii. 12:—but Greg. Naz.
applies the very words to Eusebius of Sam-
mosata [Ep. xlv. 1, vol. iii. (Migne) p. 39],
and to Basil [Orat. xviii. 1, vol. i. p. 330]:
and Basil in the Catena says, istor καὶ στυλός
tis Ἡρωσταλχή οἱ ἀντίστολοι, κατὰ τὸ εἰρήμενον, στυλός καὶ ἐδραίωμα τῆς ἀλη-
θείας: and in the Epistle of the churches of
Lyons and Vienne, Euseb. v. i., it is said
of Attalus, στυλόν καὶ ἐδραίωμα τῶν
ἐνεπείδη δὲ γεγονότα. Other cognate ex-
pressions, such as τὸ στερέωμα τῆς πίστεως
[Chrys., of St. Peter, Hom. xxii. vol. v.
p. 199; and Basil, of Eusebius, as above],
pίστεως ἔρεισμα [Greg. Naz., of Basil, Or.
viii. as above], τὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας στήριγμα
[Thl. on Luke xxii., of St. Peter], θρη-
σκείας στήριγμα [of Pastors, Nicæphorus
Hist. vii. 2], are added by Suicer.
The principal modern reasons for adopt-
ing this view have been (a) polemical—as
against Roman Catholic infallibility of the
Church, or (b) for uniformity of sym-
bolism, seeing that in Gal. ii. 9, Rev. iii.
12 men are compared to pillars [see this
very copiously illustrated in Suicer]. On
both of these I shall treat expressly
below. To the grammatical con-
struction of the sentence thus understood,
there is no objection. The nominative
στυλός after ἐσι would be not only allow-
able, but necessary, if it expressed, not a
previous predicate of the understood σε,
but the character which by the ἀναστρε-
φεσθαι he was to become or shew forth:
cf. Plat. and Demost. in Kühner, § 646,
2 ann., who however has not apprehended
the right reason of the idiom. But to the
sentence itself thus arranged and un-
derstood, there are weighty, and I conceive
fatal objections: to wit, (c) if στυλός κ.τ.λ.
had been meant to apply to Timothæus, it
would hardly have been possible that σε
should be omitted. He would thus be the
prominent object in the whole passage, not
as now the least prominent, lurking behind
ἀναστρεφεσθαι to make way for greater
things. (d) I can hardly think, that, in this
case, στυλός would have been amaranthous.
Though 'a pillar' might be the virtual
meaning,σὲ, τὸν στυλόν, or σὲ ἀναστρε-
φεσθαι, ... the στυλός, would certainly
be the Greek expression. (e) In this case
also, the καὶ ὄρολογουμένωι which follows
would most naturally refer, not to the
great deposit of faith in Christ which is
entrusted to the church to keep,—but to the
very strong and unusual expression which had
just been used of a young minister in the church,—and confessedly great is the
dignity of the least of the ministers of Christ:
for, &c. (3) The reference to the Church
is upheld by Chrys. [οὐχ ὡς ἐκκλὴσια ὁ οὐ-
δαιμος οἴκος Θεοῦ, τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ συν-
έχον τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα: ὁ γὰρ ἀλη-
θείας ἐστὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ στυλός καὶ
ἐδραίωμα. This inversion of the sentence
may have arisen from taking τῆς ἐκκλησίας
as a genitive of apposition], Thaltr. [οἴκος
Θεοῦ καὶ ἐκκλησίαν τῶν πεπιστευκότων
τῶν σύλλογον προστίθησθαι, τούτου ἐφ᾽
στυλόν καὶ ἐδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας. οὐλ
γὰρ τῆς πέτρας ἐρεθισμένοι καὶ ἀκλησ-
τοι διαισθείναι, καὶ διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων
κυρίοττον τὴν τῶν δογμάτων ἀληθείαν],
Theodor.-mops. [as cited above, on ἐκκλη-
σία, as far as σύλλογον, then he proceeds,
ὅτεν καὶ στυλόν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐδραίωμα τῆς
ἀληθείας ἐκάλεσεν, ὡς ἐν ἐν αὐτῇ τῆς
ἀληθείας τὴν σύστασιν ἐκροίσθη], Thl.,
[Ec. Ambr., Pol., the Roman Commenta-
tors, Luth., Calv. ["nonne Ecclesia mater
est piorum omnium, quæ ipsos regenerat
Dei verbo, quæ educat aliquid tota vita,
quæ confirmat, quæ ad solidam perfectione-
num usque percutit? cadem quoque ratione
columna veritatis prædicta est: quia doctri-
nae administrandae munus, quod Deus
penes eam depositit, unicum est instrumentu-
num veritatis, ne ex hominum memoriapercipiat"], Beza, Grot. ["veritatem sustentat atque attollit ecclesiam, efficit ne labatur ex animis, efficit ut longe lateque conspicuatur"], Calov., Wolf, &c. De Wette,
Huther, Wiesinger, &c. And this interpre-
tation agrees with 2 Tim. ii. 19: see note
there. But there is brought against it
the objection, that there is thus in-
duced confusion of metaphor. The
ἐκκλησία, which was the ὄικος above, now
becomes στυλός, a part of the ὄικος.
This is not difficult to answer. The
16. On the famous disputed reading in this verse, I give an analysis of the present state of the evidence:—I. rec θεός, i.e. ΘΩ, with the following (not A, nor C: see below) 19K F has ΘΩ above the ΘΩ of the codex [cent xii.] rel. The testimonies of the fathers for θεός are very doubtful. Few make a direct citation of the passage as thus read: those which seem to do so being naturally explained on the supposition of their supplying θέος as the subject of ἀσ. The reading θεός is directly supported by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Athanasius, Macedonius (who has been charged with some of the Latins with introducing the reading), Damascenus, Theophylact, Eumenius. Those supposed to favour the reading are Ignatius (ad Eph. 19, p. 660.—θεός [but the Syriac has θεό] ἀνθρωπίνως φανεροῦμεν: αὐτῶν ἀνθρώπων φανεροῦμεν), the Apostolic Constitutions (θεός κύριε ὁ θεοφάνις ἦμιν ἐν σαρκί) Hippolytus (agst Noctus: θεός ἐν σώματι φανερώθη) Gregory Thaumaturgus or rather Apollinaris (in Phot: θεός ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθεί). The testimonies of Athanasius, Nyssen, Cyril, usually adduced in favour of θεός, are either uncertain from various readings, or inapplicable (see below). II. οὐ, i.e. ΘΩ, is found in the following A (this is now matter of certainty). The black line at present visible in the ΘΩ is a modern retouching of an older one, due to the darkening of the stroke of an Θ above seen through from the other side. I have examined the page, and find that a portion of the virgula of the Θ, seen through, and now corrupted, extends nearly through the Θ, not however quite in, but somewhat above, its centre, as Sir Frederick Madden has observed to me. It was to complete this that Junius made a dot. See also Ellicott's note, Past. Epp. edn 2, p. 103. Besides which, the mark of abbreviation above the line is modern, not corresponding with those in the MS. Sir Frederick Madden now informs me that a very powerful microscope has been applied by Professor Maskelyne, at his request, to the passage in the MS, and the result has been that no trace of either virgula in the Θ or mark of contraction over it, can be discovered. It is to be hoped therefore, that A will never again be cited on the side of rec C (see Tischendorf, prolegm to his edn of the Codex Ephrēm, p. 30).FN 17. 73. 181. ms mittend by Liberatus (Cent VI) Victor Tummensis (Cent VI)
& Hinianur (Cent IX), who charge Macedonius with introducing *theb.*—goth syr (or syr-marg) copt.—Curby (recte flde ad Theodotium, to μέγα τῆς ἐσθενείας μωστρίου, τοιούτου κράτος, δό εἰγερωθή) . . . omis oüc τῆς τοῦ κράτους ἐσθενείας μωστρίου ἡ αἰστίς ἡμῶν δὲ εκ τοῦ θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγου, δό εἰγερωθή &c. That Cyril read ὅσ as in the miss, and not θεος as in the present edd., is testified by Πετρ. and Photins h. l. and by the scholia of several ms. of the N. T.) Thodor-mops (Acts of the Council of Constantinop., Mansi ix. 221) Epiph. Pseu-Chrys (but δ quod al) Galasins of Cyzium (or rather Macarius of Jerusalem [Cent IV] cited by Galas, in the Acts of the Nicene Council) Jerome (on Isa. liii. 11) — ὅσ or ὅ is in Syr. III. δ (correction to agree with μωστρίων) D (accc to Wetselm and Griesebach and recently Tischendorf) latt lat-τι γε Jerome.—The reading δσ seems to be supported by the folia: Barnabas (epist. 12, p. 764, ηγοὺς ὁ ψτεν ἀνάθεσιν ελλ' ὁ ψτεν τοῦ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ εν σαρκὶ φαινωρεις) Theodotus (ὁ σωτὴρ ὑφες κατιν τοῖς ἀγγέλοις) Justin? to Diognotus (ἐπιστελε λόγον τινά κάμψι φαν. δσ . . . διὰ ἀποτύχος κυριεῖθε ὑπὸ θεῶν ἐνεργεύς) Clem-alex in Euseb(δ μωστρίων μεθ ἡμῶν εἶδοι οἱ ἑγγελοὶ τῶν κράτων). Orig (Ἰησοῦς ἐν δίσβας ἀναλαμβάνας λέγεται) Orig-int (Is qui verbum earum factus apparet positis (or positiv) in carere, sient Apostolus dicta quia (perhaps quia?) manifesta est earne, justificatus &c) Greg.-Nyss (το μωστρίων ἐν σαρκὶ εἰγερωθή). Polyaenus τοῦτο λέγων, ὅστοι τοῦ μετακέρισι λόγος Basili(του μεγάλου μωστρίου οὐτὶ τοῦ κράτος εἰγερωθή ἐν σαρκὶ) Nestorius in Arnob-junt.(ἐν τῇ Μαρία γεννηθη) εἰγερωθή γάρ, φασιν, ἐν σαρκὶ, εὐκαθίσκου &c) Didymus (secundum quod dictum est completur earne, on 1 John iv).—Now that it may be fairly said, that merely external considerations have settled this question, we are not driven to combine internal considerations. Still the grounds which have confirmed me in deciding for δσ, may be seen detailed in the note.

to πλαύστος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μωστρίου τούτου εν τοῖς θενείς, δ ἐστιν χριστός εν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἑτείς τῆς δόξης. This was the thought in St. Paul's mind; that the great revelation of the religious life is Christ. And in accordance with his practice in these Epistles, written as I believe, far on in his course, and after the figures and results of deep spiritual thoughts had been long familiar to him, he at once without explanation, or apology as beforehand in Col. i. 27, or expression of the χριστός justifying the change of gender in the relative, joins the deep and latent thought with the superficial and obvious one, and without saying that the mystery is in fact Christ, passes from the mystery to the Person of Christ, as being one and the same. Then, thus passing, he is naturally led to a summary of those particulars wherein Christ has been revealed as ground for the εὐσθεία of His Church. And, the idea of μωστρίου being prominent before him, he selects especially those events in and by which Christ was manifest forth—came forth from that secrecy in which he had beforetime been hidden in the counsels of God, and shone out to men and angels as the Lord of life and glory. Let me say in passing, that it should be noticed, in a question which now happily no longer depends on internal considerations, how completely the whole glorious sentence is married and disjoined by the substitution of θεός. It is not the objective fact of God being manifested, of which the Apostle is speaking, but the life of God lived in the church,—the truth, of which the congregation of believers is the pillar and base of all,—as identical [John xiv. 6] with Him who is its centre and heart and stock—as unfolded once for all in the unfolding of Him. The intimate and blessed link, furnished by the δσ, assuring the Church that it is not they that live, but Christ that liveth in them, is lost if we understand μωστρίου merely as a fact, however important, historically un-vealed. There is hardly a passage in the N. T., in which I feel more deep personal thankfulness for the restoration of the true and wonderful connexion of the original text)—who (thus, and not 'which,' nor 'He who,' should we render, preserving the same transition, from the mystery, to Him of whom now all that follows is spoken. δσ is, as stated in Ellicot, and of course implied here, 'a relative term omitted though easily recognized antecedent, viz. Christ') was manifested in the flesh (it has been often maintained of late, e. g. by Mack, Winer, Huther, Wiesinger, Couyl, al, that these sentences, from their parallelism and concinnity, are taken from some hymn or confession of the ancient church. We cannot absolutely say that it may not have been so; but I should on all grounds regard it as very
IV.

1. To the Ephesians.

I. DOUBTFUL. I can see no reason why the same person who wrote the rhetorical passages, Rom. viii. 38, 39; xi. 33—36; 1 Cor. xiii. 4—7, and numerous others, might not, difference of time and modified mental characteristics being allowed for, have written this also. Once written, it would be sure to gain a place among the choice and treasured sayings of the Church, and might easily find its way into liturgical use: but I should be most inclined to think that we have here its first expression. The reason which some of the above Commentators adduce for their belief,—the abrupt insulation of the clauses disjoined from the thought in the context, has no weight with me: I on the other hand feel that so beautiful and majestic a sequence of thoughts springing directly from the context itself, can hardly be a fragment pieced in, but must present the free expansion of the mind of the writer in the treatment of his subject. On the sense of this clause, cf. John i. 14, ὁ λόγος σαρκὸς ἐγενετο,—and 2 Tim. i. 10. This is put first in the rank, as being the preliminary to all the rest. It is followed by the next clause, because the assurance and assurance of Christ's perfect unmixing righteousness was the aim of his manifestation in our flesh all those thirty years which preceded His public ministry: see below), was justified (i. e. approved to be righteous,—according to the uniform Pauline usage: not as De W., al., 'proved to be what he was.' The Apostle is following the historical order of events during the manifestation of our Lord on earth. That this is so, is manifest by the final clause being, ἀνελήμφητη ἐν δόξῃ. I take these events then in their order, and refer this to our Lord's baptism and temptation, in which His righteousness was approved and proved) in the Spirit (He was dwelt on by the Spirit in His baptism—led up by the Spirit to His great trial, and ἐν πνεύματι, the Spirit of God being His Spirit [but cf. Ellicot's note], that of which he said τὸ πνεῦμα μεν πρό-

θυμον, ἡ δὲ σάρξ ἄθετην, He was proved to be righteous and spotless and separate from evil and its agent. See Rom. i. 3, 4, where another proof of this His spiritual perfection is given, viz. the great and crowning one of the Resurrection from the dead. Some have thought of that proof here also: others, of the continued course of His miracles, especially the Resurrection: Bengal of the Resurrection and Ascension, by which He entered into His glory; ali alter. But I prefer keeping the historical order, though I would by no means limit the διάκαιωσις to that time only: then it was chiefly and prominently manifested), was seen by angels (viz. by means of His Incarnation, and specifically, when they came and ministered to Him after His temptation. This seems to be regarded as the first, or at all events is the first recorded occasion on which they ministered to Him. And thus Chrys., and Thurt.'s remark may apply: τὴν ἁρὰ ἀδάμαντος τῆς θεότητος φονοὶ οὐκ ἔχειν κόρων, σαρκώθηνα δὲ θεάσαντο, Thurt. —μηθ' ἡμῶν, as Chrys. This, one of the particulars of the glory and manifestation of the incarnate Saviour, is, though not immediately concerning the mystery of piety as upheld in the Church, cited as belonging to the unfolding of that mystery in Christ), was preached among the nations (that preaching commencing with the sending out of the Apostles, and though not then, in the strict technical sense, carried on ἐν ἑυαγείῳ, yet being the beginning of that which waxed outward till it embraced all nations. See and compare Rom. xvi. 26 [Eph. iii. 8]. So that we are still proceeding with our Lord's ministry, taking ἑυαγία in that wider sense in which the Jews themselves are numbered among them [so also Chrys., Huther], and the fact itself as the great commencement of the proclamation of Christ to men), was believed on in the world (including all that winning of faith first from His disciples [John ii. 11], then from the Jews [ib. 23, viii. 30], and Samaritans [iv. 41, 42]: see also id. x. 42. Our clause bears with it a re stringBuffer
currence of his own great saying, John iii. 16 ff.,—οὕτως γὰρ ἡγημανεν ὁ θεός τὸν κόσμον ἀπετέρα τὸν νῦν ἀυτὸν τὸν μονογενὴ ἔδωκεν, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπολάθη ἀλλ' ἔχει δόξαν αἰώνιον, οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεός τὸν νῦν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα κρίζῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ κ. τ. λ.), was received up in glory (at His Ascension [against De Wette, who understands it of celestial precedence (von einem himmlischen Bergange): but qu. his meaning?): cf. reff. ἐν δόξῃ is
best taken as a pregnant construction—was taken up into, and reigns in, glory.

It is this distinct reference to the fact of our Lord's personal Ascension, which in my mind rules the whole sentence and makes it, whatever further reference each clause may have, a chain of links of the divine manifestation of the Person of Christ, following in chronological order from His incarnation to His assumption into glory. The order and connexion of the clauses has been very variously understood, as may be seen in Wulf, and in De Wette. The triple antithesis, so characteristic of St. Paul, can hardly escape any reader: in saeculis, in pneumaticis,—ἀγγέλοις, Θεος,—in κόσμοι, in δόξα; but further it is hardly worth while to reproduce the distinctions which some have drawn, or motives for arrangement which they have supposed.

Ch. IV. 1—16.] Of future false teachers (1—6); directions to Timothy in reference to them (7—11); general exhortations to him (12—16).] 1. But (contrast to the glorious mystery of piety which has been just dwelt on) the Spirit (viz. the Holy Spirit of prophecy, speaking in the Apostle himself, or in others,—or, which is most probable, in both—in the general prophetic testimony which He bore throughout the church: cf. γνώσεις, spoken from the same point of prophetic foresight, 2 Tim. iii. 1. Some [even Wiesinger] have supposed the Apostle to refer to some prophetic passage of the O. T., or to the general testimony of the O. T. prophecies [Dan. vii. 25; viii. 23; xi. 30.], or those of our Lord [Matt. xxiv. 4 ff., 11.], or of the Apostles [2 Thess. ii. 3 ff.]. 1 John ii. 18. 2 Pet. iii. 3. Jude 18.], or all these combined. But in the two former cases, we should hardly have had το τένευμα λέγει, but ἢ γραφή, or ὁ κόσμος, or the like: το τένευμα implying rather the present agent of the Spirit: and the latter is only a less clear way of putting the explanation given above: for why should writings be referred to, when the living men were yet testifying in the power of the Spirit among them? Besides, see the way in which such written prophecies are referred to, in Jude 17] expressly (plainly, 'in so many words') ἤτοις is a past-classical word, found once in Polyb. [iii. 23. 5; given by Schweigh., Lex., and Palm and Rost, wrongly, ii. 23. 5; and by Liddell and Scott, in consej, Polyb. without a reference), ἄριστος ἐπὶ Σκελες τάνατον ἀποτέλεσθαι ἤτοις, and often in later writers—cf. examples in Wetst., especially Sext. Empir.,—ὁ Σαρώθων ἐν τοῖς ἀναρτηματικοῖς ἠτοίς φησιν, ἄποφερειαν ἄσυν [τὴν Σωκράτην] τὸ φυσικός; see also Plut. Brut. 29], saith, that in after times (not as E. V. 'in the latter times,' which though not quite so strong as 'in the last times,' yet gives the idea of close connexion with them: whereas here the Apostle speaks only of times subsequent to those in which he was writing: see the difference in 2 Tim. iii. 1] and compare Acts xx. 29] certain men (not the false teachers: rather, those who will be the result of their false teaching) shall depart (or decline: not by formal apostasy, or the danger would not be that which it is here represented: but subjectively, declining in their own minds and lives from holding Christ in simplicity) from the faith (objective—the doctrine which faith embraces, as so often), giving heed to (see reff.); the participle contains the reason and process of their declension) seducing spirits (πνεύμασιν, as Huther remarks, is in contrast with το τένευμα, ver. 1) it is to be understood as in 1 John iv. 1 and 6, in which last verse we have the cognate expression το τένευμα τῆς πλανής. Wolf's 'spiritualibus seductoris,' or 'doctoribus seducenibus' is quite inadmissible. The spirits are none other than the spirits of evil, tempting, energizing in, seducing, those who are described, just as the Spirit directs and dwells in those who abide in the faith), and teachings of daemons (doctrines taught by, suggested by, evil spirits: gen. subjective: cf. σοφία δαμανισθήσει, James iii. 15, and Tert. de præser. haer. c. 7, vol. ii. p 19, 'Ia sunt doctrine hominum et daemoniorum, prurientes auribus natis: see Col. ii. 22. So Thurt. [Chrys. is vague], and the fathers generally: 'Grot., vaguely.] Wolf, Bengel, Oslin., De W., Huther, Wiesinger, Conybh., Ellie. Two wrong interpretations have been given (1) understanding the genitive as objective, 'teachings concerning daemons;' so Mede, Works, p. 626 ff., supporting his view by διάδαχατ Βαπτιστών. Heb. vi. 2, &c., and Heydenreich ['a characteristic designation of the esse-gnostic
false teachers, who had so much to say of the higher spirit-world, of the zoons, &c. in Huther]—but against the context, in which there is no vestige of allusion to idolatry [notwithstanding all that is alleged by Mede], but only to a false and hypocritical asceticism: (2) applying δαιμονίων to the false teachers, who would seduce the persons under description [so Mosheim, Mack, al. and even Calvin—'quod perinde est ac si dixissent, attendentes pseudo-prophetis et diabolicis corum dogmatibus'] but this is without example harsh and improbable. The student may refer, as a curiosity, to the very learned disquisition of Mede on these δαίμονα (not merely for the really valuable information which it contains, but also as a lesson, to assure the ground well, before he begins to build with such pains) in the (following in the . . . εν giving the element, in which: see below) hypocrisy of those who speak lies (the whole clause belongs to τίνες ἀποστόλησαν, the previous one, προέχοντες . . . δαιμονίων, being complete in itself. Bengel gives the construction well: 'construe cum deficient. Hypocrisyca est quae est falsislogorum, illos auferet. τίνες, 5i6i. 55i. illi sunt seducto; falsologia, seductores: falsislogorum, genitivus, unice medet ab hypocrisyi. τδ falsologorum dicit relationem ad alios: ergo antiathetor est in idia, sua.' This is much better than to join the gen. ψευδολόγων with δαιμονίων so Wegscheider and Coynesb., but understanding that which is said of the demons as meant of those who follow them], or with διδασκαλίας: Estius,—'doctoris, inquam, hominum in hypocrisy loquentium mendacium',—as making the sentence which follows apply to the false teachers [cf. κωλυόντων], whom the τίνες follow. And so De W., Huther, Wiesunger: and Mede himself, book iii. ch. ii. p. 677, of men branded (with the foul marks of moral crime) so Cic., Catil. i. 6, 'quae nota domestice turpitudinis non insita vix tue est?' Livy, iii. 51, 'ne Claudius genti cum inustam maculam vellet?' Plato, Gorg. 524 e, ὁ Ραδέμαχος . . . πολλάκις τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως ἐπίκαλομενος ὡς ἄλλον ὁτόνου βασιλέως ὡς δύνατον κατείδηκεν οὐδὲν ὑγίειν ὅπερ τῆς ψυχῆς, ἀλλὰ διαμεια-
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Euseb. H. E. iv. 29, quotes from Irenæus [i. 28. 1. p. 107], ἀπὸ Σατανᾶτον καὶ Μαρqίωνος οἱ καλολομέων ἑγκρίνεται ἑχθραίην ἑκρίζεται, ἀθετοῦτες τὴν ἀρχαίαν πλαίσιν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἱρμηνευόμενοι τὸν ἄρρητον καὶ θηλήν εἰς γένεσιν ἀνθρώπων πεποιηκότος καὶ τῶν λεγομένων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐκφώνων ἀποκήν εἰςγενήσατο, ἀθετοῦτες τὸ πάντα πεποιηκότοι θεοὶ. These seem to be the persons here pointed at: and though the announcement of their success in after time is prophetic, we may fairly suppose that the seeds of their teaching were being sown as the Apostle wrote. The existence of gnosticism in its earlier form is certainly implied in ch. vi. 20: and in 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18, we find that denial of the resurrection which characterized all the varieties of subsequent gnosticism. See the whole subject discussed in the Prolegg. ch. vii. § i. 12 II.), which God made for participation with thanksgiving for (dat. commodi) those who believe, and have received the (full) knowledge of the truth. This last description of the worthy partakers of God's bounties is well illustrated by Calvin: 'Quid ergo? annon solem summ quotidian oriri factis Deus super bonos et malos (Matt. v. 45)? annon ejus jussu terra impios panem producit? annon ejus benedictione etiam pessimi aluntur? est enim universale illud beneficium quod David Psal. civ. 14 decantat. Respondo, Paulum deus uestro hic agere, cujus ratio cœsiam Deo nobis constat. Hujus minime compotes sunt impii, propter impuram conscientiam quae omnia contaminat, quern admodum habetur ad Titum, i. 15. Et sanc, proprio locuendo, solis fillis sui Deus totum mundum et quinque in mundo est destinavit, qua ratione etiam vocatnr mundi hæreditæ. Nam hac conditione constitutus initio fuerat Adam omnium dominus, ut sub Dei obedientia maneret. Proinde rebelli adversus Deum jure quod illi collatum fuerant, ipsi una cum posteris spongivavit. Quoniam autem subjecta sunt Christo omnia, ejus beneficio in integrum restitutionum, idque per fidem . . . . Posterior membro definit quos vocat fidèles, nemen qui notitiam habent samea doctrinae.' On μετὰ εὐχαριστίας, see 1 Cor. x. 30: and below on ver. 4, 5.\n
Reason for the above assertion. Because ὅτι is more the objective,— γὰρ, which follows, the subjective causal particle: ὅτι introduces that which rests on a patent fact, as here on a Scripture quotation,— γάρ, that which is in the writer's mind, and forms part of his own reasoning) every thing which God has made is good (in allusion to ref. Gen. See also Rom. xiv. 11, 20); and nothing (which God has made) is to be rejected (Wetst. cites Hom. ii. γ, 65, οὐδὲν ἀποβλητὰ ἐστὶν θεῶν ἐνυμήσατε διαρκῶς— on which the Schol., ἀποβλητὰ, ἀποβλητὰ ἔξω τὰ ἐνυμήσατε, φησὶ, δεδομένα διαρκῶς ἐστὶν. μὲν ἀρνηθείς) if received with thanksgiving ("properly, even without this condition, all things are pure: but he did not rise to this abstraction, because he was regarding meats not per se, but in their use, and this latter may become impure by an ungodly frame of mind." De Wette): for (see on ὅτι and γὰρ above) it (this subject) is gathered out of the preceding clause by implication, and = 'every πτισίμα which is partaken of with thanksgiving') is hallowed (more than 'declared pure,' or even than 'rendered pure': the latter it does not want, the former falls far short of the work of the a-signed agents. The emphasis is on ἀγιασθαί, and a new particular is introduced by it—not purity merely, but holi- ness, —fitness for the godly usage of Christian men. To this, which is more than mere making or declaring pure, it is set apart by the εὐχαριστία; so that the minus is proved by the majus. There is certainly a slight trace of reference to the higher consecration in the Lord's Supper. The same word εὐχαριστία is common to both. Ordinary meals are set apart for ordinary Christian use by asking a blessing on them: that meal, for more than ordinary use, by asking on it its own peculiar blessing) by means of the word of 7.
God and intercession (what 'word of God?' how to be understood? treating the plainer word first, the ēnteúexis is evidently intercession [see on ch. ii. 1] on behalf of the kriáma partaken of—that it may be 'sanctified to our use.' This, bound on as λάγος θεοῦ is to ēnteúexw by the non-repetition of the preposition, may serve to guide us to its meaning. And first, negatively. It cannot mean any thing which does not form part of the ēfýaristia: such as God's word in the Scripture just cited [Mack], or in any other place [Grot., al.]: or God's word in the foundation-truths of Christianity. Then, positively: it must mean in some sense the ēfýaristia, or something in it. But not, as Wahl and Leo, the 'word addressed to God,' 'oratio ad Deum facta,' which would be an unprecedented meaning for λάγος θεοῦ: the only way open for us is, that the ēfýaristia itself, or some part of it, is in some sense the word of God. This may be (1) by its consisting in whole or in part of Scripture words, or (2) by the effusion of a Christian man, speaking in the power of God's Spirit, being known as λάγος θεοῦ. This latter is perhaps justified by the ref.: but still it seems to me hardly probable, and I should prefer the former. [So Ellice, also.] It would generally be the case, that any form of Christian thanksgiving before meat would contain words of Scripture, or at all events thoughts in exact accordance with them: and such utterance of God's revealed will, bringing as it would the assembled family and their meal into harmony with Him, might well be said ἀγάλειν the ὑπόμονα on the table for their use. Many of the Commentators quote from the Const. Ap. vii. 49, p. 1057, Migne, the following grace before meat, used in the primitive times: εὐλογίζετε εἰ κώμε ὑμᾶς τρίφωμεν με ἐκ καταδίκας μου, ὁ διότι πρόφατον σαρκί πλησίων χάριν καὶ εὐφρονίας τὰς κυρίας ἡμῶν, ἵνα πάντοτε πάσαν αὐτάρκειαν ἔχουτε, περισσοτέρων εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἅγιον ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, δι’ οὗ σοὶ δῶσας τιμή καὶ κράτος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ὅμην. Here almost every clause is taken from some expression of Scripture).
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7.] But profane and anile (Baur understands this epithet to refer to the gnostic idea of an old universal mother, the sofia or άγαμωθ [see Ireneus, 1. 4. 1 ff. pp. 18 ff.]: but Wiesinger well replies that this will not suit the word γυμνασία [from γυναίκα, εἰσω, as θεος], which must be subjective,—nor βίβλιος, which on this supposition would not be appropriate) fables (see notes on ch. 1. 4 and 7, and Proleg.;) deeline (lit. excuse thyself from,' see ref., Luke xiv. 18, 19, and Palm and Rost's Lex.): but επαγγελίας thyself for piety (τοιούτοις, πρὸς πίστιν καθαράν καὶ πλοῦς δρόμων τῷ γάρ ευσέβεια γυμνασία άρα χρεία καὶ πόνων διηνίσκων· γάρ γυμνασίαν και ἀγωνίαν μη υόντος ἀγωνίζεται ἱδρώτων ἄξιος. Thl. [not Thdrt., as Huther]. 

πρὸς, with a view to, as an athlete with a view to the games: cf. Soph. El. 450, πρὸς ευσέβειαν ἡ κόρη λέγει, —and the common expressions πρὸς ἡδινὸν λέγειν, δράν, δημιουργεῖ, &c.: Soph. Antig. 1170, τάλλα ἕνω κατών σκίας οὐκ ἄν προμάχοι ανάλοι πρὸς τὴν ἡδονήν.) 

8.] for the exercise (gymnastic training; see below) of the body is to small extent ("for but little;", in reference only to a small department of a man's being: not as in ref. James, 'for a short time,' as the contrast πρὸς πάντα below shews profitable (to what sort of exercise does he allude? Ambr., Thom.-Aqu., Lyra, Calv., Grot., Heydenr., Leo, Mattthes, al., take it as alluding to corporal austerities for religion's sake: 'hoc nomine appellat quaeque religiun causae suscipiuntur externe actiones, ut sunt vigilia, longa inedia, humi cubatio, et similib.' Calv. But against this are two considerations: 1) that these are not now in question, but the immediate subject is the excellence of being trained and thoroughly exercised in piety: 2) that if they were, it would hardly be consistent with his previous severe characterization of these austerities, ver. 3, to introduce them thus with even so much creditable mention. Wiesinger has taken up this meaning again and contended very strongly for it, maintaining that the πρὸς ἡδινὸν φύσεις must be moral, not corporeal. But it may fairly be answered, if it be moral, then it cannot be said to be πρὸς ἡδινόν, for it would contribute to ευσέβεια. And indeed he may be refuted on his own ground: he says that the σωματική γυμνασία must belong to ευσέβεια: for that if it meant bodily exercise merely, πνευματική γυμνασία, not ευσέβεια, would be the proper contrast to it. But surely we may say, if σωματική γυμν. does belong to ευσέβεια, how can it form a contrast to it? On his hypothesis, not on the other, we should require πνευματική γυμνασία as the contrast. A part cannot be thus contrasted with the whole. It is therefore far better to understand the words, as Chrys., Thl., Thdrt. [οἱ τῆς τοῦ σώματος, φησίν, εὐθείαν ἐπιμελοῦμεν πρὸς ἡδινὸν ταῖς ἰάπολαισιν], Pel., Corn.-a-Iap., Estins, Wolf, al., Bengel, Mack, De W., Huther, of mere gymnastic bodily exercise, of which the Apostle says, that it has indeed its uses, but those uses partial only. Bengel adds, perhaps more ingeniously than conclusively, "Videut Thaumnthus juvenis inter gland amus fusisse aliqua exercitatione corporis [ch. v. 25] quam Paulus non tam prohibet quam non laudat." Two curious interpretations of the expression have been given; one by Chrys., as a sort of afterthought: οἵ δὲ λέγει, τοιοῦτον ἐστὶν μη ἐστὶν γυμνασίαν ποτε καθαρὸς σεαυτὸν διαλεγόμενος πρὸς ἐκεῖνον, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα τοῖς αὐτῶν παραίειν. οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν πρὸς τῶν διεστραμμένων μαχαίρων, ὀπόσι μὴ ποτε, —the other by Braun [Selecta sacra i. 10. 156, cited by Huther], who understands it by the ceremonial law): but piety (the first member of the antithesis contained the means, ή σωματική γυμνασία: this, the end, ευσέβεια; —that which is sought by γυμνασία πρὸς εὐσέβεια) is profitable for all things (not one portion only of a man's being, but every portion of it, bodily and spiritual, temporal and eternal), having (see that
IV.

it has) promise of the life (we may, as far as the construction is concerned, take ὧσις, as Elicc., abstract, of life, and then divide it off into τῆς ἀιώνιας and τῆς μελλοντικῆς. But see below), which is now and which is to come (how is the genitive ὧσις to be taken? is it the objective genitive, giving the substance of the promise, life, in its highest sense? in this case it would be ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ· και ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι. And seeing it is not so, but τῆς κόσμου τῆς μελλοντικῆς, we should have to understand ὧσις in two different meanings,—long and happy life here, and eternal life hereafter—it bears a promise of this life and of the life to come. This to say the least is harsh. It would be better therefore to take ἐπαγγελία as 'the promise,' in the sense of 'the chief blessedness promised by God,' the blessed contents of His promise, whatever they be, and ὧσις as the possessive genitive: the best promise belonging to this life and to that which is to come. It may be said, this also is harsh; and to some extent I acknowledge it,—it is not however a harshness in thought, as the other, but only in construction, such as need not surprise us in these Epistles. The concrete ἐπαγγελία instead of the abstract is already familiar to us, Luke xxiv. 49: Acts i. 4; xiii. 32, al.; and the possessive genitive after ἐπαγγελία, is justified by Rom. xvi. 8, ἐπαγγέλια, τῶν πατριών, and by the arrangement of the sentence.

9. Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all acceptation (see on ch. i. 15. The words refer to what follows, not as Heurn. to ch. iii. 16, nor as De W., Huther, Wies., al., to what went immediately before: see on γὰρ below. The connection is with καὶ τῆς μελλοντικῆς. Piety has the promise of that life attached to it, according to the well-known Christian saying which follows. Otherwise verse 10 comes in disjointedly and unaccountably: for (γὰρ is introduced from a mixture of two constructions, rendering a reason for καὶ τῆς μελλοντικῆς, as if πιστῶς ὁ λόγος had not been inserted. We have the same construction in 2 Tim. ii. 11, where Huther, though he regards the γὰρ as decisive against it here, refers the πιστῶς ὁ λόγος to what follows) to this end (viz., the σωτηρία implied in that which follows, introduced by τὴν, as in refl.: thus alone can the saying as a πιστῶς ὁ λόγος cohere together: and so Thdrt., Thl., Beza, Grot., Beng., Mosh., Wegs., Leo, Wahl:—not, as De W., Huther, Elicc., al., for the obtaining of the promise mentioned above [De W. claims Thdrt. and Bengel for this meaning, but wrongly: the former says, τί δέηστε, &c. εἰ μὴ τίς ἔστι τῶν πάνων ἀντίθεσις; ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀντίθεσις. ἀξίωσε γὰρ θεὸς ἀγαθάκτει τοῖς ἀθλητοῖς καὶ πάντων ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων σωτήρ κ.τ.λ.; and the latter, 'hoc nomine, hoc fine, hac spe,' referring to ἐπαγγελίας] we (Christians in general) [both] toil (more than labour [ἐργαζόμεθα]: it gives the idea of 'toil and moil' see refl.) and suffer reproach (climax: we might toil and bear in honour, but as it is, we have both fatigue and shame to bear. The reading ἐργαζόμεθα is very strongly supported, but appears to have been introduced from Col. i. 29, because we have fixed our hope (the same perfect occurs John v. 45: 2 Cor. i. 10: ch. v. 5, vi. 17: it refers to the time when the strong resolve and waiting began, and to its endurance since that time) on (for construction see refl., and Ellicot's note here. Thus in Polyb. i. 12. 6, τὰς . . . ἀγοράς . . . ἐρ' αἰς ἐγχών τὰς μεγαλατας ἐλπίδας) the living (inserted for emphasis and solemnity, to bring out the fact that the God in whom we trust is a veritable personal agent, not a creature of the imagination) God, who is the Saviour of all men (cf. ch. ii. 4: Tit. ii. 11: His will is that all men should be saved, and He has made full and sufficient provision for the salvation of all: so that, as far as salvation stands in Him, He is the Saviour of all men. And it is in virtue of
this universality of salvation offered by God, that we have rested our hopes on Him and become 
piestov], especially them that believe (in these alone does that universal salvation, which God has provided, become actual. He is the same as towards and all of; but those alone appropriate His 
soteria. Bengel rightly observes, ‘Late nervus argumenti a minori ad majus’; but he applies the as towards to this, and life, and of life. So also Chrys. eis de tòv àptos- 
suòv suv] ev'taiva, poûlcr màllon tòv pístovv wkeit. But this does not seem to suit the context, nor the higher sense to which is everywhere in the X. T. confined, and most especially in these Epistles, where it occurs very frequently. The true argumentum a minori ad majus’ lies in this—‘if God be thus willing for all to be saved, how much more shall he save them that their trust in Him,’ For the expression, see reft., and especially Gal. vi. 10).

11.] Command (see ch. 1. 3) these things (viz. those insisted on since ver. 7) and teach them. 12—16.] General exhortations to Timotheus. Let no one despise thy youth (as to the construction, Chrys., yap tòv àptos tòv neòttov katafrorofh] ou] Leos, Macs, Matthies, take suv as immediately governed by katafrorofh] and neòttov as a second genitive—‘thee for thy youth.’ But though I cannot think with Huther that such a construction would be illegitimate [for in what does differ in logical reference from katègrorofh?—cf. ei . . . svaròmivn . . . ] [hmel]nov vnovv kat- 
gnòtov] Demost. Meid. p. 515. 26], yet ver. 15 seems to rule in favour of the simpler construction, where we have suv preceding its governing substantive with no such ambiguity. As to the matter of the youth of Timotheus, see Prolegg. ch. vii. § ii. 55, note; and remember, that his age relative to that of the Apostle himself, whose place he was filling, rather than his absolute age, is evidently that which is here meant. By the èwv èrhojmi, we see that this comparison was before the Apostle’s mind. The interpretation of Bengel, “talem te gere quem nemo possit tanquam juvenem contemnere!”, libenter id facient sensis inanes, hence endeavouring to eliminate the fact, to Timotheus’s youth, is, forced, and inconsistent with the tòv. It is quite true [cf. what follows—αλλα τò- tos yìnov, etc.] that the exhortation is to him, not to the Ephesian church: but it is grounded on the fact of his youth, in whatever light that fact is to be interpreted)—but become (by gaining their respect for the following acts and qualities) a pattern of the believers (the comma after piestov, in which I have followed Lachmann, gives more force and independence to the clause adversative to yap k.r.t.A, and then leaves the specifications to follow).—in word (the whole of thine utterances, in public and private: èv vàgòv is elsewhere contrasted, as in Col. iii. 17, with èv àpem), in behaviour (the other outward sign of the life within: èv àpem, Col. i. c., but expressing more—‘in quotidiana conscunditine,’ as Beng. The àna- 
ptoph may testify, in cases where no actual deed is done), in love, in faith (the two great springs of Christian conduct, the one it is true set in motion by the other,—cf. Gal. v. 6, πιστεύ νι: à’gàps èvergoumen, but both, leading principles of the whole man), in purity (probably, not chastity, in the more restricted sense, though in ch. v. 2 it certainly has this meaning from the context: but in the wider and higher meaning which the context here requires, all believers being in view, of general holiness and purity. Cf. for this,—àgòv, ch. v. 22: 2 Cor. vii. 11: James iii. 17,—àgàkìs, James iv. 8: 1 Pet. i. 22. From these passages the quality would appear definable as simplicity of holy motive followed out in consistency of holy action). 13.] Till I come (not as De W., as long as thou in my absence presidest over the Ephesian church: for this supposes the Apostle to be the normal president of that Church.
14. πρεσβυτέρου ΝΠ ιν.

and Timotheus his locum-tenens, which was not the case. Timotheus was put there with a special commission from the Apostle: that commission would cease at the Apostle’s coming, not because he would resume residence and presidency, but because he would enforce and complete the work of Timotheus, and thus, the necessity for special interference being at an end, the church would revert to the normal rule of its own presbytery, attend to the (public, see below) reading (“scripture朗朗, in ecclesia. Huic adjunguntur duo principipum generem, adhortatio, que ad agendum, et doctrina, que ad cognoscendum pertinent, ch. vi. 2 fin. Rom. xii. 7 ff.” Beng. This is certainly the meaning; cf. Luke iv. 16 ff.: Acts xiii. 15: 2 Cor. iii. 14.—not that of Chrys. [άκονωμεν ἀπαντής, καὶ παιδευμένα me ἀμελεῖς τῆς τῶν θείων γραφῶν μελέτης], Grot., Calv. [“certe fons sapientiae est SCRIPTURA, unde hauriire debent pastores quicquid profecerunt apud gregem”], al., who understand private reading. Whether the O. T. Scriptures alone, or in addition to them the earlier gospels were at this time included in this public reading, cf. Just. Mart. Apol. i. (ii.) 67, p. 83 [τὰ ἀποκρυπτένα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγνώσκεται, με- χρεῖς ἑγχωρεῖ, cannot be determined with any certainty, to the (also public) exhortation, to the (also public) teaching (cf. Bengel above). Chrys. takes παρακλήσις as social, διδασκαλία as public, — τῇ παρακλήσις τῇ πρῶς ἀλλήλους, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ πρῶς πάντας — so Grot., ‘in monendie allis privativ, docendie publice;’ why but why so?]. 14. Do not neglect (ἀναγράφεισι, 2 Tim. i. 6, — do not suffer to decay and smoulder by carelessness: ‘negligent qui non exercent, nec putant se posse excidere,’ Bengel) the spiritual gift which is in thee (see more at length in 2 Tim. i. 6. The spiritual gift is that of teaching and ruling the church. Thlgr. says, too narrowly [and so nearly Ellic.], “χρήσιμα τὰν διδασκαλίαν εὔδησατ: it was not teaching only, but the whole office of God which he gave for thee to which he was set apart by special ordination), which was given thee (by God, 1 Cor. xii. 4, 6) by means of prophecy (not as Mack, ‘on account of prophecies,’ alleging the plural in ch. i. 18. That verse [see note] refers to the same fact as this—viz. that, either at the first conversion of Timotheus, or at his ordination to the ministry [and certainly the latter seems here to be pointed at], the Holy Spirit spoke, by means of a prophet or prophets, His will to invest him with χαρίσματα for the work, and thus the gift was said to be conferred, as to its certainty in the divine counsels, by such prophecy—‘ita jubente per os prophetarum Spiritui Sancto,’ Beza. All attempts to make δία bear other meanings [‘potest tamen sic accipi ut ideem valeat quod eiusmod prophetia, i.e. ad prophetandum; vel εν προφητεια ita ut quod sit hoc donum exprimatur apostolus,’ Beza] are illegitimate and needless: see Acts xiii. 2, 3, which is a case precisely analogous: the gift was in Paul and Barnabas δια προφητειας, μετα επιθεσεως χειρων. Bengel strangely joins προφητειας with πρεσβυτερου, parenthesizing μετα επιθ. τ. χειρων, alleging that ‘impositio manus propri fit per unam personam et quidem digniorem: prophethia vero fitab etiam etiam etiam aequalibus,’ &c. But this certainly was not so: see below), with laying on of the hands (see on Acts vi. 6. Næmuli, Phil. u. Lett. i. 267. There is no real difference, as De W. thinks, between this and 2 Tim. i. 6. There was a special reason there for putting Timotheus in mind of the fact that the Apostle’s own hands were laid on him: but that fact does not exclude this. See references on the χειροθεσία in Elichott’s note) of the presbytery (refl.: of the body of elders who belonged to the congregation in which he was ordained. Where this was, we know not: hardly in Lystra, where he was first converted: might it not be in Ephesus itself, for this particular office?). 15. These things (viz. the things enjoined vv. 12—14) do thou care for, in these things be [employed] (Wets. cites Plut. Pomp. p. 656 b, 67.
V. 1, 2. ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΝ Α. 343

16. "έπεξε καὶ τοὺς ἀνόητους σαρκικῶς ἔδιδον, ἵνα σώσῃς καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας σου.

V. 1. Προσβυτείαι μὴ ἐπιπλήξης, ἀλλὰ παρακάλει ὡς πατέρας νευτρίους, ὡς ἀδέλφους. 2. ὡς μητέρας νευτερίας, ὡς ἀδέλφους, ἵνα τὸ ἀγνίζῃ, ὡς διδάξων. "

15. rec ins ev bef pascw (from misunderstanding?), with D'KL rel athen Chr(explaining μὴ ἐν τῷ βίῳ μόνῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ) Thdt Dissasc : om ACΔFBN 17 latt syr opt goth arm Clem Cyr lat ff. 16. ins ev bef autors D vulg(not tol) goth lat ff. om sou N1.

CHAP. V. 1. om os πατέρας N1.

τοῦτος ὁ Καίσαρ ... ἢν: Lucret. iii. 1093, "versamur ibidem, atque insomus usque." Hor. Ep. i. 1. 11, "quod verum atque decens curro et rogo et omnis in hoc sum." To which I may add a more striking parallel, Hor. Sat. i. 9. 2, "Nescio quid meditans ungarum, et totus in illis," that thy progress (ref: προσκοπή) is branded as a "vox non immerito a grammaticis contenta" by Lobeck, Phryn. p. 85: towards perfection; certainly in the Christian life, as Heydenr., De W.: οὗτος is implied; but the more direct meaning is, with reference to the duties of thine office; and especially as respects the caution given ver. 12, that no man despise thy youth) may be manifest to all. 16. Give heed to thyself (summary of ver. 12. On ἐπεξεῖς, see Elliot's note) and to thy teaching (summary of ver. 13. "Duo sunt curanda bona pastori: ut docendo invigilet, ac se ipsum puram custodiat. Neque enim satis est, si vitam suam componat ad omnem honestatem, siquit caveat ne quod edat malum exemplum, nisi assiduam quoque docendi studium adjungat sancte vitae: et parum valebit doctrina, si non respondat vitae honestas et sanctitas." Calv.). Continue (ref) in them (most naturally, the ταύτα of ver. 15: but the words are ambiguous and puzzling. Grot. gives a curious interpretation: 'mane apud Ephesios,' which is certainly wrong: Bengel, as an alternative, refers it to τοὺς ἀκούοντας below, which is no better. I have punctuated it so as to connect this clause with what follows, and thus to render it not quite so harsh, seeing that it then will assume the form of a recapitulatory conclusion); for doing this ('is doing this,' as E. V., better than 'by doing this,' which asserts too much) thou shalt save (in the day of the Lord: the highest meaning, and no other, to be thought of in both cases) both thyself and those that hear thee (thyself, in the faithful discharge of the ministry which thou hast received of the Lord: thy hearers, in the power of thine influence over them, by God's word and ordinances).

CH. V. 1—25.] GENERAL DIRECTIONS TO HIM FOR GOVERNING THE CHURCH. 1. 2. Injunctions respecting his behaviour to the elder and younger of either sex. προσβυτέρῳ The reference to an office was called in question as early as Chrys. ἀρα τὸ ἐξίσου νῦν φησιν; οὐκ ἔγωγε οἷς, ἀλλὰ περὶ παντὸς γεγραμμένος. This indeed is evident from the quadruple specification in these verses. So even Mack, though he maintains that the νεφέων of Acts v. 6 were official, Leo, as cited by Wiesinger, gives well the connexion with the last chapter: "quum supra scripsisset, nemini licere ex jubventure Timothei ejeus despicendi occasionem sibi. Numque jam ipsum hortatur Timotheum, ut semper memoriae sua nevētostas ita se gerat erga seniores uti revera deceat virum juvenorem." But this connexion must not be too closely pressed. Some important general instructions have intervened since the μηδείς σου τὸς νεφέως καταφρονέως. ἐπιλήψῃς Thus II. μ. 211, 'Εκτορ, ἀεὶ μὲν πᾶς μοι ἐπιλήψεις ἀγορησίας ἐκλᾶθα φραζόμενος. ἀλλὰ παρακάλει ἀσαντι πρὸς πατέρα, φησὶ, προσευχηθῆς ἀμαρτάνοντα, οὕτω πρὸς ἑκεῖνον διαλέγον. Chrys. νεωτέρους] understand παρακάλει. Thus the prohibition, μὴ ἐπιλήψῃς, applies to all, all being included in the παρακάλει which is the other and adopted alternative. ὡς ἀδέλφους] as on an equality with them, not lording it over them. ὡς ἀδέλφας | Ἡ ἰερείᾳ τούτων εγγυεία οὐκ ἔχει πρὸς τὸς νεωτέρας γενόμεναι ὁμοίως δυσκό-
3 Χύρας τ' τίμα τὰς ὄντως χύρας. 4 εἰ δὲ τις χύρα 

tέκνα ἢ ἐκγόνα ἐχει, μανθανότας πρὸτον τὸν ἱδιον 

'ευσεβεῖν, καὶ ἀμοιβὰς ἀποδοίναι τοῖς ὑπὸ θεοῦ 

3. τῶν ἱδιῶν οἴκων D1.

What is the subject? (1) The ancient Commentators mostly understand ἡ χύρα, implied in τίς χύρα: so Vulg. (diseat: also D-latt, 2 cursives have μανθάνων, Chr. (see below), Thdt., Gc., Jer., Pel., Ambr., Luth., Calv., Grot., Calov., Huther, al. (2) But some of the ancients took τὰ τέκνα ἢ ἐκγόνα as the subject: e.g. Gc. 2, Thil., and so Beza, Wolf, Mosh., Wegscheid. etc. Heydenr., Platt, Mack, De W., Wiesinger, Ellicot. There is much to be said for both views; and as we advance, we shall give the interpretations on both hypotheses, (1) and (2). ἰπτότων] Either, 'first of all duties,' which seems supported by ver. 8 below; or first, before applying to the church for sustenance. These meanings will apply to both the above alternatives: whether we understand the subject to be the widows, or the children and grandchildren. 

τῶν ἱδιῶν οἰκῶν εὐσεβεῖν) On hypothesis (1), — to behave piously towards, i.e. to rule religiously (Luth.; so Vulg.), their own household. This seems somewhat to force εὐσεβεῖν, see below; while the sense of τῶν ἱδιῶν οἰκῶν is thus the simple and usual one, as the widow in question would be the head of the household. On hypothesis (2), to behave piously towards, i.e. to honour with the honour which God commands, their own family, i.e. the widowed mother or grandmother who is one of their own family. This sense of εὐσεβεῖς, εὐσεβεία, and εὐσεβεῖα, is common enough (see especially Palm and Host's Lex.): the reference being generally (not always, it is true) to superiors,—those who demand σιβάς,—those who stand in the place of God. This sense of τῶν ἱδιῶν οἰκῶν is not so usual,
but not therefore to be rejected. To dishonour their widowed mother or grandmother, would be to dishonour their family, in that one of its members who most required respect, καὶ ἀμοιβάς ἀποδοθέναι τοῖς προγόνοις;] On Hypothetical (1), as Chrys., ἀπελευθ. ἑκάστων ἡμῶν, ἀποδίδω τὴν ἀμοιβὴν οὐ γὰρ καὶ, σωτὴρ ἐγεννήσας εἰκόνων, ὄφεὶ ἀνθρώπως ἐν τοῖς ἐγκόσιοις αὐτοῦ ἀμείβων ἀποδίδω τὸ διάβλημα διὰ τῶν παλαίων. But surely it is a very strange way of requiring one's progenitors for their care of us, to be kind towards our own children; and besides, what would this have to do with the question, whether or not the widow was to be put on the charity roll of the church? But on hypothesis (2), this sentence certainly becomes more clear and natural. Let them, the children or grandchildren, learn first to be piously grateful to (these members of) their own families, and to give back returns (a return in each case) to their progenitors (so called, although living, because, the mother and grandmother having been both mentioned, πρόγονοι was the only word which would include them in one category).

τοῦτο γὰρ . . . . . . ] see ch. ii. 3. 6.] see above on ver. 3. ἡ δότιες χήρα, as opposed to the widow just described; κ. μεμονωμένη, as contrasting her condition with that of her who has children or grandchildren. Thus what follows is said more for moral exhortation of such a widow, than as commending her to the charity of the church: but at the same time, as pointing out that one who thus places her hopes and spends her time, is best deserving of the Church's help.

ἡπικευ, ch. iv. 10, has set and continues to set her hope. ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν, on God as its portion and ultimate aim,—as distinguished from ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ, ch. iv. 10, on God as its present stay. προσμενέω] compare ref. and the similar use of προσκατέρθων, Rom. xii. 12, Col. iv. 2, τοῖς θεοῖς κ. τοῖς προσευκ.; see on ch. ii. 1. The articles may refer to the public prayers of the Church, or may be possessive,—to her supplications and her prayers: or may serve merely to designate the two great divisions of prayer. νῦντες τ. ἴματος . . . . . . . Ν. ] so St. Luke of Anna the prophetess, ii. 37,—ησίαις τ. δεσποτῆς λατρεύουσα νῦντες καὶ ἡμῶν. 6.] Contrast (ἐν) to the character just described: and that certainly with a view to point out that this kind of widow is no object for the charity of the Church, as not being at all a partaker of the life unto God. σταταλάτωσι . . . . . . . ] see Aristoph., Nub. 53, and Schol. (In Wst.), and Ellie, here. ζωᾶς τεθνήκεν while alive in the flesh, has no real life in the Spirit: see ref.—and Matt. viii. 22: Eph. v. 14. Wstet. quotes many such expressions from profane writers; one, as compared with this passage, remarkably illustrative of the moral difference between Christianity and heathenism: Soph. Antig. 1183,—τὰς γὰρ ἤδωρας ὑπατί προσωπικές ἐνδείκτις, οὐ τίθεσιν εἶπώ.] ξύν τούτων, ἀλλ' ἐνθύμων ἡγούμενοι νεκρῶν. The very expression is found in Sotoeus; see ref. I cannot help regarding the idea as the background,—'and, if devoid of spiritual life, then not to be taken into account by the Church.' 7.] τοῦτα most naturally applies to the characters just given of widows, not more generally:
and in that case οὐ διεξαλαμπτόν (see ref.) συν must refer to the widows also, not to the τέκνα and ἔγκονα, or to these and the widows together, as Heydenr., or more widely still, as Grot., al. This narrower reference is confirmed by the next verse, which takes up the duty of the relations, being connected not by γνητόν, but by διέ.

8.] τίς, not only of the τέκνα ἤ ἔγκονα above, or any persons connected with widows,—but the saying is perfectly general, grounding their duties on an axiomatic truth. Agreeably with their former interpretation, Chrys., &c. regard τίς as meaning 'a widow': Calv. and Thdt. unite both, widows and children.

οἱ ἕδωι seem to be generally any connexions,—οἱ οἶκεῖοι, those more immediately included in one's own family as dwelling in the same οἶκος—see ref. Mack is certainly wrong in regarding οἰκεῖοι (without τίς πίστεως) as meaning those connected by the faith. The omission of the article (see var. read.) would make the two belong to one and the same class.

οὗ προνοεῖ, viz. in the way noted above,—of support and sustenance. Notice εἰ οὗ, in its regular usage, the negation being closely connected with the verb: "neglects to provide." On the construction of προνοεῖ, see Eilleis's note.

τὴν πίστιν ἔργαται 'ides enim non tolit officia naturalia, sed perficit et firmat.' Bengel. The Roman-Catholic Commentator Mack has some good remarks here, on the faith of which the Apostle speaks: "Faith, in the sense of the Apostle, cannot exist, without including love: for the subject-matter of faith is not mere opinion, but the grace and truth of God, to which he that believes gives up his spirit, as he that loves gives up his heart: the subject-matter of faith is also the object of love. Wherefore love is not, works there is, not nor works, Faith either: so that he who fulfills not the offices of love towards his relatives, is virtually an unbeliever.

αἵτιστον χείρων.] For even among heathens the common duties of family piety are recognized: if therefore a Christian repudiates them, he lowers himself beneath the heathen. Cf. Matt. v. 46, 47.

Also, as Calv. suggests in addition, the Christian who lives in the light of the Gospel, has less excuse for breaking those laws of nature which even without the Gospel are recognized by men. According to hypothesis (1) or (2) above, this general statement applies to the widows or to their children and grandchildren: not, as Matthies, to their mutual relations, about which the context contains no hint. But surely it would be very harsh to understand it of the widows: and this forms an additional argument for hypothesis (2).

9—16.] Further regulations respecting widows. 9.] Is χήρα subject or predicate? 'let a widow καταλέγέθω,' or 'let a woman καταλέγεθω χήρα?' I own, from the arrangement of the words, I am inclined to believe the latter to be the case. The verb καταλέγεθω introduces the new particular. Had χήρα then been the subject, the verb, having the emphasis, must have preceded. As it is, χήρα has the emphasis, as the verb would have, were it the predicate, spoken of those of whom the κατάλογος consisted. I render therefore,—Let a woman be inserted in the catalogue as a widow.

But now, for what purpose? καταλέγειν is to enrol on a list or roll: so Aristoph. Acharn. 1029: οὖν στρατιώτας καταλέγοισι ... —Lysistr., δ θε δυμόστρατος | ἔλγεν ὑπόλατα καταλέγειν Τακυρίων: Xen. Rep. Lac. iv. 3, τούτων δ' ἕκαστοι ἄδρας ἕκαστον καταλέγει: Lys. p. 172, 37. οὐ τοίνυν οὖν εἰς τῶν κατάλογον Ἀθηναίων καταλέγεις οὐδένα φανήσαι: see other examples in Palm and Rost's Lex., and in Wettst. But what catalogue are we to understand? [In replying to this question I agree in the main with De Wette, from whose note the substance of the following remarks is adopted.] Hardly, (1) that of those who are to receive relief from the Church (so Chrys. h. l., Thdt., &c. Tlal., Jer., Erasm., Calv., Est., Wolf, Neud., &c.): for thus the rule, that she is to be sixty years of age, would seem a harsh one, as many widows might be destitute at a far earlier age: as also the rule that she must not have been twice married, especially as the Apostle himself below commands second
marriage for the younger widows. Again, the duties enjoined in ver. 10 presuppose some degree of competence, and thus, on this hypothesis, the widows of the poorer classes would be excluded from sustenance by charity,—who most of all others would require it. Also, for the reason alleged in ver. 11, sustenance can hardly be in question—simply to take them off the roll, and thus be rather a benefit, than a detriment to the Church. Nor again (2) can we understand the roll to be that of the deaconesses, as Pelag., Beza, Schleierm., Mack, al.: although the Theodosian code, founded on this interpretation, ordained "nulla nisi emensis rix annis secundum praeceptum Apostoli ad Diaconissarum consortium transferatur," xvi. 2, 27 (De W.). For a) the age mentioned is unfit for the work of the deaconesses' office, and in the council of Chalcedon the age of the deaconesses was fixed at 40: b) not only widows but virgins were elected deaconesses (Balsamon, ad Can. xix. conc. Niceni, parthvou ... teosarakanatastov elikias xeyomenei, [xepos] kai keipotovia dia-koniasan echrouskomeni patow os gia. Suicer, i. 865): (3) it is implied in ver. 12, that these widows were bound not to marry again, which was not the case with the deaconesses. It seems therefore better to understand here some especial band of widows, sustained perhaps at the expense of the church, but not the only ones who were thus supported:—set apart for ecclesiastical duties, and bound to the service of God. Such are understood here by Chrys. himself in his homily on the passage [311 in div. X. T. loc. 3, vol. iii. p. 523, Migne].—καθαπερ εισι παρθενωι χοροι, οντω και χηραιν το πα- λαιον ήσαν χοροι, κα ουκ εξιν αυταις απαις ει στ τα χηρας εγγαφεσθαι, ου περι εκεινης ουν λεγει τη τεν πειρα ζωης και δομηνης βοθειαι, αλλα περι ταυτης της ελοφιης χηρας. They are also mentioned as ταγυμα χηρων, το χηρωικον, πρεσ- βωτides, prokatheminei: i. e. such widows as correspondingly in office for their own sex in some measure to the presbyters,—sat unvelled in the assemblies in a separate place, by the presbyters, and had a kind of supervision over their own sex, especially over the widows and orphans: were vowed to perpetual widowhood, clad with a 'vestis viduallis,' and ordained by lay-
married a second time: so Tertull. ad uxor. i. 7, vol. i. p. 1286: "diganos non sinit praesidere, . . . viduam allegi in ordinem nisi univirum non concedit." So that the parallel expressions here and in ch. iii. 2 will be consistently interpreted. See the mistaken views of Thdrt. ["τὸ σωφρόνας ἐν γάμῳ βιών νοοβεται," &c., treated of under ch. iii. 2], having a good character (testimony from without, cf. ref. and ch. iii. 7) in (the element or region in which that ματριβία is versed) good works (ref't.), if "(the conditions have as yet been expressed by particules in agreement with the noun: the construction is now changed for the hypothetical." De W.: but εἰ does not depend immediately on καταλεγόμενα: the intervening clauses must be taken for granted. So that it may more properly be said to be dependent on μη . . . ματριβία—such an one, if in addition she, &c.) she (at any time—keep the aor.) brought up children (her own?) or those of others? If [1], the barren might seem hardly dealt with: if [2], the word must be somewhat forced aside from its ordinary meaning [see τεκνοτροφεῖα in Palm and Rost's Lex.: where in the examples cited, bίονεινεναι mινθενεῖν if'T]. Still this latter, considering that έξενοδοξήγονται is the next good work specified, seems most probable: and so, but for the most part combining it with the other, Beng., De W., Huther, Wiesinger, al. Grot. understands it, "si nec abortum sibi fecerit, nec ob paupertatem exposuerit liberos . . . sed omnès sibi natos educaverit, et quidem honeste ac pic'e." Calv., "non sterilitatem hic damnari a Paulo, sed matrum deficiis, quae sobolis alende taeidia devorare recusant.") if she (at any time) received strangers (practised hospitality. This clearly points out a person above the rank of the poor and indigent: though Chrys. pitily replies, κἀ̂s τένεις ἡ, όικίαις έξει, οὐ γάρ δὴ αἰδρος μένει. One is glad to hear that all the Christian widows at Constantinople were so well off. But it can hardly have been so in the apostolic age. Cf. ch. iii. 2; Tit. i. 8: Rom. xii. 13: Heb. xiii. 2), if she (at any time) washed the feet of the saints ("synecdochical partis, pro omni generi officiorum humiliatis," Beng. "et tās ὑσχάτας ὁπερσίς τοις ἄγιοις ἀντασιχωτοὺς ἔξεπτελεῖς," Thl. Still, we must not dismiss from our consideration the external act itself: as Thdrt. ἐπολούν γάρ τούτο πάλαι: see John xiii. 14, and note, in which, though a formal ceremony in obedience to our Saviour's words is repudiated, the principle of humbly serving one another, which would lead to such an act on occasion presented, is maintained), if she (at any time) relieved (cf. Herod. i. 91, καυμένης αὐτῷ ἐπιτρέπει: — Eur. Hee. 963, τί χρή τοις εἰς πράσσων μὴ πράσσωσιν εἰς φιλοις ἐπαρκεῖς; — and examples in Wets. It is more rarely found with an accus.: see Palm and Rost's Lex:) the distressed (not merely the poor, as Beng., but those afflicted in any way: cf. example from Herod. above), if she followed every good work (Chrys. in his fine homily on this passage, cited above, § 15, says: τί ἐστιν ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ, ἀγ. ἐπικολούθο. ἄστε καὶ εἰς δεσμοθήριον εἰσίναι καὶ τοὺς δεδεμένους ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, καὶ ἄρνητοντας ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, καὶ θλιβόμενους παραμυθείσθαι, καὶ ὅρωμαν οὐκ αὐτούς παρακάλειν, καὶ πάντα τρόπον τά κατά δύναμιν εἰσερχόμενα ἀπαντά, καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλον παρατείνεισθαι τοὺς ἔως σωτηρίαν καὶ ἀνάσπας τῶν ἀδέλφων γενομένων τῶν ἁμετέρων. Bengel's idea, "Antistitum et virorum est, bonis operibus preire, Tit. iii. 8, 14: mulierum, subseqüi, adjuvando pro sua parte," is ingenious, but wrong: cf. Plat. Rep. p. 370 c, —ἄλλαν ανάγκη τῶν πράττοντα τῷ πραττόμενῳ ἐπικολούθειν μὴ εἰς παρέγγειον μέρη."

11.] But younger widows decline (to place on the κατάλογος, see above on verse 9: not 'avoid,' for fear of scandal, as Chrys. in the homily above cited: nor both of these combined, as Huther: nor 'decline as objects for the alms of the church,' as some above Baur's idea [Paulus u. s. w. p. 497], that χήρας is the predicate,—'the younger women decline as widows,' refuse to put on the list of widows, is not justified by the construction, nor does it derive any support from the rendering given above of χήρα καταλεγóμενα, verse
for when they shall wax wanton (a very full account of the usage of εἴων and ὅταν with the indic. is given in Klotz, Devar. ii. pp. 468 ff. Ellicott sums it up by saying that in such cases the whole conditional force is restricted to the particle, and there is no necessary internal connexion between the verb in the proposition and that in the apodosis. He does not hold this to be applicable here, and therefore prefers the red. reading against (στρφνας, and στρφνος, see reff.—from στρφνης [strenuus], "strong,"—to be strong," whence κατα-στρφν, to be strong against,—to rebel against [see Ellic. here]: and in the particular matter here treated, to become wanton against) Christ (their proper bridegroom: Jerome’s expression, cp. 123 [11] ad Agerchniam [Gerontiam] 3, vol. i. p. 901, which the Commentators blame as too strong: in fact gives the sense well,—"qua fortis earn [-cantur?] in injuriam viri sui Christi." Thl. similarly, but too vaguely,—ὅταν καθυσπιρυφανεύονται τοιό χριστοί, μη ἀποδεχόμεναι αὐτὸν νυμφίον), they desire to marry (again)—having (bearing on themselves, as a burden: see reff. and Gal. v. 10) judgment (from God: and as the context necessarily implies, condemnation: but we must not so express it in a version: that which is left to be fixed by the context in the original, should be also left in a translation. The meaning "bringing on themselves the imputation of having," &c., given by De W. and upheld by Huther, al., appears to me to be ungrammatical), because they set at nought their first faith (i.e. broke, made void, their former promise. So Chrys., interpreting it, τός πρὸς τὴν χριστῶν καταπτησάς συνθήκας, Hom. var. ut supra: and again, πίστις τῆς συνθήκης λέγει, Hom. in loc.: Thdt. ὁ πρὸς χριστὸν συνταγάλεται σωφρόνως ἐν ἐν χειρα, δευτέροις διαλύσας γαςίοις: Thl. ἐφέσωσα τοῦ συμφόρων τῆς πρὸς χριστῶν. Tert. de monogam. 13, vol. ii. p. 948,—"quod primam fidem resedereunt, illam videcĭd quia in viduitate inventa et proiisse cam non perseverant." Aug. in Ps. lxxv. 12, § 16, vol. iv. p. 908: "Quid est "primam fidem irritum fecerunt?"—voventur et non reddiderunt." Having devoted themselves to widowhood as their state of life, and to the duties of the order of προφητίςκεις as their occupation, they will thus be guilty of a dereliction of their deliberate promise. Of the later vows of celibacy, and ascetic views with regard to second marriages, there is no trace: see below. Calv. [al.] interprets τῆς πρὸτης πίστιν ἠδηγησάν of falling away from the faith,—'quia a fide baptismi et Christianismo prorsus deficientem,' and defends this view against that given above, calling it 'nimis frigidum:' but as it seems to me quite unsuccessfully. He expresses well, however, the difference between this addiction to single life and the later compulsory vows: "non ido coelebres se fore promittete bon vivere, ut sanctius agetur vitam quam in conjudio: sed quod non poterant marito et ecclesiis simul esse addicite:—see the rest of his note). 13.] Moreover they also learn to be idle (so Syr., Chr., Thl., Beza, Huther, Winer, Ellic. ["It is needless to say that Winer does not conceive an ellipsis of ὁδοια for εἰς: Bloomf.,—a mistake of which such a scholar could not be capable." Ellic. edn. 1, al.;—a harsh construction, but, it is said, not without example: however, the only one cited is from Plat. Euthyd. p. 276 b: οι ἁμαθεῖς ἄρα σοφοὶ μανθάνοντες, where the word σοφοὶ does not occur in Bekker's text, and seems on critical grounds very suspicious. Still, I conceive that the present sentence will admit of no other construction, on account of the emphatic position of ἀργαί, which is further heightened by ὁδοια ἢ ἀργαί below. De W. objects to it, that idleness is the cause, not the effect, of going about, &c.: but it may well be answered, that not only does a spirit of idleness give rise to such going about, but such going about confirms the habit of idleness. Bengel would lay the stress on μανθάνοντες—reprehendi—discendi genus: sequiturque species,—discend, quia domos obhendo discurrent, i.e. statum familiarum curiose explorant.' But μαθ. does not seem to bear this meaning. The usual interpretation has been to take τεμερία, as an infin., 'learn to go about: so vulg., Luth., &c.: but the objection to this is, that μανθάνω with a participle always means to be aware of, take notice of, the act implied in the verb: e.g. διαβηθημένοι ὑπὸ Ἀμασίος οὖ μανθάκι, Herod. iii. 1) going about
from house to house (lit. "the houses," viz. of the faithful. For the construction compare Matt. ix. 35, περιφέρειν δ τοιούτος τάς πόλεις): but not only (to be) idle, but also gossiping (περιδοθείοντας τάς οἰκίας, οὐδὲν ἀλλ' ἢ τά ταύτης εἰς ἐκείνην φρονοῦν, καὶ τά ἐκείνης εἰς τάστην. Thl. 'Ex opto nasebatur curiositas, quae ipsa garrulitatatis est mater.' Calv.) and busy-bodies (refr.), speaking (not merely 'saying,' the subject-matter, as well as the form, is involved in λαλοῦσα) things which are not fitting (his fear is that, these younger widows will not only do the Church's work idly, but make mischief by hearing about tales and scandal). I will (consult Ellie's note on βοθλομαί. We may generally state that θέλε is the resting inclination of the will, βοθλομαί its active exertion) then ("οὗν has here its proper collective force, 'in consequence of these things being so, I desire.'" Ellie) that younger widows (such, and not the younger women, is evidently the Apostle's meaning. [χήρας is supplied in several cursives, Chr., Thdrt., Jer.] The whole passage has concerned widows — and to them he returns again, ver. 16) marry (not as Chrys., ἐκείθεν αὐταλ βοθλομαί βοθλομαί καταγό. ... ἐδει μὲν οὖν τά τοῦ θεού μερισμά, ἐδει τήν πίστιν φιλάσσειν, ἐκείθεν δέ ἐκείνα οὖν ἔκχει, βλέπεται τάτα τευχείσας [so also, characteristically, the R.-Cath. Mack.]: for it is not younger widows who have been taken into the catalogue of προσβατίστες of whom he is speaking, but younger widows in general: Chrys.'s interpretation would make the Apostle contradict himself. The οὖν on which Mack lays stress as favouring this meaning, simply infers from the temptations of young widows just described. There is no inconsistency here with the view expressed in 1 Cor. viii. 39, 40: the time and circumstances were different), bear children, govern households (i.e. in their place, and with their share of the duties: οἰκουρία, as Chrys. Both these verbs belong to later Greek: cf. Lobeck on Phryn., p. 373), give no occasion (starting-point, in their behaviour or language) to the adversary (who is meant? Chrys. and the ancients for the most part understand, the devil [μὴ βοθλομένων τόν διάβολον ἀφορμήν λαυβάκιν]; and so, lately, Huther, defending it by his interpretation of λαυβάκια χαρίν [see below]. But St. Paul's own usage of ἀντικείμενοι [refr., see also Tit. ii. 8] is our best guide. Ordinarily using it of human adversaries, he surely would here have mentioned δ ἄδικον, had he intended it. And the understanding him to be here meant brings in the next verse very awkwardly, as he there has an entirely new part assigned him. Understand therefore, any adversary, Jew or Gentile, who may be on the watch to get occasion, by the lax conduct of the believers, to slander the Church) for the sake of reproach (to be joined with ἀφορμή: the ἀφορμή, when taken advantage of by the adversary, would be used λαυβάκια χαρίν, for the sake and purpose of reproaching the people of God. Mack would join Λ. ἀ. with βοθλομαί,—most un-naturally: 'I will, on account of the reproach which might otherwise come on the Church, newτέρας γαμεῖν &c.'—Lev.,—with τῷ ἀντικείμενῳ,—which would more naturally be τῷ λαυβάκια χαρίν ἀντικεί- μενος. Λαυβάκια must be kept to its true sense, reproach brought on the Gospel; not forced, as Huther, for the sake of his view of δ ἀντικείμενος, to that of
disgrace brought on the church by the fall of the widows); —for already (particular provo\c t ad experi\entiam, Beng.) some (widows) have been (we are obliged here to give a perfect rendering in English. Our language will not, as the habit of mixed constructions in the Greek permits, bear the placing an indefinite past event in a definite portion of time such as ἐσω expresses) turned away (out of the right path, ref.) after (so as to follow) Satan (‘e\ c\ o\ c\ e\ s\ i\ o\ n\ e\ m\ d\ e\ d\ e\ r\ e\ c\ a\ l\ n\ i\ a,) Beng. When De W. doubts whether St. Paul’s experience could have been long enough to bear out such an assertion — and thus impugns the genuineness of the Epistle, —this is very much a matter of dates: and even taking the earliest commonly assigned, the assertion might be strictly true, applying as it does not only to Ephesus, but to the far wider range of his apostolic ministry. 16.] Not a repetition of vv. 4, 8, but an extension of the same duty to more distant relatives than those there spoken of. If any believing (man or) woman has widows (in [his or] her family — dependent in any degree, however distant— e. g. as sister, or sister-in-law, aunt, niece, cousin, &c.), let such person relieve them (see above, ver. 10), and let the church not be burdened (with their support; “later and less correct form for μετανα\p \v s;” see Ellic.), that it may relieve those who are widows in reality (really χήραι — destitute of help).

17—25.] Directions respecting (17—19) presbyters; (20—25) church discipline; and certain matters regarding his own official and personal life. 17.] Let the presbyters who well preside (not, as in some former editions, have well presided: the perf. of ἀριστέως has the present signification throughout. I owe the correction of this inadvertence to Bishop Ellicot. Preside, viz. over their portion of the Church’s work. Chrys. has well expressed the meaning, but not all the meaning; for wisdom and ability must be taken also into account: —τὶ δὲ εὐτυχῶς, καλῶς προεστῶτας; ἀκούσωμεν τῶι κριτῶι λέγωντος; ὁ ποιὼν ὁ καλὸς της ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ τίμησεν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων. Αὐτὸ τοῖς ἐπισκόποις (προστάται), καὶ εἰς ἰδιαίτερον τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἑνεκεί, be held worthy of double (not, as compared with the widows, as Chr., — [alt. 1: διπλαῖς τῷ πρῶτῳ τὰ χήραι, ἢ τῇ πρῶτῇ τοῖς διακόνοις, ἢ τοῖς διπλάς τιμίας, πολλῆς λέγει,) Thl. [1], Constt.-ap. [ii. 28, p. 674, Migne], Erasm., Calv., al., — the deacons, as Chr. [2, see above], Thl. [2], — the po\r, as, Platt, &c. — but as compared with those who have not distinguished themselves by καλῶς προεστῶ\ p a i; and evidently, as Chrys. 3, it is not to be taken in the mere literal sense of double, but implies increase generally — see ref., and below) honour (so Plat. Legg. v. p. 378 D, τιμῶς μὲν δὴ καὶ δὲ μηνὶς ἠδικώς; ὁ δὲ μὴ ἐπήρεσα τῶν αὐτοῦ εἰκόνοις ἀλλικαὶ πλὴν διπλαί τιμίας ἔχοι: and see other examples in Wetstein. From the general tenor of those, as well as from the context here, it is evident that not merely honour, but recompense is here in question; but the word need not be confined to that meaning: honour, and honour’s fruit, may be both included in it. Grot. conceives an allusion to the double portion of the first-born [Deut. xxi. 17]: Elsner, to the double share of provision which used to be set before the presbyters in the Agape (Heydryr, Baur: cf. Const.-apost. as above). But as De W. remarks, that practice was much more probably owing to a misunderstanding of this passage): especially those that labour in (the word and teaching (therefore the preaching of the word, and teaching, was not the office of all the πρεσβυτέραι. Conyb. rightly remarks, that this is a proof of the early date of the Epistle. Of these two expressions, λέγωs
would more properly express.preaching, διαδακτάλως, the work of instruction, by catechetical or other means.

18.] Ground for the above injunction. See the first citation (an [or 'the,' an anarthrous emphatic word] or while treading,' &c., not, 'the ox that treadeth,' &c., as E. V.) treated by the Apostle at more length, 1 Cor. ix. 9. It is doubted whether the words ἀξιός ὁ ἐργάτ. κ.τ.λ. are a citation at all. Some have referred them to Levit. xix. 13: Deut. xxiv. 14, which passages however say nothing of the kind, being special directions about paying a labourer's wages before night. Thdrt. and Thl. suppose it to be quoted from the New Testament; i. e. from our Lord's saying, reff. Matt., Luke. But it is very unlikely that the Apostle should cite these under the title of ἡ γραφή: and Calvin's view seems most probable, that he adds the summation, as our Lord Himself does, as a popular and well-known saying (so Wolf and Huther). This verse it which makes it extremely probable, that τῷ μὴ above refers to the homoramus of pecuniary recompense. 19.] See the summary above. Against a presbyter (Chrys., Thl.), are certainly wrong in supposing that age, not office is again here indicated: the whole passage is of presbyters by office—cf. ver. 22 below) entertain not an accusation, except (reff. pleonastic expressions such as ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ, χωρίς εἰ or εἰ μὴ, are found in later writers, such as Plutarch, Dio Cassius, &c.; we have παρὰ εἰ μὴ in Demosth. 141. 21, 719. 1: Aristot. de Anim. 1. 5. 9, al. See Lobeck on Phrynichus, p. 459) before (lit. in presence of); and perhaps we ought to press the meaning: but from the occurrence of εἰς ἀνάμωσις διὸ μαρτ. κ.τ.λ. in ref. Deut., it is more likely figurative, 'in the presence of,' signifying merely 'εὐθανάσιον,' their presence in the case) two or three witnesses (De W. asks,—but were not these required in every case, not only in that of a presbyter? Three answers are given: one by Chrys., ἵδε εἰς ἥλιον, φησι, μάλιστα δὲ κατὰ πρεσβυτέρου, Thdrt. [συμβαίνει γὰρ ἐκλήσιας αὐτῶν προστασίαν πεπιστευμένων καὶ λυπήσει τῶν ἀμαρτανόντων τινῶν, εἰτα ἐκτεθὲν ἡκείνους δειμένας διατεθέντας συμφαίνων ὑφήματι, δεὶ τοῖνυ ἀπαντησά τῶν μαρτύρων τῶν ἀριθμῶν; and so Calvin at more length: the other by Huther, that Timotheus was not constituted judge in private men's matters, only over the officers of the church in faults with which they might be charged as regarded the execution of their duty: a third by Bengel,—'privatus potestas, lege Mosis, citari uno teste, non condemnari: presbyterum ne citari quidem Paulus jubet, &c.' But this is manifestly a distinction without point—the καταγορίαν παραδεχεται being used not of mere citation, but of entertaining the charge as a valid one: in other words, as including citation and conviction as well. So nearly Grocius, but bringing out a different distinction, which is manifestly here not in question—'poterat ad unius testis dictum vir plebeius capi aut cona eum inquisitio ineipi: non ita autem contra Senatorum, cui aequiparatur Presbyter.' The first reason seems the more probable: that he is only calling the attention of Timotheus to a known and prescribed precedent, which was in this case especially to be always observed. Somewhat otherwise Ellicott: see his note).

20.] [But] those who are doing wrong (if ἐδε is read, these are the sining presbyters, and cannot well be any others. Without the particle, the application may be doubted. De W., Wiesinger, and Ellicott, following a few others [Aret., Heiri., Matthis, al.], maintain the general reference. So appears Chrys., to have done, understanding πρεσβ. merely of age, and going on without any further remark, and so [apparently] Thdrt. But, even thus, the other view is more likely, from the strong language used in ver. 21, and the return again to the subject in ver. 22; and so most Commentators. The pres. part. is no argument against it (against De W. and Wiesinger): 'those who are
[detected in] simming,' which are proved to be living in sin, may well be intended by it: the fact of their being ἀναρρήτουν is not ascertained till they have been charged with fault, and the evidence of the witnesses taken) reprove in the presence of all (not all the presbyters, the 'concessus presbyterorum': see on καὶ οἱ λατοῖο below: but the whole congregation. Had it not been for ecclesiastical considerations, we should never have heard of such a limited meaning for ἐνώπιον πάντων, that the rest also (not, the other presbyters, which would have certainly been pointed out if intended,—but in its usual sense of 'the rest,' generally: the καὶ seems to make this even plainer: that the warning may not be confined to a few, but may also spread over the whole church) may have fear (see Dent. xiii. 11: fear, on seeing the public disgrace consequent on sin. έχεσθαι, as above, ver. 12).

21.] I adjure thee (see reff, especially 2 Tim. iv. 1) in the presence of God, and of Christ Jesus (on the supposed reference to one Person only, see Ellic.'s note); and of the elect angels (the holy angels, who are the chosen attendants and ministers of God. Thus ἐλκετων is an epithet distributed over the whole extent of ἄγγελον, not one designating any one class of angels above the rest, as De W. Bengel says rightly, ἐλκετων, "epitheton, Timothei reverentiam acceens:—the angels, God's chosen ministers." Various meanings have been proposed: good angels as distinguished from bad (so Thl., Ambri., Grot., Est., Wolf, al.),—but οἱ ἄγγελον without any such designation, are ever good angels:—the guardian angels of Timothens and the Ephesian church (Mosheim): 'those especially selected by God as His messengers to the human race, as Gabriel' (Comy.),—which, if we suppose these to be any particular class of angels, would be the best; but I doubt έλκετός, absolute, ever bearing this meaning, and much prefer that uptl. above, Calvin says: 'electos vocat angelos non tantum ut a reprobis discernat, sed excellentiae causa, ut plus reverentiae habeat corum testimonium.' There is a parallel form of adjuration in Jos. B. J. ii. 16. 4, where Agrippa is endeavouring to persuade the Jews to remain in the Roman allegiance: μαρτυρίαν μη ἐνωπὶ αὐτοῦ ἀγγέλων καὶ τῶν ἵπτων ἅγγελον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ πατρίδα τὴν κυνῆν. Schleiermacher thinks this mention of one class of angels as 'elect,' inconsistent with the Apostle's warning against genealogies and idle questions: but with the above interpretation such objection falls to the ground. Baub would explain the expression by the gnostic notion of angels more immediately connected with our Lord, alluded to by Iren. i. 4. 5, p. 21, οἱ ἡλικιωταί αὐτοῦ ἀγγελοι: see ib. 7. 1, p. 32. But Irenaeus' text is μετὰ τῶν ἡλικιωτῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν ἅγγελων, which hardly justifies the interpretation: and if it did, the whole lies too far off the matter in our text, to be brought to bear upon it), that thou keep these things (viz. the injunctions, vv. 19, 20. De W., taking ver. 20 generally, is obliged, although he confesses that the connexion with ver. 19 would be best if only vv. 19, 21 came together, to explain ταῦτα of ver. 20 only, see below) without prejudice ('prae-judicium'—previous condemnation before hearing a man's case: a word only found here), doing nothing according to partiality (bias towards, as the other was bias against, an accused presbyter. Diod. A Ά
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μηδὲ ἡ κοινώνει ἀμαρτίας ἀλλοτρίως, σεαυτὸν τῷ ἀγώνι

μηδὲ ἡ κοινώνει ἀμαρτίας ἀλλοτρίως, σεαυτὸν τῷ ἀγώνι

τῇ τῷ στόμαχῳ καὶ τὰς πυκνὰς σου ἀθενείας.


Sic, i.ii, 27, uses the word in its literal sense: ὁ δὲ βρῶν διὰ τὴν γυμνότητα πρὸς αὐτὸ πλεονάκει πρόκλησιν τοῦ γώνος, τετρυμένον ἄτροπον:—Diogn. Laert., procem. 20, in its metaphorical: ἔσεν μιᾶς τῆς κατηγορίας ἀξιοπατία πιστεύσαντα κατακρίνει, ἢ φιλαπληθύνων διακείμενον τούτῳ ποιεῖ τῆς ἀκριβοῦς ἐισπάσας. μήτε τῶν ἐλέγχων προφανῶν γεγονόμων ἀναβαλλέων τῇ πρὸς τῶν κρινόμενον χάρις τὸ δικαίως διαφερόμε- 

τα, 22 ἑτ. The same subject is continued, and direction given whereby the scandal just dealt with may be prevented: viz, by caution in ordaining at first. The reference is primarily to presbyters: of course extending also in its spirit to all other church offices. This reference, which is maintained by Chrys., thrart., Thil., Grot., Est., Flatt, Mack, αλ, is de- 

nied by De W., Wiesinger, and Huther: the two former (as also Hammond, Ellic,) understanding the command of receiving back into the church excommunicated persons, or heretics, which from later testi- 

monies (Cypr., the Nicene council, &c,) they shew to have been the practice: Huther, rightly rejecting this idea, yet interprets it of laying on of hands as merely conveying eclec- 

tical blessing on many various occasions. But surely this is too 

tangible and unimportant for the solemn language here used. Regarding the whole, to v. 23, as connected, and belonging to one 

subject, I cannot accept any interpretation but the obvious and ordinary one: see especially ch. iv. 14: 2 Thm. i. 6.

Lay hands hastily on no one, nor be par- 

taker in other men's sins (as he would do by being the means of negligently ad-

mitting into the ministry unfruitful and ungodly persons, being properly held responsible for the consequence of those had habits of theirs which more care might have ascertained.  

ἀμαρτίας points to the former ἀμαρτίαντος:—keep thyself (highly emphatic: not merely others over whom thou art called to preside and pro-
nounce judgment in admitting them to the ministry. And the emphasis is peculiar in place here, as applying to that which has just preceded. If he were to admit improper candidates to the ministry from bias or from negligence, his own character, by his becoming a partaker in their sins, would suffer: whatever thou dost therefore, be sure to maintain, by watchful care and caution, thyself above all stain of blame) pure (not here to be referred to personal purity and chastity, though that of course would be the most important of all elements in carrying out the precept: but as above. On the word, see Ellic.).  

No longer (habitually) drink water, but use a little wine, on account of thy stomach, and of thy frequent illnesses (the question, why this injunction is here inserted, has never been satisfactorily an-

swered. Est., Grot., αλ, De W., Ellic., αλ, take it as a modification of σεαυτῷ ἀγώνι τῷ ἀγώνι, so as to prevent it from being misunderstood as coining upon asceti-

icism. But on our explanation of the words, and I may add on any worthy view of the context, such a connexion will at once be repudiated. Chrys. has caught the right clue, when he says δεικνύει δε μοι καὶ ἀλλοι ἑνώπιον εἰμι χρή, καὶ τοῦτο δεικ- 

νών ἀλεξάντως διὰ τὰς πυκνὰς σου ἀθενείας, ἀπὸ τοῦ στόμαχου, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀλλῶν μερῶν: but he has not followed it up. Timotheus was certainly of a feeble bodily frame, and this feebleness appears, from other hints which we have respecting him, to have affected his character. See especially 1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11, and note there. Is it not very possible, that such feebleness, and perhaps timidity, may have influenced him as an overseer of the church, and prevented that keen-sighted judgment and vigorous action which a bishop should ever shew in estimating the characters of those who are candidates for the ministry? If this was so, then it is quite natural that in advising him on this point, St. Paul should throw in a hint, in fatherly kindness, that he must not allow these maladies to interfere with the effi-

cient discharge of his high office, but take all reasonable means of raising his bodily
condition above them. I feel compelled to adopt this view, from the close connexion of the next verse with the whole preceding passage, and the exceedingly unnatural isolation of this, unless it bears such a reference. It is impossible to avoid remarking, that the characteristic, but unnecessary anxiety of Ellicott to rescue the apostolic Timotheus from any imputation of feebleness of character, has blinded him to the delicate connexion of thoughts here, as frequently in the second Epistle. 24. The same subject continued: τὸν περὶ τῆς χειροτονίας ἀνάλαμβάνει λόγον. Thrdt. If my view of the last verse is correct, the connexion will be found in the fact, that the conservation of himself in health and vigour would ensure his being able to deal ably and firmly with the cases which should come before him for decision. To guide him still further in this, the Apostle subjoins this remark, indicating two classes of characters with which he would have to deal in judging, whether favourably or un-favourably. Of some men the sins (connects with ἀμαρτίαι ἀλλοτριαῖς, ver. 22) are evident (there does not seem to be any relation of time in πρόδηλος, ‘manifest beforehand,’—for thus the meaning would be,—as in πρόδηλος πάστόμον, κύνδινως, &c., that the sins were manifest before they were committed, which would reduce this case to the other [see below]: but the πρό- seems rather of place than of time,—πρὸ τῶν ὑδαταῖς,— openly manifest,—notorious by common report), going before them (so that the man’s bad report comes to the person appointed to judge, before the man himself: not trans- light, as Heinrichs,—‘peccata in judicium eos vocant’) to judgment (i. e. so that when they come before thee to be judged of as candidates, their sins have arrived before them): but some men again they (their sins) follow (i. e. after-proof brings out the correctness or otherwise of the judgment. Their characters come before thee unanticipated by adverse rumour: but thou mayest by examination discover those flaws in their conduct which had been skilfully concealed—the sins which, so to speak, follow at their heels. Therefore be watchful, and do not let the mere non-existence of previous adverse rumour lead thee always to presume fitness for the sacred office). 25.] So also (in like manner on the other side of men’s conduct) the good works (of some) are openly manifest: and those which are otherwise situated (which are not πρόδηλα cannot be hidden (will come out, just as the sins in ver. 24, on examination. The tendency of this verse is to warn him against hasty condemnation, as the former had done against hasty approbation. Sometimes thou wilt find a man’s good character go before him, and at once approve him to thee: but where this is not so, do not therefore be rash to condemn—thou mayest on examination soon discover, if there really be any good deeds accompanying him: for they are things which cannot be hidden—the good tree like the bad will be known by his fruits, and that speedily, on enquiry). I have abstained from detailing all the varieties of interpretation of these verses, following as they do those already specified on verses 20—22. They may be seen shortly enumerated in De W. and Ellicott, and commented on at somewhat tedious length in Wiesinger. Chrys., al., confuse the context by understanding κρίσις of eternal judgment, and the sentiment as equivalent to εἰκόν τῶν γυμνῶν ἔστιν. And so even Ellicott, who in objecting to the above interpretation (which is also Dr. Wordsworth’s) charges it somewhat naively with failure in explaining the context. That it only does explain it satisfactorily, is, in my view, the decisive consideration in its favour.
VI. 1 "Osoi eisiv upo d'lygyn dOuloiv, toutov e'diouv e'se-
spotacis pasis f tmyis a'zivos g hgeisathsan, ina mu tv e
onomia tov theov kai i diexiskalia hle blasphemiai. 2 oii
dev' pistous exountes devspotas, me katafroinestwv, oti
achelvoi eisiv affa mallovo n chuvnei estwv, oti 1 pistoiv

Chap. VI. I. for douloiv, douloiv F: eisiv b 1 k 73 subh. aft dool. pi is written by
ri, but marked and erased. for theou, kuriou D 17 vulg goth Pelag Ambrst Gelas.
blasphemiai. KI. 17.

VI. 1 "Osoi eisiv upo d'lygyn dOuloiv, toutov e'diouv e'se-
spotacis pasis f tmyis a'zivos g hgeisathsan, ina mu tv e
onomia tov theov kai i diexiskalia hle blasphemiai. 2 oii
dev' pistous exountes devspotas, me katafroinestwv, oti
achelvoi eisiv affa mallovo n chuvnei estwv, oti 1 pistoiv

given, and by the contrast in the next verse, not by any formal opposition in terms. The account to be given of the absence of such opposition is, that this verse contains the general exhortation, the case of Christian slaves under unbelieving masters being by far the most common. The exception is treated in the next verse).

2, But (see above) let those who
have believing masters not despise them
because (belongs to katafroinestwv only,
containing the ground of their contempt,—
not to the exhortation me katafroinestwv-
sav they (the masters, not the slaves)
are beloved, but all the more serve
them (mallovo has the emphatic position: cf.
Eph. v. 11, where it merely signifies 'rather,' and the verb has the emphasis, 
mallovo de kai ellethe. Cf. also Rom.
Od. o. 369, filie de me korphi mallovo:
in the same sense epi mallovo, Herod.
i. 91,—epe te de oik apineia to kakov,
all' epi mallovo epi biazevai, iii. 101;
iv. 181. "The slaves who were under
heathen masters were positively to re-
gard their masters as deserving of honour;—
the slaves under Christian masters were,
negatively, not to envious any want of
respect. The former were not to regard their
masters as their inferiors, and to be in sub-
ordinate; the latter were not to think them
their equals, and to be disrespectful." 
Elliott), because those who receive (mu-
tually receive: the interchange of service
between them in the Christian life being
taken for granted, and this word purposely
used to express it. So Eur. Andr. 712 ff.,
kav . . . tovaptov hev o'sorphous kath 'emai,
'asorphous antilkhsetai. | thimomtevoi de,
teinei thumomtevoi, ergasi e' erga dia-
dox ho antilkhsetai. This sense, in the
active, also occurs Theogm. 110, oto eivde
katho ev devnoi, e' evaloi antilthxov. And Plut.
Pericl. circa init. has it with the middle and
the negative construction,—tein ev gn e
ainthsetai, kata 'athos ths plhrgas antil-
xapamenei wov prptugaxantov. ; ; ;
and so Porphyr. de abstinentia, i. 16, mihe

**Note:**

The text appears to be a mixture of Greek and Latin, referencing various authors and works. It seems to discuss the nature of faith and its benefits, possibly in a philosophical or religious context. The page contains references to other works and authors, indicating a scholarly or academic setting. The text is filled with technical terms, possibly from a field like theology or philosophy. Without further context, it's challenging to provide a comprehensive translation or explanation.
VI.

" φιλάνθρωπος, ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ καθεστάτου, ἔτη ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἡμέρᾳ, πόλεμος ἐπὶ ἄρχοντα ἐστὶν."

But the continuance of the war was not sufficient to pacify the minds of men. It only served to increase the number of those who were discontented with their situation. The result was, that the people became more and more restless, and that the state of things became more and more disagreeable to all parties concerned in it. And thus it was that the war came to an end, and the state was restored to peace and tranquility.

The war continued for many years, and the state was in a state of constant fear and alarm. The people were constantly on the alert, and the government was constantly engaged in the defense of the state. But the war was at last brought to a close, and the state was restored to peace and tranquility.

This war was a great and a lasting one, and it was a war which was waged with great energy and vigor. The people were constantly on the alert, and the government was constantly engaged in the defense of the state. But the war was at last brought to a close, and the state was restored to peace and tranquility.
all sprung from the difficulty of the shorter and original construction. The meaning appears to be,—we were appointed by God to come naked into the world, to teach us to remember that we must go naked out of it. But this sense of ἔξω is not without difficulty. De W. cites II. π. 35, γλαυκή δὲ σε τίκτε βάλασσα, πέται τ' ἡλίατον, ὅτι τοι νόσο ἐστὶν ἀπήλτη,—and Od. χ. 36, ὧ κύθε, ὧ μ' ἐτ' ἐφάκδα ὑπότροπον οἰκάδι ἱκέσαι | δήμου ἀπὸ Τρώων, ὧτι μοι κατεκερτέσθη οἴκον, in both which it has nearly the sense required, of ‘seeing that.’ The sentiment is found in Job i. 21, Eccl. v. 14: and in words remarkably similar, in Seneca, Ep. 102. 21, ‘non flet plus efferre, quam intuleris.’ See also examples in Wetst.):

[8] but (contrast to the avatars, who forget this, or knowing it do not act on it: not as De W., ὡν, which would be a direct inference from the preceding verse) having (if we have) food (the δια- gives the sense of ‘sufficient for our continually recurring wants,’)—the needful supply of nourishment:—the plur. corresponds to the plur. ἐξοντες, and implies ‘in each case’) and covering (some take it of both clothing and dwelling: perhaps rightly, but not on account of the plural: see above:—Chrys., al. of clothing only,—τινατά ἀμφίβλητον, ὧ σκεπᾶσαι μόνον ἡμᾶς ὄριλει καὶ περιστεῖλε τὴν γύρωκας. These words occur together [Huther] in Sextus Empiricus ix. 1), with these (so ἀγαπᾶω, στέργω, χαίρω, &c. take a dative of the cause or object of the feeling. See ref. Luke, and Matthie, § 103) we shall be sufficiently provided (the fut. has an authoritative sense:—so in Matt. v. 18, and Xen. Hell. ii. 3, 31, cited by Huther, ὡμει ὁν, ἐκν σωφρονεὶτε, ὅ το τούτον, ἀλλ' ὃμών φείσεσθε:—but is not therefore equivalent to an imperative, ‘let us be content’ for its sense is not properly subjective but objective,—to be sufficed,’ or ‘sufficiently provided,’ and it is passive, not middle),

[9] But (contrast to the last verse) they who wish to be rich (not simply, ‘they who are rich,’ cf. Chrys.: ὃν ἄπλωσ εἰπὲν, ὃν πλουτότες, ἀλλ', ὧ βουλόμενον ἐστὶ γὰρ τίνα καὶ χρήματά ἔξοντα καλὸν ὁκονομεῖν καταθρονοῦντα αἰτῶν), fall (refl.) into temptation (not merely ‘are tempted,’ but are involved in, cast into and among temptations:—in ἐμπίπτειν is implied the power which the πειρασμοί exercises over them,” Huther) and a snare (being entangled by the temptation of getting rich as by a net), and many foolish and hurtful lusts (foolish, because no reasonable account can be given of them [see Ellie, on Gal. iii. 1]: hurtful, as inflicting injury on all a man’s best interests), such as sink men (mankind, generic) into destruction and perdition (temporal and eternal, but especially the latter: see the usage in refl. of both words by St. Paul: not mere moral degradation, as De W.).

10] For the love of money is the (not ‘α’, as Huther, Conyb., and Ellicott, after Middleton. A word like μήτα, a recognized part of a plant, does not require an article when placed as here in an emphatic position: we might have ἥ γὰρ μήτα, or μήτα γάρ: cf. 1 Cor. x. 3 [which, notwithstanding what Ellie has alleged against it, still appears to me to be strictly in
point to show that for which it is here addedauce, παντός ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ χριστὸς ἡ ἐστίν, κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικὸς ὁ ἄνηρ, κεφαλὴ δὲ τοῦ χριστοῦ ὁ θεός. Here in the first clause it is requisite to throw παντὸς ἀνδρὸς into emphasis: but had the arrangement been the same as that of the others, we should have read κεφαλὴ (not ἡ κεφ.), παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ὁ χριστὸς: but no one would therefore have thought of rendering ‘a head’ root of all evils (not, is the only root when all evils spring) but is the root whence all [manner of] evils may and as matter of fact do arise. So that De W.’s objections to the sentiment have no force: for neither does it follow [1] that the covetous man cannot possibly retain any virtuous disposition,—nor [2] that there may not be other roots of evil besides covetousness: neither of these matters being in the Apostle’s view. So Diogenes Laert. vit. Diogen. [vi. 50], τὴν φιλαργυρίαν ἐπε μητρόπολι πάσσων τῶν κακῶν: and Philo de judice 3, vol. ii. p. 316, calls it ὀργήσωμα τῶν μεγίστων παραφηγημάτων. See other examples in Wctst.: after which (φιλαργυρία, see below) some lusting (the method of expression, if strictly judged, is somewhat incorrect: for φιλαργυρία is of itself a desire or διθές, and men cannot be properly said ὀργήσωμά after it, but after its object ἀργύρου. Such inaccuracies are, however, often found in language, and we have examples of them in St. Paul elsewhere: e. g. ἐλατὶ βελομένη, Rom. viii. 24,—ἐλάπιδα . . . ἦν καὶ αὐτοὶ οὕτω προσεξόμενοι, Acts xxiv. 15) wandered away from the faith (ch. i. 19; iv. 1), and pierced themselves through the faith (not ‘all round’ or ‘all over,’ as Beza, Elsner, al.: the peri refers to the thing pierced surrounding the instrument piercing so perip. ἦν τὴν κεφαλὴν περὶ λόγχην, Phil. Galb. 27: see Palm and Rost, and Suicer, sub voce) with many pains (the ὄνωπα being regarded as the weapons, ἀκανθά εἰσαι αἱ ἐπιθυμίαι—καὶ καθέπερ ἐν ἀκανθαις, θλέον ἐν τις ἄφησαν αὐτῶν, ἤμαξε τὰς χείρας καὶ τραύματα ἐγράψατο ὁ θεός καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τὸ αὐτὸ πεισάται ὁ ταύτας ἐμπεσαν, κ. τ. ἡ πυρὶς άληγνόθεν περιβαλαί. Chrys.). 11—16.] Exhortation and conjunction to Timotheus, arising out of these considerations. 11.] But (contrast to τινὲς above) thou (emphatic), 0 man of God (the designation of prophets in the O. T.: cf. LXX, 1 Kings ix. 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12; and hence perhaps used of Timothy as dedicated to God’s service in the ministry: but also not without a solemn reference to that which it expresses, that God, and not riches [see the contrast again ver. 17] is his object of desire), flee these things (φιλαργυρίας and its accompanying evils): but (the contrast is to the following these things, underlying the mention of them) follow after (ref. 2 Tim., where both words occur again) righteousness (see Ellic.’s note and references), piety (so δικαιος, ἐνερβως, Tit. ii. 12), faith (not more rectitude in keeping trust, for all these words regard the Christian life), love, patience (under afflictions: stedfast endurance: better than stedfastness’ [Conyb.], which may be an active endurance, meek-spiritedness (ref.: we have πραϋπαθεῖς in Philo de profugis, i, vol. i. 517, —πραϋπάθεις in Basil. M. These two last qualities have reference to his behaviour towards the opponents of the Gospel): 12.] Strive the good strife (see ref. and ch. i. 18: 1 Cor. ix. 24 ff.: Phil. iii. 12 ff.) of the faith (not ‘of faith,’ abstract and subjective: but that noble conflict which the faith,—the profession of the soldier of Christ, entails on him), lay hold
12. see aff εἰς ὅπως καὶ, with o (d h l m, e si) syr-w-ast Thl ΕΕ Ambrost-ms : om ADFKL and latt Syr copt sah arm Petra-alex Ephr Chr Thrdr Damasc Pelag.

13. παραγγέλλων, omg (as also Ν1 17) eou, F, om ιντ του Ν : om ιντ του Θεου 109. see (for ζωογονοῦσας) ζωοποιοῦσας, with KLN rel Cyr-jer : txt ADF 17 Ath Cyr Thdr thrall ΕΕ-comm.  stricter bef χρ. FN Syr Did Thl Tert. upon (as the aim and object of the life-long struggle; the prize to be gained: so that the second imperative is, as Winer well observes, edn. 6, § 42, not the mere result of the first, as in 'divide et impera,' but correlative with it and contemporaneous: 'strive, ... and while doing so, endeavour to attain') everlasting life, to which thou wast called (here apparently the image is dropped, and the realities of the Christian life spoken of. Some have supposed an allusion to the athletes being summoned by a herald: but it seems far-fetched—and indeed inaccurate: for it was to the contest, not to the prize, that they were thus summoned), and diist confess (we must not supply εἰς ὅπως again before ὑμολογήσας, with Mack, al., 'in reference to which,'—a most unnatural construction: but regard it, with De W., as simply coupled to ἐκλήθης the good confession (of faith in Christ: the confession, which every servant of Christ must make, on taking upon himself His service, or professing it when called upon so to do. From the same expression in the next verse, it would seem, that the article rather represents the notoriousness of the confession, 'bo-

nam illam confessionem,' than its definite general character. There is some uncertainty, to what occasion the Apostle here refers; whether to the baptism of Timotheus,—so Chrys. (?), [Ee, ΕΕ, Thr. [alt.], Ambr., Grot., Beng., &c.: to his ordination as a minister,—so Wolf, al.: to his appointment over the church at Ephesus,—so Mack: to some confession made by him under persecution,—so, justifying it by what follows, respecting our Lord, Huther, al. Of these the first appears to me most probable, as giving the most general sense to ἡ καλὴ ὑμολογία, and applying best to the immediate consideration of αἰώνας ὧν, which is the common object of all Christians. The reference supposed by Thdrt. [πάντας παρ' αὐτόν δεξιομένον τὸ κήρυγμα μάρτυρα ἵνα τὴς καλῆς ὑμολογίας], Calv., al., to Timothenos's preaching, is clearly inadmissible) before many witnesses. 13.] I charge thee (ch. i. 3) in the presence of God who endues all things with life (for the sense, see reef.): most probably a reference to αἰώνας ὧν above: hardly, as De W., al., after Chrys., to the resurrection, reminding him that death for Christ's sake was not to be feared: for there is here no immediate allusion to danger, but only to the duty of personal firmness in the faith in his own religious life), and of Christ Jesus, who testified ('testari confessionem erat Domini, confessi confessionem erat Timothei,' Bengel. See Ellicott's note) before Pontius Pilate (De W., al. [and Ellicott: see below on ὑμολογία] would render it, as in the Apostles' creed, 'under Pontius Pilate,' but the immediate reference here being to His confession, it seems more natural to take the meaning, 'coram' and so Chrys., who as a Greek, and familiar with the Creed, is a fair witness)—the good confession (viz that whole testimony to the verity of his own Person and to the Truth, which we find in John xviii., and which doubtless formed part of the oral apostolic teaching. Those who render εἰς, 'under,' understand this confession of our Lord's sufferings and death—which at least is far-fetched. There is no necessity, with Huther, to require a strict parallel between the circumstances of the confession of our Lord and that of Timotheus, nor to infer in consequence of this verse that his confession must have been one
Прοσ Τιμοθεον Α. 

VI.

οἵασι σε την ἐντολήν ἀστιλον, ἀνεπίλημπτον, μέχρι τῆς ἐπιφανείας του κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ, ἵνα ἐνεδίκησην και δυνάστησιν, ἔκαστος γὰρ καὶ κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων, ἐν μονον ἐξών ἀδανασίαν, φῶς ὀικίων ἀπροσ.

14. om σε D1 43 Did. χρ. αφι στ. Ν. 
16. ισι καὶ φως D1 vulg Did, Ambrost Pelag Ang. 

for ἀπροσ., ἀορατον 67.

before a heathen magistrate: it is the fruit of a confession having been made in both cases that is put in the foreground—and that our Lord's was made in the midst of danger and with death before him, is a powerful argument to firmness for his servant in his own confession. Another rendering of this verse is given by Mack, al.: it makes τὴν καλὴν ὀμολογίαν governed by παραγγέλλω, and understands by it the same confession as in verse 12: 'I enjoin on thee,—in the presence . . . and of Christ Jesus who bore testimony before Pontius Pilate—the good confession.' But this is quite inadmissible. For it is opposed both to the sense of παραγγέλλω, and to the following context, in which ἡ ἐντολή, not ἡ καλὴ ὀμολογία, is the thing to be observed, that thou keep (preserve: cf. ἀποσιλαφω below, and ch. v. 22) the commandment (used not to designate any special command just given, but as a general comphendium of the rule of the Gospel, after which our lives and thoughts must be regulated: cf. παραγγελεια in the same sense, ch. i. 5) without spot and without reproach (both epithets belong to τὴν ἐντολήν, not to σε, as most Commentators, some, as Est., maintaining that ἀνεπιλημπτος can be used of persons only. But this De W. has shewn not to be the case: we have ἡ ἀνεπιλημπτος τέχνη in Philo de opif. 22, vol. i. p. 15: ἀνεπιλημπτοτερὸν τὸ λεγόμενον in Plato, Philib. p. 43 c. Besides, the ordinary construction with τηρεῖν is that the qualifying adjective should belong to its object: cf. ch. v. 22: James i. 27: 2 Cor. xi. 9. The commandment, entrusted to thee as a deposit [cf. ver. 20], must be kept by thee unstained and unreproached. Consult Ellie's note until the appearance (refl.) of our Lord Jesus Christ (τοῦτος is, says Chrys., μέχρι τῆς σὺς τελευτῆς, μέχρι τῆς ἐξίδου. But surely both the usage of the word ἐπιφάνεια and the next verse have kept him from this mistake. Far better Bengel: "fideles in praxi sua prophebant sibi diem Christi ut appropriuantem: nos solemnus nobis horam mortis proponere." We may fairly say that whatever impression is bestowed by the words that the coming of the Lord would be in Timotheus's lifetime, is chastened and corrected by the καφοὶς ἰδίοις of the next verse. That, the certainty of the coming in God's own time, was a fixed truth respecting which the Apostle speaks with the authority of the Spirit: but the day and hour was hidden from him as from us: and from such passages as this we see that the apostolic age maintained which ought to be the attitude of all ages, constant expectation of the Lord's return).
of the Epistle, from the existence of wealthy members in the Ephesian church.

17.] To those who are rich in this present world (νοὶ ἐκεῖνοι ἐν τῷ νῷν), because πλοῦσιοι ἐν τῷ νῷν άἰωνιοί is the designation of the persons spoken of. Had there been a distinction such as Chrys. brings out,—εἰδὼς ὁ θάνατος, ἡ διάλογος ἡνίκα ἠνέχρηστος, οὗτος ἢ ἄνθρωπος ἔναντι τοῦ θεοῦ ἔπαινος. To those who are rich, οἱ τούτοι λατρεύειν τὸν θεὸν ἂν προσέπεμα, καὶ τοὺς πιστεύειν ἔναντι τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν θεὸν λέγειν ἃ ἐνίοτε ἀγαθόν, διδομένος ἐν τῷ νῷν άἰωνιοίν καὶ τοῦ νῷν μένους, τῶν μὲν ἄνθρωπος, τῶν δὲ πρὸς οἵτινες μεταβάλλει καὶ πολλοὺς ἔχον κυρίου, οὐδὲν ἐστὶν κτήμα. An uncertain author, in the Anthology, having complained of the fickleness of Fortune, says, μεν ἐκεῖνοι τῷ κτήματι, but in (see var. read.): no distinction of meaning need be sought between ἐπί and ἐν:
18. πλοῦτις εἰς F.  
19. αποθησαυρίζων D vulg Ambrst-ed. 

see Winer, edn. 6, § 50. 2) God (‘transfertur Ejus officium ad divitias, si spes in locatur,’ Calv.), who affordeth us all things richly (πλοῦτος of a nobler and higher kind is included in His bounty: that βασιλεία πλούτων which is a bane and snare in its worldly sense, will be far better attained in the course of his abundant mercies to them who hope in Him. And even those who would be wealthy without Him are in fact only made rich by His bountiful hand: ‘alias nemo foret πλούτοις,’ Beng.) for enjoyment (for the purpose of enjoying: cf. ch. iv. 3, εἰς μεταλήμφαιν. The term ἀπόλαυσις, the reaping enjoyment from, and so having done with (cf. ἀπέχω &c.), forms a contrast to ἑλπίκων ἐπί, in which riches are not the subject of ἀπόλαυσις, but are richly looked on as a reliance for the future);—to do good (ref.: ‘to practise benevolence,’ as Conyb.), but to be rich in good works (honourable deeds: ἀγάθος is good towards another, κάλος good in itself, noble, honourable),—to be free-givers, ready-contributors (Chrys. takes κοινωνίς for affable, communicative, &c., originally, φήσις, proserpae: so also Thdrt.: τὸ μὲν [ἐμεταδ. ἐστὶ τῆς τῶν χρημάτων χρηγαγός] το δὲ τῶν ἕδω καταργόν τοις ἄνωθεν ἔχοντας. But it seems much better to take it of communicating their substance, as the verb in Gal. vi. 6, and κοινωνία in Heb. xiii. 16, where it is coupled with ἑποίεια), (by this means) (‘therefrom,’ implied in the ἐκ) laying up for themselves as a treasure (hoarding up, not uncertain treasure for the life here, but a substantial pledge of that real and endless life which shall be hereafter. So that there is no difficulty whatever in the conjunction of ἀποθησαυρίζων θεμέλιων, and no need for the conjectures κείμελιον [Le Clerc] or θέμα λιῶν καλῶν [Lamb-Bos].) For the expression, cf. ch. iii. 13) a good foundation (refl., and Luke vi. 48) for the future (belongs to ἀποθησαυρίζων), that (in order that, as always: not the mere result of the preceding: ‘as it were,’ says De W., ‘setting foot on this foundation,’ or firm ground) they may lay hold of (ver. 12) that which is really (refl.) life (not merely the goods of this life, but the possession and substance of that other, which, as full of joy and everlasting, is the only true life).

20. 21.] Concluding Exhortation to Timotheus. O Timotheus (this personal address comes with great weight and solemnity: ‘appellat familiariter ut filium, cum gratitate et amore,’ Beng.), keep the deposit (entrusted to thee: refl. 2 Tim. [μὴ μειώθῃς οὐκ ἐστὶ σα: τὰ ἄλλα τάξιν ἐνεπιστεύθης μὴ δέχεσθαι, Chrys. I cannot forbear transcribing from Mack and Wiesinger the very beautiful comment of Vincentius Lirinensis in his Commonitorium [A.D. 434], § 22 f. p. 667 f.: ‘O Timothee, inequitatem custodi, devitans profanas vocum novitatem reading καινοφρονισαι—see var. readd.’) ‘O! exclamation ista et prae scientiae pariter et caritatis. Previderebatur eum futuros, quo esse pere dolabat, errores. Quid est ‘depositum custodi?’ Custodi, inquit, prosperitates, propert inimicos, nec dormientibus hominibus supersemenit zizania super illud tritici bonum semem quod seminaverat filius hominis in agro suo. ‘Depositorium, inquit, custodi.’ Quid est ‘depositum?’ id est quod tibi credidit est, non quod a te inventum: quod accepisti, non quod exegi: rem non ingenui sed doctum, ne usurpationis private sed publice traditio: rem ad te percutiam, quia non auctor debes esse sed custos, non institutor sed sectator, non ducens sed sequens. ‘Depositorium, inquit, ‘custodi.’ Catholice fidei talentum involutionem illatunacque conserva. Quod tibi credidit est, hoc peces te maneat, hoc a te tradatur. Aurum accepi, aurum reddet. Nolo mihi pro aliis alia sub-
Titus 3:1-7

For the grace of God that brings salvation has appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in the present age, looking for the blessed hope and the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ. 

2 Peter 1:1-8

But as those who have been chosen according to the purpose of God for sanctification, through the obedience of faith to wait for the revelation of the Lord Jesus, who will be our reward and a glory that does not fade away. For you will be enriched in every way by Jesus Christ to rule with us, and to be gloriﬁed with us. Therefore I seek to stir up your remembrance of these things in all the presence of Titus, so that, when I come, I may not have to search for such things as these, for you know well how you ought to conduct yourselves and are established in your present conduct. For的确, as one knows for himself, it is not without reason that I write these things to you, for I desire to have you instructed in all things, that you may be blameless, prepared for every good work. But for the sake of universal agreement and harmony in the faith, as I have said before, so now I write you, that you have no other fear. But the one thing I desire from you is that you prove to be pure in heart, not  ____1____ as of a son to his father. For Titus is a good worker in the Lord's vineyard, to whom I have sent you. Now I urge you, that you receive him in the Lord in a manner worthy of God, and that you assist him in his need, that he may be encouraged in all things through your assistance. For Titus is not ashamed of his bonds, but of good works. Therefore, if you assist him in the matter of the Lord, you do not assist his bonds, but his grace. For he is my fellow worker, and a true helper of the gospel of Christ.
are not therefore justified in assuming that it had received so definite an application, as afterwards it did to the various forms of Gnostic heresy. All that we can hence gather is, that the true spiritual γνώσις of the Christian was already being counterfeited by persons bearing the characteristics noticed in this Epistle. Whether these were the Gnostics themselves, or their precursors, we have examined in the Prolegomena to the Pastoral Epistles, 21. which some professing (ch. ii. 10) erred (reft.: the indefinite past, as marking merely the event, not the abiding of these men still in the Ephesian church) concerning the faith. 22. Concluding benediction: The grace (of God,—ἡ χάρις, the grace for which we Christians look, and in which we stand) be with thee. On the subscription we may remark, that the notice found in A. al., owes its origin probably to the notion that this was the Epistle from Laodicea mentioned Col. iv. 16. So Thl.; τίς δὲ ἢν ἡ ἀπὸ Λαοδικείας; η̣ πρὸς Τιμόθεον πρώτη. αὕτη γὰρ ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἐγράφη. The further addition in rec. al. betrays a date subsequent to the fourth century, when the province of Phrygia Pacatiana was first created. See Smith’s Dict. of Geography, art. Phrygia, circa finem.
I. 1. Παύλους ἀπόστολος χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ἄγαπητῶν τέκνων τῆς ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 2. Τιμοθέων ἀγαπητῷ τέκνῳ, ἀδέλφῳ καὶ ἀγαπητῷ τῷ δόξῃ τῶν ἀγαπητῶν τέκνων τῆς ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.  

1 (ref.): Tit. 1:17
2 Cor. 1:1
A 1 Cor. 1:1
B 2 Cor. 1:1
C 1 Tim. 4:8
D 1 Tim. 2:1

**TITLE.** cf. π. τ. αποστ. η πρ. τ. επ. δευτερα: Steph η πρ. τ. επ. δευτ.; του αγ. απ. π. επ. β’ πρ. τιμ. I: txt AKN h k m n o, 17. and (prefg αρχεται) DF.

**CHAP. 1. 1, 2.** Address and greeting. 1. διὰ θεοῦ. Cf. refl. 2. ἀγαπητῷ τέκνῳ] Cf. refl.

_κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν_ [according to] (in pursuance of, with a view to the fulfilment of) the promise (ref.) of life, which is in Christ Jesus (all this is to be taken with ἀπόστολος, not with θεοῦ). Thdrt. explains it well, ἄστε με τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἀπὸ κύριου τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κηρύχοι. Chrysostom sees, in this mention of the promise of life in Christ, a consolation to Timotheus under present troubles: ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ποιεῖται τὴν παραμορφίαν εἰ ἐπαγγελία ἐστι, μὴ ἔστω αὐτήν ἐνταῦθα ἐλπὶς γὰρ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐλπὶς. And this idea seems to be borne out by the strain of the subsequent portion of the Epistle, which is throughout one of confirmation and encouragement. So Bengel, _“nervus ad Timotheum hortandum, ver. 10, cap. ii. 8”_.

2. _ἀγαπητῷ τέκνῳ_ ["Can it be accidental," says Mack, “that instead of γνησίῳ τέκνῳ, as Timotheus is called in the first Epistle, i.e., and Titus i. 4,—here we have ἀγαπητῷ? Or may a reason for the change be found in this, that it now behoves Timotheus to stir up afresh the faith and the grace in him, before he could again be worthy of the name γνησίου τέκνων in its full sense?”] This may be too much pressed; but certainly there is throughout this Epistle an altered tone with regard to Timotheus,—more of mere love, and less of confidence, than in the former: and this would naturally shew itself even in passing words of address. When Bengel says, “in Ep. i., scripterat, genuino: id compensatur hic versum 5,” he certainly misses the delicate sense of ver. 5: see below. To find in ἀγαπητῷ more confidence, as Heyd. (and Chrys., maintaining that οἱ κατὰ πίστιν ὡς ἐστιν ἀγαπητοὶ, δι᾽ οὗ ἐστὶν ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ ἢ δι᾽ ἀρετὴν, can hardly be correct: the expression of feeling is different in kind, not comparable in degree: suiting an Epistle of warm affection and somewhat saddened reminding, rather than one of rising hope and confidence. I regret to be, on this point, at issue throughout this second Epistle, with my friend Bishop Ellictot, who seems to me too anxious to rescue the character of Timotheus from the slightest imputation of weakness: thereby marring the delicate texture of many of St. Paul’s characteristic periods, in which tender reproof, vigorous re-assurance, and fervent affection are exquisitely intermingled. See refl. and notes.
3. The reason for the profession may perhaps be found in the following mention of the faith of the mother and grandmother of Timotheus, which was already in the Apostle's mind. We may observe that he does not, as De W. charges him, place on the same ground the Jewish and Christian service of God: but simply asserts what he had before asserted, Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 1, — that his own service of God had been at all times conscientious and single-hearted, and that he had received it as such from his forefathers) in pure conscience, how (not 'that,' as Chrys. [ἐκαθαρτῶ τῷ θεῷ ὅτι μετημηνιάν αὐτῷ, φησίν, οὖν σὲ φιλῶ], Luth., E. V., al., — nor 'when,' as Calvin. [quotations tui recordor in precipius meus, id enim facio continentem, simul etiam de te gratias ago'], — nor 'since,' as being, Heyd., Flatt, al., — nor 'as,' as De W., Huthier, Elle, al.; but as in the parallel, Rom. i. 9, the construction is a mixed one between ἑλπιστὸν ὑμὶν ἐκ τῆς ἀσίδας ἀδιάλ. ἔχω, and ἐκχειριστῶ ἀδιάλειπτον ἔχων: and hence the meaning 'how' must be retained, and it the invention of construction, which is characteristic of one with whom expressions like these had now become fixed in dictum, and liable to be combined without regard to strict logical accuracy) unceasing I make my mention (not 'mention' only, on account of the article, which specifies the μετα as a thing constantly happening) concerning thee (so Herod. i. 36, πάντως μὲν περὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ μη μελαπάτε ἐτί: — Xen. Cyr. i. 6, οὐδ᾽ ὑπὸντοι πεφέρουσαν ἐπεμβολήν: — Plat. Laches, p. 181 a, δὲ ἐστὶ σωκράτης, περὶ ὧν ἑκάστοτε μεμυηθής: and Heb. xi. 22) in my prayers, night and day (see Luke ii. 37 note: belongs to ἐξουσίαστ🍬) ἐχω κ. τ. λ., not to δεξιάσθαι, much less, as Mack, al., to the following, for which 1 Thess. ii. 9, iii. 10 are no precedents, as here such an arrangement would deprive the participle ἐπιθυμοῦσιν of its place of emphasis; longing (ἰπταμένος, as the prep. in composition so often, seems to mark not intensification, but direction: see Ellie.'s note) to see thee, remembering thy tears (shed at our parting), that I may be filled with joy (the expressions in this verse are assurances of the most fervent personal love, strengthened by the proof of such love having been reciprocal. From these he gently and most skilfully passes to a tone of fatherly exhortation and reproof): having remembrance (the aer. participle may be taken either (1) as dependent on ἔκνεισα, and the condition of παραδοθο, or, which is more probable, (2) as in apposition with ἐπιθυμοῦντοι and μεμυηθήσασθαι) of the unfeigned faith [which was] (Ellie. objects to 'was,' and would render 'is,' see note above on ver. 2. But I do not see how St. Paul could be said ὑπημήνιον λαβεῖν of a thing then present. Surely the remembrance is of the time when they parted, and the faith then existing. But the sentence does not require any temporal filling up — the unfeigned faith in thee is quite enough, and is necessarily thrown into the past by the ἐπιθυμοῦσιν)
6. for αναμ., υπομνημάσκον D. for χαρ., βεληνὴ XI. for θεῷ, χριστῷ Λ.

μήχαν λαβὼν. See more below) in thee (there is perhaps a slight reproach in this ὑπόμνησιν and τῆς ἐν σοί, as if it were a thing once certain as fact, and as matter of memory, but now only, as below, resting on a πέπειμαι ὅτι: and in presence of such a possible inference, and of ὑπόμνησιν, I have ventured therefore to render τῆς ἐν σοί, 'which was in thee,' viz. at the time of τὰ δάκρυα, —its present existence being only by and by introduced as a confident hope) such as dwelt first (before it dwelt in thee) in thy grandmother (μάμμῃ τῆν τοῦ πατρὸς ἢ μητρὸς μητέρα, οὐ λέγωσιν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι, ἀλλὰ τίθην [i. τίθην]. Phryn., p. 133, where see Lobbeck's note. It is thus used, as he shews, by Josephins, Platarch, Appian, Herodian, &c., and Polinx says [iii. 17], ἢ δὲ πατρὸς ἢ μητρὸς μητέρα τίθη καὶ μάμμα καὶ μάμμα. But he adds none of the stricter philologists as agreeing with Phrynichus) Lois (not elsewhere mentioned), and thy mother Eunice (Τιμώδεος, νῦν γυναῖκος ἱουδαίας ποιητής, πατρὸς δὲ Ἕλλανος, Acts xvi. 1): see also ch. iii. 15. Both these were probably converts on Paul's former visit to Lystra, Acts xiv. 6 ff.), but (the δὲ gives the meaning 'notwithstanding appearances.' It is entirely missed by Ellic, and not fairly rendered in the E. V., 'and,' see note below) I am persuaded that (supply ένοικεῖ, not ένοικησε, as Grot., al.) also in thee (there is undoubtedly a want of entire confidence here expressed; and such a feeling will account for the mention of the faith of his mother and grandmother, to which if he wavered, he was proving untrue. This has been felt by several of the ancient Commentators; e. g. Thdrt., — τῇ μετ' εὐφημίας μημή τῶν προγόνων ὁ θεὸς ἀπόκτολος κρατήσει τὴν πίστιν ἐν τῷ μαθήτῃ, αὐλήν γὰρ οὕτως οὐνήσει ὡς οἰκεῖον παραδείγματα. καὶ ἐπείδη συμβαίνει τιμὼν ἡ εὐσεβίας γεγομένων μὴ ζηλωσά την τῶν προγόνων εὐσεβείαν, ἀναγκαῖα έκβαλεν εὐθύγατε "πέπειμαι δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἐν σοί," εἰτα τούτο αὐτὸ τῆς παραπάντεως εποδάρων ποιεῖται). 6—14.] Exhortation to Timotheus to be firm in the faith, and not to shrink from suffering: enforced (9—11) by the glorious character of the Gospel, and free mercy of God in it, and (11—13) by his own example. For which cause (refl.: viz. because thou hast inherited, didst once possess, and I trust still dost possess, such unfeigned faith — ταῦτα περὶ σου πεπειμένοις, Thdrt.) I put thee in mind to stir up (see examples in refl. and in Wets.). The metaphorical use of the word was so common, that there is hardly need to recur to its literal sense. Cf. especially, Iambl. vit. Pythongor. c. 16: ἀντεκάθαρσε τὴν ψυχήν, καὶ ἀνεσυράρει τὸ θεῖον εν αὐτῇ. At the same time it is well to compare, as Chrys. does, 1 Thess. v. 19, τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυε. He adds, ἐν ὧν γὰρ ἑστὶ καὶ σβένεται καὶ ἀνάφαι τοῦτο. ὡσ γὰρ ἀκμίας καὶ ραβδίας σβέννυται, ὡσ δὲ νῆσεως καὶ προσοχῆς διεγερταῖ (τὴν ἔκκλησίαν, Chrys.): not 'the gift of the Spirit imparted to all believers;' see 1 Tim. iv. 11, note. Of those ministerial gifts, that of παραβολία would be most required in this case, 'videtur Timotheus, Paulo din carens, nonmihil remississe: certe nunc ad majora stimulatur.' Bengel), which is in thee by means of the laying on of my hands (these words, especially when compared with 1 Tim. iv. 14, mark the sense of χάρισμα to be as above, and not the general gifts of the Spirit which followed the laying on of hands after baptism. Any apparent discrepancy with that passage, from the Apostle here speaking of the laying on of his own hands alone, may be removed by regarding the Apostle as chief in the ordination, and the presbyters as his assistants, as is the case with Bishop's at the present day. As to the διὰ τῆς ἐπιθ., we can only appeal, against
the Roman-Catholic expositors, e.g. Mack, to the whole spirit of St. Paul's teaching, as declaring that by such an expression he does not mean that the inward spiritual grace is operated merely and barely by the outward visible sign,—but is only asserting, in a mode of speech common to us all, that the solemn dedication by him of Timotheus to God's work, of which the laying on of his hands was the sign and seal, did bring with it gifts and grace for that work. In this sense and in this alone, the gift came διὰ τῆς εἰρήνης, that laying on being the concentrated and effective sign of the setting apart, and conveying in faith the answer, assumed by faith, to the prayers of the church. That the Apostle had authority thus to set apart, was necessary to the validity of the act, and thus to the reception of the grace.—but the authority did not convey the grace. I may just add that the 'in-delicability of orders,' which Mack infers from this passage, is simply and directly refuted by it. If the χάρισμα τὸ ἐν σοὶ required ἀναφωτισθαι, if, as Chrys. above, ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστι καὶ σβίσας καὶ ἄνεβαι τοῦτο,—then plainly it is not indelible.

7.] For (q. d., and there is reason for my thus exhorting thee, seeing that thou hast shewn a spirit inconsistent with the character of that χάρισμα.) The particle is passed over by Ellicott; God did not give (when we were admitted to the ministry: not 'has not given' [δεδώκεν]) us the Spirit (q. d., 'the spirit which He gave us was not?') see Rom. viii. 15 and note. The usage of πνεῦμα without the art, in the sense of the spirit of man dwell in by the Spirit of God, and as the Spirit of God working in the spirit of man, as e.g. continually in Rom. viii. [vv. 4, 5, 9 bis, 13, 14], in 1 Cor. ii. 4; and 1 Cor. vi. 17, forbids our rendering πνεῦμα 'a spirit' [subjective], as Conyb. al.) of cowardice (the coincidence in sound with the πνεῦμα δουλείας of Rom. viii. 15, is remarkable, and the most decisive of all testimonies against De Wette's unworthy and preposterous idea that this passage is an imitation from that. Rather I should account the circumstance a fine and deep indication of genuineness;—the habitual assertion of the one axiom having made even its sound and chime so familiar to the Apostle's ear, that he selects, when enunciating another like it, a word almost reproducing that other. There is also doubtless a touch of severity in this διείλας, putting before Timotheus his timidity in such a light as to shame him: οὖν ἦν διειλώμεν τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐθείας καθύνουσ, Thdrt.), but (the spirit) of power (as opposed to the weakness implied in διείλας), and love (as opposed to that false compliance with men, which shrinks from bold reproof:—that lofty self-abandonment of love for others, which will even sacrifice repute, and security, and all that belongs to self, in the noble struggle to do men good), and correction (the original meaning of σωφρονίσματος, 'administration of others that they may become σωφρονεῖν,'— τὸ σωφρονεῖν τινα, cf. Tit. ii. 4,—must be retained, as necessary both on account of that usage of the verb, and on account of the context. It is this bearing bold testimony before others, from which Timotheus appears to have shrunk: cf. μὴ οὖν ἐπαίσχυνθη τὸ μαρτύρον, ver. 8. It also suits the construction of the other two genitives [against Huther], which both express that which the Spirit inspires a man with. For the meaning itself, cf. Palm and Rost's Lex. We have examples of it in Hippodamus [Stob. 13. 93, p. 250].—τοι μὲν νέοι δείναι σωφρονίσματος καὶ καθύνουσας Plut. Cat. maj. 5,—εἰλ ἰδούσαι καὶ σωφρονίσματος τῶν ἄνων: Appian, de rebus Punicis viii. 65,—εἰλ γὰρ οἱ καὶ τόδε νομίζουσιν, αὐτοὺς ἐὰν Ῥωμαίων σωφρονιστῶν ἠθελήσας γείτονα καὶ ἀντιπαλόν αὐτοῖς φόβον ἐς ἅλ καταλαμβάνειν. The word in after times became a common one for discipline or ecclesiastical correction: see examples under σωφρονεῖος and -σιμός in Snuer. Some, retaining this proper meaning, understand it by it that the Spirit ςωφρονεῖείς χάιας: so [alt.] Chrys., Thl. [ἡ] οὐ σωφρονισμόν ἐχώμεν ἐπί πνεύμα; but this does not suit the construction of the other genitives, in which it is not power over us, or love towards us, that is meant, but power and love wrought in us as towards others, and opposed to cowardice and fear of man. Thl. gives as another alternative the right meaning—ἡ οὖν καὶ ἀλλοις ἀμεν σωφρονισταῖ καὶ παιδευταί. The making σωφρονισμὸς = σωφρονεῖν, as E. V. and
many Commentators, is surely not allowable, although Chrys. puts it doubtfully as an alternative. The only way in which it can come virtually to that, is by supposing the συνφρονίσω to be exercised by ourselves over ourselves, as Thlur.: θεῷ συνφρονισώμενοι τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν κινουμένων παθημάτων τῷ ἄταξι. But this does not seem to me to suit the context so well as the meaning given above.

8. Be not then (seeing that God gave us such a Spirit, not the other) ashamed of (for construction see reft.) I cannot see, with Ellic., that the aor. subjunc., with μή, 'ne te pudeat unquam,' as Leo, implies in matter of fact that "Timothy had as yet evinced no such feeling." Surely, granting that such is the primary constructional inference from the words, it would be just in keeping with the delicate tact of the Apostle, to use such form of admonition, when in fact the blame had been already partly incurred. See note on ver. 11).

1) the testimony of our Lord (i. e. the testimony which thou art to give concerning our Lord, gen. objective: not 'the testimony which He bore,' gen. subjective, as Corn.-a-lup., al.,—nor, as Chrys. [apparently], 'the martyrdom of our Lord,' nor must we, with Mack, lay stress on κυρίου, and understand the μαρτύριον to be especially this, that Jesus is the Lord. The ημῶν is added, hardly for the reason Bengel gives, 'hunc opponit Casari, quem sui sic appellantur,' which would hardly have been thus expressed, requiring more prominence to be given to ημῶν, but because, being about to introduce himself, he 'bonds by this word Timotheus and himself together), nor of me His prisoner (I would hardly say, with De W., Huther, al., that this refers only to the services which the Apostle expected from the services which the Apostle expected from the services which the Apostle expected from the services which the Apostle expected from the services which the Apostle expected from the services which the Apostle expected from the services which the Apostle expected from the services which the Apostle expected from the services which the Apostle expected from the services which the Apostle expected from the services which the Apostle expected from the services which the Apostle expected from the services which the Apostle expected from the services which the Apostle expected from the services which the Apostle expected from the ser

again: but I cannot believe it to be more than secondary. On the expression, τοῦ δεξιόμοι αὐτοῦ, see Eph. iii. 1 note: the gen. implies not possession, but the reason for which he was imprisoned, cf. Phil. 1. 13, δεσμοί τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, but suffer hardship with me for the Gospel (this is the meaning [ref.], and not 'suffer hardship together with the Gospel,' as Thlur. τῶν κυρίων τοῦ πάθος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου προσφέρθησεν πάθος), Calv. [?], Grot. ["prospicaxioi evangelifum, cuique sensum tribuit, quomodo alibi legi morti, pro carne," etc.]: for St. Paul, speaking of his own bonds, ch. ii. 9, says, ὅλης τοῦ θεοῦ οὗ δέδεται. This συγκαταθήκη extends the sphere of his fellow-suffering with the Apostle beyond his mere visiting Rome) according to the power of God (what power? that which God has manifested in our salvation, as described below [gen. subj.], or that which God imparts to us [gen. obj.]. — God's power, or the power which we get from God? On all grounds, the former seems to me the juster and worthier sense: the former, as implying indeed the latter à fortiori—that God, who by His strong hand and mighty arm has done all this for us, will help us through all trouble incurred for Him. Chrys. gives this meaning very finely: ἐπεὶ φορτικόν ἦν τοῦ εἰπτέον, καικοπάθεσθαν, πᾶλιν αὐτὸν παραμαρτήσεται λέγου, οὐκ κατὰ τὸ ἔργα ἡμῶν τούτωσι, ἥρη τῇ δυνάμει λογίδου τῇ σῇ, ἀλλὰ τοῦ του θεοῦ ταῦτα φέρειν, σὺν μὲν τὰρ τὸ ἐλέον καὶ προθυμήσει, θεοῦ δὲ τῷ κοινόσι καὶ πρασίνα. ἔστι καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ δείκνυσί: τὰ τεκμήρια, πῶς ἐσώθη ἐννέα, τῶν ἑλκύσεων, ἀστίρον ἐξέλεγεν, κατὰ τὴν ἐνεργείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργομένην ἐν ἡμῖν, ἀντὶ τοῦ ποιήσεως τὸ ὑπαράξτων μετεῖχεν δύναμιν ἀνιθῇ ἡ, τὸ πεῖσα, τὴν οἰκομονίαν, who saved us (all believers: there is no reason for limiting this ἁμα to Paul and Timotheus. It is painful to see such Commentators as De Wette so blinded by a preconceived notion of the spuriousness of the Epistle, as to call this which follows, 'zieh ganz ab,' meine übertöpfliche Erinnerung an die driflichen Geisteberathser. I need hardly
say to the reader who has been hitherto following the course and spirit of the passage, that it is in the strictest coherence, as indeed is shewn by Chrys. above. — Be not cowardly nor ashamed of the Gospel, but join me in endurance on its behalf, according to God’s power, who has given such proofs of that power and of its exercise towards us, in saving us,—calling us in Christ,—destroying death—&c., of which endurance I am an example [11—13]—which example do thou follow [13, 14], and called us (this, as indeed the whole context, shews that it is the Father who is spoken of: see note on Gal. i. 6), with an holy (ταυτέτιτικα, ἄγιοις ξειρίσατο ἄμαρτωλος οὐτας καὶ ἔξωθος, Chrys. κλάσις expressing the state, rather than merely the summoning into it [as does νομίσα] also], ἀγία is its quality) calling (see Eph. iv. 1; i. 18: Rom. viii. 28—30, and notes), not according to (the measure of, in accordance with) our works: but according to (after the measure of, in pursuance of) his own purpose (τοιοῦτον οὐδενὸς ἁμαρτήματος, οὐδενὸς συμβουλευόμενος, ἀλλ ’ενδοτος προδέσωσι, οἰκονομὴν εκ τὴς ἀγάθοτητος αὐτοῦ ὄργωμον, Chrys. οὐκ εἰς τὸν ημετέρον ἀποβλήσας βίον, ἀλλὰ διὰ μόνην φιλανθρωπίαν, Thurt. “ Originem tam vocations nostrae quam totum salutis designat: non enim erat nobis opera quibus Decum praeveniremus: sed totem a gratuito ejus proposito et electione penit.” Calv.), and (according to) the grace which was given to us (this expression, which properly belongs only to an actual imparting, is used, because, as De W., that which God determines in Eternity, is as good as already accomplished in time. No weakening of δοθέασιν into δεσταται must be thought of) in Christ Jesus (as its element and condition, see Eph. i. 4; iii. 11) before the periods of ages (see reff.; τοιοῦτον, ἀμαρτάς, Chrys. There is hardly possible in the presence of Scripture analogy to take the expression πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων as ‘meaning (cf. Conyb.) the Jewish dispensation’ still less, as Dr. Burton, that ‘the scheme of redemption was arranged by God immediately after the fall, before any ages or dispensations.’ Even Calvin’s interpretation, ‘perpetuum annorum seriem a mundo condito,’ fails to reach the full meaning. In the parallel, Rom. xvi. 25, the mystery of redemption is described as having been χρόνως αἰωνίως σαρκικά—whether obviously includes ages previous to the καταβολή κόσμου as well as after it—see Eph. iii. 11, compared with i. 4: 1 Cor. ii. 7), but (contrast to the concealment from eternity in the manifestation in time) manifested now (νῦν τοῖς προφητοῦσιν τῷ ἐπιστήμη, Thurt. See Col. i. 26; Tit. i. 3) by the appearing (in the flesh: here only used thus, see reff.: but not referring to the birth only: ‘His whole manifestation’) of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who abolished (when He made of none effect,’ Ellie., objecting to my rendering, as confounding an amn. participle with one preceeded by the article. But, pace tanti viri, and recognizing to the full the distinction, I must hold that the slightly ratiocinative force of the amn. participle is more accurately represented by “who abolished,” than by introducing the temporal element contained in “when He.” The bald literal rendering, “abolishing [not, ‘having abolished;’ the aor. participles are synchronous throughout] as He did,” is most nearly approached by “who abolished;” and it is an approximation to the sense, not grammatical purism, which must be our object) [indeed] death (cf. especially i Cor. xiv. 26). By the death of Christ, Death has lost its sting, and is henceforth of no more account: consequently the mere act of natural death is evermore treated by the
Lord Himself and his Apostles as of no account: cf. John xi. 26; Rom. viii. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 55; Heb. i. 14: and its actual and total abolition foretold, Rev. xxi. 4. Ἐθανάτον must be kept here to its literal sense, and its spiritual only so far understood as involved in the other. The delivering from the fear of death is manifestly not to the purpose, even if διὰ τοῦ ζωῆς, belong to both participles. Notice τὸν Ἐθανάτον. As Bengel says, 'Articulus notanter positus.' As if he had said, 'Oremus illum.' (ζωὴν and ἀφθαρσίαν below have no articles), but (contrast to the gloom involved in Ἐθανάτον) brought to light (threw light upon, see ref. 1 Cor., and thus made visible what was before hidden: ἀντὶ τοῦ προμηθεῦσατος, Thdr.), life (i.e. the e. new and glorious life of the Spirit, begun here below and enduring for ever: the only life worthy of being so called) and incorruptibility (immortality —of the new life, not merely of the risen body: that is not in question here, but is, though a glorious yet only a secondary consequence of this ἀφθαρσία; see Rom. viii. 11) by means of the (preaching of the) Gospel (which makes these glorious things known to men. These words are better taken as belonging only to φωτ. δὲ κ. ἀφθ., not to καταργ. μὲν τὸν θάν. For this former is an absolute act of Christ, the latter a manifestation to those who see it), for which (viz. the ἐναγγέλιον, the publication of this good news to men) I was appointed a herald, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles (see the same expression, and note, in 1 Tim. ii. 7. The connexion in which he here introduces himself is noticed above, on ver. 8. It is to bring in his own example and endurance in sufferings, and grounds of trust, for a pattern to Timotheus): on which account (viz. because I ἐστίθην, as above) I also (besides doing the active work of such a mission. Or καὶ may be taken with ταῦτα, as Ellic., —'even these things') am suffering these things (viz. the things implied in τὸν δέσμην αὐτοῦ, ver. 8, and further specified by way of explanation and encouragement to Timotheus below, ver. 15): but I am not ashamed (cf. μὴ ἐπαυξηνοθῇ, ver. 8), for I know whom I have trusted (hardly to be formally expressed so strongly as De W. 'in whom I have put my trust' [εἰς ὑπὸ πεπ.], though the meaning, in the spiritual explanation, is virtually the same: the metaphor here is that of a pledge deposited, and the depositor trusting the depository: and it is best to keep to the figure. The ὁ refers to God, as Tit. iii. 8: Acts xxviii. 25?), and am persuaded that He is able (reff. as used of God) to keep my deposit (how are the words to be taken,—and what is meant by them? Does μου import, the deposit which He has entrusted to me, or the deposit which I have entrusted to Him? Let us consider the latter first. In this case μου is the gen. subjective. Now what is there which the Apostle can be said to be trusted of to God? Some say, (a) his eternal reward, the crown laid up for him, ch. iv. 8; so Thl., Beza, Calv., Wolf, ['hoc est κληρονομία quae dicitur τετηρημένη ἐν σφαίροις, 1 Pet. i. 4; habes hic τὸ φυλάσσειν']: but then we should have this reward represented as a matter not of God's free grace, but of his own, delivered to God to keep: (b) his soul, as in 1 Pet. iv. 19: Luke xxiii. 46: so Grot. ['Deus apud nos deposit verbum sumum: nos apud Deum deponimus spiritum nostrum']. Beng. ['anima nostra: nos ipsi, et portio nostra celestis. Paulus, descecsvi proximus, duo deposita habebat: alterum Domino, alterum Timotheo committendum']: Co- nyb. and others [see this treated below]: (c) his salvation, so Ambr., Calv., Huther, al. [see ib.]: (d) the believers who had been converted by his means, as Chrys. and Thl. [alt.], and as in the Ep. ad Heron. of the Pseudo-Ignatius, 7. p. 916,—φυλάξας μου τὴν παραθήκην . . . παρατηθήσας σοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν Ἀντιοχέων, which hardly needs refutation, as altogether unsupported by the context. Then, under the former head, which would make μου a gen. possessive,
we have the following meanings assigned:—(c) the Holy Spirit, as Thurt. [δεσπ. parapéchei] as of the πνεῦματος χάριν ἀκριβῶς φυλάζει μέχρι τῆς αὐτοῦ παροιμίας;—(f) the faith, and its proclamation to the world. So Chrys. [τῇ ἐστὶ παρακαθήκη; ἡ πίστις, τὸ κήρυγμα: but only as an alternative, see above].

Ellic.; not Grot. as De W. see above: (g) the apostolic office [Corn.-a-lap., Heinrichs, De W., al.] which the Apostle regarded as a thing entrusted to him, a stewardship, 1 Cor. ix. 17: (h) the faithfulness which had been converted by him, in the [alternative in Chrys. and Thl.] view of their having been committed to him by Christ: (i) his own soul, as entrusted to him by God, as Bretschneider, al., after Josephus, B. J. iii. 5, where speaking against suicide, he says, εἰδήσθων παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶναι . . . . ψυχὴ ἀδάντος ἄει, καὶ θεοῦ μόρια τοῖς σώμασιν ἐνοικίζεται. εἰστά ἄν μὲν ἀραίωσις τις ἀνθρώπου παρακαθήκης, ἡ διαβάτευτα κακός, πνεῦμα, ἐνεκεῖσται καὶ ἄσπιτος. And even more strikingly Philo, quis rerum div. harae, 28, vol. i. p. 491:—τοῦτ' ἐπανός ἐστὶ τοῦ σπουδαῦ, τὴν ἑαυτὴν ἥν ἔλαβε παρακαθήκην, ψυχῆς, αὐθοίσως, λόγου, θείας σοφίας, ἀνθρωπίνης ἐπιστήμης, καθαρῶς καὶ ἀδόλους, μὴ ἐκατόφ, μόνον δὲ τῷ παπστενκότι φιλάξαστοι. And Hermas Pastor, ii. 3, p. 918: "qui ergo mentiuntur, abnegant Dominum, non reddentes Domino deposident, quod accesserunt." On all these, and this view of the paráthēkē generally, I may remark, that we may fairly be guided by the same words paráthēkēn φυλάζων in ver. 14 as to their sense here. And from this consideration I deduce an inference precisely the contrary to that of De Wette. He argues from it, that para-
thēkē must necessarily have the same meaning in both places, without reference to the verb with which it is joined: and consequently that because in ver. 14 it signifies a matter entrusted to Timotheus, therefore here it must signify a matter entrusted to St. Paul. But this surely is a very lax and careless way of reasoning. The analogy between the two verses, if good for any thing, goes further than this. As, in ver. 14, paráthēkēn φυλάζει is said of the subject of the sentence, viz. Timotheus, keeping a deposit entrusted to him,—so here paráthēkēn φυλάζει must be said of the subject of the sentence, viz. God, keeping a deposit entrusted to Him. Otherwise, while keeping the mere word paráthēkē to the same formal meaning in both places, we shall, most harshly and unnaturally, be requiring the phrase paráthēkēn φυ-
λάζει to bear, in two almost consecutive verses, two totally different meanings. The analogy therefore of ver. 14, which De W. uses so abundantly for his view, makes, if thoroughly considered, entirely against it, and in fact necessitates the adoption of the first alternative, viz. the objective genitive,—and the deposit committed by the Apostle to God. And when we enquire what this deposit was, we have the reply, I conceive, in the previous words, ὥς πεπιστευκα [see this especially shewn in the quotation from Philo above, where the πεπιστευκά is God, not man.]

He had entrusted himself, body, soul, and spirit, to the keeping of his heavenly Father, and lay safe in his hands, confident of His abiding and effectual care. A strong confirmation of this view is gained,—notwithstanding what Ellic. says of the moral reference there, and not here: for the parallel is to be sought not between φυλάζει and ἀγάπας, but between φυλάζει and τηρήσας, which is a very close one,—from 1 Thess. v. 23, αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἄγας δόλωτε- λεῖς, καὶ ἀδικήσῃς ὡμον τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχή καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἁμήκτης ἐν τῇ παρ-

οιαὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἠμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τηρηθῆι (for with reference to, as an object;—'against,' as we say, in a temporal sense: not simply 'until!') that day (viz. the day of the parousiā; see ref., and cf. especially ch. iv. 8).]

The utmost care is required, in interpreting this verse, to ascertain the probable meaning of the words in reference to the context. On the right appreciation of this depends the question, whether they are to be taken in their strict meaning, and simple grammatical sense, or to be forced to some possible but far-fetched rendering. It has been generally, as far as I know by all the Commentators, assumed that ὄποτοποισιν ἐχει = ἐχει (= κάτεχε, see ref.) τὴν ὑποτύπωσιν, and that then ὑγιανύτων λόγων is to be taken as a subject. gen. after ὑποτύπ: i.e. as in E. V., 'Hold fast the form of sound words;' thus making the exhortation perfectly general,—equivalent in fact to the following one in ver. 14. But to this there are several objections. The
want of the art, before ὑποτύπωσις might indeed be got over: a definite word emphatically prefixed to its verb is frequently anathematic. But (1) this sense of ἔχε can hardly be maintained in its present unemphatic position. The sense is found (or something approaching to it, for it would require to be stronger here than in either place) in the refl.: but in both, the verb precedes the substantive, as indeed always throughout the N. T. where any stress whatever is to be laid on it. Cf., for some examples of both arrangements, (a) ἔχε preceding, with more or less reference to its sense of having or holding, as a matter to be taken into account, Matt. v. 23; viii. 9 ||, xi. 15 || (always thus), al.,—Mark ix. 50, x. 21, xi. 22, al.,—Luke iii. 11, vii. 6, xi. 5, al.,—John iii. 15, 16, 29, 36, al.,—Acts ii. 44, 47, ix. 14, 31, &c.,—Rom. ii. 20, iv. 2, vi. 22 (cf. ver. 21), xii. 6, &c.: and (b) ἔχε following its substantive, with always the stress on the subst., and not on the verb, Matt. iii. 14, v. 16, viii. 20, &c.,—Mark ii. 22, 26, viii. 11—18, &c.,—Luke iii. 8, viii. 13, &c.,—John ii. 3, iv. 17 (instances of both arrangements, and each in full significance), &c.,—Rom. xiv. 22, &c. I cannot therefore assent to the view, which would give ἔχε the chief emphasis in the sentence, but must reserve that emphasis for ὑποτύπωσις. Then (2) there is an objection to taking ὑποτύπωσις as 'a form' with a subjective genitive,—a 'form consisting of sound words.' The word is once only used (ref.) elsewhere, and that in these Epistles, as a 'pattern,' 'specimen;' and there can hardly be a doubt that so uncommon a word must be taken, as again used by the same writer, in the same meaning, unless the context manifestly point to another. (3) A third objection, not so important as the other two, but still a valid one, will be that according to the usual rendering, the relative ὅν would much more naturally be ἦς, referring as it ought to do in that case to ὑποτύπωσις, the object of ἔχε, not to the λόγοι of which that ὑποτύπωσις was composed. This being so, we shall have the rendering so far.—Have (take) an example of (the) healthy words which thou

hearest of me in faith and love which are in Christ Jesus. Then two questions arise for us: to what (1) does ὑποτύπωσις ἔχε refer? I answer,—to the saying immediately preceding, οἶδα γὰρ κ.τ.λ. This was one of those πιστοὶ λόγοι or ύγιανντες λόγοι, of which we hear so often in these Epistles; one which, in his timidity, Timotheus was perhaps in danger of forgetting, and of which therefore the Apostle reminds him, and bids him take it as a specimen or pattern of those sound words which had been committed to him by his father in the faith. To what (2) do the words ἐν πίστει κ. ἀγάπῃ τ. ἐν χρ. ἰ.ς. refer? Certainly not, as 'Thdr., to παρ' ἐμοῦ, taking ἐν us = peri (τὴν παρ' ἐμοῦ περὶ πίστεως κ. ἀγάπης γεγενεκέναι διὰσκαλαί): not, again, to ἔχε, to which in our understanding of ὑποτύπωσις ἔχε, such a qualification would be altogether inapplicable: but to ἦκουσα, reminding Timotheus of the readiness of belief, and warmth of affection, with which he had at first received the wholesome words from the mouth of the Apostle, and thus tacitly reproaching him for his present want of growth in that faith and love; q. d. Let me in thus speaking, 'I know whom I have believed &c.,' call to thy mind, by one example, those faithful sayings, those words of spiritual health, which thou once hearest with such receptivity and ardour as a Christian believer. [I am bound to add, that Chrys., having too much sense of the import of the Greek arrangement, does not fall into the ordinary mistake of making ἔχε = κάτεχε and emphatic, but, as will be seen, understands it, "From the ύγιανντες λόγοι which I delivered thee, take thine examples and maxims on every subject." But that would rather require ύγιανντας λόγους ὥσπερ . . . I subjoin his words; καθά περ ἐπὶ τῶν ζωγράφων ἑνετυπωμένων, φησίν, εἰδέναι σοι τῆς ἀρετῆς, καὶ τῶν τῶν τετρ. δοκίμων (εὐθείων?) ἀπάντων, ὅσπερ τινά καυδά κ. ἀρχίτυπον κ. ὄρος καταβαλάς ἐδώ τὴν σὴν ψυχὴν, ταῖτα ὦν ἔχε, καὶ περὶ πίστεως, καὶ περὶ ἀγάπης, καὶ περὶ σωφρονισμοῦ δέχεται βουλευσάσαι, ἐκείνην λάμβανε τὰ παραδειγματα. Ellice's note seems not altogether
perspicuous. He does not enter into the difficulty: and his "not for κάτεχε, though somewhat approaching it in meaning," leaves the student under some doubt as to whether he does or does not agree with the E. V. Then following as on another page, the whole glorious deposit is solemnly committed to his care:—being a servant of One who will keep that which we have entrusted to Him, do thou in thy turn keep that which He, by my means, has entrusted to thee: 14. that godly deposit keep, through the Holy Spirit who dwelleth in us (not thee and me merely, but all believers): cf. Acts xiii. 52. Chrys. remarks: οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἀνθρωπίνης ψυχῆς οὐδὲ δύναμεως, τοσοῦτοι ἐξισοπετεθέντες, ἀρκεῖα πρὸς τὴν φυλακήν, διὰ τί; ὡς πολλοὶ ἐλπιστοὶ, σκότος βαθὺ ὁ διάβολος ἐφασκόην ἑξῆς κ. ἐφεδρείην. 15.-18.] Notices of the defective adherence of certain brethren. These notices are intimately connected with what has preceded. He has held up to Timothy, as an example, his own boldness and constancy: and has given him a sample of the faithful sayings which ruled his own conduct, in ver. 12. He proceeds to speak of a few of the discouragements under which in this confidence he was bearing up: and, affectionate gratitude prompting him, and at the same time by way of an example of fidelity to Timothy, he dilates on the exception to the general declaration of him, which had been furnished by Onesiphorus. Thou knowest this, that all who are in Asia (it does not follow, as Chrys., that εἰκός ἦν, εἰς Ὀρφή εἴναι πολὺ τότε τῶν ἀκότοις τῶν Ἀσίας μεριμν.: this would rather require ὁ ἀκότος τῆς Ἀσίας: but he uses the expression with reference to him to whom he was writing, who was in Asia) repudiated me (not as E. V., 'are turned away from me' [perfl.]: the act referred to took place at a stated time, and from what follows, that time appears to have been on occasion of a visit to Rome. They were ashamed of Paul the prisoner, and did not seek him out, see ch. iv. 16: ἐφύγον τοῦ ἀποστόλου τῆς συνοικίας διὰ τὸ Νέρωνος δέος, Θριθ.: but perhaps not so much from this motive, as from the one hinted at in the praise of Onesiphorus below. The πάντες must of course apply to all of whom the Apostle had had trial [and not even those without exception, vv. 16-18]: the E. V. gives the idea, that a general apostasy of all in Asia from St. Paul had taken place. On Asia, i.e. the proconsular Asia, see note, Acts xvi. 6), of whom is (ἐστιν is hardly to be pressed as indicating that at the present moment Phygellus and Hermogenes were in Rome and were shunning him: it merely includes them in the class just mentioned) Phygellus and Hermogenes (why their names are specially brought forward, does not appear. Suetonius, Domit. c. 10, mentions a certain Hermogenes of Tarsus, who was put to death by Domitian; 'propter quasdam in historia figuras'). 16.] May the Lord give mercy (an expression not found elsewhere in N. T.) to the house of Onesiphorus (from this expression, here and in ch. iv. 19, and from what follows, ver. 18, it has been not improbably supposed, that Onesiphorus himself was no longer living at this time. Some indeed, as Thirl. [= υἱὸν αὐτῷ ἀλλὰ καὶ παντὶ τῷ οίκῳ τῶν θείων ἀντιδεκαν ἑλέων], Calv. ["of him and to him all the family and all the house of the Lord"]), al., take it merely as an extension of the gratitude of the Apostle from
Onesiphorus to his household: but ch. iv. 19 is against this. Thdrt. indeed [as also Chrys.] understands that Onesiphorus was with him at this time: but the aorists here [cf. γεννάμου] will hardly allow that), because on many occasions he refreshed me (from ψυχ., not from ψυχ. Any kind of refreshing, of body or mind, may be implied), and was not ashamed of (ver. 8) my chain (reft.): but when he was in Rome, sought me out with extraordinary diligence (literally: with more diligence than could have been looked for. Or perhaps, the more diligently: soil, because I was in chains. They all ἀπετράφησαν με: he not only did not this, but earnestly sought me) and found me.

18.] May the Lord grant to him to find mercy from the Lord (the account to be given of the double κύριος, κύριον, here is simply this—that διησοῦ ὁ κύριος had become so completely a formula, that the recurrence was not noticed. This, which is Huther’s view, is far better than to suppose the second κύριο. merely ἐπανοί, or to enter into theological distinctions between κύριος as the Father, and παρὰ κύριον as from the Son, the Judge) in that day (see on ver. 12): and how many services he did (to me: or, to the saints: the general expression will admit of either) in Ephesus (being probably an Ephesian, cf. ch. iv. 19), thou knowest well (the comparative is not for the positive, here or any where: but the signification is, better: than that I need remind thee’).

Ch. II. 1—26.] Exhortations to Timotheus, founded on the foregoing examples and warnings.

1.] Thou therefore (οὐδὲν follows, primarily on his own example just propounded [cf. αὐγκακοπάθησον below], and secondarily on that of Onesiphorus, in contrast to those who had been ashamed of and deserted him), my child, be strengthened (reft. The pres. indicates an abiding state, not a mere insolated act, as παράδοθα below. The verb is passive, not middle: see reft., and Fritzsche on Rom. iv. 20) in the grace which is in Christ Jesus (τουτάτη διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ χριστοῦ, Chrys. But more than that: the grace of Christ, the empowering influence in the Christian life, being necessary for its whole course and progress, is regarded as the element in which it is lived: cf. ἀνέβησεν ἐν χάριτι, 2 Pet. ult. χάρις must not be taken, with Ambr., Calov., Mack, al., for his ministerial office), and the things which thou heardest from me with many witnesses (i.e. with the intervention, or [as Conybh.] attestation of many witnesses: διὰ [reft.] imports the agency of the witnesses as contributing to the whole matter treated of: so διὰ παλλῶν δακρύων, and διὰ προφητείας, 1 Tim. iv. 14. These witnesses are not, as Chrys., Thdrt., the congregations whom Timotheus had heard the Apostle teaching [ἐπερ ἥκουσας μοι πολλοὺς διδακτάριους, Thdrt.], or as Clem. Alex. in Ec., testimonies from the law and prophets: nor as Heydenr., the other Apostles: much less, as he gives in another alternative, the Christian martyrs: but the preachers and others present at his ordination, cf. 1 Tim. iv. 14; vi. 12; and ch. i. 6. No word such as ματρυγουῖα or ὑβεβλημένα [Heydenr.] need be supplied), these deliver in trust (cf. παραθέσεω above, ch. i. 14) to faithful men (i.e. not merely ‘believers,’ but ‘trustworthy men,’ men who τὴν καλὴν παραθέσεων φυλάξατε) such as shall be (not merely ‘are,’ but ‘shall be’—give every hope of turning out) able to teach them (so I take ἔτερους, not as a first, but as a second accussative after διδάζατα, the first being included in ταύτα above) others also (καὶ carries the mind on to a
further step of the same process—impli-
ing ‘in their turn.’ These ἐστερα would be other trustworthy men like themselves). The connexion of this verse with the foregoing and the following has been ques-
tioned. I believe it to be this: ‘The true keeping of the deposit entrusted to thee will involve thy handing it on unim-
paired to others, who may in their turn hand it on again. But in order to this, thou must be strong in grace—thou must be a fellow-sufferer with me in hardships—thou must strive lawfully—thou must not be entangled with this life’s matters.’ So that ver. 2 serves to prepare him to hear of the necessity of endurance and faithful adhesion to his duty as a Chris-
tian soldier, considering that he has his deposit not only to keep, but to deliver down unimpaired. It is obviously a perversion of the sense to regard this verse as referring (as Bengel, ‘παράθηκον, antequam istim ad me proficisceret’) merely to his journey to Rome—that during that time he should, &c.: the ἔσωντα, and the very contemplation of a similar step on the part of these men at a future time, are against such a supposition.

Mack constructs a long argument out of this verse to shew that there are two sources of Christian instruction in the Church, written teaching and oral, and ends with affirming that those who neglect the latter for the former, have always shewn that they in reality set up their own opinion above all teaching. But he forgets that these two methods of teaching are in fact but one and the same. Scripture has been God’s way of fixing tradition, and rendering it trust-
worthly at any distance of time; of obviating the very danger which in this Epistle we see so imminent, viz. of one of those teachers, who were links in this chain of transmission, becoming inefficient and transmitting it inadequately. This very Epistle is therefore a warning to us not to trust oral tradition, seeing that it was so dependent on men, and to accept no way of conserving it but that which God’s providence has pointed to us in the canonical books of Scripture.

3.] Suffer hardship with me (Conyb. happily renders it, ‘Take thy share in suffering.’ The συνι- binds it to what precedes and follows, referring primarily to the Apostle himself, though doubtless having a wider reference to all who similarly suffer: see above, on the connexion of ver. 2), as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.

4.] No soldier when on service is (suffers himself to be: the passive sense predominates: ‘is,’ as his normal state. Or the verb may be middle, as Ellic., ‘entangleth himself;’ and vulg., ‘implicat se’) entangled (ref., ‘ἐν μαλακοῖς ἐνεπλακτον ἀνθρώποις, Platt. Legg. vii. p. 814 e. Grob. quotes from Cicero ‘occupati non implicat’) in the businesses of life (cf. Plato, Rep. vi. p. 500, ὁδίῳ γὰρ τον . . . ἐχόλη τῇ γε ὅσα ἄλλα ἐστὶν τῶν ὁσίων τὴν διάνοιαν ἔχοντι κάτω βλέ-
πειν εἰς ἄνθρωπον πραγματείας. Arian, Epict. iii. 22 [Weitst.], ὃς ἐν παρατάξει, μηγιπα ἐπιστάσθησαι εἶναι δεῖ, δόλον πρὸ τῇ διακοίνω τοῦ θεοῦ . . . οὐ προσθε-
mένοι καθιστῶν ἰδιωτικῶς, οὐ δὲ ἐπι-
πλεγμένοις σχέσεσι: Ambros. de Off. i. 36 [1841], vol. iii. p. 49, ‘εἰς, qui imperatori militat, a suspicionibus litium, actu negotiorum foresium, venditione mercium prohibetur humanis legibus, quanto magis &c.’ Ps-Athanas. quest. in Epistolis Pauli 117: εἰ γὰρ ἐπέγραψε βασιλεί ὁ μέλλων στρατεύσει αὐτι ἄρει, ἡν μη ἄρεις πᾶσας τῶν τίνος βιῶν ποιήσας, πόση μᾶλλον μέλλων στρα-
τεύσει τῇ ἐπιουργίᾳ βασιλεί; see other examples in Weitst. ‘Vox Graeca πραγμάτεια (καταγρα), pro mercatura,
sepius occurs in Pandectis Talmudici." Schöttgen. On the whole matter, consult Grothus's note, that he may please him who called him to be a soldier (who originally enrolled him as a soldier: the word signifies to levy soldiers, or raise a troop, and ὁ στρατολογήσας designates the commander of such troop. So ἀντὶ τῶν ἀπολωλότων ἄδρων στρατολογήσαντες εἰς ἁπάντης φυλάς, Dion. Hal. xi. 24. The same writer uses στρατολογία for a muster, a levy of soldiers,—vi. 41; ix. 38. The 'ei se probavit' of the vulgate is unintelligible, unless as Grot. suggests, it is an error for 'qui se probavit.' The taking of these precepts according to the letter, to signify that no minister of Christ may have a secular occupation, is quite beside the purpose: for 1) it is not ministers, but all soldiers of Christ who are spoken of: 2) the position of the verb ἐμπλέκεστα shows that it is not the fact of the existence of such occupation, but the being entangled in it, which is before the Apostle's mind: 3) the Apostle's own example sufficiently confines such an idea. Only then does it become unlawful, when such occupation, from its engrossing the man, becomes a hindrance to the work of the ministry,—or from its nature is incompatible with it.

5.] The soldier must serve on condition of not dividing his service: now we have another instance of the same requirement: and in the conflicts of the arena there are certain laws, without the fulfilment of which no man can obtain the victory. But (the above is not the only example, but) if any one also (q. d. to give another instance) strive in the games (it is necessary to adopt a periphrasis for ἄθλης. That of E. V. 'strive for masteries,' is not definite enough, omitting all mention of the games, and by consequence not even suggesting them to the ordinary reader. The vulg. gives it 'certat in agone;' and Lat., merely 'cémpfét; so also Ostervald and Diodati: Scio,—'idia en los juegos publicos.' The word ἄθλειν, in the best Attic writers, means 'to work,' 'to endure,' and ἄθλειν, 'to contend in the games.' [See however Ellie's note.] This usage belongs to later Greek: see Palm and Rost's Lex.), he is not crowned (even in case of his gaining the victory? or is the word inclusive of all efforts made to get the crown,—'he has no chance of the crown?' rather the former, from ἄθλησα below), unless he have striven (this seems to assume the getting of the victory) lawfully (according to the prescribed conditions [not merely of the contest, but of the preparation also, see Ellie.]. It is the usual phrase: so Galen, comm. in Hippocr. i. 15: οἱ γυμνασταῖ καὶ οἱ νομίμως ἀθλοῦντες, ἐπὶ μὲν τὸν ἀριστοῦ τῶν ἄρτων μόνον ἐσθίον, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ δεῖπνο τοῦ κρέας: Arrian, Epict. iii. 10,—εἰ νομίμως ἢθλισα, εἰ ἐφαγε ὡσα δεῖ, εἰ ἐγνυκάθαι, εἰ τοῦ ἀθλείτου ἱσχύσας [Wetst., where see more examples]. Compare the parallel place, 1 Cor. i. 24.—τί ἔστιν, εάν μη νομίμως; οὐκ, εάν τις τῶν ἄγνων εἰσέλθῃ, ἀρκεῖ τοῦτο, οὖδ' ἐκ νομίμως, οὐδέ ἐκ ἁθλίου, οὐδὲ ἐκ σωματικῆς, ἀλλὰ ἐκ τοῦ παίντα τῶν τῆς ἄθλους νόμων φυλάττω, καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ σιτῶν, καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ αὐξανοῦσα καὶ συμφύτης, καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ παλαιστρας, καὶ παίντα ἀπλάς διήλθο τα τοῦ ἄθλους προτέχοντα, οὐδέποτε στεφάνουσα. Chrys.).

6.] Another comparison shewing the necessity of active labour as an antecedent to reward. The husbandman who is engaged in labour (who is actually employed in gathering in the fruit: not κοπιάσαντα) must first partake of the fruits (which he is gathering in: the whole result of his ministry, not here further specified. The saying is akin to βοῶν ἀλώντα μὴ φιμαντεῖ— the right of first participation in the harvest belongs to him who is labouring in the field: do not thou therefore, by relaxing this labour, forfeit that right. By this rendering, keeping strictly to the sense of the present part., all difficulty as to the position of πρωτόν is removed. Many Commentators [Calv., E. V. marg., al., Grot., al., take πρωτόν for 'īta demum'] not observing this have supposed, in the sense, a transposition of πρωτόν, and given it as if it were τῶν γεωργῶν δεῖ, κοινών τῶν πρωτών, τῶν καρπῶν μεταλ., or as Wahl and Winer [so in older editions of his grammar, e. g. edn. 3, p. 458: but now, edn. 6, § 61. 4, he merely states the two renderings, without giving an opinion].—τὸν
7. rec for δ, with DKL38 vel vulg syr copt: txt ACFN1 17 Syr goth Chr-comm. rec δων (probably change for the sake of softening, and rendering more likely, the exprn. The choice between the readings is difficult, the rec having a claim, as the harder one: but the authority for txt is strong), with KL rel syrr Chr Thdrt, δωει C3: txt AC DFN1 17. 67² latt copt arm Damase Ambrost Pelog Hil Vig-taps.

8. μηνυμενευειν χρ. ηπ. D 111.

g. τον θέληται τῶν κ. μεταλ., δει πρῶτον κοιπίαν: but in both cases κοιπίαν was required, if not absolutely necessary, yet more natural. Thdrt. and Ee, understand πρῶτον of the preference which the teacher has over the taught, —πρῶτον τῶν κεκτημένων οί γνώναι μεταλαμβάνοντο τῶν καρπῶν. Ambr., Pel., Mosh, believe the bodily support of ministers to be imported by τῶν κ. μεταλ.: but Chrys. answers this well, οὖν ἔχει λόγον πόσο γὰρ οὐκ ἀπλὸς γεωργὸν εἶπεν, ἀλλά τὸν κοιπίαν: but his own idea hardly seems to be contained in the words,—πρῶτον τὰς μέλλησιν ἡμῖν μεθερμένα, δήν φθαίνει, ἀπολαμβάνεις, ὡς ἐν εὐτυχείᾳ τοῦ κόσμου ἀντίδειος: and certainly there is no allusion to that of Athanasius [in De W.], that it is the duty of a teacher first to apply to himself that which he teaches to others: nor to that of Bengel, 'Paulus Timothius animam excoluit, c. i. 6, ergo fructus ei imprimit ex Timoteo debeatur.'

7.] Under-stand (νοεῖ ... "if it be inwardly tie, suitfully etc. Berlandi stattigkeit." Beck, Biblica Seelcunde, p. 56. It is the preparatory step to συνειδα, id. ib. note, and p. 59, —which is "ein der Zusammen-stand mit seinen Gründen und Folgen begreifenb Erkennen") what I say (ἐστι οὖν τὰ παραδείγματα θύμη τὸν τῶν στρατιωτῶν κ. ἀθλητῶν κ. γεωργῶν, καὶ πάντα ἀπλῶς αἰνιγματωδῶς ... ἐπηγάζετε, νοεῖ δ. λέγω, Chrys.: so also Thdrt., all.: not as Calv., who denies the above, "he com non addidit propter similitudinem obsceni-tatem, sed ut ipse suggereret Timotheo quanto praestantior sit sub Christi aspi-ciis militia, et quanto amplior merces:"

this would not agree with σύνεσιν διάσει: for the Lord (Christ) shall give thee thorough understanding (on σύνεσις see citation from Beck above) in all things (i. e. thou art well able to penetrate the meaning and bearing of what I say: for thou art not left to thyself, but hast the wisdom which is of Christ to guide thee. There is perhaps a slight intimation that he might apply to this fountain of wisdom more than he did: —'the Lord, if thou seekest it from Him').

8—13.] This statement and substantiation of two of the leading facts of the gospel, seems, especially as connected with the exhortations which follow it on vv. 14 ff., to be aimed at the false teachers by whose assumption Timotheus was in danger of being daunted. The Incarnation and Resurrection of Christ were two truths especially imperilled, and indeed denied, by their teaching. At the same time these very truths, believed and persisted in, furnished him with the best grounds for steadfastness in his testimony to the Gospel, and attachment to the Apostle himself, suffering for his faithfulness to them: and on his adherence to these truths depended his share in that Saviour in whom they were manifest, and in union with whom, in His eternal and unchangeable truth, our share in blessedness depends. Remember, that Jesus Christ has been raised up from the dead (the accus. after μηνυμενευειν imports that it is the fact respecting Jesus Christ, not so much He Himself, to which attention is directed [see reff.]). Eilic. takes exactly the other view, citing in its favour Winer, § 15. 4, who however implicitly maintains my rendering, by classing even 1 John iv. 2, 2 John 7, with Heb. xiii. 23, γνώσετε τὸν δ. Τιμόθεον ἀπολαμβάνειν, which he renders "νοίας εἰρ. ζήσοντες κ. entblaffen ift." Eilic. refers to my note on 1 John iv. 2, as if it were inconsistent with the rendering here; but the verb there is ὤμολογεῖν,
not μημονέων, which I conceive makes all the difference. According to Ellic.’s rendering, unless we refer ἐν Θῷ to Christ, which he does not, the context becomes very involved and awkward. The gen. is more usual in later Greek (see Luke xvii. 32: John xv. 20; xvi. 4, 21: Acts xx. 35, &c.)—but the accus. in classical, see Pahn and Rost sub voc. and cf. Herod. i. 36, Ἀσχήλ. Pers. 769 [733 Dindorf], Soph. Ag. 1273, Philoct. 121, Eur. Androm. 1165 [1141 Matthiae], &c.). (Jesus Christ, who was) the seed of David (this clause must be taken as ἐν Θῷ σπέρμα. Δαυίς, and the mallovable and otherwise unaccountable ellipse of the article may probably be explained, as De W., by the words being part of a recognized and technical profession of faith. Compare Rom. i. 3, which is closely parallel. Mack’s attempt to join ἐν σπέρμα. Δ. to ἐγγεγερμένον ἐν τέκνῳ, ‘that Jesus Christ was raised from the dead in His flesh, as He sprang from David,’ is hardly worth refutation), according to my Gospel (‘the Gospel entrusted to me to teach,’ as in ref.) Here the expression may seem to be used with reference to the false teachers,—but as in the other places it has no such reference, I should rather incline to regard it as a solemn way of speaking, in identifying these truths with the preaching which had been the source of Timothy’s belief. Baur, in spite of ἐν Θῷ &c. following, understands this εὐαγγ. μου of the Gospel of St. Luke, as having been written under the authority of St. Paul. See Prolegg. to St. Luke’s Gospel in Vol. I. § iii. 6, note), in which (‘cujus annuntiandi munere defungens,’ Beza: see ref.) I suffer hardship (see ver. 3) even unto (consult Ellic.’s note and his references on μετά τοῖς chains (see ch. i. 16) as a malefactor (‘κακοτάθεο, κακοφρονός—malum passionis, ut si praecessisset malum actionis,’ Bengel), but the word of God is not bound (δεσμοῦνται μὲν αἱ χεῖρες, ἀλλ’ φῶς ἡ γλῶττα, Chrys.: similarly Thdrt. But we shall better, though this reference to himself is not precluded [cf. ch. iv. 17: Acts xxviii. 31], enlarge the words to that wider acceptance, in which he rejoices, Phil. i. 18. As regarded himself, the word of God might be said to be bound, inasmuch as he was prevented from the free proclamation of it: his person was not free, though his tongue and pen were. This more general reference Chrys. himself seems elsewhere to admit [as cited in Heydem.] : ὁ διδάσκαλος εἴδετο καὶ ὁ λάγος ἐπέτετο ἐκεῖνο τὸ διδασκαλίαν φόρει, καὶ ἡ διδασκαλία παραδόθησεν τῆς οἰκουμένης ἔτρεχε. The purpose of adding this seems to be, to remind Timotheus, that his sufferings and imprisonment had in no way weakened the power of the Gospel, or loosened the ties by which he [Timothæus] was bound to the service of it: hardly as Chrys.: εἰ ἤμεν δεδεμένοι κηρυκτομεν, πολλῶν μακρολογ ὑμᾶς τούτως λεγομένων τοῦτο ποιην χρῆ). 10. For this reason (what reason? ‘quia me vinco evangelium currit,’ says Bengel: and with this agree Huther, De W., al. But neither 1) is this sound logic, nor 2) is it in accordance with the Apostle’s usage of διὰ τοῦτο . . . οὖν. 1) The fact, that the word of God is not bound, is clearly not the reason why he suffers these things for the elect: nor can we say with Huther, that the consciousness of this fact is that in which he endures all. De W. takes the predominant idea to be, the dispersion and success of God’s word, in and by which the Apostle is encouraged to suffer. But this would certainly, as Wolf says, render the connexion ‘dilutio et parum cohaerens.’ 2) In 1 Tim. i. 16, διὰ τοῦτο ἠλεηθῆ . . . οὖν, and Philem. 15, διὰ τοῦτο ἐξωφρασθῆ . . . οὖν, the reference of δ. τ. is evidently to what follows: cf. also Rom. iv. 16, 2 Cor. xiii. 10. I would therefore refer the words to the following, and consider them, as in the above instances, as a marked way of indicating the reason presently to be given: ‘for this purpose, . . . that,’ so Chrys., Thdrt., Wolf, Wiesinger, al. I endure all things (not merely suffer [obj.]: but readiness and persistence [subj.] are implied in the word, and the universal πάντα belongs to this subj. meaning—‘I am enduring, ready to bear, all things’) for the sake of the elect (see ref., especially Tit. i. 1. The Apostle does not, as De W., refer merely to those elect of God who are not yet converted, but generally to the whole category, both those who are
already turned to him, and those who are yet to be turned: cf. the parallel declaration in Col. 1. 24, ἀναταπθήρα τά ἐστερήματα τῶν βλέψεων τοῦ χριστοῦ... ἐκ τοῦ σάματος αὐτοῦ, δ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία, that they also (as well as ourselves, with reference to what is to follow, the certainty that we, who suffer with Him, shall reign with Him:—De W. [see above] says, 'those yet unconverted, as well as those already converted,' and the mere καὶ αὐτός might seem to favour this view; but it manifestly is not so) may obtain the salvation which is in (as its element and condition of existence) Christ Jesus with eternal glory (salvation here, in its spiritual presence and power—χάριν ἐστε σωσιμοῦν, Eph. ii. 5; and glory hereafter, the full development and expansion of salvation, Rom. viii. 21). Faithful is the saying (see on ref.): another of those current Christian sayings, probably the utterances originally of the Spirit by those who spoke προφητείας in the Church,—and, as in 1 Tim. iii. 16, bearing with it some balance of balance and rhetorical arrangement, as to seem to a portion of some hymn): for (Chrys., Eec., al., regard this γάρ as rendering a reason why the λόγος is πιστός, understanding πιστός ἐστιν of what has gone before, viz. the certainty that δ ἡ ἰδιότης οὐράνιον τυχεῖν, καὶ αἰείου τετελεσμένον. But this is most unnatural. The γάρ is not merely explicative, as Grot., Huther, al., but as in 1 Tim. iv. 9, renders a reason for the πιστός,—in the assertion of the fact in well-known words: for the fact is so, that if κ. if we died with Christ (on account of the aorist, pointing to some one definite event, the reference must be to that participation in Christ's death which takes place at baptism in all those who are His, and which those who follow Him in sufferings emphatically show that they then did really take on them: see Rom. vi. 3, 4, 8; Col. ii. 12. Certainly, if the aor. stood alone, it might be taken prophetically, looking back on life from that future day in which the σωσιμοῦν will be realized: but coupled as it is with the present ὑπομονέων and the future ἀρνησόμεθα, we can hardly take it otherwise than literally as to time, of an event already past, and if so, strictly as in the parallel Rom. vi. 8, where the reference is clear), we shall also live with Him (hereafter in glory): if we endure (with Him: the σωσιμοῦν must be supplied, cf. ἐπιτριτομοί, Rom. viii. 17), we shall also reign with Him (see Rom. v. 17; viii. 17. In the former pair, death and life are opposed: in this, subjection [ὑποτεύχων] and dominion. See the interesting anecdote of Nestor, quoted from the martyrology by Grotius: if we shall deny (Him), He also will deny us (see Matt. x. 33): if we disbelieve (not, His Resurrection, as Chrys.: εἰ ἄπουρον δι' ἀνίστης, οὐδὲν ἄτο οὐτοῦ βλαστεῖται εἰκόνα: nor His Divinity, as Eec.2 δι' θεοῦ ἐστὶ, but Him, generally. Elich's note [which see] has convinced me that ἀνίστα seems always in the X. T. to imply not 'untruthfulness,' 'unbelief,' but definitely 'unbelief': see note on Rom. iii. 3, in Vol. II. edn. 5). He remains faithful (to His own word cited above): for He cannot deny Himself (i.e. if we desert faith in Him, He will not break faith with us); He having declared that whosoever denies Him shall be denied by Him, and we having pledged ourselves to confess Him,—we may become unbelieving, and break our pledge, but He will not break His: as He has said, it shall surely be. See Rom. iii. 3. Chrys. gives
a curious explanation: ἡλθες ἐστίν, Βχβνάς ἐστιν, δι' τε εἶπας, δι' τι μὴ εἶπας, ἕνεκα γὰρ αὐτὸς μεῖνε καὶ ἄρομανεν καὶ μὴ ἄρομανεν. ἴσης ἀπεφανήσαται γὰρ ἐκ τούτων οὐ δύναται, τοῦτοτι, μὴ εἶναι. ἦσες λεγοντι ὥστιν ἦν ἄρτος, εἰ καὶ μὴ τὸ πράγμα φαντάζεται, οὐκ ἦσες φαντάζεται καὶ ἐνυποτι πράγματος ὡστέ εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὸν χωρίζει, αὐτὸ μὲνεί, αὐτὸν ἵστοι αὐτὸς ὑπόστασις, μὴ τοῖς ἄρα χωρίζομεν αὐτῷ, οὔτω διακειμένη, ἢ ἀς καταβλάβωσε. But manifestly there is no such motive as this last brought forward, nor is the assertion ἐκεῖνος μεῖνε, but ἐκ πιστοῦ μεῖνε. Mack proposes another alternative. — If we fall from the faith and forfeit our own salvation, He still carries forward His own gracious will, in saving mankind by the Gospel." But that given above seems best to suit the context.

14—26.] Application of the above general exhortations to the teaching and conversation of Timotheus, especially with reference to the false teachers. 14.] These things (those which have just preceded vv. 8—13) call to their minds (refr.: the minds viz. of those among whom thou art ministering, as the context shows: see a similar ellipse in Tit. iii. 8), testifying to them before the Lord not to content with words (see 1 Tim. vi. 4). The var. reading λογοιμαία changes the whole arrangement, and attaches διαμαρτ. ἐκτὸς τοῦ κυρίου to the preceding. The chief objections to this are 1) that ἵστοις διαμαρτομοῦσε διαμαρτομοῦσεν ἐκ τοῦ κυρίου is a very lame and inconsistent junction of terms, the strong emphasis of the διαμ. κ.π.λ. not agreeing with the far weaker word ἵστοις: 2) that in the other places where διαμαρτομαῖα occurs in St. Paul, it precedes an exhortation, e.g. 1 Tim. v. 21; ch. iv. 1, and αρπομαία Eph. iv. 17), — (a thing) useful (χρήσιμον is in apposition with the preceding sentence, as καθαρίζον in the rec., reading of Mark vii. 19: see Winer, edn. 6, § 59. 9. b) for no purpose (the reading εὐθεῖας, which has been put by,—cf. Ellic. here,—on account of the rec., illustrating St. Paul's love of propositional variation, does in fact illustrate it quite as much, εἰ ἦν having dat. and accus. in the same sentence, cf. Ps. cxiv. 9 var. ἐκ χρήσιμον is constructed with εἰς in LXX: e.g., Ezek. xv. 4; Wisd. xiii. 11, Cf. also Wisd. xv. 15), (but practised) to present thyself (emphatic, as distinguished from those alluded to in the preceding verse) to God approved (refr.: tried by trial, and found to have stood the test. Not to be joined with ἐγράψας, as Mack), a workman (a general word, of any kind of labourer, used [see ref. of teachers perhaps from the parable in Matt. xx.) unshamed (by his work being found unworthy: cf. Phil. i. 20,—ἐν οὖν διὰ αἰεί ἐγνωσμόν, and 1 Cor. iv. 4: "cui tua ipsius conscientia nullum pudorem incitati," Beng. Kyprke quotes from Jos. Antt. xviii. 9 'But I cannot find the passage, μηδὲ δειτερευθεὶς ἀνεπασίασμον ἐγγον, 'neque credas id pudere vacare, si secundum renaes locum." Chrys., al., would take the word actively, "not being ashamed of his work," τούτιστα, μηδὲν δει τερευθεὶς πάρει τῶν, εἰς εὐθείας ἑκόνων, κἂν δουλεύῃς δὲν, κἂν ὑποτικώς παῖδες, Chrys.: and so Agapeus. in Wets., παρ' ἀλλ' εὑρήκατα μιψάεως παράρρητο, ἀλλὰ μανθάνει μὲν ἀνεπασίασμον: but the above seems more according to the context. The opposite to ἐγγον.
16. καινοφωφιας F D-latt Chr Lucif Aug Ambrost. (G-latt has both.)

16. καινοφωφιας F D-latt Chr Lucif Aug Ambrost. (G-latt has both.)
16—19. ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΝ Β. 385

graivn e nomiνi εξει. l'ων εστιν 'Εμεναιος και Φιλτους,

18 εις οιτίνες η περὶ την 'αληθειαν κατ' επιθυμησαν, λεγοντες

[την] αναστασιν ηγη γεγονναι, και ανατεταυσαι την

τινων πιστων. 19 ον μεντοι ο στεφως τοι' δεμελοι του

θεου εστηκεν, εκουν την της αφαραγια ταυτην της Εγνων κυμο

k 1 Tim. i. 9, reff.
1 Tit. i. 11 only. Prot. x. 3.
27 al. James ii. 8. Jude 8 only.
p 1 Cor. iii. 11. Heb. vi. 1 al. Ps. lxxxvi. 
al. 142. Chal. viii. 6.
1 Tit. ii. 9 reff. N. v. xvi. 6.

19. for θεου, κυριον N: χριστον 91.

(nom' [pasture, ref. John. Aristot. Hist. An. 10], from νεμεον [το φοιμα εκωραιν ενυμετρ προς, Ierod. iii. 133]), is the medical term for the consuming process of mortifying disease: cf. νομαρι παροδοθεις, Plut. Mor. p. 163 e: το ελκον θαπτον ποιειται νομη, Polyb. i. 81. 6, and Hippocrates and Galen in Wetst. It is also used of the devastating progress of fire, as in Polyb. i. 18. 5, την μεν νομην του πωρον ενεργον συνεβην γιαγιαθαι, and xi. 5. 6, το πωρ λαιμβανειν νομην) as a
gangrene (γαγγραινα, from γαγον, γαγων, to eat into, is defined by Hippocrates [in Wetst.] to be the state of a tumour between inflammation and entire mortification—εσται τας μεγαλιας φλεμονας η καλυμνη γαγγραινα, νεκρανεις τη αθανασια του πασχοντος μοριον, και η ην δια ταχεων της αυτην ιασηναι, νεκρανει βραδιος το πασχον τουτο μοριον, επιλαμβανει τα τα συνεγη και αποκινει τον άνωθησαιον. Sometimes it is identical with καρκινον, a can-
cer: of whom is (ref.) Hymenaeus (see note, 1 Tim. i. 20) and Philetus (of him nothing further is known), men who con-
cerning the truth went astray (cf. 1 Tim. vi. 21), saying that the resurrection has already taken place (cf. Tert. de resurr. carnis, e. 19, vol. ii. p. 820, —"resurrection

error, which belonged to the Gnostics subsequently, may well have been already sown and springing up in the apostolic age. If the form of it was that described by Ter-
tullian, it would be one of those instances of wresting the words of St. Paul himself [cf. Col. ii. 12: Rom. vi. 4, al.] of which St. Peter speaks 2 Pet. iii. 16. See on this Aug. Ep. lv. [exix.], 4, vol. iii. p. 206. Thdrt. [so also Pol.], gives a curious and certainly mistaken meaning,—τασ ει πατο-
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touc's ontac's autvov, Kai 'Aposotmto apò adiakias paiz o 'ononumazov to onoma kuriou. 20 ev megaly c' oikia ouk estin monon wv skev chousa kai agnoua, alia Kai xuliva Kai yostakina, kai wv a men wv eis timin, wv a c' eis a atimian. 21 evn sun tis e' ekadap kai eautov apototov, estai w skeuos e' eis timin, giamismon, exuvosanov to

petram, i.e. Christum, a Deo firmiter fundata, nullis aut Sanctae machinis aut tentationum fluctibus subverti potest aut labefacta: nam eti quidam da ea deficient, ipsa tamen in suis electis perseveratur usque in fennm." He then cites 1 John ii. 19: Matt. xxiv. 24: John x. 28: Rom. viii. 35, 39: and proceeds, "Ex his admodum fit verisimile, firmum Dei fundamentum intelligi fideles electos: sive, quod idem est, ecclesiam in eclectis." Against the tottering faith of those just mentioned, he sets the steperos theu, and the estetek. It cannot be moved: Heb. xxii. 28), having ("seeing it hath," part. with a very faint causal force, illustrating the previous declaration: cf. Donalds, Gr. § 615." Ellici, this seal (probably in allusion to the practice of engraving inscriptions over doors [Deut. vi. 9; xi. 20] and on pillars and foundation stones [Rev. xxi. 14]. The "seal" [inscription] would indicate ownership and destination: both of which are pointed out in the two texts following:

(1) The Lord knoweth (see 1 Cor. viii. 3, note: 'novit amaner [?], nec nosse disniit,' as Bengel) them that are His (the LXX runs: upeisketai kal evno o theo tov ontac autov ai tov agnous, kai prospasteto proz evautov): and (2) Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord (viz. as his Lord: not exactly equivalent to 'calleth on the name of the Lord') stand aloof from iniquity (the passage in Isa. stands, apostatti, apostatne, ekevate ekevete, kai akatharizein o agnoe, . . . odorifanei oi fereotes ta skeu kuriou. It is clearly no reason against this passage being here alluded to, that [as Cony.] it is expressly cited 2 Cor. vi. 17. Ellici, remarks, that it is possibly in continued allusion to Num. xvi. 26, apostatheste apo tov skenov, ton anfrotov ton skleron tovtov). 20] Those who are truly the Lord's are known to Him and depart from iniquity: but in the visible church there are many unworthy members. This is illustrated by the following similitude. But (contrary to the preceding definition of the Lord's people) in a great house (= ev t' oikou meg' pase, Chrisy, who strenuously upholds that view; so also Thdrt. and the Greek Commentators, Grot., al.; but far better understood of the church, for the reason given by Calv.: "contextus qui dem huc potius nos ducit, ut de ecclesia intelligamus: neque enim de extraneis disputat Paulus, sed de ipsa Dei familia?" so also Cypr., Aug., Ambr., all. The idea then is much the same as that in the parable of the drag-net, Matt. xii. 47—49: not in the parable of the tares of the field, as De W.; for there it is expressly said, o apre meta ovd o koum (there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and earthenware; and some for honour, some for dishonour (viz. in the use of the vessels themselves: not, as Mack, al., to bring honour or dishonour on the house or its inhabitants. Estius, anxious to avoid the idea of heretics being in the church, would understand the two classes in each sentence as those distinguished by gifts, and those not so distinguished: and so Corn. a-Lap., al.; but this seems alien from the context: cf. especially the next verse. On the comparison, see Ellic.'s references). 21] Here the thing signified is mingled with the similitude: the voluntary act described belonging, not to the vessels, but to the members of the church who are designated by them. If then (ovdev deduces a consequence from the similitude: q. d. 'his positis') any man (member of the church) shall have purified himself (not as Chrisy., painteleos katharty: but as Bengel), 'purging sese erisci de numero horum: the ek corresponds to the apo be-
A page of a document with many abbreviations and references to ancient texts. The text is a mix of Greek and Latin, with references to authors such as Chrysostom, Calvin, and others. The document appears to be a scholarly work, possibly a commentary or an exhortation, discussing theological and exegetical matters. The text is complex and requires a good knowledge of ancient languages and Christian theology to understand fully.
cline (refr.), being aware that they gender strife (refr.) : but (contrast to the fact of μάχα the (better than σα, as De W. The meaning being much the same, and δοῦλον in the emphatic place representing τὸν δοῦλον, the definite art., in rendering, gives the emphasis, and points out the individual servant, better than the indefinite) servant of the Lord (Jesus; see 1 Cor. vii. 22). It is evident from what follows, that the servant of the Lord here, in the Apostle's view, is not so much every true Christian,—however applicable such a maxim may be to him also,—but the minister of Christ, as Timotheus was : cf. διδακτικῶν, &c. below. must not strive (the argument is in the form of an enthymeme: — προσεκτικὸν ab experientia manifestum relinquat. Assumptio vero tacitum sibi probationem includit, camque uniusmodi : servum oportet imitari Dominum suum. Estius), but be gentle (refr.) towards all, apt to teach (refr. : so E. V. well: for, as Bengel, 'hoc non solum soliditatem et facilitatem in docendo, sed vel maxime patientiam et assiduitatem significat.' In fact these latter must be, on account of the contrast which the Apostle is bringing out, regarded as prominent here), patient of wrong (so Conyb., and perhaps we can hardly find a better expression, though 'wrong' does not by any means cover the meaning of the κακῶν : 'long suffering' would be unobjectionable, were it not that we have μακρόθυμον, to which that word is already appropriated. Plutarch, Coriolan. c. 15, says, that he did not repress his temper, οὐδὲ τὴν ἐρμία εὔσωκον, ὥς Πλάτων ἔλεγεν, αἰνεῖαν εἰδὼς ὅτι δει μᾶλλον διασφειρόντα πράγματος κοινοὶ καὶ ἀνθρώπους ὑμιλοῦν, καὶ γενέθαι τῇ πολλᾷ γελωμένης ὑπ’ εὐνῶν ἀνέκκακας ἐραστήσῃ), in meekness correcting (not instructing, see refr., and note on ἀπαίδευσος, ver. 23) those who oppose themselves (better than as Ambrest., 'ecos qui diversa sentiunt: ' to take the general meaning of διατίθεθαι, satisfies the context better, than to supply τὸν νοῦν. The Vulg., 'ecos qui resistunt veritati,' particularizes too much in another way), if at any time (literally, 'rest at any time': but μpite in later Greek sometimes loses this aversive meaning and is almost equivalent to εἴπτοτε. Cf. Viger, p. 457, where the annotator says of μπήπτο, 'vocula tuncibus saepissime crucem figens, cum significat fortasse, vel si quidam,' and he then cites this passage. The account to be given of the usage is that, from μὴ being commonly used after verbs of fearing, &c., then after verbs expressing anxiety of any kind [φοβητικός, μή . . . Χει.: σκοτώ, μή . . . Plat.: ὑποπτεινέω, μή . . . Χει.: αἰνηκοῦναι, μή . . . Plat.], its proper aversive force by degrees became forgotten, and thus it, and words compounded with it, were used in later Greek in sentences where no such force can be intended. De W. refers to Kypke for examples of this usage from Plat. and Athenaeus: but Kypke does not notice the word here at all) God may give them repentance (because their consciences were impure [see above on ver. 22]) and lives evil. Cf. Ellie.'s remarks on μετατόν.) in order to the knowledge of [the] truth (see note, 1 Tim. ii. 4), and they may awake sober (from their moral and spiritual intoxication: so ἐκφραστῇ, in ref. 1 Cor., and this same word in Jos.: the ἐκφράσῃ there, as the entrance by the devil here, being regarded as a kind of intoxication. There is no one word in English which will express ἀναγνώσια: Conyb. has paraphrased it by 'escape, restored to soberness' ["return to soberness," Ellie.]; perhaps the E. V., 'recover themselves,' is as near an ap-
proach to the meaning as we can get. We have the word used literally by Plutarch, Camillus, c. 23: ὁ Κάμιλλος . . . . περὶ μέσας τὰς νύκτας προσέρχετο τῷ χάρακι . . . . ἑκαταράττων ἀνθρώπων κα-
ως ὑπὸ μέθης κ. μάλις ἐκ τῶν ὁπων ἀναφεροντα πρὸς τὸν θύρμουν. ὑλὸς μὲν οὖν ἀνανήφιαν ἐν τῷ φόβῳ κ. δια-
σκευασάμενοι, τούς περὶ τῶν Κάμιλλου ὕπεστησαν . . . . Sir Thomas North renders it, 'There were some notwithstanding did bustle up at the sudden noise.' See also examples in Wetst.) out of the snare of the devil (gen. subj., 'the snare which the devil laid for them.') There is properly no confusion of metaphor, the idea being that these persons have in a state of intoxication been entrapped, and are enabled, at their awaking sober, to escape. But the construction is elliptic, ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ = ἐκφράσιον ἀνανήψω-
σει ἐκ, having been (during their spiritual μέθη) taken captive by him unto (for the fulfillment of, in pursuance of) the will of Him (viz. God: that Other, indicated* by ἐκεῖνον. Thus I am now persuaded the words must be rendered: αὐτοῦ, referring to the devil, and it being signified that the taking captive of these men by him only takes place as far as God permits; according to His will. Rendering it thus, as do Aret., Estius, and Ellicott, I do not hold the other view, which makes αὐτοῦ and ἐκείνου both refer to the devil, to be untenable. I therefore give my note much as it stood before, that the student may have both sides before him. The difficulty is of course to determine whether the pronouns are used of the same person, or of different persons. From the Greek expositors downwards, some have held a very different rendering of the words from either of those here indicated: Thl. e. g.,—ἐν πλάνη, φρον., νήφο-
ται, ἠλλὰ ζωγράφησεν ὑπὸ θεοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα, τουτέστι τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵππος ἀνανήψωσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀδότων τῆς πλάνης. This, it is true, does not get rid of the difficulty respecting the pronouns, but it pointed a way towards doing so: and thus Wetst., Bengel, and Mack, understand αὐτοῦ to apply to the δοῦλος κυρίου,— ἐκείνου to God—'taken prisoners by God's servant according to His will.' [Bengel however, as Beza, Grot., joins εἰς τὸ ἐκ.
θάλ, with ἀνανήψωσιν, which is unnatural, leaving ἔξωγρ. ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ standing alone.] The great objection to this is, the exceeding confusion which it introduces into the figure, in representing men who are just recovering their sense and liberty, as ἔξωγρημοι,—and in applying that partici-
pile, occurring as it does just after the mention of παρίς, not to that snare, but to another which does not appear at all. Aret. and Estius proposed the rendering given above;—'taken captive by the devil according to God's will,' i. e. as Est., 'quandiu Deus voluerit, ejus voluntati nec diabolus resistere potest.' De W. charges this with rendering εἰς as if it were κατά, but the charge is not just: for the permitting the devil to hold them captive, on this view, would be strictly εἰς, 'in pursuance of,' so as to follow,' God's pur-
pose. The real objection perhaps is, that it introduces a new and foreign element, viz. the fact that this capture is overruled by God,—of which matter there is here no question. There is no real difficulty whatever in the application of αὐτοῦ and ἐκείνου to the same person. Kühner, § 629, ann. 3, gives from Plato, Cratyl. p. 430, δεῖξαι αὐτῷ ἢν μὲν τόχῳ, ἐκείνου εἰκόνα, ἢ δὲ τόχῳ, γνωσεῖς [where the reason for the use of ἐκείνου, viz. to em-
phasize the pronoun, is precisely as here; see below]: from Lysias, c. Eratosth. p. 429, ἦσο δ ἐκείνου μὲν ἐκείνου καύρος ἐπιμελᾶς ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἐτήρησθαι [which cases of ἐκείνου followed by αὐτὸς must not be dis-
missed, as Ellie, as inapplicable: they shew at all events that there was no abso-
lute objection to using the two pronouns of the same person. See below]. But he does not give an account of the idiom, which seems to be this: ἐκείνος, from its very meaning, always carries somewhat of emphasis with it; it is therefore unfit for mere reflexive or unemphatic use, and accordingly when the subject pointed out by ἐκείνου occurs in such unemphatic position, ἐκείνος is replaced by αὐτός. On the other hand, where emphasis is required, ἐκείνος is repeated: e. g. Soph. Aj. 1039, κεῖνος τὰ κεῖνος στεργέτω, κἀγω
III. 1. Τοῦτο ἐὰν γίνωσκε, ὦτι ἐν ἔσχάταις ἡμέραις ἔννοισαι τινος ἐναντίον τοῦ φιλάντοι, έξουσίας ἢ λατρείας, εὐφρένει αὐτοῦ, οὐδέποτε ἔτι εὐφρένοις, τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῇ υπερήφαναι, "ἐν ἐκείνοις ἡμέραις, ἠμόραστοι, ἕνας, ἑβάλοντος μετὰ καταπώσεως, ἀλάγωνος, υπερήφαναν, "βλασφήμοι, ἐγκεφαλίζετε ἁπάντεσας, ἀλλὰ, ἀνοίγοι, τῷ τοῖς προφητικοῖς ἐπιτάχθησαι, προφήτας τῷ τοῖς προφητικοῖς, τῷ τοῖς προφητικοῖς. "

Chap. III. 1. γινώσκετε AF 17 ἀθ-rom Aug: txt CDKLX5 vel vulg (and F-lat) sýrr copt goth ath-pl gr-lat-sc.

Chap. III. 1—9. Warning of bad times to come, in which men shall be ungodly and hypocritical:—nay, against such men as already present, and doing mischief.

1. Μὴ (the contrast is in the dark prophetic announcement, so different in character from the hope just expressed) this know, that in the last days (see 1 Tim. iv. 1, where the expression is somewhat different. The period referred to here is, from all N. T. analogy [cf. 2 Pet. iii. 3: Jude 18], that immediately preceding the coming of the Lord. That day and hour being hidden from all men, and even from the Son Himself, Mark xiii. 32,—the Spirit of prophecy, which is the Spirit of the Son, did not reveal to the Apostles its place in the ages of time. They, like the subsequent generations of the Church, were kept waiting for it, and for the most part wrote and spoke of it as soon to appear; not however without many and sufficient hints furnished by the Spirit, of an interval, and that not short one, first to elapse. In this place, these last days are set before Timotheus as being on their way, and indeed their premonitory symptoms already appearing. The discovery which the lapse of centuries and the providence have made to us, ἀρνοίζει δ κρόδος μου ἐλείων, misses none but unfaithful servants: while the only modification in the understanding of the premonitory symptoms, is, that for us, He with whom a thousand years are as one day has spread them, without changing their substance or their truth, over many consecutive ages. Cf. ref. 1 John,—where we have the still plainer assertion, ἐστάθη ὃς ἐστὶν grievous times shall come (we can hardly express ἐστάθησατι nearer in English). 'instantum,' of the Vulg., though blamed by De W., is right, in the sense in which we use 'instant' of the present month or year [Ellie. quotes Auct. ad Herenn. ii. 5, 'dividitur (tempus) in temporum tria, præteritum, instantes, consequens'); 'aderunt' of Grot. and Bengel amounts in fact to the same. See note on 2 Thess. ii. 2).

2. for (reason for χαλεποῦ men (机电 generic: the men who shall live in those times) shall be selfish (οἱ πάντα πρὸς τὴν ἐναυτὴν ἄρθραν ποιοῦσας, Theod-Mops. Aristotle, in his chapter περὶ φιλανδίας, Eth. Nicom. ix. 8, while he maintains that there is a higher sense in which τὸν ἄγαθον δεὶς ψάλλοντον εἰναὶ,—allows that οἱ πολλοί use the word of τὸν ἐναυτὸν ἀπονεμοντας τὸ πλεον ἐν ἡρμῆς, καὶ τιμαίς, καὶ θλοναίς ταῖς σωματικαίς: and adds, δικαίως δὴ τοῖς οὕτω φιλανδίας νοεκοῦση), covetous (ref.: we have the subst., 1 Tim. vi. 10, and the verb, 2 Macc. x. 20), empty boastors (ἄλαξονοι, καυχόμενοι ἐκεῖνοι καὶ μὴ ἐκνοτίν, Theod-Mops.; see ref. and definitions from Aristotle in note), haughty (μεγάλα φρονοῦντες, ἐπὶ τοῖς οὕτως, Theod-Mops.: ref. and note), evil speakers (κατηγορίαις χαρακτίστεις, Theod-Mops. Not 'blasphemers,' unless, as in ref. 1 Tim., the context specifies to what the evil-speaking refers), disobedient to parents ('character temperum colligendum imprimis etiam ex juventute moribus.' Bengel), ungrateful, unholy (ref. ἐπιμέλεια τοῦ δικαίου μη ποιοῦμενοι, Theod-Mops., and Beza's 'qui-
bus nullum jas est nec fas' are perhaps too wide: it is rather 'irreligious', without natural affection (ref. and note), implacable (it does not appear that the word ever means 'truce-breakers,' οὐ βέβαιοι περὶ τὰς φιλίας, αὐτῶν ἀλήθεις περὶ συντίθεται, as Théod-Mops. In all the places where it occurs in a subjective sense, it is, 'that will make' or 'admit no truce:' e. g., Esch. Agam. 1235, ἄστορον δ' ἄραν φιλος πιέωνων: Eur. Aleest. 126, τῷ κάτωθι ἀπόσπω θεον: Demosth. p. 311. 16, ἄστορον κ. ἀκρίβεια τὸ λόγον: the same expression, ἄστ. πόλεμος, occurs in Polyb. i. 65. 65. For the primary objective sense, 'without στόνα,' see Thucyd. i. 37; ii. 32; v. 32, and Palm and Rost's Lex.), calumniators (ref.), incontinent (we have the subst. ἀκραια, 1 Cor. vii. 5), inhuman (ὡμι, ἀπόθρησις, (Ec.), no lovers of good (ἐχθρόν παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ, Thil.), traitors, headlong (either in action, 'qui precipitae sunt in agenda,' Beng.: or in passion [temper], which would in fact amount to the same), besotted by pride (see note, 1 Tim. iii. 6), lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God (τοῦ λαοῦ . . . φιλόθεον κ. φιλοπαθῆ μᾶλλον ἢ φιλάρετον κ. φιλόθεον. Philo, de agric. § 19, vol. i. p. 313), having a (or the?) form (outward embodiment: the same meaning as in ref., but here confined, by the contrast following, to the mere outward semblance, whereas there, no contrast occurring, the outward embodiment is the real representation. 'The more correct word would be μόρφωμα [Esch. Ag. 573, Eum. 112], μόρφωμα being properly active, e. g., σχεματισμός κ. μορφώμας τῶν δεδράων, Theophr. de caus. plant. iii. 7. 4: there is, however, a tendency in the N. T., as in later writers, to replace the verbal nouns in -μα by the corresponding nouns in -σις: cf. ὁποτόπωσις, ch. i. 13.' Ellicot (of piety, but having repudiated (not pres., 'denying,' as E. V., 'renouncing,' as Conyb.; their condemnation is, that they are living in the semblance of God's fear, but have repudiated its reality) the power of it (its living and renewing influence over the heart and life). Cf. throughout this description, Rom. i. 30, 31. Huther remarks, 'We can hardly trace any formal rule of arrangement through these predicates. Here and there, it is true, a few cognate ideas are grouped together: the two first are connected by φιλος: then follow three words betokening high-mindedness: γονέων ἀπειθείας is followed by ἀχώριστος: this word opens a long series of words beginning with a privative, but interrupted by διάμολος: the following, προδόται, προπετεῖς, seem to be a parenthesis: the latter of these is followed by τετυφωμένοι as a cognate idea: a few more general predicates close the catalogue. But this very interpenetration serves to depict more vividly the whole manifoldness of the manifestation of evil.' And from these turn away (ref.: cf. ἔκτρέπεσθαι, 1 Tim. vi. 20. This command shows the last of the Apostles, this is the symptoms of the last times as not future exclusively, but in some respects present: see note above, ver. 1): 6.] For (reason of the foregoing command, seeing that they are already among you) among the number of these are they who creep (ἐδει τὸ ἀναλάχθουν πῶς ἐκλιασά τοῦ ἐπεύ, ἐφόνοντες τὸ ἄτιμον, τὴν ἀπάτην, τὴν κολασίαν, Chrys. Cf. Aristoph. Vesp. 1020, εἰς ἄλλοτριας γαστ- τέρας ἐνδοῦς. Bengel interprets it 'irre- peutes clandum') into [men's houses and take captive (as it were prisoners; a word admirably describing the influence acquired by sneaking proselytizers over
those presently described: attach to themselves entirely, so that they follow them as if drugged about by them: a late word, said to be of Alexandrian or Macedonian origin, and condemned by the Atticist: see Ellicott) silly women (the diminutive denotes contempt) laden with sins (De W. alone seems to have given the true reason of the insertion of this particular. The stress is on σεσωφρεμένα: they are burdened, their consciences oppressed, with sins, and in this morbid state they lie open to the insidious attacks of these proselytizers who promise them case of conscience if they will follow them), led about by lusts of all kinds (I should rather imagine, from the context, that the reference here is not so much to 'fleshly lusts,' properly so called,—though from what we know of such feminine spiritual attachments, ancient [see below] and modern, such must by no means be excluded,—as to the ever-shifting [ποικίλη] passion for change in doctrine and manner of teaching, which is the eminent characteristic of these captives to designing spiritual teachers—the running after fashionable men and fashionable tenets, which draw them [ἀγωνία] in flocks in the most opposite and inconsistent directions, ever-more learning (always with some new point absorbing them, which seems to them the most important, to the depreciation of what they held and seemed to know before), and never (on μηδὲν, see Ellicott) able to come to the thorough knowledge (refl., and notes: the decisive and stable apprehension, in which they might be grounded and settled against further novelties) of the truth (this strain is referred by Chrys., all, to moral deadening of their apprehension by profligate lives: ἐπέθετο ἐναῦς κατάξωσαν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ἐκείναις καὶ τοῖς ἀμαρτήσαις, ἐπαράξενες αὐτῶν ἡ διάνοια. It may be so, in the deeper ground of the psychological reason for this theirickle and imperfect condition: but I should rather think that the Apostle here indicates their character as connected with the fact of their captivity to these teachers.

With regard to the fact itself, we have abundant testimony that the Gnostic heresy in its progress, as indeed all new and strange systems, laid hold chiefly of the female sex: so Irenæus, i. 13. 3, p. 61, of the Valentinian Marcus, μᾶλιστα ἐν τοῖς γυναικῶις ἁσχολεῖται, and in ib. 6, p. 63 f., καὶ μαθηταὶ δὲ αὐτῶν τοις ἐκ τοῦ ποιήματος γυναικείου γένους, then quoting this passage. Jerome, Ep. exxxiii. ad Ctesiphontem 4, vol. i. p. 1051 f., collects a number of instances of this: "Simon Magnus haræsin conditit Helene meretricis adjutus auxilio: Nicolaus Antiochenus omnium immunitatis repertor choros duxit feminos: Marecon Romam premissit mulierem quem decipiendo sibi animos prepararet. Apelles Philumencum suarum comitent habuit doctrinarum: Montanus . . . Priscam et Maximilian . . . primum auro corruptit, deinde haeresi polluit . . . Arius ut orbon deceperet, sororem principis ante decept. Donatus . . . Lucille opinus adjutus est: Agape Elpidium . . . crecum cecae ductit in foream: Priscelliano juncta fuit Gallia."

The general answer to Baur,— who again uses this as a proof of the later origin of these Epistles,—will be found in the Prolegomena, ch. vii. § i. De Wette remarks, "This is an admirable characterization of zealous soul-hunters (who have been principally found, and are still found, among the Roman Catholics) and their victims. We must not however divide the different traits among different classes or individuals: it is their combination only which is characteristic." "DICERES, EX PROFESSO PAULIN HIC VIVAM MONACHUM:S CIFIGIEN PINGERE." (Calvin).

8. But (q. d. if it is no wonder that there should be now such opponents to the truth, for their prototypes existed also in ancient times) as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses (these are believed to be traditional names of the Egyptian magicians mentioned in Exod. vii. 11, 22. Origen says [in Matt. comment. 117, vol. iii. p. 916], "quod ait, 'sient Jannes et Mambres [see var. read.] restiterunt Mosi,' non inventur in publicis scripturis, sed in libro secreto, qui suprascribitur..."
Jannes et Mambres liber.” But Thdrt.’s account is more probable [τά μείστοι τοῦτον ὄνομα οὐκ ἐκ τῆς θείας γραφῆς μεμάθη- κέν ὁ θεῖοι ἀπόστολοι, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῆς ἀγρά- φου τῶν Ιουδαϊκῶν διδασκαλίας], especially as the names are found in the Targum of Jonathan on Exod. vii. 11; Num. xxii. 22. Schöttgen has [in loc.] a long account of their traditional history: and Wetst. quotes the passages at length. They were the sons of Balaam—propheted to Pharaoh the birth of Moses, in consequence of which he gave the order for the destruction of the Jewish children, —and thenceforward appear as the counsellors of much of the evil,—in Egypt, and in the desert, after the Exodus,—which happened to Israel. They were variously reported to have perished in the Red Sea, or to have been killed in the tumult consequent on the making the golden calf, which they had advised. Origen, contra Cels. iv. 51, vol. i. p. 543, mentions the Pythagorean Numenius as relating the history of Jannes and Jambres: so also Euseb. prep. evang. ix. 8, vol. iii. [Migne], p. 412. Pliny, H. Nat. xxx. 1, says, “Est et alia Magices factio, a Muse et Janme et Jotape Judaicus pendeus, sed multis millibus annum post Zoroastrem.” The later Jews, with some ingenuity, distorted the names into Joannes and Ambrosius, thus these also withstand the truth, being men corrupted (refl. : the Lexx. quote καταφώρα- peis τῶν βλατρῶν from a fragment of Manen- der) in mind,worthless (not abiding the test, ‘rejectanei’) concerning the faith (in respect of the faith: πεπληκτίων is not, as Luther, equivalent to πεπληκτεῖσθαι, but expresses more the local meaning of πεπληκτίων: 'cirea,' as the Vulg. here has it. In 1 Tim. i. 19, πεπληκτίων ἐναυάγησαν, we have the local reference brought out more strongly, the faith being, as it were, a rock, on, round which they had been shipwrecked).

9.] Notwithstanding (Ellie. well remarks that ἀλλά here after an affirmative sentence should have its full adversative force) they shall not advance further (in ch. ii. 16, it is said, ἐπὶ πλείους προκοφού- σιν ἄνεβιας: and it is in vain to deny that there is an apparent and literal inconsistency between the two assertions. But on looking further into them, it is manifest, that while there the Apostle is speaking of an immediate spread of error, here he is looking to its ultimate defeat and extinction: as Chr. and so πρότερον ἀνθηση τὰ τῆς πλάνης, εἰς τέλος ὁ διαμενεῖ: for their folly (unintelligent and senseless method of proselytizing and upholding their opinions [see ref. Luke], — and indeed folly of those opinions themselves) shall be thoroughly manifested (ref. πάντες ἐπισκέψεως ἐνδοκα). Demостh. 21. 10] to all, as also that of those men was (Exod. viii. 18; ix. 11: but most probably the allusion is to their traditional end).

10.—17.] Contrast, by way of reminding and exhortation, of the education, knowledge, and life of Timotheus with the character just drawn of the opponents. But thou followedst (ref. not, as Chr., Thl., [Ec., al., τούτον σὺ μάρτυς,—for some of the undermentioned occurred before the conversion of Timotheus, and of many of them this could not be properly said,—but ‘followedst as thy pattern’: it was my example in all these things which was set before thee as thy guide—thou wert a follower of me, as I of Christ.’ So Calvin [‘laudat tanquam suarum virtutum imita- forem, ac si dieceret, jam pridem assu- factus es ad mea instituta, perge modo qua cupisti’], Aret., De W., Huther,
Wiesinger, all. The aorist is both less obvious and more appropriate than the perfect: this was the example set before him, and the reminiscence, joined to the exhortation of ver. 14, bears something of reproof with it, which is quite in accordance with what we have reason to infer from the general tone of the Epistle. Whereas the perfect would imply that the example had been really before him, and followed up to the present moment: and so would weaken the necessity of the exhortation)

*my teaching, conduct (refl.: and add 2 Mac. iv. 16; yi. 8; xi 21: τῇ δίᾳ τῶν ἐργῶν πολιτείᾳ, Thdt.) All these words are dependent on μου, not to be taken [Mack] as applying to Timotheus, 'Thou followedst my teaching in thy conduct, &c.,' which would introduce an unnatural accumulation of encomia on him, and would besides assume that he had been persecuted [cf. tois διωγμοῖς], which there is no reason to suppose, purpose (ref. to ποῦ τοπὶ προσβολάς καὶ τοῦ παραστῆματος τῆς ψυχῆς, Chrys. Eille, remarks, that in all other passages in St. Paul's Epistles, πρόβασις is used with reference to God, faith (ὅπως ἔχω περὶ τῶν δεσπότων διάθεσις, Thdt.), long-suffering (ὅπως φέρω τὰς ἄδελφους παμμελημέσσα, Thdt.: or perhaps as, Chrys., πῶς οὖν με τούτων ἐπάρατε, his patience in respect of the false teachers and the troubles of the time), love (ὅπερ οὖν εἶχον οὖντοι, Chrys.), endurance (πῶς φέρω γενναῖως τῶν ἐναντίων τῶν προσβολάς, Thdt.), persecutions ('to these ὑπομονῆς the note of transition,' Haith.), sufferings (not only was I persecuted, but the persecution issued in infliction of suffering), such (sufferings) as befell me in Antioch (of Pisidia), in Iconium, in Lystra (why should these be especially enumerated? Thdt. assigns as a reason, that τῶν ἄλλων καταληψίων τῶν ἐν τῇ Πισίδᾳ καὶ τῇ Λυκανησίᾳ συμβεβηκότων αὐτῷ κωτόν ἀνέμισε. Λυκανὴ γὰρ ἦν καὶ αὐτὸς πρὸς τὸν γέραμφη, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἦν αὐτῷ γνωριμώτερα. And so Chrys., and many both ancient and modern. It may be so, doubtless: and this reason, though rejected by De W., Huther, Wiesinger, al., seems much better to suit the context and probability, than the other, given by Huther, al., that these persecutions were the first which befell the Apostle in his missionary work among the heathen. It is objected to it, that during the former of these persecutions Timotheus was not with St. Paul. But the answer to that is easy. At the time of his conversion, they were recent, and the talk of the churches in those parts: and thus, especially with our rendering, and the aor. sense of παρακαληθήσεσαι, would be naturally mentioned, as being those sufferings of the Apostle which first excited the young convert's attention to make them his own pattern of what he too must suffer for the Gospel's sake. Baur and De Wette regard the exact correspondence with the Acts [xiii. 50; xiv. 5, 19; xvi. 3] as a suspicious circumstance. Wiesinger well asks, would they have regarded a discrepancy from the Acts as a mark of genuineness?); what persecutions (there is a zeugmatic construction here—understand, 'thou sawest; in proposing to thyself a pattern thou hadst before thee ...' [I cannot see how, as Eille, asserts, this rendering vitiates the construction. Doubtless his rendering, 'such persecutions as,' is legitimate, but it seems to me feeble after the preceding oia.] Heydenn, Mack, al., understand these words as an exclamation: οίως διώμη, ὑπήργεια! I need hardly observe that such an exclamation would be wholly alien from the character and style of the Apostle) I underwent, and out of all the Lord delivered me (ἀμφότερα [both clauses of the sentence] παρακλήσεως 'ὅτι καὶ ἐγὼ προσβολάς παρείχεμεν γενναίαν, καὶ [ὅτι] οὐκ ἐγ-
12. ήν bec eidos AN m 17 syr copt Origig Athi.: txt C SDKL rel latt Syr goth Atha, Chr Thdr Thl.
13. for χειρον, πει-νον 67. ἡγοιτα D1: ἡγοιτα D2-3F.
14. rec τίνως (applying it to Paul alone: see ch ii. 2), with CSDKL rel vulg(and F-lat) syr copt goth athChr Thdr DamastHil Aug.: txt ACOHN 17 Ambrst.

κατέλειφην. Chrys.). 12.] Υεα, and (or, and moreover). I have explained this καλ. . . . 5ε on 1 Tim. iii. 10. 'They who will, &c., must make up their minds to this additional circumstance,' viz. (persecution) all who are minded (purpose: see ref.): 'whose will is to,' Elfic.: hardly so strong as 'who determine,' Conyb. Nor can it be said that θλοντες is emphatic, as Hutch. It requires its meaning of 'purpose' to be clearly expressed, not slurred over: but that meaning is not especially prominent) to live piously (ref.) in Christ Jesus (extra Jesum Christum nulla pietas, Beng.: and this peculiar reference of ενθεοια [cf. 1 Tim. ii. 16] should always be borne in mind: in these Epistles) shall be per-sec-u-ted. 13.] But (on the other hand): a reason why persecutions must be expected, and even worse and more bitter as time goes on. The opposition certainly, as seems to me [see also Wicisinger and Ellicott], is to the clause immediately preceding, not, as De W. and Huther maintain, to ver. 10 f. There would thus be no real contrast: whereas on our view, it is forcibly broken that the breach between light and darkness, between ενθεοια and πνευμα, would not be healed, but rather widened, as time went on) evil men (in general,—over the world: particularized, as applying to the matter in hand, by the next words) and seducers (lit. magicians, in allusion probably to the Egyptian magicians mentioned above) Jose contra Apion. ii. 16, has the word in this sense: —τούτοις τις ημών ο ἐνομάζεται, εφ γονε, εφι επατειν. Demosth. p. 374. 20, puts into the mouth of ησχινες, respecting Philip, ἀποστος, γονε, πνευμα. See Wetst., and Suicer in loc., an exam-Ellicott's note here) that they now worse and worse ('advance in the direction of worse': see above, ver. 9. There the dif-fusion of evil was spoken of: here its in-tensity), deceiving and being deceived (πλανώμενοι: is not middle [as Bengel, 'qui se seducuntia dos permittunt'] but pas-sive: rather for contrast's sake, as the middle would be rapid, that for the rea-son given by Huther, that if so, it would stand first, because he that deceives others is first himself deceived: for we might say exactly the same of the passive. Nor is the active participle to be assigned to the γονες and the passive to the πονηροι, as Bengel also: both equally designate both. But his remark is striking and just, 'Qui semel alios decepit crucip, eo minus ipse ab errore se recipit, et o facili-lus alienos erremus mutuo amplitud tur').
14.] But do thou continue in the things which (the object to ἐμαθες, and the remoter object to επισταθαι, must, in the construction, be supplied out of the τινος) thou learnest (= ηκουσας παρ' έμου, ch. ii. 2) and went convinced of (so Homer, Od. φ. 217 f., where Odysseus shows his shrew, ει τά πάντα η τί καλ σημα άρικαθετη, άκλα παντα, έπον, έπον, έπον, έπον, ποιητητης, τί νη έμος, and Soph. Od. Col. 1010, αν δ' ήμιν. Οιδίπους, έκηλος αντιν μιμη, πιστωθεις οτι ημ ημ έαμα ανω ποναθεν, ουγ καλοςποιαι. The Vulg. 'credita sunt tibi,' followed by Luth., Beza, Calv., besides the Roman-Catholic expositors, would require οπηθυ-θην, cf. 1 Cor. ix. 17 al.), knowing (thou dost) from what teachers (viz. his mother Lois and grandmother Eunice, ch. i. 5. cf. ἕνδε βραθων below: not Paul and Barnabas, as Grot., nor the παλαι μάρτυρες of ch. ii. 2. If the singular τίνως, then the Apostle must be meant) thou learnest them, and (knowing that (the Vulg. renders δι quia, and thus breaks off the connexion with ειδαι: and so also Luth., 'und weif' . . . Bengel [adding, 'ατιολογia duplex. Si-milis constr. δια . . . καλ δι, Joh. ii. 16.1-17.495.
15. om 1st τα C'DFN 17 Damasc.; ins AC'D^KL rel Clem. όδες D.
16. cm καί vulg Syr copt Clem (Orig.'s [?]) see note Thodor-nops(in Facund) Tert Ambrst Pelag Cassidy: ins ACDFKLN rel Orig Chr Thdrt Damasc. rec ελεγχων, with DKL rel Orig Chr Thdrt Damasc.: txt ACFN.

24, — ἐπιγνῶς ... καὶ ὅτι, Act. xxii. 29')

... But the other construction is much more natural] from a child (έπι πρώτης ἡμίκες, Chrys. The expression carries the learning back to his extreme infancy: see Ellic. here) thou hast known the (with or without the art., this will be the rendering) holy scriptures (of the O. T. This expression for the Scriptures, not elsewhere found in the N. T. [hardly, as Huther, John vii. 15], is common in Josephus: see Wetst.: cf. also reff. 2 Macc.) which are able (not as Bengel, 'quae potentior,' vis præteriti ex nosti redundat in participium: for οἶδας is necessarily present in significacion: 'thou hast known which were' would be a solecism) to make thee wise (reff. So Hes. Op. 6.147,—οὕτε τὴν ναυτιλή σεσοφισμένης, οὕτε τὴν μνήμην: Diog. Laert. v. 90, in an epigram, ἀλλὰ διεφέσεθι, σεσοφισμένες unto (towards the attainment of) salvation, by means of (the instrument whereby the σοφία is to take place: not to be joined to σωτηριαν, as Thl., Bengel, al.; not so much for lack of the art. τῆς prefixed, as because the τῆς εν χ. Ἰησ. would thus become an unnatural expansion of the merely subordinate πίστεως) faith, namely that which (σωτηρία διὰ πίστεως being almost a technical phrase, it is best to keep πίστεως here abstract, and then to particularize) is in (which rests upon, is reposed in) Christ Jesus. 16.] The immense value to Timotheus of this early instruction is shown by a declaration of the profit of Scripture in furthering the spiritual life. There is considerable doubt about the construction of this clause, πᾶσα ... ὡφέλιμος. Is it to be taken, (1) πᾶσα γραφὴ (subject) θεόπνευστος (predicate) (έστω), καὶ ωφ., i. e. 'every Scripture [see below] ἐστι θεόπνευστος and ὡφέλιμος: or (2) πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος (subject) καὶ ωφ. (έστω) (predicate), i. e. Every γραφὴ θεόπνευστος is also ωφέλιμος? The former is followed by Chrys. [πᾶσα οὖν ἡ τοιαύτη θεόπνευστος, Greg.-Nys. [διὰ τούτου πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος λέγεται], Ath., Est. ['δuo affermantur: omnem scripturam esse divinitus inspiratam, et eadem esse utilitarem, &c.], all, by Calv., Wolf, al.: by Do W., Wiesing, Conby., &c., and the E. V. The latter by Orig. [πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος ὁδὸ ὁφέλιμος ἐστι, in Jesu nave Hom. xx. 3, vol. ii. p. 444: repeated in the Philocal. c. 12, vol. xxv. p. 65, ed. Lomm.], Thdrt. [θεόπνευστον δὲ γραφὴν τὴν πνευματικὴν ὁμοιασέως], al.: by Grot. ['bene expressit sensum Syrus: omnis Scriptura que a Deo inspirata est, etiam utilis,' &c.], Erasm. ['tota Scr. que nobis non humano ingenio &c., magnam habet utilitatem,' &c.], Cramer, Whitby, Hammond, al.: by Rosenm., Heinr., Huther, &c. and the Syr. [above], Vulg. ['omnis Scriptura divinitus inspirata utilis est,' &c.], Luth. ['denn alle Schrift von Gott eingegangen ist' &c., &c., &c.]: in deciding between these two, the following considerations must be weighed: (a) the requirement of the context. The object of the present verse plainlj is to set before Timotheus the value of his early instruction as a motive to his remaining faithful to it. It is then very possible, that the Apostle might wish to exalt the dignity of the Scripture by asserting of it that it was θεόπνευστος, and then out of this lofty predicate might unfold καὶ ὡφέλιμος, &c.—its various uses in the spiritual life. On the other hand it may be urged, that thus the two epithets do not hang naturally together, the first consisting of the one word θεόπνευστος, and the other being expanded into a whole sentence: especially as in order at all to give symmetry to the whole, the θεόπνευστος ἐκ κ.τ.λ. must be understood as the purposed result of the θεοπνευστία as well as the ὡφέλεια of the Scriptures, which is hardly natural: (b) the requirements of the grammatical construction of καὶ, which must on all grounds be retained as genuine.
Can this καί be rendered 'also,' and attached to ἀφέλιμος? There seems no reason to question its legitimacy, thus taken. Such an expression as this, πάς ἀνήρ πλευρικτής, καὶ εἰδωλολατρής, though a harsh sentence, would be a legitimate one. And constructions more or less approximating to this are found in the N. T.: e. g., Luke i. 36, 'Ἐλισαβέτ ἡ συγγενις σου καὶ αὐτή συνελθήσατι: Acts xxvi. 26, πρὸς ὑμὶν καὶ παρθηριασκήνων καλῶ: xxviii. 28, αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀκούονται: Rom. viii. 29, οἴκος προέγρακα καὶ προϊόντων: Gal. iv. 7, εἰ δὲ ὑδα καὶ ἐλπιονόμου. In all these, καί introduces the predicatory clause, calling special attention to the fact enunciated in it. Cf. also such expressions as καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἤττον καὶ ἀθαναστῶν, Plato, Symp. p. 177 b,—σκέψει τάλαν, ὡς καὶ κατογγελῶντα το πάγυμα φαίνεται, Aristoph. Eccel. 125,—ἡ μάλλον καὶ ἐπιτεθέντο, Thuc. iv. 1.

I own on the whole the balance seems to me to incline on the side of (2), unobjectionable as it is in construction, and of the two, better suited to the context. I therefore follow it, hesitatingly, I confess, but feeling that it is not to be lightly overthrown. See on the whole, Ellicott, who takes the same view. Every Scripture (not 'every writing': the word, with or without the art., never occurs in the N. T. except in the sense of 'Scripture,' and we have it, as we might expect in the later apostolic times, ananarthrous in 2 Pet. i. 20, πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς. Where it occurs ananarthrous in the Gospels, it signifies a passage of Scripture, 'a Scripture,' as we say: e. g. John xix. 37. It is true, that πᾶσα γραφή might be numbered with those other apparent solecisms, πᾶσα ὑκοδομή, Eph. ii. 21, πᾶσα ἰεροσόλυμα, Matt. ii. 3, where the subst. being used ananarthrous, πᾶς = πᾶς ὁ: but, in the presence of such phrases as ἥτερα γραφή λέγει [John i. c.], it is safer to keep to the meaning, unobjectionable both grammatically and contextually, 'every Scripture'—i. e. 'every part of [= in the sense, 'all'] Scripture' given by inspiration of God (as γραφή answers to γράμματα above, so θεόπνευστος to λέπα. De W. has well illustrated the word: 'θεόπνευστος 'divinitus inspirata,' Vulg., is an expression and idea connected with πνεῦμα [properly breath], the power of the divine Spirit being conceived of as a breath of life: the word thus amounts to 'inspired,' 'breathed through,' 'full of the Spirit.' It [the idea] is common to Jews, Greeks, and Romans. Jos. contra Apion. i. 7, τῶν προφητῶν τὰ μὲν ἐνωτάτω καὶ τὰ παλαιστάτα κατὰ τήν ενπνευσίν τῆν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μαθητῶν. Eschyl. Suppl. 18; ἐπικοινωνία Διός, and similarly Polyb. x. 2. 12. Plat. republ. vi. 99 b, legg. v. 738 c: Phocyl. 121, τίς δε θεοπνευστοί σώφα λόγους ἄτιμοι προφῆται: Plut. mor. p. 904, τοῦ ἀνεφεύρουσαν θεοπνευστῶν: Cic. pro Arch. 8, 'poetam...quasi divino quodam spiritu art[-]i (a) in[-]biri 'de nat. deor. ii. 66, 'nemo vir magnus sine aequo et aequitatis divino unquam fuit: 'de div. i. 18, 'oraculam instinctor divino affluantque funduntur.' First of all, θεόπνευστος is found as a predicate of persons: ὁ θεόπνευστος άνήρ Wetst. [from Marcus Ephes.] etc., cf. Jos. and Cic. in the two passages above,—2 Pet. i. 21, ὅποι πνευματος ἀγίου φημομένου ἐλάχιστος ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἀδύνατοι: Matt. xxii. 43, Δανεῖβ ἐν πνεύματι καλί αὐτῶν κιρίων: then it was also applied to things, cf. the last passage of Cicero, and Phocyl. Plutarch, above." On the meaning of the word as applied to the Scriptures, see Prolegg. to Vol. I. 'On the inspiration of the Gospels,' and compare Ellicott's note here. As applied to the prophets, it would not materially differ, except that we ever regard one speaking prophecy, strictly so called, as more immediately and thoroughly the mouthpiece of the Holy Spirit, seeing that the future is wholly hidden from men, and God does not in this case use or inspire human testimony to facts, but suggests the whole substance of what is said, direct from Himself) is also (besides its other quality of inspiration: on the construction, see above) profitable for (towards) teaching (αὐτὸς αὐτοματός ἐκεῖνος μαθηματικός, Thdt. This, the teaching of the person reading the Scriptures, not the making him a teacher, as Estius characteristically, is evidently the meaning. It is not Timotheus' ability as a teacher, but his stability as a Christian, which is here in question), for conviction (ἐλέγχη ἵνα ἤμοι τῶν παρόμοιων βλεψιν, Thdt. The above remark applies here also), for correction (παρακαλεῖ γὰρ καὶ τοὺς παρατρέπεται ἐπιμελεῖ τίς εἰς τήν εὐθείαν ὁδὸν, Thdt. So Philo, Quod Deus immut. 37,
17. for ἀρτιος, τελοιος D1. εξηρτιμενος F: εξηρτημ. Κε ν ο.

CIIAP. IV. 1. rec aft διαμαρτυρομαι ins ovm εγω, with D3K rel: om ACD'FLR 17. 62 η ποιν οντα εισπορευθειν: similarly Polyc. p. 50, 26 al. freq. in Raphel: so Epictetus, ib.). for discipline (ref. Eph. and note) in (if the construction is filled out, the παθείαν is abstract, and the τὴν ἐν particularizes; discipline, viz. that which . . . righteous- ness (which is versed in, as its element and condition, righteousness, and so disciplines a man to be holy, just, and true): that (result of the profitableness of Scripture: reasons why God has, having Himself inspired it, endowed it with this profitableness) the man of God (ref. 1 Tim. and note) may be perfect (ready at every point: ‘aptus in officio,’ Beng.), thoroughly made ready (see note on ref. Acts. It is blamed by the etymologists as an ἀδόκιμον. Jos. Antt. iii. 2. 2, has πολεμεύνον πρὸς ἀνθρώ- πους τοῖς πάσι καλῶς εξηρτισμένους) to every good work (rather to be generally understood than officially: the man of God is not only a teacher, but any spiritual man: and the whole of the present passage regards the universal spiritual life. In ch. iv. 1 if. he returns to the official duties of Timotheus: but here he is on that which is the common basis of all duty). Ch. IV. 1—8.] Earnest exhortation to Timotheus to fulfill his office; in the near prospect of defection from the truth, and of the Apostle’s own departure from life. I adjure thee (ref.) before God, and Christ Jesus, who is about to judge living and dead (λέγει τοὺς ἤδη ἀπελευθηκαί καὶ τοὺς τότε καταλειφθησι- μούς ἡττάτα, Thl.: so also Thdrt., and Chrys., alt. 2: not as Chrys., alt. 1, ἀμαρ-
tions),' as Bretsch. and so Huther. But there seems no need to confine the sense so narrowly. The quotations in De W. himself justify the meaning of 'press on, 'be urgent,' generally: not perhaps in preaching only, but in the whole work of the ministry. Cf. Demosth. p. 1187. 6, ἐπείδῃ . . . ἐφεστικεῖν ἥντι Αλληλο-
πιετότας . . . . . . ὧν ἡ διηθεῖσα μᾶς κατηγοροῦντες αὐτὸν, —
presseed upon him,' urgenbant eum: id. p. 70. 16, διὰ ταῦτ᾽ ὑγρωφεῖν ἐφεστικεῖν, . . . . . . ἐν season, of seasone (μη καί-
rὸν ἔχε ἀρσιμένων, δεῖ σοι καρός ἄστω μή ἐν εἰρήνῃ, μή ἐν ἀδέλῃ, μηδὲ ἐν ἐκκλη-
sίᾳ καθόμενος μόνον καὶ ἐν τοῖς κινώ-
νοις, καὶ ἐν διημαρτυρίᾳ βς, καὶ ἀξίων πεπρωμένων, καὶ μέλλῃ ἐξείναι εἰπάθα
νοικ, καὶ παρ᾽ αὐτῶν τῶν καρπῶν ἔλεγξιν, μὴ ὑποστάλη ἐπιτιμήσα τὸ γὰρ καὶ ἡ ἐπίτιμας ἔχει καρύ, ὅταν τὸ δέ ἐλεγχος προκρίθη, καὶ ἄποδεπίοσι τὸ ἐργον, Chrys. I cannot forbear also transcribing a very beautiful passage cited by Suicer i. 146 from the same father, Hom. xxxx. vol. v. p. 221: ἂν δ᾽ ἀρα τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπιμενο 
προς καὶ μετὰ τὴν παρακήναν, ὀδὸν ὑποτε ἡμεῖς ἀποστημόεια τῆς πρὸς αὐτοὺς συμβουλῆς, καὶ γάρ καὶ κρίνει, καὶ μῆδες δῷρευται, ἰδέους καὶ οἱ πατοιμοί, καὶ μῆδες πίνη, τρέχουσι. δει τοῖνοι καὶ τὸν λέγοντα, καὶ μῆδες προέχει, τά πάρ ἐαυτοῦ πάντα πληροῦν καὶ γὰρ νόμος ἡμῖν, τὸν τῆς τὸν λόγον διακονοῦν ἐγκεχειρεῖσθαι, παρὰ τοῦ φιλελήσων κεῖται θεό, μάθετον τὰ πάρ ἐαυτοῦ ἐλλημπᾶνε, μήδε στήγ., καὶ ἀχούς τις, καὶ παρατέκχι. This latter passage gives the more correct reference,—not so much to his opportunities, as the former, but to theirs [as Ellic. quotes from Aug. on Ps. cxxviii., vol. iv. p. 1689, 'sonet verbum Dei vo-
lentibus opportune, obdolentibus impor-
tune']. Bengel, from Priceus, gives examples of similar expressions: "Nicetas Choniates, παὐδαγγέλως ἐμβρίστη ἐκκοσά, εἰ-
καίρως ἀκαίρως ἐπέηπτν. Julian: ἐπι-
ρεβέτο ἐπὶ τῶν φῶν ὁδίας ἀκάλαυτος
κεκλήμενος. Virgilii: 'digna indigant
paθι, 'Tercentii: 'cum milito into presens
absens ut sies.' So funda nefandu, plus
minus, notens volens, &c., convict, re-
buke (refl.), exhort, in (not 'with:' it is 
not the accomplishment of the actions, 
but the element, the temper in which 
they are to be performed) all (possible)
long-suffering and teaching (not sub-
jective, 'perseverance in teaching,' as Co-
yrb.; but 'teaching' itself: it [objective]
is to be the element in which these acts 
take place, as well as makroθυμία [sub-
jective]. The junction is harsh, but not 
therefore to be avoided. Of course, hen-
diadys [= ἐν πάνῃ μακροθυμίᾳ διδαχῇ, 
Grot. Rosemm.] is out of the question. 
On διδαχὴ and διδασκαλία, see Ellicot's 
note). 3. 4.] Reason why all these 
will be wanted. For there shall be a 
time when they (men, i. e. professing 
Christians, as the context shows) will not 
endure (not bear—as being offensive to 
them: ref.) the healthy doctrine (refl. : 
viz. of the Gospel), but according to (after 
the course of) their own desires (instead 
of, in subjectication to God's providence) 
will to themselves (emphatic) heap up (one 
upon another) τὸ διδασκότων πλῆθος 
ἐξῆλθε, Chrys. There is no meaning of 
'heap upon themselves,' to their own 
cost," as Luther, 'werben se ihm selbst 
fügiger auftaten,' so Heydenr. also 
teachers, having itching ears (γησοφνέτι 
tι ἀκοῦσαι κακ' ἤδονην, Hesych. 'ser-
mones quarrant vitia sua stilillantes,' Grot. 
This in fact amounts to the same as 
Chrys.'s, τῇ ἢδονῇ χάριν λέγονταs
5. om. κακοπάθησθων Ν'. aft κακοπάθησθων ins os καλὸς στρατηγὸς χρ. ἤπει τ. Λ.
6. ἐν ὑμῖν ἀναλ., ἀναλ. μον ACGR m 17 cοpt arm Eus Ath Ephr Pallad Cypr.;
txt DKL rel am(with demid F-lat) syrr Chr Thidr Euthal-mss Damasc, Th' Ec Cypr.

καὶ τέρτων τὴν ἀκοὴν ἐπιέγετοντες, though De W. draws a distinction between them. Plut. de superst. p. 167 b [Wets.], μοναχὴν φησὶν ὁ Πλάτων . . . ἀνθρώποις οὐ τρυφῆς ἐνεκα καὶ κηθεός ὄτις δοκήν: see more examples in Wets.], and shall avert their ears from the truth, and be turned aside (ref. and note) to fables (the art. seems to imply that they would be at least like the fables already believed: see 1 Tim. i. 4, and cf. Ellic. here). 5 ff.] He enforces on Timotheus the duty of worthily fulfilling his office, in consideration of his own approaching end. For this being introduced, various reasons have been given:—
(1) he himself would be no longer able to make head against these adverse influences, and therefore must leave Timotheus and others to succeed him: so Heydenr., Huther, al.: (2) "ego quamdiu vivi max. num tibi porrecti: tibi meae assidue exhortationes non defuerunt, tibi mea consilia fuerunt magni adjunctum, et exemplum ctiam magnae confirmationi: jam tempus est ut tibi ipsi magister sit atque hortator, natareae incipias sine cortice: cave ne quid morte mea in te mutatum animadversione," Calv.: similarly Grot.: (3) "causa quae Timotheum movat ad officium: Pauli dispensat et beatitudin: finis coronat opus." Beng., and so Chrys., Hom. in loc., in a very beautiful passage, too long for transcription: (4) to stir up Timotheus to imitation of him: so Pol., Ambdr., Heinr., al. [in De W.]. There seems no reason why any one of these should be chosen to the exclusion of the rest: we may well, with Flatt, combine (1) and (4), at the same time bearing (2) and (3) in mind:—"I am no longer here to withstand these things: be thou a worthy successor of me, no longer depending on, but carrying out for thyself my directions: follow my steps, inherit their result, and the honour of their end." 5.] But (as contrasted with the description preceding) do thou (emphatic) be sober (it is difficult to give the full meaning of νήφη in a version. The reference is especially to the clearness and wakefulness of attention and observance which attends on sobriety, as distinguished from the lack of these qualities in intoxication. ' Keep thy coolness and presence of mind, that thou be not entraped into forgetfulness, but discern and use every opportunity of speaking and acting for the truth,' Mack: cf. also Ellic.) in all things, suffer hardship (ref.); do the work of an Evangelist (ref.: here probably in a wider sense, including all that belongs to a preacher and teacher of the Gospel), fill up the measure of (fill up, in every point; leaving nothing undone in. Beza's rendering, 'ministeriī tui plement fidem facito, i.e. veris argumentis comproba te germanum esse Dei ministrum,—so Calv. 'ministerium tuum probatum rede,'—is justified by usage (ref.), but hardly in accordance with ver. 17: see there) thy ministry. 6.] For the connexion, see above. For I am already being offered (as a drink-offering: i.e. the process is begun, which shall shed my blood. ' Ready to be offered' [E. V., Corbyh., so also Matthies, Est., al.] misses the force of the present. Grot. would render it ' jam num aspergor vino, id est, preparar ad mortem: but such a meaning for σπένδωμαι does not seem to be justified: see ref. Phil. That σπένδωμαι is there followed by ἐπι τῇ θεσίᾳ κ.τ.λ., and here stands absolutely, is surely no reason why this usage should not be as significant and as correct as that; against De W.), and the time of my departure (ἀράξαντος [ref.] is merely this, and not dissolatius, as Vulg., Matthies,—nor as Elsner [so also Wolf] imagines, is there any allusion to guests
breaking up [ἀναλύομεν] from a banquet and making libations [σπένδομεν] in a public place:

But against this we have only to oppose that most sound and useful rule, that an allusion of this kind must never be imagined unless where necessitated by the context; and certainly here there is no trace of the idea of a banquet having been in the mind of the Apostle, various as are the images introduced is at hand (not, is present, 'if varietatibus', Luth. : which would be ἐνόπτης, see 2 Thess. ii. 2 note).

7. I have striven the good strife (it is hardly correct to confine ἄγων to the sense of 'right.' : that it may be, but its reference is much wider, to any contest, see note on ref. 1 Tim. : and here probably to that which is specified in the next clause : see especially Heb. xii. 1). I have finished my race (see ref. : the image belongs peculiarly to St. Paul. In Phil. iii. 12 ff. he follows it out in detail. See also 1 Cor. ix. 24 ff.: Heb. xii. 1, 2. Wets. quotes Virg. Aen. iv. 653, "Vixi, et quae mea laborem vindicar""). I have kept the faith (not, as Heydenr., "my right to observe the laws of the race? : but as Bengel rightly observes, "res bis per metophoram expressa nume tertioc loco exprimitur proprium." The constant use of ἡ πίστις in these Epistles in the objective technical sense, must rule the expression here. This same consideration will preclude the meaning 'have kept my faith," 'my fidelity," as Raphel, Kyjke, al.).

8.] henceforth (perhaps this adverb expresses οὖν better than any other. It appears to be used in later Greek, from Polybius downwards, in this VOL. III. sense of 'proinde,' 'itaque,' cf. Polyb. ii. 68. 9; iv. 32. 5; x. 45. 2) there is laid up (reft.) for me the (not 'α:', as E. V.) crown (reft., and cf. Phil. iii. 14) of righteousness (i. e. the bestowal of which is conditional on the substantiation and recognition of righteousness—q. d. "a crown among the righteous") ὑποτεθεμένου λέγει, Thdrt.: and so De W. after Chrys., δικαιοσύνης ἑπτάνυμον πάλιν τὴν καθάλον φήμαν ἀρέτην. This is better than with Huther, al., to take the gen. as one oppositions, as in James i. 12, ὅ στ. τίς ὡς: and 1 Pet. v. 4, ὅ τίς δὲ ἐστι στ.: both these, ὡς and ἐστι, may well constitute the crown, but it is not easy to say how δικαιοσύνη can. Thdrt.'s alternative, τῶν δικαίων ἡγίσκω ἄριστον[5] so Heydenr., Matth., al.], is equally objectionable. There is, as Calv. has shown, no sort of inconsistency here with the doctrines of grace: "neque enim gratia justificatio: quo nobis per fidem confertur, cum operum remunerationis pugnat quin nullius rite conveniunt ista duo, gratis justificari hominem Christi beneficio, et tamen operum mercedem coram Deo relatumur. Nam simulatque nos in gratiam recipit Deus, opera quoeque nostra grata habet, ut praemio quoque [licet indebito] dignetur." See further on this point Estius's note, and Conc. Trinit. Canones, Sess. vi. c. 16, where the remarkable expression is noted from the Epist. of Pope Celestines I. 12, "Dei tanta est erga omnes hominum bonitas, ut eorum velit esse merita, quae sunt ipsius doma"); which the Lord (Christ: cf. εἰςφά: ariot below) shall award (more than 'give,' see ref., and Matt. vi. 4, 6, &c., xvi. 27, the idea of requital should be expressed. Compare however Ellicott's note) me in that day (reft.), the righteous (subj., 'just,' but the word 'righteous' should be kept as answering to 'righteousness' above) judge (see Acts x. 42. In D D
this assertion of just judgment, there is nothing, as De W. imagines, to countervert the doctrines of grace: see above); — and (but) **not only to me** (better than ‘not to me only,’ E. V., &c. [οὐδὲ ἐμοὶ μόνῳ], which though true, does not correctly represent the sense), but also to all who have loved (who shall then be found to have loved and still to be loving, see Winer, edn. 6, § 40. 4 a: loved, i. e. [refl.] looked forward with earnest joy) **His appearing** (ver. 1).

9—22.] Request to come to Rome. **Notices of his own state and that of others:** greetings.

9 ff.] Do thine endeavour (so also Tit. iii. 12) to come to me quickly (this desire that Timotheus should come to him, appears in ch. i. 4, 8: its reason is now specified): for (I am almost alone) **Demas** (mentioned Col. iv. 14 with Luke, as saluting the Colossians, and Philm. 24, also with Luke [and others], as one of the Apostle’s **servi**), deserted me, loving **(ἀγαπήσας** [used perhaps in contrast to ver. 8 above] is contemporary with ἐγκατελειπὼν — through love of?) so Eille, also, who has hardly represented me rightly, when he quotes me as holding the temporal sense of the participle) **this present world** (τῆς ἀνίστασες ἔρασθει, τοῦ ἀκιν- δοῦν καὶ τοῦ ἀσφαλοῦ, μᾶλλον ἢτο {oil} τρφφυ, ἢ ἡμ ἐμοὶ τελεπωιεθείαι καὶ συνδικαφέειν μοι τού παράσης κυ- δίους, Chrys.), and **went to Thessalonica** (‘his birthplace,’ says De W.: cf. ὦτοι, Chrys., above: but how ascertained? He may have gone there for the sake of traffic, which idea the ἄγαπήσας τον τῶν αἰώνα would seem to support), **Crescens** (not named elsewhere. He is said traditionally to have preached the Gospel in Galatia **[Constat. apost. vii. 46, p. 1056]**, and, more recently [in Sophronimus], to have founded the church at Vienne in Gaul: this latter interpretation of Galatian [τάς Γαλατίας αὐτῶς ἐκάλεσεν, see var. readd.] Thdrt. also adopts. All this traditional fabric is probably raised by conjecture on this passage. Winer, R.W.B.) to **Galatia** (see Prolegg. to Gal. § ii. 1, Titus [Prolegg. to Titus, § i.] to **Dalmatia** [part of the Roman province of Illyricum [Suet. Aug. 21. Tib. 9], on the coast of the Adriatic [Plin. iii. 22. Strabo, vii. p. 315], south of Líburnia [Plin. iii. 26], Winer, R.W.B. See the art. Dalmatia in Dr. Smith’s Dict. of Geography. Thdrt. says, referring to ἄγαπήσας τον τῶν αἰώνα, ὦτοι [Crescens and Titus] τῆς κατηγορίας ἐκείνης ἐλεύθε- ροι, ὅτ’ αὐτὸ γὰρ ἀπεστάλησαν τοῦ κη- ρίγματος ἑνεκα. But this hardly agrees with ἀπορεύθη, which must be understood with both names: see also the contrast in ver. 12. They had certainly left the Apos- tle of their own accord: why, does not appear): **Luke** (see Prolegg. to Luke’s Gospel, § i.) is **alone with me** (De W.’s question, ‘where then was Aristarchus [Acts xxvii. 2. Col. iv. 10. Philm. 24]?’ is one which we have no means of answering: but we may venture this remark: a forger, such as De W. supposes the writer of this Epistle to be, would have taken good care to account for him). **Mark** (Col. iv. 10, note: Philm. 24. John Mark, Acts xv. 38) **take up** (on thy way: so ἀναλαμβάνειn implies in the two first refl, and probably also here) and **bring with thee:** for he is to me useful for the **ministry** (for help to me in my apostolic labours: not, as Cownh., ‘his services are profitable to me,’ adding in a note below, ‘διακοινοῖς, not, ‘the ministry,’ as E. V.” — no such conclusion can be drawn from the omission of the art. after a preposi-
tion, and least of all in these Epistles. Cf. *θέμενος εἰς διακοινίαν*, ref. 1 Tim.—Grot. suggests, ‘forte ob Latini sermonis consuetudinem’; but (apparently a slight contrast is intended to those above, who ἐπροεδρύσαν of their own accord) Tychicus (see Eph. vi. 21 note) I sent to Ephesus (on the various attempts to give an account of this journey, and its bearing on the question, whether Timothicus was at Ephesus at this time, see Prolegg. to this Epistle, § 1. 15.) 13. The cloak (φελόνης is said to be a corrupted form of φαινόλης, lat. *paulula*, a thick outer cloak; but as early as Chrys., there has been a doubt whether this is the meaning here. He says, φελόνην ἑνταῦθα τὸ μάτιον λέγει, τινὲς δὲ φασὶ τὸ γλωσσόκομον [bag or case, John xiii. 29] ἔθα τὰ βιβλία ἔκειστο: and so Syr. and all.: but it is against this idea, as indeed Bengel remarks, that the books should be afterwards mentioned. It would be unnatural, in case a bag of books had been left behind, to ask a friend to bring the bag, also the books, and especially the parchments: ‘the bag of books and parchments which I left.’ would be its most obvious designation. A long discussion of the meanings of φελόνης, and of the question whether it is rightly supposed to be a corruption from φαινόλης, may be found in Wolf ad loc.: see also Eilic. The Jews also had the word περίς for a cloak) which I left (behind me: οἱ δὲ ἀνθρείναις ἀπολειφθέντες, Xen. Mem. iv. 1. 32: for what reason, is not clear: but in St. Paul’s life of peril, it may well be conceived that he may have been obliged to leave such things behind, against his intention) in Tross (respecting his having been at Tross lately, see Prolegg. to Past. Epp. § ii. 16, 30, 31) with (‘chez’) Karpus when thou art coming (setting out to come) bring, and the books (i.e. papyrus rolls: on these, and on μεμβράνας, see Dict. of Antiquities, art. Liber. τι δὲ αὐτῷ βίβλου λιῶν ἐδείκτην ἀποδιμέων πρὸς τὸν θεόν; καὶ μάλιστα ἐδείκτην, ὡστε αὐτῷ τοὺς παραθέσεις, καὶ ἀντὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ διδασκαλίας ἔχειν αὐτὰ. Chrys. This may have been so: but there is nothing inconsistent with his near prospect of death, in a desire to have his cloak and books during the approaching winter, especially the parchments (which as more costly, probably contained the more valuable writings: perhaps the sacred books themselves. On a possible allusion to these books, &c., which the Apostle had with him in his imprisonment at Caesarea, see note, Acts xxvi. 24). 14. Alexander the smith (Eustathius, on Hom. Od. γ. p. 139 [Wetst.], says, χαλκεὺς δὲ ὁ πρὸ βραχεῶς χρυσάρχως, κατὰ ὦνομα γενειῶν ἀπὸ πρώτων φανείτων μετάλλων. διὸ καὶ ὁ Ἡρασίωτος χαλκεύς ἠλέγετο, καὶ χαλκεύων τὸ οἰκονόμος ἐκάλεσεν τῶν χρυσάρχων. Similarly the Etymol. [ib.].—αὐτὸ γὰρ τοῦ πρώτου φανείτων μετάλλων πάντας τῶν δημιουργῶν ἐκάλεσεν οὐτάς οἱ παλαιοὶ. See ref. Gen., and 2 Chron. xxiv. 12. Perhaps the same with the Alexander of 1 Tim. i. 20, where see note. There is nothing here said, inconsistent with his being an Ephesian resident. It has been indeed supposed that he was at Rome, and that the following caution refers to Timothicus’s approaching visit: but the aor. ἐνεδέξατο seems to suit better the other hypothesis. It must ever remain uncertain, whether the Alexander whom we find put forward by the Jews in the Ephesian tumult, Acts xix. 33, 34, is the same person: nothing in that narrative is against it. The title ὁ χαλκεύς may be intended to mark another Alexander: but it may also be a mere cursory designation of the same person) did to me much evil (such, as in E. V., is the nearest representation in our language of the phrase κακὰ ἐνεδέξαθαι. Cf. Gen. I. 15, μοι ποτὲ ἐνυσικακά τῷ ἱματίῳ ἵππω καὶ ἀνταπόδομα ἀνταποδόμῳ ἵματιν
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παντα τα κακα & ενεδειξαθ τα εις αυτον — and ver. 17, δρες αυτοις . . . . δτι πανηθ ανεδειξαθα. In both these places ενεδειξαθα represents the Hebrew verb יָצָא, 'ascert.' similarly in the Song of the Three Children, ver. 19, έντραπησαν παντες οι ενεδειξµνοι τοις δουλοις σου κακα: and 2 Macc. xiii. 9, τοις δε φρονηµασις δο βασιλεου βεβαρθαρµενον ήρχετο, τα χειριστα των ένα του πατριν, αυτον γεγονοντο ενεδειξµνον τοις Ιουδαιοις. This usage is easily explained. From the primary sense of the middle verb 'to manifest,' applied to a subjective quality [refr. Tit., Heb., and ευνους, Aristoph. Plut. 755,—γνωσθη, Herod. viii. 141: al. in Lxx.], we have idiomatically the same sense applied to objective facts in Helenistic Greek: Pahn and Rost give from Plutarch, ενεδειξαθαι φιλανθρωπιας, a phrase intermediate between the two usages. Then in rendering ενεδειξαθαι τιναι κακα, it is for us to enquire, whether we shall be best expressing the mind of the original by changing the subjective ενεδειξαθαι into an objective verb, or by changing the objective subjunct. κακα into a subjective quality [κακαι]—and the answer to this is clear. The κακα were facts which we must not disguise. The ενεδειξαθαι, not the κακα, is used in an improper and secondary meaning; and therefore in rendering the phrase in a language which admits of no such idiom, it is the verb which must be made objective to suit the substantive, not vice versa. Conyb.'s rendering, 'charged me with much evil,' as also his alternative, 'manifested many evil things (?) against me,' would, it seems to me, require the active verb: the Lord shall require him according to his works (the optative of the rec. makes no real difficulty: it is not personal revenge, but zeal for the cause of the Gospel which the wish would express, cf. ver. 16 below, where his own personal feelings were concerned): whom do thou also beware of (see above, on Alexander); for he exceedingly withstood our (better than, 'my,' seeing that μου occurs in the same sentence, and immediately follows. The plural may be used because the αγορι such were as were common to all Christians — arguments for, or declarations of, our common faith) words. 16.] In my first defence (open self-defence, before a court of justice, see ref). For a discussion of this whole matter, see the Proleg. and Ellie's note. I will only remark here, that any other defence than one made at Rome, in the latter years of the Apostle's life, is out of the question. no one came forward with me ("verbum sumparagwnèthai indicat patronos et amicos, qui alios, ad causam dicendam vocantes, nunc praesentia sun, nunc etiam oratione [not in the time of Cicero, who clearly distinguishes, De Orat. ii. 74, between the orator or patronus, and the advocati: speaking of the former he says, 'orat reus, urgent advocatus ut inveheamur, ut maledicamus, &c.' But in Tacit. Annal. xi. 6, the orators are called advocati) adjuvare solabunt. Id Cicero, cap. 29, pro Sulla, adesse supplici, et cap. 40, pro Milone, simpliciter adesse dicit. Graeci dierunt nunc paragwneòthai, nunc paréwai, nunc simparétai." Wolf. So Demosth., κατα Νεαπς, 1369. 17, sumparagwneomon autè dikamomènon), but all men deserted me: may it not be laid to their charge (by God: refl. την παρακατα περι αυτων ειδικς εισπλαχνων, ου κακοπέθειαν ινα, άλλα δειλία η ὑποσχέσις, Thdrt.): but the Lord (Jesus) stood by me, and strengthened ("put strength in:" a word especially used of and by our Apostle, refl.) me, that by my means the proclamation (of the Gospel) might be delivered in full measure (see on ver. 5) and all the Gentiles might hear (one is tempted, with Thdrt., al., to interpret this of his preservation for further missionary journeys [Thdrt. thinks this defence happened during his journey to Spain]: but the spirit of the whole context seems to forbid this, and to compel us to confine this παραφορα to the effect of the single
15—18. ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΝ Β.

παρέστη καὶ ἐνεδυνάμωσεν με, ἵνα δι’ ἐμοῦ τὸ κήρυγμά ὑπεροφορηθῇ καὶ ἀκούσωσιν πάντα τὰ ἐθνην καὶ ἦν ἐν σὸν ἄγγελον ὑπεροφορηθῇ καὶ ἀκούσωσιν πάντα τὰ ἐθνην καὶ ἦν ἐν σὸν ἄγγελον. 18 ἥ οὔστιν με ὁ κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἐργαὶς, καὶ σώσει εἰς τὴν βασι-
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hardly necessary to observe, that πονηρω here cannot be gen. masc., 'of the evil one,'—as Pelagius and Mosheim, in De W., and shall preserve me safe (σωτει) in its not uncommon, pregnant sense of 'bring safe:' cf. σωτει των, II. ε. 224; εις οικους, Soph. Philoct. 311; εις την Ελλαδα, Αν. An. vi. 4. 8: 6. 23, al. freq.) unto his kingdom in heaven (though it may be conceded to De W. that this expression is not otherwise found in St. Paul, it is one to which his existing expressions easily lead on: e. g. Phil. i. 23, compared with iii. 20): to whom be the glory unto the ages of ages. Amen (it is again objected, that in St. Paul we never find doxologies ascribing glory to Christ, but always to God. This however is not strictly true: cf. Rom. ix. 5. And even if it were, the whole train of thought here leading naturally on to the ascription of such doxology, why should it not occur for the first and only time? It would seem to be an axiom with some critics, that a writer can never use an expression once only. If the expression be entirely out of keeping with his usual thoughts and diction, this may be a sound inference: but this is certainly not the case in the present instance. Besides, the petition of the Lord's Prayer having been transferred to our Lord as its fulfiller

[cf. John xiv. 13, 14], the doxology, which seems to have come into liturgical use almost as soon as the prayer itself [see Matt. vi. 13 var. read.], would naturally suggest a corresponding doxology here.

19—21.] Salutations and notices. Salute Prisca and Aquila (see notes, Acts xviii. 2: Rom. xvi. 3) and the house of Onesiphorus (himself probably deceased. See on ch. i. 16). Erastus (Acts xix. 22), an Erastus was sent forward into Macedonia by the Apostle from Ephesus,—and Rom. xvi. 23, an Erastus sends greeting, who is described as the οικουμενος της πολεως [Corinth]. This latter would seem to be the person here mentioned) abode in Corinth (on the inferences to be drawn from this, see Prolegg. to Past. Epp. § ii. 30 f.), but Trophimus (he accompanied the Apostle from Greece into Asia, Acts xx. 4. He was an Ephesian, id. xxi. 29, and was with the Apostle in Jerusalem on his last visit there) I left (not 'they [the Asian brethren who came to Rome] left,' as Hug) in Miletus (see again this discussed in Prolegg. to this Epistle, § i. 5. Various conjectures have been made to escape the difficulty here presented: en Μιλετον [Baromins, Beza, Grot., Est., &c.]—a Miletus in Crete [Michaelis, Schrader]) sick. Endeavour
to come before winter (when the voyage would be impossible, and so the visit thrown over to another year. See also on ver. 13). Eubulus (otherwise unknown) greets thee, and Pudens (see excursus at the end of the Prolegg. to this Epistle on Pudens and Claudia), and Linus (Iren. iii. 3. 3, p. 176, oι ἀπόστολοι . . . Λίνος τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς [at Rome] λειτουργιαν ἐνεχείρισαν. τούτου τοῦ Λίνου Παύλου ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Τιμόθεου ἐπιστολαῖς μέμνηται. So also Euseb. H. E. iii. 4), and Claudia (see excursus as before), and all the brethren.

22.] Concluding blessing. The Lord [Jesus Christ] be with thy spirit (reft.): (the) grace (of God) be with you (the members of the church where Timotheus was: see Prolegg.).
ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΤΟΝ.

I. 1 Παύλος a δούλος a θεοῦ, αὐτοῦ, ἀπόστολος ἐκ Ἰησοῦ Ἰδου ἡ πρ. t. t. επιστολῆς τοῦ αγίου απ. π. ε. τ. t. t. I: txt AN k 1 m n o 17, and presg ἀρχέται DF.

2. for επ' (εφ' D1), ev FII: om c m 17.

CHAP. I.—4.] ADDRESS AND GREETING.
1. The occurrence of δούλος ἡμῶν, not elsewhere found in the superscriptions of St. Paul's Epistles, is a mark of genuineness: a forger would have been sure to suit every expression of this kind to the well-known habits of the Apostle. ἀπ. 84 ἀπ. further defines—a servant of God,—this is general—but a more particular designation also belongs to the present matter: κατὰ πίστιν has been variously rendered: (1) 'according to the faith of,' &c., so E. V., Luth., Matthis, al.; (2) similarly Calv., Beza, Aret., 'mutus est intemerus apostolatum et fidei ecclerosum Dei consensus': (3) 'so as to bring about faith in,' &c.,—as De W., justifying it by κατὰ τὴν ἀθήναν ἐκπλάσαντες, Herod. ii. 152. κατὰ δὲν ἤκειν, Thuc. vi. 31,—so also Thdr. [ἐπὶ πιστεύσαι τὴν ἐκλογήν ἄτόλωσ, (Ec. 2. Thl. 1. Jer., Grot., al., but see below). We may at once say that (1) and (2) are inadmissible, as setting up a standard which the Apostle would not have acknowledged for his Apostleship, and as not suitting ἐπίγνωσιν below, which also belongs to the κατὰ. Nor do the instances given to justify (3) apply here: for as Huther has observed, in them it is the acquisition of the noun which is spoken of: so that here it would be to get, not to produce faith. The best sense seems to be that which he gives,—that of reference, 'with regard to,' i. e. to bring about, cherish, and perfect; nearly in the same sense as εἰς ὑπάκοι πίστεως, Rom. i. 5. See also 2 Tim. i. 1. I would render then 'for' Paul, a servant of God, but an Apostle of Jesus Christ, for (on this sense of κατὰ, destination, see Ellic.'s note) the faith of the elect of God (those whom God has chosen of the world—refl.: and their faith is the only true faith—the only faith which the apostolic office would subserve) and the thorough knowledge (refl. and notes: subjective, and κατὰ as before —to promote the knowledge. Thl. gives as an alternative,—διοτὶ ἐπίγνωσιν τὴν ἀληθιναίαν, δια τοῦτο ἐπιστευθήναι κ.τ.λ.) of the truth—which is according to (belongs to, —is conversant in and coincident with: for as Chrys., ἐστιν ἀληθεία πραγμάτων ἀλλ' οὗ κατ' ἐστίν, on τὸ εἰδεναι τὰ γεωργικά, τὸ εἰδεναι τέχνας, ἀληθῶς ἐστιν
I. 1—4. ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΤΟΝ.

εἰδέναι ἀλλ' αὕτη κατ' εὐσέβειαν ἢ ἀληθεία.
κατά cannot, as De W., import the aιν', which leads to εὐσ. It does not lead to it, but rather runs parallel with piety.

2. in hope (on condition of, in a state of, see note on επί, Rom. v. 12) of life eternal (to what are the words εἰς ἀμέτρητα κ. α. to be referred? Not back to ἀπόστολος, regarding them as a co-ordinate clause with κατά πίστιν κ. α. [not for the reason assigned by Huther, that thus καὶ would be required, cf. the similar sentence, Rom. xvi. 25, 26,—but because such a personal reference would not agree with ver. 3 below, where his preaching, not his prospects, is in question]—not to κατά πίστιν καὶ εἰπτ. τ. ἀλ. as subordinate to it—nor to εὐσέβειαν, nor to any one portion of the preceding sentence: for by such reference we develop an inferior member of the former sentence into what evidently is an expansion of the main current of thought, and thus give rise to a disproportion:—but to the whole, from κατά πίστιν to εὐσέβεια, as subordinate to that whole, and further conditioning or defining it: q. d., that the elect of God may believe and thoroughly know the truth which is according to piety, in hope of eternal life, which (eternal life: not ἀληθεία, nor ἐλπίς) God who cannot lie (so ἀληθεία ἀφθονεῖ, Herod. i. 49; Eur. Orest. 364, ἀψιφόεις θεός, ὅ ἐστιν ἄκαθος εἰπέν ἐρωμάτως παραστάσεις: see Wetst. and cf. Hch. vi. 18) promised from eternal ages (the very distinct use of πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων in 2 Tim. i. 9, where the meaning 'from ancient times' is precluded, should have kept Commentators from endeavouring to fix that sense on the words here. The solution of the difficulty, that no promise was actually made till the race of man existed, must be found by regarding, as in 2 Tim. i. c., the construction as a mixed one,—compounded of the actual promise made in time, and the divine purpose from which that promise sprang, fixed in eternity. Thus, as there God is said to have given us grace in Christ from eternal ages, meaning that the gift took place as the result of a divine purpose fixed from eternity, so here He is said to have promised eternal life from eternal ages, meaning that the promise took place as the result of a purpose fixed from eternity, So Thdrt. τάστα γὰρ ἄνωθεν μὲν καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων ἐδεδοκίτο τῷ τῶν ἀλῶν τεθεὶ δῆλα δὲ πεποίηκεν, ὅτε ἐδοκιμάσει. 3. but (contrast to the eternal and hidden purpose, and to the promise, just mentioned) manifested in its own seasons (not, 'His own seasons' [Ellic. al.], cf. ref. Gal.—the times belonging to it, τοίτους, τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς, Θλ.—fixed by Him for the manifestation) His word (we naturally expect the same object as before, viz. ἄνωθεν αἰώνων: but we have instead, τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ,—not to be taken in application with ἦσσα, as Heinrichs:—i. e., the Gospel, see Rom. xvi. 25) in (as the element or vehicle of its manifestation) the proclamation (see 2 Tim. iv. 17) with which (on the construction, see ref.) I was entrusted according to (in pursuance of, ref.) the command of our Saviour God: 4. to Titus (see Prolegg. § 1.) my true (genuine, see on 1 Tim. i. 2) child according to (in respect of, or agreeably to, in conformity with the appointed spread and spiritually generative power of that faith) the common faith (common to us both and to all the people of God: hardly as Grot. 'Judean, quals Paulus, et Graecis quals Titus,' for there is no hint of such a distinction being brought out in this Epistle): grace and peace from God the Father (see on 1 Tim. i. 2), and Christ Jesus our Saviour (ref.).
5. rec κατελίπον, with D'KLN3 rel: txt ACDⅤ17 Orig Bas-mss (-λειτον ACP160), επιδιωθώς Α: επανορθώσεις D: διειρθώσεις F: txt CD'KLN rel Orig Chr Thldr.

6. ανεγκαθιστος (but η marked and erased) Ν1.

5—9.] Reason stated for Titus being left in Crete—to appoint elders in its cities. Directions what sort of persons to choose for this office. 5.] For this reason I left thee behind (refl.: αύτά, gives the mere fact of leaving behind when Paul left the island;—κατελίπον, would convey the idea of more permanence: cf. Acts xviii. 20; xxiv. 27. This difference may have occasioned the alteration of the reading from ecclesiastical motives, to represent Titus as permanent bishop of Crete) in Crete (on the island, and the whole matter, see Prolegg.) that thou mightest carry forward the correction (already begun by me: ἢπι implying the furtherance, addition of διαφθοράμα). The middle voice, as so often, carries only so far the subjective sense, that whereas the active would state the mere fact of διαφθορά, the middle implies that the subject uses his own agency: facile per se: see Krüger, Griechische Sprachlehre, p. 363, who calls this the dynamic middle. So Polybius, xxx. 5. 13, τά μὲν όντά κατὰ τοὺς Καννιούς ἀπεκλείσατο of those things which are defective ("que ego per temporis brevitate non potui expedire,' Beng.: ὁ γὰρ τῆς εὐσέβειας λόγος παραπόδιον πάσης παρ' αὐτοῦ, ἠλείπτω δὲ οἰκονόμησα τα κατὰ τοὺς πεπιστευκότας, καὶ έστιν σκληρύνσεις διαπεράσθησοι, Theod-Mops. in Huther), and (kai brings out, among the matters to be attended to in the επιδιωθώς, especially that which follows) mightiest appoint city by city (refl.) elders (see 1 Tim. iv. 14: note on Acts xx. 17. Thl. remarks, τοὺς εἰστικόποτος οὖν ἐπιστάσθη φησιν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Τιμοθέου κατὰ πόλεις δὲ φησιν. οὐ γὰρ ἐμπιστεύτω πάνω τῶν νῦν εὐπρεπῶν ἔσται, ἀλλὰ ἐκάστη πόλιν τῶν ίδιων ποιμενὰ ἐχεῖν οὖν γὰρ καὶ οὗ πάγον κοφότερον, καὶ ἡ ἐπιμελεία ἀκριβεστέρα, as I pre-
scribed (refl.) to thee ("εἰσταξάμην refers as well to the fact of appointing elders, as to the manner of their appointment,— which last particular is now expanded in directions respecting the characters of those to be chosen." De W.); 6.] if any man is blameless (see 1 Tim. iii. 10. No intimation is conveyed by the εἰ τις, as Heinr. and Heydenr. suppose, that such persons would be rare in Crete: see besides refl. Matt. xviii. 20; 2 Cor. xi. 20), husband of one wife (see note on 1 Tim. iii. 2), having believing children ("nam qui liberos non potuit ad fidem perducere, quomodo alios perducet?" Beng.: and similarly Chrys., Thl. πιστοί implies that they were not only 'ad fidem perducit,' but 'in fide stabiliti,' who are not under (involved) accusation of profligacy (see Eph. v. 18, note) or insubordinate (respecting the reason of these conditions affecting his household, see 1 Tim. iii. 4. I have treated in the Prolegg. ch. vii. § 1., the argument which Baur and De W. have drawn from these descriptions for dating our Epistles in the second century.") 7.] For it behaves an (τον, as so often [refl.], generic, the, i. e. every: our English idiom requires the indefinite article) overseer (see note, 1 Tim. iii. 2; here most plainly identified with the presbyter spoken of before. So Thlrt.: ἐντεύθεν δήλω, ὡς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους εἰπικότος ὁμόραμον) to be blameless, as God's steward (see 1 Tim. iii. 15, to which that, of a responsible servant and dispenser [1 Pet. iv. 10] in the house of God, the allusion perhaps is, rather than to that of 1 Cor. iv. 1. There is clearly no allusion to the ἔπισκοπος's own household, as Heydenr. supposes. Mack well remarks, we perhaps perhaps more than the word convey, "God's steward;—consequently spiritual superiors are not merely servants and commissioned
agents of the Church. According to the Apostle's teaching, church government does not grow up out of the ground), not self-willed (ἐπίσκοπος ἐκόνων ἄρχων, oikonomos, οἰκονομός, οὐκ ἔφειλεν αὐθάδης εἶναι ἑαυτογονίωμα καὶ ἀυτοφοβία καὶ ἀνέ γυμνός τῶν ἁρμομένων παρατέονς. Ὄρμων ἱκάρια ὑποτάξονον καὶ τῆς ἀπόστολως καὶ ἤνω γνώμης τῶν ἁρμομένων παρατέονς. τυρικηνον ἱκάρια νοτικτε τούτῳ. Θλ. συμπτόμης δ' ἡτάν αὐθαδείας ἀνά μετον τό καί ἀργελίας, ἐστὶ δὲ περὶ τός ἐκτέτοις. ὧ τέρα ἄρα τούτως ἐστὶν οἷς μηθεϊν ἐντυχείν μηδ' ἄνταλλη γεμακ. καὶ ἀναιώναμεν διδώκοντι από τό τρόπον κείσθαι οὐ δέρι αὐθαδείας αὐτοχαίς τίς ἐστὶν, ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτὸς αὐτῷ ἀργελίας, Aristot. Magn. Moral. i. 9: see also Theophr. Char. c. xvi. [ἀρμομενας ἐστιν ἀπήνευουμεν ἐν λόγιον:] Suicer, i. p. 572: and Ellis's note here), not soon provoked (οἱ μὲν οὖν ὁργίλοι ταχείως μὲν ὁργίλοιται καὶ οἷς οὐκ δέ, καὶ έρ' οἷς οὐκ δεί, καὶ μᾶλλον ή' δέ, παρακατεί δέ ταχείως δ' ή κιβύπτιον ἔχουσι, Aristot. Eth. Nic. iv. 5: this meaning, and not Thdrt. 's, ὁργίλοι δέ, τῶν μημακικαν,— must be taken), not a brawler, not a striker (for both these, see 1 Tim. iii. 3, not greedy of gain (1 Tim. iii. 8, note), but hospitable (1 Tim. iii. 2, note, and 3 John 5), a lover of good (cf. the opposite φιλόμονα, 2 Tim. iii. 3. It is hardly likely to mean a lover of good men, coming so immediately after φιλέονθον. Thexon. Explains it, τῶν ἐπισκοπῶν τῶν διακονῶν των μηθεϊνονται. Dionys. Acrop., Ep. viii. 1, p. 597, calls God τῶν ὁμομορφαίον καὶ φιλοκαθαρίας —and Clem. Alex., Paed. iii. 11, p. 291 P., classes together ἄνδρα, σωφρονίαν, φιλοκαθαρίας, self-restrained (see 1 Tim. ii. 9, note. I am not satisfied with this rendering, but adopt it for want of a better: "discreet is perhaps preferable." See Ellis. on 1 Tim. as above), just, holy (see on these, and their distinction, in notes on Eph. iv. 24: 1

\[\text{Thess. ii. 10}, \text{continent} (\text{ὁ πάθος κρατοῦντα, τὸν καὶ γλώττης καὶ χειρός καὶ ἀφθαρσίας ἀκάθαρτος τοῦτο ἢ ἐπικαθαρία, τὸ μηδεὶς ὑποστάθη πάθει, Chrys., and id. Epist. ii. ad Olympicid., vol. iii. p. 560 (Migne), ἐγκαθαρίαται ἐκείνων φανερον... τοῦ ἔτους ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐνοχλομένων, καὶ κρατοῦντο ταύτης. See Suicer i. p. 998 ff., for a full explanation of the subsequent technical usages of the word. Here, the sense need not be limited to sexual continence, but may include spread over the whole range of the indulgences), holding fast (see ref. on 1 Tim. i. 10, which I have not been able to quote the whole of the indulgences), Thess. ii. 10), for ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκ. καὶ τῇ ἔνδοκαις, τοὺς παίδες ἥλυτον.

9. niv ins καὶ Π. 17, 73. for εν τῇ διδασκ. καὶ τῇ ἔνδοκαις, τοὺς παίδες ἥλυτον.
have a tautological sentence, in which the method, and the result of the practice [τῶν κ.τ.λ.], would have the same power to instruct predicated of them; besides that ἀντεχόμενον would require some form of making it apply in this sense of "constantly using." The passive acceptance of διδαχή is therefore preferable: and the meaning will be much the same as in 2 Tim. iii. 15, μένε ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες,—cf. 1 Tim. iv. 6, οἱ λόγοι τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας ἡ παρακολουθήσας. So Ellic, also, that he may be able both to exhort (believers) in (the element of his παράκλησις) healthy teaching (the teaching which is healthy), and to reprove (see ver. 13 below) the gain-sayers.

10—16.] By occasion of the last clause, the Apostle goes on to describe the nature of the adversaries to whom he alludes, especially with reference to Crete.

10. For (explains τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας of ver. 9) there are many [and] insubordinate (ver. 6 above). The joining πολὺς with another adjective by καί is a common idiom. So Herod. viii. 61, πολλά τε καὶ κακά ἔλεγε: Aristoph. Λύσ. 1159, πολλών κύριοι: Plat. Rep. p. 325, πολλά τε καὶ ἀνθία εἰργάσμενοι: Xen. Mem. ii. 9, 6, συνείδησι αὐτῷ πολλά καὶ πονηρά. Matth. 15. 411) vain talkers (see 1 Tim. i. 6, and ch. iii. 9) and deceivers (see Gal. v. 12: deceivers of men's minds), chiefly (not only—there were some such of the Gentile converts) they of the circumcision (i.e. not Jews, but Jewish Christians: for he is speaking of seducers within the Church: cf. ver. 11.

On the Jews in Crete, see Jos. Antt. xvii. 12. 1: B. J. ii. 7: 1: Philo, Leg. ad Cai. § 36, vol. ii. p. 587), whose mouths (ἐλέγχεις σφραγώς, ἦστε ἀποκλείειν αὐτοίς τὰ στόματα, Thl.) it is necessary to stop (we hardly need introduce here the figure of a bit and bridle, seeing that ἐπιστομίζειν is so often used literally of "stopping the mouth," without any allusion to that figure: e.g. Aristoph., Eq. 111, ἦλω γάρ ἐστι εἰργασμένον τοιοῦτον ἑρχόμεν ἦστε ἀπασχοληταῖς τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἑρχόμεν ἐπιστομίζειν: Plat. Gorg., p. 329 d, —ἀδεὶς ὑπὸ σοῦ ἢμοιοθεσίας ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἐπιστομήθη ἰασχυνθείς & ἐννοεῖ οἷς: see also examples in Wests. And Philt., Alcib. 2, speaks of τῶν ἀδύν ἐπιστομίζειν καὶ ἀπώφαται. Cf. Palm and Rost's Lex.): such men as ("inasmuch as they," Ellic, which perhaps is logically better) over-turn (ref. 1 Tim. i. so, literally, Plat. Rep. v. p. 471 b, ὡς τὴν γῆν ἔθελεσκα κεφεῖν αὐτῶν, ὀστε οἰκίας ἀνατρέψετε: and fig., Demost. 778. 22, ἀνατρέψετε οἷς τὰ κοινὰ δίκαια, and so often) whole houses (cf. Juv. Sat. x. 5: "evertere domos totas optantibus ipsis | Di facilest.") Here it will mean, "pervert whole families." Thl. says, μοχλοὶ γάρ εἰσι τοῦ διαβόλου, δι' ὁν καθαίρει τοὺς τοῦ θεοῦ οἴκους, teaching things which are not fitting (on the use of ἐκ with [things which are definitely improper or forbidden], and ἐκ δὲ [things which are so either in the mind of the describer, or which, as here, derive a seeming continuance from the mode in which the subject is presented], see Ellic's note here and his references to Herm. on Viger, 267,
and Krüger, Sprachlehre, § 67, 4, 3) for the sake of base gain (cf. 1 Tim. vi. 5).

12.] One of them (not, of the πολλοί spoken of above,—nor, of the οἱ εἰκ περιτομῆς: but of the inhabitants of Crete, to which both belonged), their own prophet (see below) said, "The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies" (Thl. says: ὁ μὲν οὖν εἰρήνακος, Ἐπιμενίδης ἐστίν, ἐν τοῖς μᾶλασταῖς τῶν παρ᾽ Ἕλλησι σφόδρων θειασμοῖς καὶ ἀποτροπαιαμοῖς προσέχουσιν, καὶ μακρικοὶ δυκαὶ κατορθίσαι. And so also Chrisy., Epiph., and Jer. But Thdrt. ascribes the verse to Callimachus, in whose Hymn to Zeus, ver. 8, the words Κρίτης ἀεὶ φιάσταται are found. To this however Jer. [as also Epiph.] answers, "integer versus de Epimenide poeta ab Apostolo sumptus est, et ejus Callimachus in suo poenam nus est exordio." Epimenides was a native of Phaestus in Crete (Ἐπιμενίδης ὁ Φαίστιος, Phil. Soph. 12 or Chrousus, Diog. Laer. i. 109, Κρίτης τὸ γένος, ἀπὸ Κυκάων. He makes his father's name to have been Φαίστιος:—πατρὸς μὲν ἴδιον Φαίστιον, οἱ δὲ, Δωσίδαόν, οἱ δὲ Αγγαράκον, and lived about 600 B.C. He was sent for to Athens to undertake the purification of the city from the pollution occasioned by Cylon (see artt. 'Epimenides' and 'Cylon,' in the Dict. of Biogr. and Mythol.), and is said to have lived to an extreme old age, and to have been buried at Lacedaemon (Diog. Laer. i. 115). The appellation 'prophet' seems to have belonged to him in its literal sense: see Cicero, de Divin. i. 18,—"qui concitatione quadrum animi, aut soluto libero moque motu futura presentiunt, ut Baris Bectius, ut Epimenides Cres:" so also Apuleius, Florid. ii. 15. 4,—"necon et Cretensis Epimeniden, inclytum fatilobreque et poëtam:") see also id. Apol. 449). Diog. Laer. also gives instances of his prophetical power, and says, λέγοντες δὲ τινες ὅτι Κρίτης αὐτῷ θύουσιν ὡς θεόν. On the character here given of the Cretans, see Prolegg. to this Epistle, § ii. 9 ff. As to the words, —κακὰ θηρία is abundantly illustrated out of various writers by Wetst., Kyper, and Raphel: γαστέρες ἀργαί is said of those by whom it is observed everywhere, (cf.) to despise their bodily appetites have become corpulent and indolent: so Juven. Sat. iv. 107, "Montani quoque venere adest abdomine tardus."

13.] This testimony is true. Wherefore (ἐπειδὴ ἦδον αὐτοῖς ἐστὶν ἡμῶν καὶ δολεροί καὶ ἀκόλαστοι, Chrisy.) reprove them sharply (ὅταν ψεύδονται προκειμένω καὶ δολεροὶ ἦσι καὶ γαστρομαχοὶ καὶ ἀργάς, σφοδροὶ καὶ πληθυντικοὶ τοῦ λύγου διεἰποντες γάρ ὁ σιν ἄμελες ὁ τουτοίς, Chrisy. ἀπότομος, 'cut off,' 'abrupt:' hence, met., 'rugged,' 'larsch;' so Eur. Alcest. 955, ὅπνευ τοις ἀπότομοις λήματος ἐστὶν ἀϊδώς: Soph. Ed. Tyr. 876, ἀπότομοι ἀροῦν ἔσται ἀναγκαῖς), that (in order that) De W. takes ἦν κ.τ.λ., for the substance of the rebuke, as in παραγγελεῖν ἴνα καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον, ἵνα εἰσέλθῃ τῷ παρακαλούντω καὶ ἐπιφορτισθῇ (ὑπερήφανος: for there appears to be no sufficient reason for this) they may be healthy in the faith (not, 'in faith,' as Conyb.: even were no article expressed after ἵνα, it might be 'in the faith?' when that article is expressed, the definite reference can never be overlooked. The Κρίτης indicated here, who are to be thus rebuked in order to their soundness in the faith, are manifestly not the false teachers, but the ordinary believers: cf. ver. 14),

14.] not giving attention to (ref.) Jewish fables (on the probable nature of these, see 1 Tim. i. 4 note: and on the whole subject, the Prolegg. to these Epistles, § i. 12 ff. They were probably the seeds of the gnostic mythologies, already scattered about and taking root) and commandments (cf. 1 Tim. iv. 3: Col. ii. 16, 22: and our next verse, by which it appears that these commandments were on the subject of abstinence from meats and other things appointed by God for man's use) of men turning away (or the prese. part. may express habitual character—
15. "πάντα καθαρά τοῖς καθαροῖς τοῖς δὲ μειμαίνεσιν καὶ ἀπίστοις οὐδὲν καθαρῶν, ἀλλὰ μειμαίνεται αὐτῶν καὶ οὐ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις. 16. θεὸς ὁ οἰμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι τοῖς ἐγγονοίς ἀγονουταί, ὁ δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἀνείθεις καὶ αἰτεῖς θείες καὶ θρός πάν ἐγγον ἁγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι.

whose description it is that they turn away—in idiomatic English, the participle clause being merely epithet, not ratiocinative [agg Ellicott], "who turn away") from (ref) the truth. 18.] The Apostle's own answer to those who would enforce these commandments. All things (absolutely—all things with which man can be concerned) are pure to the pure (οὐδὲν δὲ θεὸς ἀκάθαρτον ἐποίησεν οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀκάθαρτον, εἰ μὴ ἡ ἁμαρτία μόνη, ψυχῆς γάρ ἀπέστειλαι καὶ ταύτῃ τούτῳ, Chrys. 'Omnia externa ipsis qui intus sunt mundi, munda sunt," Bengal. Cf. Matt. xxiii. 26: Luke xi. 41. There is no ground whatever for supposing this to be a maxim of the false teachers, quoted by the Apostle, any more than the πάντα μοι ἔγειστιν 1 Cor. vi. 12, where see note. The maxim here is a truly Christian one of the noblest order. τοῖς καθαροῖς is the dat. commodi,—'for the pure to use,' not, as often taken, "in the judgment of the pure." This is plainly shown by the use of the same dative in Rom. xiv. 14, where to render it "in the judgment of" would introduce an unnecassary tautology: τῷ λογισμῷ τις κοινῶν εἶναι, ἐκεῖνος κοινῶν—'to him [for his use] it is common." As usual in these Epistles [see Prolegg. § i. 38], purity is inseparably connected with soundness in the faith, cf. Acts xv. 9, and 1 Tim. iv. 3, where our τοῖς καθαροῖς is expanded into τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ ἐπιγνωσάς τὴν ἀλήθειαν, but to the polluted and unbelieving (cf. the preceding remarks) nothing is pure, but both (or 'even,' as E. V.—but the other sounds preferable, on account of the close correspondence of καὶ δὲ νοῦς with καὶ ἡ συνείδησις) their mind (their rational part, Eph. vi. 17, which presides over and leads all the determinative acts and thoughts of the man) and their conscience is polluted (cf. Dion. Hal. de Thineyd. 8,—κράτιστον δὲ πάντων τὸ μὴθὲν ἐκοινωνίας ψεύδεσθαι, μηδὲ μαίνεσιν τὴν αὐτῶν συνείδησιν. And therefore, uncleanness tainting their rational acts and their reflective self-recognitions, nothing can be pure to them: every occasion becomes to them an occasion of sin, every creature of God an instrument of sin; as Mack well observes, "the relation, in which the sinful subject stands to the objects of its possession or of its inclination, is a sinful one." Philo de legg. spec. ad 6 et 7 dec. cap. § 337, vol. ii. p. 333 f., has a sentence which might be a comment on our verse:—ἀκάθαρτος γὰρ κωσμὸς ὁ ἄθικος καὶ ἀσέβης . . . πάντα φύονες καὶ συχνοί διὰ ταῦτα ἀμετρίας τῶν φυσιῶν καὶ τῶν κακῶν ὑπερβολῶς. ὅτε δὲν ἠφάντηται πραγμάτων πάντα ἐστίν ἐπίληπτα τῇ τοῦ δικαίου συμμεταβαλλόντος μοχθήρας, καὶ γὰρ κατὰ τὸ ἐναυτόν αἱ πράξεις τῶν αὐθανῶν ἐπαναίτητα, βελτιστοὶ παρά τῶν ἑνεργοῦντος ἀρετῶν, ἐπειδὴ περίκειτο πῶς τὰ γινόμενα τοὺς δρώνων ἐξουσιοθέτησα. Here again, the reference of the saying has been variously mistook,—ἡ ὑπακοὴ διανοία κακὰς πόστων λογισμοῦ ἐντύπως συμμετέχει ταῦτα, έκ.: and similarly Chrys., Thl., al.: 'non placet Deo quae agent etiam circa res mediocris, quia actiones tales ex animo Deus estimatur,' Grot.: 'nisi nihil prodest externa atulitio et ciborum desieruam observatio,' Baldwin. Croc. de E W.).
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II. 1 Σὺ δὲ λάλει ἃ πρέπει τῇ ῥγιναινῇ διδασκάλια, 2 προσβύτας γυμνοίς εἶναι, σεμινοίς, 3 προσβύτας, 4 γυμνοῖς πίστες, γινομενοι, 5 προσβύτις, 6 ως τῶν καταστήματι ιεροπροπεις, μηδείς οίων πολλῶν δεδουλωμέναι, καὶ κοινοὶ καθαροὶ, ἢ ἕνα σωφρονίζωσιν τὰς νέας φιλάν.

(ψευδ. 2 Tim. iv. 5.)

2. ch. i. 8, ver. 5 only t. 2 Tim. iii. 1. 11 only. Prov. xv. 26. x 1 Tim. iii. 1. 7. a here only t. 3. Col. i. 11 only.

b = 1 Tim. iii. 2. 6. h here only. 1 Tim. iii. 2. 6. Jost. Antt. ii. 1. 5. Acts iv. 11. c here only. 1 Cor. vi. 19. 22. 1 Cor. ix. 10. Gal. iv. 3. 2 Pet. i. 10. h here only t. 1 Cor. vii. 1. 7. j here only t.

CHAP. II. 1. aet de ins a N.

3. καταστήματα F. εἰσπρεπεῖς CH² m 17 latt syr copt arm Clem Bas Thadrt Amnstr Pelag Jer Sedul. for μηδε, DFHKL83 rel: txt ACHN. 4. rec σωφρονίζωσιν, with CDKL81 rel: txt AFH80 o.

joined with ἀκάθαρτος and disobedient, and for (towards the accomplishing of) every good work worthless (ref).

Ch. II. 1—III. 11. Directions to Titus, how to exhort the believers of various classes, and how to comport himself. For intermediate divisions, see below.

1. But (contrast to the persons just described: 'on the other hand') do thou speak (not what they speak, ch. i. 11: but) the things which befit the healthy teaching (that teaching which is sound and wholesome, not teaching & μὴ δει): viz., that the aged men (not δισεβότρειον, which implies eldership, and not old age only) be sober (see note on 1 Tim. iii. 2), grave (1 Tim. iii. 3, note), self-restrained (a better word for σωφρόνων would be a valuable discovery: see above on ch. i. 8, and 1 Tim. ii. 9: 'discreet' is good, but not adequate), healthy in their faith, in their love, in their patience (see ref. 1 Tim., where the same three are joined together. The dative is of the element or condition: the same was expressed with ἐν, ch. i. 13: ἐν ἀγίασμάι ἐν τῇ πίστει. The articles should not be overlooked. The occurrence of τῷ ἀγάπῃ and τῷ ὑπομονή prevents us from rendering τῇ πίστει objective as in ch. i. 13, and compels us to take the subjective and reflective meaning).

3. The aged women (προσβύτεραι. 1 Tim. v. 2, there being in this case here no official term to occasion confusion) likewise (after the same general pattern, to which the separate virtues above mentioned belong) in department (cf. Porphyry. de abst. in Wetst.,—το δὲ σέμινων κάκω τοῦ καταστήματος ἐσώπτο. πορεία τῃ γάρ ἐν εὐπορίας, καὶ βλέμα παθητικός ἐσπευδώτευο, ἀδ ὡς θεωρήσων ὑπὸ σκορδαματίστων γέλες δὲ σπάνιος, εἰ δὲ που γένοιτο, μέχρι μειδίασιν, ἕνας ἐν τῷ τος σχήματος αἰ χείρες. The κατάστημα would thus include gesture and habit,—more than καταστολή of 1 Tim. ii. 9), reverend (two examples, of those given by Wetst., seem nearest to touch the meaning of the word here as connected with outward deportment,—the one from Jos. Antt. xi. 5. 5, describing the high Priest Jaddus going forth to meet Alexander the Great,—ποδόμενος δ' αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸ τῆς πόλεως, πρόεις μετὰ τῶν ἔρεων καὶ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ πλήθους, εἰσπρεπεῖς καὶ διαφερόμενως τῶν ἀλλων ἐθνῶν ποιησμόν τὴν ὑπάνθησιν . . . το μὲν πλῆθος ἐν ταῖς λευκαῖς ἐσθήσῃ, τοῖς δὲ ἐρείπων προσπάττωσιν ἐν ταῖς βουσιναῖς αὐτῶν, τοῦ δὲ ἁριεία ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ καὶ διαχρόνωσι στολή: the other from Plato, Theages, § 3, p. 262, Θεαγῆς ὤνομα τοῦτο, ὁ Σκυρατής. Καλὸν γε, ὃ Δημόδωκε, τῷ ὀνεὶ τῷ ὄνομα ἔθηκε καὶ εἰσπρεπέσ, not slanderers (see ref. 1 Tim. and note), nor yet enslaved (so προσέχοντας, 1 Tim. iii. 8) to much wine (this vice may be included in the character given of the Cretans above, ch. i. 12), teachers of that which is good, that they school (see ref. σωφρονίζωσι, 2 Tim. i. 7.)

The occurrence of ἐνa here with a pres. indic. in the best MSS. is remarkable—especially as the only other instances of this construction in St. Paul, 1 Cor. iv. 6 and Gal. iv. 17 ['see notes there'], may be accounted for on the hypothesis of an unusual [provincial] formation of the subjunctive, being both verbs in -δω. If this reading is to stand, it would shew that that hypothesis is unnecessary, and that St. Paul did really write the indic. pres. after ἐνa: see also 1 John v. 20. Y. Wineer, edn. 6, § 11 b. 1. c. If he did thus write it, it may be questioned whether he intended to convey any sense very distinct
PROS TITON.

II.

from the pres. subj.: perhaps more immediate and assumed sequence may be indicated: but it is hardly possible to join logically in the mind a causal particle with a pres. indic.) the young women to be lovers of their husbands, lovers of their children, discreet (this term certainly applies better to women than self-restrained): there is in this latter, in their case, an implication of effort, which destroys the spontaneity, and brushes off, so to speak, the bloom of this best of female graces. See, however, note on 1 Tim. ii. 9. The word is one of our greatest difficulties, chaste, workers at home (the word is not found elsewhere, and has perhaps on that account been changed to the more usual one oikouvros. It is hardly possible that for so common a word oikouvros should have been substituted. If the rec. is retained, keepers at home will be signified: so Dio Cass. lvii. p. 291 [Wetst.], πας οίκουρος γυνηίς σωφρόν, oikouvros, oikouvros, παιδοτρόφος; see Elscner’s note on the word, in which he shows that, as might be expected, the idea of keeping at home and guiding the home are both included: so Chris.: ἤ οἰκούρος γυνηίς καὶ σωφρόν ἑστατός ἡ οἰκουρία· καὶ οἰκονομική ὥστε περὶ τροφοδοσίαν, ὥστε περὶ ἐξοδοὺς ἀκαρδοὺς, ὥστε περὶ ἔλλοι τῶν παιδιῶν ἐφορηθῆται, good (Thl. joins this with with oikouvros—oikouvros ἀγάθη. So also Syr. But it seems better to preserve the series of single epithets broken in the next clause by the construction. As a single epithet [refr.]. It seems to provide, as Heydeur, that their keeping, or working, at home, should not degenerate into churlishness or niggardliness, in subjec-

tion to their own (inserted to bring out and impress the duties they owe to them —so in Eph. v. 22) husbands, that the word of God (the Gospel) be not illspoken of (by γὰρ προφάσει θεοθείας κατασταθήσεται τοὺς ἄνδρας, βλασφημίας ἐφέτερ τῇ κηρύγματι, Thdrt.). 6 ii.
The younger men in like manner exhort (see above ver. 5, and 1 Tim. ii. 9, note), shewing thyself (the use of σωτινείς with παρεξέσθαι is somewhat remarkable, but borne out by Xen. in ref.) The account of it seems to be, that παρεξέσθαι τύπον would be the regular expression for ‘to set an example,’ the personal action of the subject requiring the middle [see Krüger, p. 368]: and, this being so, the form of such expression is not altered, even where ἐστώ is expressed in opposition to τύπον. Cf. Ellie’s note) in ‘about,’ ‘in reference to’ [refr.]: a meaning of peri with the ace. derived from its local meaning of ‘round about’ see Winer, edn. 6, § 19, 1.) all matters (not music, singing) an example (κοινονία διδασκαλίας καὶ ὑπόδειγμα δρέτης) ἡ τοῦ κυρίου δια τοῦ λαοῦ πρεσβύτης ἐστὶν, συν’ εἰς εἰκόνα ἐν ἑαυτοῦ τῆς προκειμένης τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐνσωματωθῆσαι τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ καλῶν, Thb.) of good works, (refr.); —in thy teaching (παρεξέσθαις) incorrupt (it is difficult exactly to fix the reference of ἀφθονία [or ἀδιαφορία, which means much the same). It may be objective, of the content of the teaching—that it should set forth purity as its character and aim: or subjective, that he should be, in his teaching, pure in intent, uncorrupted: so Wiesinger, comparing 2 Cor. xi. 3, μὴ πασὶ... φθορῇ
acceptable, would seem to bring the slave too near to the position of a friend, not contradicting (in the wide sense, not merely in words, see especially ref. John), not purloining (ref. νοσφιζόμενον, ϕαιρομενον, ἰδιοσφιζόμενον, Σωιτό αὐτο καὶ σφετερισθαι, Eustath.), but manifesting (see ref. 2 Cor.) all, (possible, ref.) good faith; that they may adorn in all things (not before all men, as Heydeur, al.: cf. εν πάσιν above) the doctrine of our Saviour, God (see on 1 Tim. i. 1. Not Christ, but the Father is meant: in that place the distinction is clearly made. On this 'adorning' Calvin remarks, 'Hac quoque circumstancia notanda est [this is hardly worthy of his usually pure latinity], quod ornamentum Deus a servis accipere dignantur, quorum tam vilis et aljecta erat contidio, ut vix censeri solit sió inter homines. Neque enim simulatos intellect quales hodie in usu sunt, sed mancipia, quae pretio empta tarnquam盒子 aut possideabantur. Quo si corum vita ornamentum est Christiani nominis, multo magis videant qui in honore sunt, ne illud turpitudine sua manculet. 'Thl. strikingly says, καὶ γὰρ τῶ δεσπότη διακονῆς ἄλλα ἢ τιμή εἰς θεον ἀπατεχεῖ, οὐτὶ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν φθόνον ἐκείνων ἢ πρὸς τῶν δεσπότων εὐνοια τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἔχει. 11—15.] Ground of the above exhortations in the moral purpose of the Gospel respecting us (11—14): and consequent exhortation to Titus (15).

11.] For (reasons for the above exhortations from ver. 1: not as Chrys., al., only for vv. 9, 10. The latter clause of ver. 10, ποιεῖν...
it is true, gives occasion to this declaration: but the reference of these verses is far wider than merely to slaves the grace of God (that divine favour to men, of which the whole process of Redemption was a proof: not to be limited to Christ's Incarnation, as Gr. and Thurt.: though certainly this may be said for their interpretation, that it may also be regarded as a term inclusive of all the blessings of Redemption: but it does not follow, that of two such inclusive terms, the one may be substituted for the other) was manifested, bringing salvation (not, 'as bringing salvation: σωτηρίος is not predicates after ἀπεφ., but πάνευσια which follows: σωτηρίος is still part of the subject, and to make this constructionally clearer, the art. ἦ has been inserted) to all men (dat. belonging to σωτηρίος, not to ἀπεφανήν, which verb is used absolutely, as in ch. iii. 4: cf. σωτήρ πάνων ἀνθρώπων, 1 Tim. iv. 10: see also ib. ii. 4), disciplining us (see note on 1 Tim. i. 20. There is no need to depart from the universal New Testament sense of πανέωσις, and soften it into 'teaching:' the education which the Christian man receives from the grace of God, is a discipline, properly so called, of self-denial and training in godliness, accompanied therefore with much mortification and punitive treatment. Luther has well rendered πανευσια εἰμί by 'und gütigst uné.' Corn.-a-Lap. [cited in Mack] explains it also well: 'tacquam pueros rudes crudelis, corrigens, formans, omnique disciplina institens et imbucens, perinde ut pedagogus puerum sibi comissum tam in litteris quam in moribus: hoc enim est πανευσις, inquit Gall. i. 13. 13'), that (by the ordinary rendering, 'teaching us, that,' we make ἵνα introduce merely the periphrasis of the teaching: and so, following most Commentators, De W., and I am surprised to see, Huther, although I suppose representing in some measure the philological fidelity of Meyer, under whose shelter his commentary appears. There must have been some defect of supervision here.

Wiesinger only of the recent Commentators, after Mack and Matthies, keeps the telic meaning of ἵνα. The Greek Commentators, as might be expected, adhere to the propriety of their own language. So Chrys. [ἦλθεν ὁ χριστός, ἵνα ἀρνησάμεθα τὴν ἁμαρτίαν], Thl. [πανευσία γὰρ ἡμᾶς, ἵνα τοῦ λοιποῦ σωφρόνων ἡσυχαίν], Thurt. [τοῦτον χάριν ἐνθρόπη- πισεν . . . . ἵνα . . . . ]. The truth is, that πανευσία is one of those verbs, the purpose and purport of which mutually include each other. The form and manner of instructive discipline itself conveys the aim and intent of that discipline. So that the meaning of ἵνα after such a verb falls under the class which I have discussed in my note to 1 Cor. xiv. 13, which see. Our English 'that,' which would be dubious after 'teaching,' keeps, after 'disciplining,' its proper telic force), denying (not, 'having denied:' the aor. part. ἀρνησάμενοι is, as so often, not prior to, but contemporaneous with, the aor. ἔφαγεν following. [This, against Ellic., requires pressing here. The whole life being summed up in ἔφαγεν, aor., not ἔφαγε, pres., the aor. part. ἀρνησάμενοι must be so rendered, as to extend over all that sum, not as if it represented some definite act of abnegation anterior to it all.] διὰ τοῦ ἀρνησάμενοι, says Thl., τὴν ἐκ διαθήκης ὀλοκλήρου ἀποστροφήν σημαίνει. "Has [cupiditates] abnegamus, cum eis consensum negotium, cum delectionatione quam suagerunt, et actum ad quem sollicitant, abunmus, imo ex mente et animo ridiculus evellimus et extirpamus." S. Bernard, Serm. xi. [Mack] impiety and the lusts of the world (the τάς gives universality— all worldly lusts.) κομικάς, belonging to the κόσμος, the world which ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ κεῖται, and is without God: see 1 John ii. 15—17 and Ellicott's note here), we might live soberly (our old difficulty of rendering κακοφρων and its derivatives recurs. 'Soberly' seems here to express the adverb well, though 'sober' by no means covers the meaning of the adjective. The fact is, that the peculiar
meaning which has become attached to 'sober,'—so much so, as almost to deprive it of its more general reference to life and thought,—has not taken possession of the adverb and justly (better than 'righteously,'—'righteous,' by its forensic objective sense in St. Paul, introducing a confusion, where the question is of moral rectitude) and piously in the present life ("Bernard, Serm. xi.: sobrie erga nos, juste erga proximum, pie erga Deum, Sahner. p. 630 f.: dieimus in his verbis Apostolum tribus virtutibus, sobrietatis, pietatis et justitiae, summanum justitiae Christianae complecti. Sobrietas est ad se, justitia ad proximum, pietas erga Deum. . . . sobrie autem agit, cum quis se propter Deum diligit: juste, cum proximum diligit: pie, cum charitate Deum colit." Mack. Wolf quotes from Lucian, Somn. p. 8, the same conjunction: τήν ψυχήν . . . κατακοσμήσω . . . σωφρόνην, δι- καιοσύνην, καὶ εὐσεβία . . . ταῦτα γὰρ ἔστων διὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἄκριτος κόσμος. These three comprising our παιδεία in faith and love, he now comes to hope: looking for (this expectation being an abiding state and posture,—not, like ζησωεῖν, the life following on and unfolded from the determining impulse co-ordinate with the ἀρήσασθαι,—is put in the proes., not in the aor.) the blessed hope (here, as in reff. Gal. and Acts, Col. i. 5 al., nearly objective,—the hope, as embodying the thing hoped for: but keep the vigour and propriety both of language and thought, and do not tame down the one and violate the other, with Grot., by a metonymy, or with Wolf, by a hypallage of μακάρια ἐλπὶς for ἐπεικομενὴ μακαριτῆς) and manifestation (ἐλπίδα κ. ἐπιφ. belong to- gether) of the glory (δόο δεικνυόν ἐν- ταῦθα ἐπίφανειας καὶ γὰρ εἰς δύο ἡ μὲν προτέρα χάριτος, ἡ δὲ δεύτερα ἀντ- αποδύσεως, Chrys. Nothing could be more unfortunate than the application here of the figure of hendiadys in the E. V.: see below) of the great God (the Father: see below) and of our Saviour Jesus Christ (as regards the sense, an exact parallel is found in Matt. xvi. 27, μέλλων γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχεσθαι ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, compared with Matt. xxv. 31, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ. See also 1 Pet. iv. 13. The glory which shall be revealed at the ap- pearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ is His own glory, and that of His Father [John xvii. 3; 1 Thess. iii. 13]. This sense having been obscured by the foolish hendiadys, has led to the asking [by Mr. Green, Gr. Test. Gram., p. 216], "What intimation is given in Scripture of a glorious appearing of God the Father and our Lord in concert?" To which the answer is, that no such appearing is even hinted at in this passage, taken as above. What is asserted is, that the δόξα shall be that of τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. And we now come to consider the meaning of these words. Two views have been taken of them: (1) that τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν are to be taken together as the description of Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ,—'of Jesus Christ, the great God and our Saviour;' (2) that as given above, τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ describes the Father, and σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ the Son. It is obvious that in dealing with (1), we shall be deciding with regard to (2) also. (1) has been the view of the Greek orthodox Fathers, as against the Arians [see a complete collection of their testimonies in Dr. Wordsworth's "Six Letters to Granville Sharp on the use of the definite article in the Greek text of the N. T." Lond. 1802], and of most ancient and modern Comment- tators. That the former so interpreted the words, is obviously not [as it has been considered] decisive of the question, if they can be shown to bear legitimately another meaning, and that meaning to be the one most likely to have been in the mind of the writer. The case of ἐνα in the preceding verse [see note there], was wholly different. There it was contended that ἐνα with a subjunctive, has, and can have, but one meaning: and this was upheld against those who would introduce another, inter alia, by the fact that the Greek Fathers dreamt of no other. The argument rested not on this latter fact, but on the logical force of the particle it- self. And similarly here, the passage must be argued primarily on its own ground, not primarily on the consensus of the Greek Fathers. No one disputes that it may mean that which they have interpreted it: and there were obvious reasons why they, having licence to do so, should choose this interpretation. But it is our
object, not being swayed in this or any other interpretation, by doctrinal considerations one way or the other, to enquire, not what the words may mean, but what they do mean, as far as we may be able to ascertain it. The main, and indeed the only reliance of those who take (1), is the omission of the article before σωτήρος. Had the sentence stood τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν 'Jesus Christ our Saviour,' the omission would have been decisively for (2), is plain: but is it equally plain, that its omission is decisive for (1)? This must depend entirely on the nature and position of the word thus left anarthrous. If it is a word which had by usage become altogether or occasionally anarthrous,—if it is so connected, that the presence of the article expressed, is not requisite to its presence in the sense, then the state of the case, as regards the omission, is considerably altered. Now there is no doubt that σωτήρ was one of those words which gradually dropped the article and became a quasi proper name: cf. 1 Tim. i. 1 [I am quite aware of Bp. Middleton's way of accounting for this, but do not regard it as satisfactory]; iv. 10; which latter place is very instructive as to the way in which the designation from its official nature became anarthrous. This being so, it must hardly be judged as to the expression of the art. by the same rules as other nouns. Then as to its structural and contextual connexion. It is joined with ἡμῶν, which is an additional reason why it may spare the article: see Luke i. 78: Rom. i. 7: 1 Cor. i. 3 [1 Cor. ii. 7; x. 11]: 2 Cor. i. 2, &c. Again, as Winer has observed [edn. 6, § 19, 5 b, note 1], the prefixing of an appositional designation to the proper name frequently causes the omission of the article. So in 2 Thess. i. 12: 2 Pet. i. 1: Jude 4: see also 2 Cor. i. 2; vi. 18: Gal. i. 3: Eph. i. 2; vi. 23: Phil. i. 2; ii. 11; iii. 20 &c. If then σωτῆρ ἡμῶν 'Jesus Christ our Saviour,—on comparing the two members of the clause, we observe, that θεός has already had its predicate expressed in τοῦ μεγάλου; and that it is therefore natural to expect that the latter member of the clause, likewise consisting of a proper name and its predicate, should correspond logically to the former: in other words, that τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν 'Jesus Christ our Saviour,' would much more naturally suit (1) than τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν 'Jesus Christ our Saviour,' in cases where the two appellative members belong to one expressed subject, we expect to find the former of them without any predicative completion. If it be replied to this, as I conceive on the hypothesis of (1) it must be, that τοῦ μεγάλου is an epithet alike of θεοῦ and σωτῆρος, 'our great [God and Saviour],' I may safely leave it to the feeling of any scholar, whether such an expression would be likely to occur. Let us now consider, whether the Apostle would in this place have been likely to designate our Lord as ὁ μεγάς θεὸς καὶ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν. This must be chiefly decided by examining the usages of the expression θεὸς ὁ σωτήρ ἡμῶν, which occurs six times in these Epistles, once in Luke [i. 47], and once in the Epistle of Jude. If the writer here identifies this expression, 'the great God and our Saviour,' with the Lord Jesus Christ, calling Him 'God and our Saviour,' it will be at least probable that in other places where he speaks of "God our Saviour," he also designates our Lord Jesus Christ. Now is that so? On the contrary, in 1 Tim. i. 1, we have κατ' ἐπίταγῇ θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, καὶ χριστοῦ Ἡσυχ τῶν ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν: where I suppose none will deny that the Father and the Son are most plainly distinguished from one another. The same is the case in 1 Tim. ii. 3—5, a passage bearing much [see below] on the interpretation of this one: and consequently in 1 Tim. iv. 10, where ἐστιν σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων corresponds to θέλει πάντας σωθῆναι in the other. So also in Tit. i. 3, where the σωτῆρ ἡμῶν θεός, by whose ἐπίταγῇ the promise of eternal life was manifested, with the proclamation of which St. Paul was entrusted, is the same αἰῶνας θεός, by whose ἐπίταγῇ the hidden mystery was manifested in Rom. xvi. 26, where the same distinction is made. The only place where there could be any doubt is in our ver. 10, which possible doubt however is removed by ver. 11, where the
same assertion is made, of the revelation of the hidden grace of God [the Father]. Then we have our own ch. iii. 4—6, where we find τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ in ver. 4, clearly defined as the Father, and διὰ Ἰσωῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν in ver. 6. In that passage too we have the expression ἡ χριστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἐπεφέξει τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμ. θεοῦ, which is quite decisive in answer to those who object here to the expression ἐπιφάνειας τῆς δόξης as applied to the Father. In the one passage of St. Jude, the distinction is equally clear: for there we have μόνον τιθεντὶ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰσωῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. It is plain then, that the usage of the words ‘God our Saviour’ does not make it probable that the whole expression here is to be applied to the Lord Jesus Christ. And in estimating this probability, let us again recur to 1 Tim. ii. 3, 5, a passage which runs very parallel with the present one. We read there, ἐς γὰρ θεός, εἰς καὶ μετάτις θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἀνθρώπος χριστὸς Ἰσωῦς, δὸς ἐαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον κ.τ.λ. Compare this with the μεγάλῳ θεῷ καὶ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν Ἰσωῦ χριστὸν, ό ἐκωκεν ἐαυτῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἡ λύτρωσις κ.τ.λ. Can there be a reasonable doubt, that the Apostle writing two sentences so closely corresponding, on a point of such high importance, would have in his view the same distinction in the second of them, which he so strongly lays down in the first? Without then considering the question as closed, I would submit that (2) satisfies all the grammatical requirements of the sentence: that it is both structurally and contextually more probable, and more agreeable to the Apostle’s way of writing: and I have therefore preferred it. The principal advocates for it have been, the pseudo-Ambrose [i.e. Hilary the deacon, the author of the Commentary which goes by the name of that Father: whose words are those, “hanc esse dicit beatam spem credentium, qui expectant adventum gloriam magnum Dei quod revelati habet judicem Christo, in quo Dei Patris videbitur potentias et gloria, ut fidei sui premium consequantur. Ad hoc enim redemit nos Christus, ut” &c.], Erasm. [annot. and paraphr.], Grot., Wetst., Heirn., Winer [ubi supra, end], De W., Huther [the other view,—not this as stated in my earlier editions, by inadvertence,—is taken by Ellicott]. Whenever way taken, the passage is just as important a testimony to the divinity of our Saviour: according to (1), by asserting His possession of Deity and right to the appellation of the Highest: according to (2), even more strikingly, asserting His equality in glory with the Father, in a way which would be blasphemous if predicated of any of the sons of men), who (our Saviour Jesus Christ) gave Himself (‘the forcible εαυτῶν, ‘ Himself, His whole self, the greatest gift ever given,’ must not be overlooked: cf. Beveridge, Serm. 93, vol. iv. p. 285.” Ellicott) for us (‘on our behalf,’ not ‘in our stead’: reff.), that He might (by this assertion of the Redeemer’s purpose, we return to the moral aim of verses 11, 12, more plainly indicated as in close connexion with Christ’s propitiatory sacrifice) redeem (λυτρώσασθαι, ‘to buy off with a price,’ the middle including personal agency and interest, cf. καθαρίσῃ εαυτῷ below. So in Diod. Sic. v. 17, of the Barcarians, ὅταν τινὲς γυναῖκες ὑπὸ τῶν προσπλευόντων ἱρατῶν ἀλώνως, ἀντι μίας γυναικὸς τρεῖς ἢ τέσσαρα ἄνδρας διδόντες λυτρώσατοι. Polyb. xvii. 16. 1, of King Attalus and the Sicelyonians, where only personal agency is implied in the middle, τὴν ἱερὰν χώραν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱλυτρώσατο χριστίων ἀυτοῦ οὐκ ἀλώνως. See note, 1 Tim. ii. 6: and cf. ref. 1 Pet., where the price is stated to have been the precious blood of Christ) us from all lawlessness (see reff. and especially 1 John iii. 4, ἡ ἀμαρτία ἐστίν ἡ ἀνομία) and might purify (there is no need to supply ἡμᾶς, though the sense is not disturbed by so doing. By making λαόν the direct object of καθαρίση, the purpose of the Redeemer is lifted off from our particular case, and generally and objectively stated) to Himself (‘dat. commodi’) a people (object: not, as De W., Wies., al., predicate, ‘(us) for a people’) peculiarly His (see note on Eph. i. 14, and cf. the ref. here in the LXX, from which the expression is borrowed. See also 1 Pet. ii. 9, and Ellicott here. The
III. 1. 

The force and effect of the exhortations to follow, and of the general command last appeared, and enforced it on Titus. In ch. iii. 1, the train of thought is again resumed. These things (the foregoing: not, the following) speak and exhort (in the case of those who believe and need stirring up) and rebuke (in the case of those who are rebellious) with all imperativeness (μετὰ ἀδερφίας καὶ μετὰ ἐξουσίας πολλᾶς, Chrys.—τουτεστι, μετὰ ἀπότομας, Thl.). Let no man despise thee (addressed to Titus, not to the people, as Calv. ['populum ipsum magis quam Titum hic compellat']: 'so conduct thyself in thine exhortations, with such gravity, and such consistency, and such impartiality, that every word of thine may carry weight, and none may be able to cast slight on thee for flaws in any of these points').

III. 1, 2. Rules concerning behaviour to those without. Put them in mind (as of a duty previously and otherwise well known, but liable to be forgotten) to be in subjection to governments, to authorities, to obey the magistrate (παιδαρχεῖς here probably stands absolutely, not, as Huther, connected with the dat. ἀρχαῖς ἐξ. So Xen. Cyp. viii. 1, 4, μισθού ἀγάθω τῷ παιδαρχεῖ φαίνεται εἰς τὸ καταράττειν τὰ ἀγάθα. The other construction has however the refl. in its favour), to be ready towards every good work (the connexion seems to be as in Rom. xiii. 3, where the rulers are said to be οὐ φόβος τῷ ἄγαθῳ ἔργῳ, ἄλλα τῷ κακῷ. Compare also the remarkable coincidence in the sentiment of Xen. quoted above. Jerome in loc., Wetst., De W., al., suppose these exhortations to subjection to have found their occasion in the insubordination of the Jews on principle to foreign rule, and more especially of the Cretan Jews. In the presence of similar exhortations in the Epistle to the Romans and elsewhere, we can hardly perhaps say so much as this: but certainly Wetst.'s quotations from Diod. Sic., al., seem to establish the fact of Cretan turbulence in general. The inference drawn by Thdt., al., from these last words,—οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰς ἀπάντα δεῖ τοὺς ἄρχοντας παιδαρχεῖν (does not seem to be legitimately deduced from them), to speak evil of no one (these words set forth the general duty, but are perhaps introduced owing to what has preceded, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 10: Jude 8), to be not quarrelsome (ref. and note), forbearing (ib., and note on Phil. iv. 5. "The ἐπισκοπηκτέομαι must have been, it is to be feared, a somewhat exceptional character in Crete, where an ἐμφυτὸς πλεονεκία, exhibited in outward acts of aggression, καὶ ἰδίᾳ καὶ κατὰ κοινών ['Polyb. vi. 46—9'] is described as one of the prevailing and dominant vices," Ellicott), manifesting all meekness towards all men (from what follows, πάντα ἀνθρώπων is evidently to be taken in the widest sense, and especially to be applied to the heathen without: see below).

3.] For (reason why we should shew all meekness, &c.: οὐκοῦν μηκέτι ἀνδίστα σαι, φρονί τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἐστι καί αὐτός, Chrys. δ καὶ δ ἁμώς πρὸς τὸν ἐπεμοίρασθεν ἔλεγεν, ὥστι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι ἔσων. Thl.) we (Christians) also (as well as they) were (emphatically prefixed) once without understanding (of spiritual things, see Eph. iv. 18), disobedient (to God, ch. i. 16: he is no longer speaking of authorities,
καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνόητοι, ἀπεθεῖς, πλανῶμεν, δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἱδοναῖς πυκνίαις, ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φθονῷ διάγοντες, στυγνοί, μισοῦντες ἄλληλους. Ότε δὲ ἦν ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ ἑγερνοθωρία ἐπέφαν τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ, οὐκ ἦν ἐγγυόν τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἀποτελεσμάτων. 

3. ἀποτελοῦσθαι καὶ διασταύρωσις εἰς Ν ἕν Ν (Ν² disapproving). 

5. rec for ἀδ (correction for elegance), with CAΔΙΚΛ rel Ath(many MSS) Cyr-jer Ps-Ath Chr Thdrfz: τακτο CAΔΙΦ Μ 17 Clem Cypu/sepe. [C is deficient from εὐποιήσαμεν but has passed into a new train of thought].

led astray (so Conyb.: the passive sense should be kept, as best answering to N. T. usage, ref. 2 Tim.: ref. Heb. and James, which Huther quotes for the neuter sense, are both better rendered passive, Eliic. advocates the neuter ‘going astray’), slaves to divers lusts and pleasures (see ref.: an unusual word in N. T., though so common in secular Greek), passing our lives (in ref. 1 Tim. Blov is expressed) in malice (ref.) and envy—hateful, hating one another (the sequence, if there be any, seems to be in the converse order from that assumed by Thl., ἓνοικος ἡμεῖς, ὡς ἄλληλοι μισοῦντες. It was our natural hatefulness which begot mutual hatred. Or perhaps the two particulars may be taken separately, as distinct items in our catalogue of depravities.

4. But when the goodness (ref.) and love-towards-men (I prefer this literal rendering of φιλανθρωπία to any of the more usual ones: cf. Diog. Laert. Plat. iii. 98, τῆς φιλανθρωπίας ἐστιν εἴδη τρία ἐν διά τῆς προσηγορίας γινόμενον, οἷον ἐν οἷς τίνων τὸ γίνεσθαι πάττω προαγορεύομεν καὶ τίνων δείαν ἐμβάλλοντο χαριτείσουσιν ἄλλο εἴδος, ὅτι τις βοηθοῦσι νὰ παντὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἑνὸς ἐστὶ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας ἐν ὧν τίνες φιλανθρώποι εἰσὶ. The second of these is evidently that here intended, but Huther’s view of the correspondence of this description of God’s kindness to us with that which we are required [ver. 2] to shew to others, appears to me to be borne out: and thus His φιλανθρωπία would parallel πράσινα πάτταν ἀνθρώπους above, and the fact of its being ‘love towards men’ should be expressed. Bengel’s remark also is worth notice: “Hominum vitia plane contraria enumerantur versus 3.” The junction of λόγος, ὁτίς, with φιλανθρωπία, ἵαι, is very common: see the numerous quotations in Wets.) of our Saviour, God (the Father: cf. διὰ ἑαυτοῦ. χρ. below, and see note on ch. ii. 13), was manifested (viz. in Redemption, by the Incarnation and Satisfaction of the Redeemer), not by virtue of ἐξ, as the ground out of which an act springs. Cf. besides the frequent ἐκ πίστεως, ἐξ ἐργῶν, — Matt. xii. 37 bis: Rom. i. 4: 2 Cor. xiii. 4) works wrought in (I have thus represented the τῶν ἐν: ἐργῶν [general, ‘any works’] τῶν ἐκ δικ. [viz. ‘which were,’] particularizing out of those, inclusive of righteousness’] ἐν δικ. in righteousness, as the element and condition in which they were wrought) righteousness which we (emphatic) did (not, ‘have done,’ as E. Y., nor ‘had done,’ as Conyb., —which in fact obscures the meaning: for God’s act here spoken of was a definite act in time—and its application to us, also a definite act in time [see below]: and if we take this εὐποιήσαμεν pluperfect, we compose the Apostle’s repudiation of our works, as moving causes of those acts of God, to the time previous to those acts. For aught that this pluperfect would assert, our salvation might be prompted on God’s part by future works of righteousness which He foresaw we should do. Whereas the simple acrostic sense throws the whole into the same time,—‘His goodness, &c. was manifested . . . not for works which we did . . . He saved us’,—and renders the repudiation of human merit universal. On the construction, cf. Thl.: ἐσώσαν ἡμᾶς οἶκ ἐξ ἐργῶν ἐν εὐποιήσαιμεν, ἀντὶ τοῦ οὗτο εὐποιήσαμεν ἐργα δικαιοσύνης, οὗτε ἐσώθη-
to *εσωθεν,*] neces tua, *with D*KL rel Chr : txt AD*FGN* 17. 67* Clem Max Ath Cyr-ger Thudrt Damase, — *T. e. bef aut DEF.* ins tua bef *λουτρων Λ* : om CDFKLN rel Orig-!gape Ath Cyr-ger. ins dia bef *πνευματος* D*F.*

6. for ο, η D*1* lect-17.

*μεν ικ ουτων, αλλα το παν ρ αιγαθης αυτου εποηθε* *but according to* (after the measure of, in pursuance of, after the promptings of: see Ellic’s note) *His compassion He saved us* (this *εσωθεν* must be referred back to the definite objective act of God in Redemption, which has been above mentioned. On the part of God, that act is one—in the application of it to individuals, it is composed of many and successive acts. But this *εσωθεν,* being contemporaneous with *τη εμεφανη* above, cannot apply, as De Wette, to our individual salvation alone. At the same time, standing as it does in a transitional position, between God’s objective act and the subjective individual application of it, it no doubt looks forward as well as backward— to individual realization of salvation, as well as to the divine completion of it once for all in Christ. Calvin, h. I., refers the completeness of our salvation rather to God’s looking on it as subjectively accomplished in us: “De fide loquitur, et nos jam salutem adepto esse docet. Ergo utneque peccato impliciti corpus mortis circumferens, certi tamen de salute nostra summus, si modo fide insita sinna in Christum, secundum illud [Joh. v. 24]: ‘Qui credit in filium Dei, transivit de morte in vitam.’” Panlo post tamen, fidei nomine interposito nos re ipsa nondum adepto esse ostendit, quod Christus morte sua praeitis. Unde sequitur, ex parte Dei salutem nostram implicitam esse, cujus fructio in finem usque militiae differt.” The *ημας* here is not *all mankind,* which would be inconsistent with what follows, —nor *all Christians,* however true that would be,—but the same as are indicated by *και ημεις* above, —the particular Christians in the Apostle’s view as he was writing—Titus and his Cretan converts, and himself) by means of the *laver* (not *washing,* as E. V.; see the Lexx.: but always a vessel, or pool in which washing takes place. Here, the baptismal font: see on Eph. v. 26) of regeneration (first, let us treat of *παλιγγενεσια.* It occurs only in ref. Matt., and there in an objective sense, whereas here it is evidently subjective. There, it is the great second birth of heaven and earth in the latter days: here, the second birth of the individual man. Though not occurring elsewhere in this sense, it has its cognate expressions, — *e. g.* *αυγενεια,* 1 Pet. i. 3, 23: *γεννηθαι ανωθεν,* John iii. 3 &c. Then, of the *genitive.* The font is the ‘laver of regeneration,’ because it is the vessel consecrated to the use of that Sacrament whereby, in its completeness as a Sacrament [see below], the new life unto God is conveyed. And insomuch as it is in that font, and when we are in it, that the first breath of that life is drawn, it is the laver of—belonging to, pertaining to, settling forth,—regeneration. Observe, there is here no figure: the words are literal: Baptism is taken as in all its completion,—the outward visible sign accompanied by the inward spiritual grace; and as thus complete, it not only represents, but is, the new birth. Cf. Calvin: “Solent Apostoli a Sacramentis ducere argumentum, ut rem illie significatam prophet, quia principium illud valere debet interios pios, Deum non inanibus nobisce figuris ludere, sed virtute sana intus praestare quod externo signo demonstrat. Quare Baptismus congruenter et vere lavacrum regenerationis dicitur. Vimi et usum Sacramentorum recte est tenebit qui rem et signum ita connectet, ut signum non faciat inane aut inefficax: neque tamen cujus orandi causa Spiritus sancto detrahatur quod signum est.” The font then, the laver of regeneration, representing the external portion of the Sacrament, and pledging the internal,—that inward and spiritual grace, necessary to the completion of the Sacrament and its regenerating power, is not, as too often, left to follow as a matter of course, and thus baptismal regeneration rendered a mere formal and meaningless thing, ‘ex operae operato,’ —but is distinctly stated in the following words) and (understand *δια* again: so Thudrt. apparently,—Bengel ‘*dus res commemorant: lavacrum regenerationis,* quae baptismo in Christum peripherias,—
et renovatio Spiritus sancti [ ], al. On the other hand, most Commentators [see Ellic. here] take ἀνακαίνωσίας as a second gen. after λαυτρῶ θ: and for the purpose of making this clearer, the τοῦ seems to have been inserted before λαυτρῶ [see var. readd.]. The great formal objection to this is, the destruction of the balance of the sentence, in which παλιγγενεώς would be one gen., and ἄνακαίνωσίων πνεύματος ἄγιον the other. The far greater contextual objection is, that thus the whole from παλ. to ἄγιον would be included under λαυτρῶ, and baptism made not only the seal of the new birth, but the sacrament of progressive sanctification the renewal (ἀνακαίνωσις, see ref.) is used of the gradual renewal of heart and life in the image of God, following upon the new birth, and without which the birth is a mere abortion, not leading on to vitality and action. It is here treated as potentially involved in God's act ἐσωθέν. We must not, as Herr, al., for the sake of making it contemporaneous with the λαυτρῶν, give it another and untenable meaning, that of mere incipient spiritual life of (brought about by ; genitive of the efficient cause) the Holy Spirit (who alone can renew unto life in progressive sanctification. So that, as in 1 Pet. iii. 21, it is not the mere outward act or fact of baptism to which we attach such high and glorious epithets, but that complete baptism by water and the Holy Ghost, whereof the first cleansing by water is indeed the ordinary sign and seal, but whereof the glorious indwelling Spirit of God is the only efficient cause and continuous agent. 'Baptismal regeneration' is the distinguishing doctrine of the new covenant [Matt. iii. 11]: but let us take care that we know and bear in mind what 'baptism' means: not the mere ecclesiastical act, not the mere fact of reception by that act among God's professing people, but that, completed by the divine act, manifested by the operation of the Holy Ghost in the heart and through the life. 6.] which (attr.; not = ἐξ οὗ, as Heydenr. οὗ, viz. the Holy Spirit, not λαυτρῶν, as even De W. confesses, who yet maintains the dependence of both genitives on ἐνακαίνωσις) He poured out (ref. on us richly (again, it is mere waste of time to debate whether this pouring out be the one general one at Pentecost, or that in the heart of each individual believer: the one was God's objective act once for all, in which all its subjective exemplifications and applications were potentially and essentially wrapped) through (as its channel and medium, He having purchased it for us, and made the pouring out possible, in and by His own blessed Sacrifice in our nature) Jesus Christ our Saviour (which title was used of the Father above: of Him,—ultimately: of our Lord, immediately: "Pater nostre salutis primus anctor, Christus vero opifex, et quasi artifex," as Justinian in Ellicot, whose own remarks are well worth consulting), 7.] in order that (this ἐν, in the form of the sentence, may express the aim either of ἐσωθεν [Beng. De W., Huther, Ellic.] or of ἐξεχεον: more naturally, I believe, of the latter [Wiesinger]: and for these reasons, that ἐσωθεν seeming to have its full pregnant meaning as it stands, (1) does not require any further statement of aim and purpose: but ἐξεχεον being a mere word of action, is more properly followed by a statement of a reason why the pouring out took place: and (2) that this statement of aim and purpose, if it applies to ἐσωθεν, has been already anticipated, if ἐσωθεν be understood as including what is generally known as σωτηρία. Theologically, this statement of purpose is exact: the effusion of the Spirit has for its purpose the conviction of sin and manifestation of the righteousness of Christ, out of which two spring justifying faith) having been justified (the aor. part. here [expressed in English by 'having been'] is not contemporaneous with the aor. subj. below. Ordinarily this would be so: but the theological consideration of the place of justification in the Christian life, illustrated by such passages as Rom. v. 1, δικαιοθετεῖν οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως εἰρήνην ἐξεχεον πρὸς τ. θεόν, κ.τ.λ., seems to determine here the aor. part. to be antecedent to γεννήθημεν by His (ἐκεῖνων, referring to the more remote subject, must be used here not of our Lord, who has just been mentioned, but of the Father: and
for πιστος, αληθις 67. — rec ins τω before ἰω, with ref: om ACDFKLN Thdrt Damasc Thl. (17 defective). rec ins τα before καλα, with D1 ref Thdrt: om ACDFKLN m Chr Damasc. (17 def.)

so, usually, χαρις θεον [Acts xi. 23; xx. 24, 32: Rom. v. 15: 1 Cor. i. 4, &c.] is the efficient cause of our justification in Christ) grace, we might be made (perhaps passive, see however on 1 Thess. i. 5) heirs (see especially Gal. iii. 29) according to (in pursuance of, consistently with, so that the inheritance does not dispossess, but fully accomplishes and satisfies the hope; not 'through' (?) as Conyb., referring to Rom. viii. 24, 25, where, however, the thought is entirely different) the hope of eternal life (I cannot consent, although considerable scholars e.g. De W., Ellic.) have maintained the view, to join the gen. ζωης with κληρονομαι, in the presence of the expression, in this very Epistle, ete' επιτι ζωης αιωνων, ch. i. 2. The objection brought against joining ολοις with ζωης here is that thus κληρονομαι would stand alone. But it does thus stand alone in every place where St. Paul uses it in the spiritual sense; viz. Rom. iv. 14; viii. 17 bis [‘θεον is a wholly different genitive]: Gal. iii. 29; iv. 1, 7: and therefore why not here? Chrys.'s two renderings, both of which Huther quotes for his view, will suit mine just as well: κατ' ολοις, τουτουτι, καθως ἥπιασαι, ὅτως ἀπολαυσομεν, ἢ ἣν ὑδὴ καὶ κληρονομοι οὕτως. The former is the one to which I have inclined: the latter would mean, "we might be heirs, according to the hope"—i.e. in proportion as we have the hope, realize our heirship—"of eternal life".)

8—11.] General rules for Titus. 8.] Faithful is the saying (refl.: viz. the saying which has just been uttered, δι' ἡ χρηστοτητις κ.τ.λ. This sentence alone, of those which have gone before, has the solemn and somewhat rhetorical character belonging for the most part to the "faithful sayings" of the apostolic church quoted in these Epistles), and concerning these things (the things which have just been dwelt on; see above) I would have thee positively affirm ('confirmare,' Vulg.; 'asseverare,' Beza: cf. Polyb. xii. 12. 6, διορισθεμεν και διαβεβαιωθεμεν περι τοιτων. The δια implies persistence and thoroughness in the affirmation, in order that (not, 'that,' implying the purport of that which he is διαβεβαιωθήθα, nor is that which follows the πιστος λόγος, as would appear in the E. V.: what follows is to be the result of thorough affirmation of vv. 4—7) they who have believed (have been brought to belief and endure in it: the present would perhaps express the sense, but the perfect is to be preferred, as much as πασιναι is often used of the hour and act of commencing belief: cf. Acts xix. 2: Rom. xii. 11) God (trusted God, learned to credit what God says: not to be confounded with πιστ. εἰς, John xiv. 1, 1 Pet. i. 8, 21—or πιστ. εἰς, Mark i. 15 [not used of God], or πιστ. εἰς, Rom. iv. 5. There appears no reason for supposing with De W. that these words describe merely the Gentile Christians) may take care to (φοροντις with an inf. is not the ordinary construction: it commonly has ἔπος, ἵνα, ὡς, εἰ, μή, or a relative clause. We have an instance in Plut. Fab. Max. c. 12, τα πραπτομενα γινοσκε έφοροντις. See Palm and Rost, sub voce) practise (a workman provides over, is master and conductor of, his work: and thus the transition in προσπασθαι from presiding over to conducting and practising a business was very easy. Thus we have, tracing the progress of this transition, ὤποι μάλιστα προστηκεισαν της μεταβολης, Thue. viii. 75: τοις ου φανεροι ὃτι προστάτες των πράγματος τα γνωσθειν γη ὄμοι ἀποστερησαμεν με ζητομε, Demosth. 689, 2: 'Ασπασια ου κοσμιον προστασια εγεργαια, Plut. Peric. 24: τέχνης προσπασθαι,—δε τοιοιν ἔχροι δι προστήτην φθονον, Soph. El. 968: χειρι βιαιω προστηται των πανοργηματος, Synes. Ep. 67, p. 211 d. See Palm and Rost, sub voce) good works: these things (viz. same as toitων before, the great truths of vv. 4—7, this doctrine; not, as Thl., ἡ φορονος και ἡ προστασια των καλων ἐργων, ἡ
9. for γενεα, λογοχαίας Φ. 

10. νομοθετικών δέ & δευτεραν DF sy Chr Thdt.; txt ACKLİN rel vulg.(and F-lat) Eus Ath. (17 def.)—for καὶ, ἦ Φ.—for δευτεραν, δύο D copt Iren-int, Jer,(remarks, in ms. latt. legit Post umum et alteram corrupt.)

11. απολλώνα Φ: απολλών D²Η¹, 

9. for ερεις, ev D¹FN¹. 
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for σπουδ., ταχεῖς Φ. 

αἰτή D¹ b g² m Thdt-ed.

9. for γενεα, λογοχαίας Φ. 

10. νομοθετικών δέ & δευτεραν DF sy Chr Thdt.; txt ACKLİN rel vulg.(and F-lat) Eus Ath. (17 def.)—for καὶ, ἦ Φ.—for δευτεραν, δύο D copt Iren-int, Jer,(remarks, in ms. latt. legit Post umum et alteram corrupt.)

for σπουδ., ταχεῖς Φ. 

αἰτή D¹ b g² m Thdt-ed.
15. for ἀσπασαι, ἀσπασάσθη A.  

with zeal Zenas the lawyer (Zηνᾶς = Ζηνόδωρος. Probably a Jewish scribe or jurist [Matt. xxii. 35, note] who had been converted, and to whom the name of his former occupation still adhered, as in the case of Μαρταῖος ὁ τελωνής. Hippolytus and Dorotheus number him among the seventy disciples, and make him to have been subsequently bishop of Diospolis. There is an apocryphal 'Acts of Titus' bearing his name. Winer, RWB.) and Ἀπόλλων (see on Acts xviii. 21: 1 Cor. i. 12; xvi. 12), that nothing may be wanting to them. 14.] Moreover (connexion of δὲ καὶ: the contrast in the δὲ is, 'and I will not that thou only shouldest thus forward them, though I use the singular number; but see that the other brethren also join with thee in contributing to their outfit'), let also our people (our fellow-believers who are with thee) learn to practise (see note, ver. 8) good works, contributions to (eis, for the supply of) the necessary wants which arise (such is the force of τὰς: such wants as from time to time are presented before Christians, requiring relief in the course of their Father's work in life), that they may not be unfruitful (implying, that in the supply by us of such ἀναγκαία χρεῖαι, our ordinary opportunities are to be found of bearing fruit to God's praise).

15.] Salutations: greetings: apostolic benedictions. All that are with me salute thee. Salute those that love us in the faith (not in faith: see note, 1 Tim. i. 2). This form of salutation, so different from any occurring in St. Paul's other Epistles, is again [see on ch. i. 1] a strong corroboration of genuineness. An apocryphal imitator would not have missed the Apostle's regular formula of salutation. God's (ἡ) grace be with all of you (of the Cretan churches. It does not follow from this that the letter was to be imparted to them: but in the course of things it naturally would be thus imparted by Titus). On the subscription in the rec., making our Epistle date from Nicopolis, see in Prolegg. § ii. 30 ff.
ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΗΜΟΝΑ.

Παύλος ἀδέσμιος Χοστου Ἰησοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεου οὗ ἐκλέφος Φιλήμον ἑκάτερον τῷ ἐάναπτω καὶ διενεργῶν ἤμων καὶ Λαβίμῳ τῷ ἐκεῖνῳ καὶ Ἀχιππίῳ τῷ έσυναστράει.

John vi. 45. Winer, edn. 6, § 20. 2. d ver. 24. Phil. ii. 25. e Acts xv. 25. Rom. i. 7. xvi. 3, 8 al.

Τίτλος. rec Παύλου ον ἐπιστολῆς πρὸς φιλήμονα επιστολῆς: Παύλου (προφΗ Ων ιγιαττῆς ιλισβίος προστιττῆς προστιττῇ
τῷ θεῷ, καὶ τῇ κατ' οἶκον σου ἐκκλησίαν. Ἐφ 4:8

3. Ἐφ 4:8

4. Ἐφ 4:8

5. Ἐφ 4:8

6. χρηστοῦ.

3. om ημῶν Ν

4. τιστιν καὶ τὴν αγαπην (see Eph 15, Col i. 4, 1 Thess i. 3) D m 73. 116 Syr arm Ambrst. ree for eis, pros (see note), with DFKLGl slr syr G-lat (ad dominium . . . et in omnes); txt ACBD17 copt.

6. for διάκ. κοινωνία Ν ins erγων bef ἀγαθον F2 c e g l vulg (with fuld, agst

 Cf. Col. iv. 17. συντρατώθη] see reff. and 2 Tim. ii. 3. He was perhaps Philemon's son (so Michael, Oskh., al.) or a family friend ἔπερον τινα ἐκείνου φίλον, Chrys.: so Thl.: or the minister of the family (ὁ δὲ Ἀρχιππος τὴν δίδασκαλίαν αὐτὸν ἐπέστειλεν, Thdrt.): the former hypothesis being perhaps the most probable, as the letter concerns a family matter: but see on next clause. To what grade in the ministry he belonged, is idle to enquire: nor does Col. iv. 17 furnish us with any data. τῇ κατ' οἶκ. ο. ἐκκλ.] This appears to have consisted not merely of the family itself, but of a certain assembly of Christians who met in the house of Philemon: see the same expression in Col. iv. 15, of Nymphas: and in Rom. xvi. 3—5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19, of Aquila and Priscus. Meyer remarks the tact of the Apostle in associating with Philemon those connected with his house, but not going beyond the limits of the house. The former part is noticed also by Chrys.: συμπαραλαμβάνει κ. ἔτερον (—ρους) μεθ' ἐαυτοῦ δέκα κύκλων υπὸ πολλῶν ἄξιον ὑπέρ τῶν ἀγίων, 6λλον εἰς κ. δοῦναι τὴν χάριν.

4.—7. RECOGNITION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER AND USEFULNESS OF PHILEMON.

4.] See Rom. i. 8: 1 Cor. i. 4. πάντου belongs to εὔχαριστο—προσευχῶν μου. The mixing of prayer and thanksgiving in that clause does not exclude the idea of intercessory prayer, nor does (as Meyer maintains) the subsequent clause make against this: the ἄκοινον κ.τ.λ. was the reason why he ἐπί τῶν προσευχῶν αὐτοῦ, and ὅπως κ.τ.λ. the aim of his doing so. To join ὅπως κ.τ.λ. with ἔχεις is flat in the extreme, and perfectly inconceivable as a piece of St. Paul's writing. In order that the communication of thy faith (with others) may become effectual in the element in which it works) the thorough knowledge (entire appreciation and experimental recognition [by us]) of every good thing (good gifts and graces)—cf. Rom. vii. 18, the negation of this in the carnal man] which is in us, to (the glory of: connect with ἐνεργής γενεται Christ [Jesus]. This seems the only simple and unobjectionable rendering. To understand ἡ κοιν. τῆς π. σου, 'fides tua quam communem nobiscum habes,' as Bengel (and indeed Chrys., Thl., al.), is very objectionable: to join εἰς ἡ παρακλησιμα πασίν, 're cognition by others' (παρακλήσιμα sumitur
habetque innotescendi significationem,' Grots.: so Erasm., Beza, Est., all.) worst of all. The interpretation given above, I find in the main to be that of De W., Meyer, and Koch. 7.] If we read χάριν with the rec., it will be correctly interpreted by 2 Cor. 1:5, as a benefit,—an outpouring of the divine χάρις—not χάρ. ἔχειν in the sense of 1 Tim. 1:12: 2 Tim. 1:3. 'to give thanks,' for then it seems always to be followed by a dative. The γάρ gives a reason for the prayer of ver. 6 as De W., not, as Meyer, for the thanksgiving of ver. 4: see above. [διὰ κ.τ.λ.] further specification of τῇ ἁγίᾳ σου, whose work consisted in ministering to the various wants and afflictions of the saints at Colosse. ἀδελφος is skilfully placed last, as introducing the request which follows.


8.] διό relates to διὰ τῇ ἁγίᾳ, below, and refers back to the last verse; it is not to be joined to the participial clause as Chrys., al.: it was not on account of ver. 7 that St. Paul had confidence to command him, but that he preferred beseeching him.
of this Epistle and those to Eph. and Col.; see Prolegg. to Eph. § iv.), I beseech thee, &c. If we read ἐγώ before ἐγένησα, the repetition of ἐγώ—ἐγώ will serve, as Meyer remarks, to mark more forcibly the character of his own child, and ἐν τοῖς διασκόπισι gives more weight still to the entreaty. ὀνόσιμον is not (with Erasm.-Schmid) to be treated as if it were a play on the name, ἐν ἐγένειν... ὀνόσιμον, 'profitable to me;' but simply to be regarded as an accusative by attraction. 1. Here there certainly appears to be a play on the name—'quondam... parum suō nominī respondens,—nunc in diversum mutatus.' Erasm. (No play on χριστός as Koch, al.) must be thought of, as too far-fetched, and because the datives σοί and τοῖς fix the adjectives to their ordinary meanings.) He had been ἀχριστός in having run away, and apparently (ver. 18) defrauded his master as well. Meyer quotes from Plat., Lys. p. 204 B: φαῖλος κ. ἀχριστός; and from ib. Resp. p. 411 B: χριστός κ. ἀχριστός ἐπόσιν. On account of the σοί καὶ ἐμοὶ, ἀχριστόν must not be limited to the sense of outward profit, but extended to a spiritual meaning as well—profitable to me, as the fruit of my ministry,—to thee as a servant, and also as a Christian brother (ver. 16). 12.] There does not appear to be any allusion to the fact of sonship in τά ἐνα σπλάγχνα, as Chrys., Thdrt., (though ἐπίν νῦς, ἐκ τῶν ἐμῶν γεγενηματι σπλάγχνων), al.; for thus the spiritual similitude would be confused, being here introduced materially. But the expression more probably means, mine own heart—'as dear to me as mine own heart.' Meyer compares the expressions in Plautus,—

meum corculum,' Cas. iv. 4. 14.—meum mel, meum cor,' Pcen. i. 2. 154. Cf. also, 'Hic habitatus tuns illo hospes, mea visera, Thesbion,' Marius Victor, in Suicer, Theis. ii. 998, and examples of both meanings in Wetst., Suicer, and Koch. The construction (see var. read.) is an anacoluthon: the Apostle goes off into the relative clause, and loses sight, as so often, of the construction with which he began: taking it up again at ver. 17. 13.] ἐγώ, emphatic, ἴ. for my part. ἐβουλομένῳ, nearly as ἰδίχρισμον, in Rom. ix. 3 (though in that place there certainly is, as Ell: c. remarks, a more distinct reference to (suppressed conditional clause).—was wishing,—had a mind, could have wished, in our idiom. ἡδέλθησα, ver. 14, differs from ἐβουλομένῳ, (1) in that it means simply willed, as distinguished from the stronger wished, (2) in that it marks the time immediately preceding the return of Onesimus, whereas the imperfect spreads the wish over the period previous. I was (long) minded... but (on consid.) I was not willing. ὑπὲρ σοῦ] For, worth thou here, thou wouldst minister to me: I was minded therefore to retain him in thy place. διακονή, pres. subj., representing the ἐβουλομένῳ as a still continuing wish. ἐν τοῖς διασκόπισι τῶν εὐγελίων explained well by Thdrt., ὀφείλει μοι διακονήν ἢ μαθητήν διδασκάλω, κ. διδασκάλω τά θεία πρόποτιντε: not without allusion also to the fetters which the Gospel had laid on himself.
apply only to the particular thing in hand; (= 'nothing in the matter'), that thy good (service towards me: but not in this particular only: the expression is general—
the particular case would serve as an example of it) **might not as** (appearing as if it were: = particula ὧς, substantivis, partici-
cipis, totius enuntiationibus proposita, rer veritate sublata aliquid opinione, er-
reore, simulatio niti declarat.) Fritz. on Romans, ii. p. 360) of (after the fashion of, according to: = Ἰἐδε ὅτι πάντες κατ' ἀνάγκην αὐτῷ κοινωνήσουσιν τῶν πραγ-
μάτων, Polyb. iii. 67. 5) necessity, but of free will. 15.] τάχα is delicately said, to conclude Πιλιμέου: so Chrys.,
καλῶς τό τάχα, ἵνα ἑξή διεσπαρσίτης ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀπὸ σωφροσύνης ἕχων ἡ ὕφη τῷ διεσπαρμένῳ διανοίᾳ, κ. οὐκ ἀπὸ ποιημαῖς, λέγει τάχα. And Je-
rome says, = occulta sunt quippe judicia Dei, et temerariam est quasi de certo pro-
unciacione.' He refers to Gen. xlv. 5, where Joseph suggests the purpose which God's providence had in sending him down into Egypt.
[ἐξωρίσθη] εὐφήμως καὶ τὴν ὕφην χρωμάτων καλεῖ, ἵνα μὴ τῷ ὕμνῳ τῆς ὕφης παρέβαλεν τῶν διεσπαρμένων, Thl.: similarly Chrys. 
πρὸς ὄραν much has been built upon this as indicating that the Epistle was written not so far from Colossae as Rome: but without ground: the contrast is between πρὸς ὄραν and αἰώνιον.
ἀλώνιον agrees with αὐτῶν: see reff.: and imports ὅπως ἐν παρουσίᾳ μόνον καρός, ἀλλὰ κ. ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι, as Chrys. 
[ἀπεχώρης] see reff., and note on Matt. vi. 2—mayest have him for thine own—possess him fully, entirely.

So Antonius, xi. 1, says that the logiκὴ ψυχῆ does not bear fruit for others to reap, ἀλλά, but ὅπως ἐν καταληφθῇ, πάλινς κ. ἀπροσδεσθὲν τῇ τρεπτον τοιοῦτο ἔστε εἰτείν, Ἐγὼ ἀπέκρυψα τά ἐμα.

16.] And that, in a different relation from the one before subsisting. But ὅπως διδαχὴ does not imply his manumis-
sion; rather the contrary: the stress is on ὃς and ὅπως—'no longer as a slave' (though he be one), but ὅπως a slave.'

[μάλιστα, 'of all other men,' of all those without thy house, with whom he has been connected: but πόσῳ μᾶλλον σοι, with whom he stands in so near and lastin g a relation.

17.] takes up again the sentiment (and the construction) broken off at the end of ver. 12. The κοινωνία referred to is that shown by the ἀγαπή of him, common to both, mentioned in the last verse: but extending far wider than it, even to the community of faith, and hope, and love between them as Christian men: not that of goods, as Bengal: 'ut tua sint mea et mea tua.'

18.] δὲ: in contrast to the favourable reception bespoken for him in the last verse. 'Confessus crat Onesimus Paulo, quae fece-
rat,' Bengal. ὃς ἐντονον, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀλλὰ τί; ἐν τῇ ἡδίκησι: ἄμα κ. τῷ ἁμαρτήματι ἀφελέσθη, καὶ ὅπως ἔστω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν πρὸς φιλόν, τῇ τῆς ἀδίκιας μᾶλλον ἢ τῇ τῆς κλη-
ρίας ὑποκάτου ἀρετῶν, Chrys. 

[ἡ ὁφειλή is said of the same matter, and is merely explanatory of ἡ ὁφειλή: τοῦτο referring to both verbs. The weight of MS. testimony to ἐλλογή over-
bears the mere assertion of Fritzsche (cn

Γ  f
Rom. v. 13)—'λαοὺς εἶστιν διευθυντικά (Luc. Lexipph., p. 15), sed ἄλλως vox nulla est:—that reckon, or impute to me: hardly perhaps, notwithstanding the engagement of the next verse, with a view to actual repayment, but rather to inducing Philemon to forego exacting it.

19.] The inference from this is, that the whole Epistle was autographic: for it would be most unnatural to suppose the Apostle to break off his amanuensis here, and write this engagement with his own hand. ονα μὴ λέγω, “est σχήμα παρασωτικώς sive reticentiae, cum dicimus nos omittere volle, quod maxime dicimus,” Grot. ονα μὴ does not exactly, as Meyer, give the purpose of St. Paul in εγγαγας—ἀποτίσων: but rather that of an understood clause,—yield me this request, lest I should have to remind thee, &c. Ellic. paraphrases, "repay: yes I say this, not doubting thee, but not wishing to press on thee all the claim that I might justly urge." καὶ τούτο ἀνάγας καὶ κατὰ τὸν τὴν φιλια λαγόν, καὶ τοῦ σφόδρα βαθύν  ἡν, Climys. And this may well be the right view.

καὶ σωτρῶν] οὐ τὰ σωτήριον μόνον, Chr. δι᾽ ἐμὸν γὰρ, φησί, τὰ τοῖσι πεπραμεθασασας καὶ ἐπετρέπαν δόλων, ὡς ἐπὶ ἀποστολὴς διδασκαλίας ἐξεσθή ὁ Φιλίμων, Thdttr.

20.] οὐ, as so often when we make requests, asserts our assent with the subject of the request: so Phil. iv. 3, al. ἐγὼ καὶ σοῦ are both emphatic—and the unusual word ἀνάγαμη, thus thrown into the background, is an evident allusion to the name Ὀνήσιμος. "The form ἀνάγαμη is similarly used by Ignatius (Polye. 1, 6, pp. 720, 725; Magn. 12, p. 672, al.),—once (Eph. 2, p. 645), curiously enough, but apparently by mere accident, after a mention of an Onesimus." Ellicot. (Lobeck, on Phryg., p. 12, gives a complete account of the forms and tenses of this verb which are in use.)

The sentiment itself is a reference to σωτήριον μοὶ προσφέρετε:—this being so, let me have profit of thee, εἰς κυρίον, not in worldly gain, but in the Lord—in thine increase and richness in the graces of His Spirit. ἀνάπαυον . . . refresh (viz. by acceding to my request) my heart (as above)—the seat of the affections. τὰ ἀπάγαμα μοῦ must not for a moment be imagined, with Jer., Est., Schrader, al., to designate Onesimus, who was so called in ver. 12: which would be most unnatural) in Christ (as εἰς κυρίον above).

21.] Serves to put Philemon in mind of the apostolic authority, with which he writes: and hints deliberately (perhaps: but this may be doubtful: compare Ellic., here) at the manumission of Onesimus, which he has not yet requested.

καὶ, also, besides doing what I say, 22. ἀμα δὲ καὶ But at the same time (as thou fulfilllest my request), also . . . . We may, perhaps, take this direction as serving to secure the favourable reception of Onesimus: for the Apostle would himself come and see how his request had fared: τολῆ γὰρ ἡ χάρις κ. ἡ τιμὴ Παύλου ἐνθυμούντος, Παύλου μετὰ ἥλικιαν, Παύλου μετὰ δεσμοὺς, Climys. Or it may be, as
χριστῷ Ἰησοῦν, 24 Μάρκος, Ἀρίσταρχος, Δημᾶς, Λουκᾶς, οἱ 1 συνεργοὶ μου.

25 ἔν ἐμῇ χάρι ἐν τῷ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ μετὰ τοῦ ἀ πνεύματος ὑμῶν.

ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΗΜΟΝΑ.

25. om ἑκὼν Ν 17. 31. 47. 116. rec at end ins αμην, with CDKS rel: om AD1 17 arm Jer.

SUBSCRIPTION. rec adds εγγραφὴ απὸ ρωμῆς διὰ ὑπησιμοῦ οἰκετοῦ, with K al: ΓΓ are deficient after ver 20: but Γ (not Γ) after a vacant space notes ησαυακήσας (Laudicenses G-lat) αρχεται επιστολή τοῦ αγίου απόστ. παυλ. επ. πρ. φίλημ. κ. απειλοῦσαν τον ὑπησιμοῦ και πρὸς ἀρχηγοῦ τοῦ διακόνου τῆς εὐ κολουσαί εκκλησίας εγγραφὴ απὸ ρωμῆς διὰ ὑπησιμοῦ οἰκετοῦ I, b: om I: A deficient: εργ. ἀπ. ρ. Δ. ὁ οἰκ. h k m: txt C 17, and D(adding επιληπθη), Ν(adding στιχων, without numeral).

Ellie, that Philemon was not to consider the Epistle as a mere petition for Onesimus, but as containing special messages on other matters to himself. ὑμῶν and ὑμῖν refer to those named in vv. 1, 2. 23—25.] CONCLUSION. See on Col. iv. 10, 12, 14, where the same persons send greeting. Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγήμενος Ἰουστός (Col. iv. 11) does not appear here. 25.] For this form of salutation, see reff. On all matters regarding the date and circumstances of writing the Epistle, see the Prolegomena.

END OF VOL. III.