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PREFATORY NOTE.

THE Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians was translated from the third edition of the German by the late Mr. G. H. Venables; but, as it became necessary to incorporate the numerous alterations and additions made by Dr. Meyer for the fourth edition, the work of revising and completing the version of Mr. Venables has been entrusted to the Rev. John C. Moore, who has also executed independently the greater portion of the translation, from the fourth German edition, of the Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians. I have myself translated a small portion of the latter, and, as in previous volumes, have revised the whole with some care, and carried it through the press.

It is stated by Dr. Meyer’s son, in the Preface to the new edition of this volume, that his father had, before his fatal illness, despatched the one half of the manuscript of his revision to the printers, and that the other half was found labelled “ready for the press.” The book, therefore, although issued subsequently to the author’s death, is entirely his own work. I have reserved the biographical sketch of Dr. Meyer given by his son for the first volume of the series. The Commentary on the Epistle to Philemon, which in the German accompanies those now issued, will also appear subsequently.

It is scarcely necessary to say that the explanations given in preceding volumes as to the principles on which this translation is issued, and the caveat inserted regarding the views or opinions occasionally expressed by Dr. Meyer, are equally applicable to the present.

W. P. D.

GLASGOW COLLEGE,
October 1875.
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THE

EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. THE PHILIPPAN COMMUNITY.¹

The fortified city of Philippi² was situated in Macedonia, on the borders of Thrace; in earlier times, as a Thasian colony, it was called, from its site abounding in springs, Κρηνίδες (Diodor. S. xvi. 3. 8; Strabo, vii. p. 490), but it changed this name for that of its enlarger and fortifier, Philip, the son of Amyntas. It was rich in gold mines (Herod. vi. 46; Appian. Bell. civ. iv. 15; Strabo, vii. p. 511); and the victory over Brutus and Cassius made it a landmark in the history of the world. Through this overthrow of Roman freedom it acquired a high rank as a Roman colony with the Jus Italicum (see on Acts xvi. 11); but it obtained another and higher historical interest, attended by a greater gain for the Roman Empire, through the fact that it was the first city in Europe in which Paul, under the divine direction in a nocturnal vision (see on Acts xvi.


PHIL.
9 f.), and amid ill-treatment and persecution (Acts xvi. 16 ff.; 1 Thess. ii. 2), planted Christianity. Thus did the city vindicate its original name, in a higher sense, for the entire West. This event took place in the year 53, during the second missionary journey of the apostle, who also, in his third journey, laboured among the Macedonian churches (Acts xx. 1 f.), and especially in Philippi (Acts xx. 6). With what rich success he there established Christianity is best shown by our epistle itself, which exhibits a more cordial, affectionate, and undisputed relation between the church and the apostle, and bears a more unalloyed testimony to the distinction of the church (comp. especially iv. 1), than we find in any other apostolic letter. This peculiar mutual affection also explains the fact that Paul, contrary to his usual custom, accepted aid on more than one occasion from the Philippians (iv. 10 ff.; 2 Cor. xi. 9); from which, however, on account of this very love, we are not entitled to infer that they were specially wealthy. The Jews were so few in number that they had only a προσευκτη (see on Acts xvi. 13), and the Christian church was one consisting mostly of those who had been Gentiles. The view which discovers a Judaizing faction (iii. 2) in it (Storr, Flatt, Bertholdt, Eichhorn, Rheinwald, Guericke, and others), seems all the more unwarrantable, when we consider how deeply the apostle was concerned to ward off from his beloved Philippians the danger, at that time everywhere so imminent, of the intrusion of Judaistic disturbance, and how susceptible the Philippians themselves were to such a danger, owing to a certain spiritual conceit which had already impaired their unanimity (i. 12–ii. 16, iv. 2). Comp. i. 28. See, against the view of heretical partisanship, Schinz, p. 48 ff.; Rilliet, Commentaire, Geneva, 1841, p. 352 ff.; Weiss, Introduction to his Ausleg., Berl. 1859; compare, however, Huther in the Mecklenb. theolog. Zeitschrift, 1862, p. 623 ff.

1 Credner, § 158 f., represents the conceit of the Philippians as apparent also in "the servile courting of the rank of a ἀρχής." But the statement in Acts xvi. 12, which, besides, is purely historical, gives no warrant for the charge of any arbitrary assumption of rank.
§ 2. PLACE AND TIME OF COMPOSITION, OCCASION, AND CONTENTS.

It is justly the universal tradition (Chrysostom; Euthalius, in Zacagni, Coll. vet. mon. pp. 547, 642, 648; Synopsis of Athanasius, Syrian Church, the subscriptions), and the almost unanimous view of modern writers, that the epistle was written in Rome. We are pointed to Rome by the oikla Καλαρως (iv. 22), and by the crisis between life and death in which Paul was placed,—a crisis which presupposes his appeal to the emperor as the ultimate legal resort (i. 20 ff., ii. 17),—as well as by the entire conformity of his position and work (i. 12 ff.) to what we find recorded in Acts xxviii. 16 ff. The epistle must, moreover, have been written during the later period of the Roman captivity; for the passages, i. 12 ff., ii. 26 ff., betoken that a somewhat lengthened course of imprisonment had elapsed, and the apostle was already abandoned by all his more intimate companions (ii. 20), except Timothy (i. 1). A more precise specification, such as Hofmann in particular gives (that the apostle had then been transferred from his hired dwelling to the prison-house), is not deducible either from i. 12 ff., or from the mention of the Praetorium and the imperial house. We must reject the isolated attempts to transfer its composition to Corinth (Acts xviii. 12; Oeder, Progr., Onold. 1731) or to Caesarea (Acts xxiii. 23–xxvi. 32; Paulus, Progr., Jen. 1799; and Böttger, Beitr. I. p. 47 ff.; favoured also by Rilliet, and Thiersch, Kirche im apost. Zeitalt. p. 212). Concerning and against these views, see particularly Hoelemann, Commentar, 1839, p. iii. ff.; Neander, Gesch. d. Pflanzung, etc., p. 498 f.

We are to assume, therefore, as the date of composition, not indeed the full expiration of the διερλα διη of Acts xxviii. 30 (Hofmann), but the latter portion of that period,—in the year 63 possibly, or the beginning of 64.¹ See on Acts, Introd. § 4.

The occasion of the epistle was the fact that the Philippians had sent Epaphroditus with pecuniary aid to Paul, who, on

¹ Marcion properly assigned to our epistle the last place, in point of time, among his ten Pauline epistles.
the return of the former after his recovery from "a sickness nigh unto death," made him the bearer of the letter (ii. 25–28). In the utterances of the epistle, however, there is nothing to suggest any special change in the situation of the apostle as having afforded a motive for this gift on the part of the church; and it is an uncertain reading between the lines to assume, with Hofmann, not merely that the apostle was transferred to the prison-house, but that with that transference the process had reached the stage of its judicial discussion, in which the Philippians believed that they could not but discern a change to the worse for Paul, whom they regarded as suffering privations in prison. Those traces, also, which Hofmann has discovered of a letter of the church brought to Paul by Epaphroditus along with the contribution, and expressing not only the concern of the Philippians for the apostle, but also their need of instruction regarding the assaults to which their Christianity was exposed, and regarding various other matters of theirs that required to be settled and arranged, are so far from being warranted by the exegesis of the passages in question, that there is neither direct occasion nor any other sufficient reason for going beyond the oral communications of Epaphroditus in order to account for the apostle's acquaintance with the circumstances of the Philippians. And just as the aid tendered by the careful love of the church had furnished the occasion for this letter to them, so also does its entire tenor breathe forth the heartfelt and touching love, which the captive apostle cherished towards his Philippians. Not one of his epistles is so rich as this in hearty effusions of affection and in tender references; and not one of them is so characteristically epistolary, without any rigid arrangement, almost without dogmatic discussion, as also without quotations from the Old Testament or dialectic chains of reasoning. Not one is so eminently an epistle of the feelings, an outburst of the moment, springing from the deepest inward need of loving fellowship amidst outward abandonment and tribulation; a model, withal, of the union of tender love, and at times an almost elegiac impress of courageous resignation in the prospect of death, with high apostolic dignity and unbroken holy joy, hope, and
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After the apostolic salutation (i. 1 f.), Paul, with heart-winning fervour, expresseth thanks, intercession, and confidence as regards his readers (i. 3–11), and then enlarges on his present position, with his hope of a speedy return (i. 12–26); after which he exhorts them to unanimity and humility, and generally to the Christian life (i. 27–ii. 18). He promises to send Timothy to them soon, yet trusts that he himself shall also soon come to them (ii. 19–24); in the meantime he sends away to them Epaphroditus, their messenger, who is delicately and touchingly commended to them (ii. 25–30). On the point, apparently, of passing on to a conclusion (iii. 1), he proceeds to deal with his Jewish opponents, with whom he compares himself at some length, thereby inciting his readers to be like-minded with him, to keep in view the future salvation, and so to maintain their Christian standing (iii. 2–iv. 1). After a special exhortation to, and commendation of, two women (iv. 2, 3), the apostle subjoins the concluding words of encouragement (iv. 4–9), to which he had already set himself in iii. 1, adds yet another grateful effusion of his heart on account of the aid given to him (iv. 10–20), and ends with a salutation and a blessing (iv. 21–23).

§ 3. GENUINENESS AND UNITY.

The genuineness of this epistle is established externally by the continuous testimonies of the ancient church from Polycarp, iii. 11, onwards; see Marcion in Epiph. Haer. 42; Canon Murat.; Tertull. c. Marc. v. 19, de praescr. 36; literal use made of it, as early as the epistle from Vienne and Lyons, in Eus. v. 2; direct quotations from it in Iren. iv. 18. 4, v. 13. 3; Cypr. Test. iii. 39; Clem. Paed. i. 107; Tert. de resurr. 23, 47,—in the presence of which testimonies it is unnecessary to adduce uncertain allusions from apostolic Fathers and Apologists. Internally it bears the seal of genuineness in the thoroughly Pauline character of its contents, of its spirit, of its emotions, of its delicate
turns and references, of its whole diction and form, and in the comparative absence, moreover, of doctrinal definition properly so called, as well as in the prominence throughout of the features characteristic of its origin as a cordial and fresh occasional letter. Nevertheless, Baur, after repeated threats (see die sogen. Pastoralbr. pp. 79, 86, and Tub. Zeitschr. 1836, 3, p. 196), has directed his bold attacks against this epistle also (see his Paulus der Ap. Jesu Christi, 1845, p. 458 ff., and second ed. II. p. 50 ff.; also in the theol. Jahrb. 1849, p. 501 ff., 1852, p. 133 ff.¹); and Schwegler, nachapostol. Zeitalt. II. p. 133 ff., has adopted the same views. See, against these attacks, now hardly worth the trouble of refutation, besides the Commentaries and Introductions, Lünemann, Pauli ad Phil. epist. contra Baurum defend., Gött. 1847; Brückner, Ep. ad Phil. Paulo auctori vindicata contra Baur., Lips. 1848; Ernesti in the Stud. u. Krit. 1848, p. 558 ff., 1851, p. 595 ff.; Grimm in the Lit. Bl. of the Allg. K.Z. 1850, No. 149 ff., 1851, No. 6 ff.; Hilgenfeld in his Zeitschr. 1871, p. 309 ff. According to the opinion of Baur, the epistle moves in the circle of Gnostic ideas and expressions, to which it attaches itself; but the only passage adduced as a proof is ii. 5 ff., and this entirely under mistaken explanations or arbitrary references of the several elements of that passage. Comp. the commentary on this passage, and the remark after ii. 11. The further charges—that the epistle labours under feeble repetitions (copies of passages in other epistles, as iii. 4 ff. from 2 Cor. x. 18, et al.), under a want of connection, and poverty of ideas (in proof of which stress is laid on iii. 1, as the author's own confession)—rest entirely on uncritical presupposition, and on a mistaken judgment as to the distinctive epistolary peculiarity of the letter, and as to the special tone of feeling on the part of the apostle in his present position generally and towards his Philippians. Lastly, we must reckon as wholly fanciful the doubt thrown upon what is said at i. 12, for which a combination of this passage with iv. 22 is alleged to furnish ground, and to which the mention of Clement, iv. 3,

¹ Compare also Plank in the same, 1847, p. 481 f.; Köstlin in the same, 1850, p. 263 ff.
who is taken to be Clement of Rome, and is supposed to weave the bond of unity round Paul and Peter, must supply the key; while the supposed anachronism in the mention of the bishops and deacons in i. 1, the Euodia and Syntyche in iv. 2, and the σύζυγος γυνής in iv. 3, are likewise wrongly adduced against the Pauline authorship. Indeed, even the historical occasion of the epistle—the aid sent to Paul—is made to appear as a fictitious incident at variance with 1 Cor. ix. 15. The special arguments of Baur are set aside by an impartial interpretation of the passages to which they refer, and the same may be said with regard to the latest attacks of Hitzig (zur Kritik d. paulin. Brieß, 1870) and of Hinsch (in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift, 1873, p. 59 ff) on the genuineness. The latter, though independent in his movement, stands on the ground occupied by Baur; the former has no ground whatever. Against Hinsch, see Hilgenfeld in his Zeitschr. 1873, p. 178 ff.

Heinrichs, with whom Paulus in the main concurred, Heidelb. Jahrb. 1817, 7, has sought to do away with the unity of the epistle by the assumption that there were originally two epistles,—one esoteric, addressed to the whole church, consisting of i. 1—iii. 1, χαλάετε ἐν κυρίῳ, and the salutations, iv. 21—23; the other esoteric, to the apostle's more intimate friends, which contained from iii. 1, τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν, down to iv. 20. But this idea is nothing but a consequence of misconceiving the free epistolary movement, which, especially in a letter like this called forth by a special occasion, and addressed to a community so dear to him, might naturally be most unfettered (see on iii. 1); and in this case, the distinction of exoteric and esoteric elements is a mistake, which is no less unhistorical than contrary to all psychological probability.

From iii. 1 we must, moreover, assume that, prior to our epistle, Paul had addressed another letter to the Philippians, which is not now extant; and this is confirmed by Polycarp (Phil. 3). See on iii. 1, remark.

1 Without any grounds whatever, Weisse (see his Beiträge z. Krit. d. paulin. Brieß, edited by Sulze, 1867) has found himself forced, in accordance with his criticism based on style, to regard the portion from chap. iii. onwards as the fragment of a second Epistle to the Philippians.
CHAPTER I.

Ver. 1. 'Ιησοῦ χριστοῦ] Lachm. and Tisch. read χριστοῦ Ιησοῦ. The same in vv. 6 and 8. This is to be preferred on account of the strong attestation of B D E Ε (the latter, however, only in vv. 1 and 8), which is reinforced in ver. 8 by A; it was readily supplanted by the more usual 'I. x. — Ver. 7. Elz. has merely τῇ ἁτολογ. without ἵν. Lachm. has ἵν, which Griesb., Matth., Scholz, and Tisch. adopt, in brackets. It is found in B D* E K L P Ε, min. Syr. Copt. Arr. Vulg. It. and some Fathers. Looking at this indecisive attestation, and seeing that ἵν might more readily be supplementarily or mechanically added than omitted, it should be deleted. — Ver. 8. iον] after μον is defended by Griesb., bracketed by Lachm., omitted by Tisch., following B F G Ε, min. Vulg. It. Aeth. Chrys. An addition made from a reminiscence of Rom. i. 9. — Ver. 9. περισσεύ] B D E have περισσεύ. So Lachm., who has placed περισσεύ in the margin, and Tisch. 7. With the considerable testimony which exists in favour of the Recepta, restored also by Tisch. 8, it should be retained, as περισσεύ might very easily originate in the similarity of sound in the following final syllables: ἵππωξε, τάσει, and αἰαθ SCIP. The Recepta is also supported by the readings περισσεύ and περισσεύ. — Ver. 11. Elz. has καρτῶν . . . τῶν, against decisive testimony. An emendation. — Ver. 14. Lach. and Tisch. 8 have τῶν Θεοῦ after λόγον, although, according to testimony of some weight (such as A B N, Clem.), only an explanatory addition, which some Codd. give in a different position, while others change it into τῶν χριστοῦ. — Vv. 16, 17. Elz. reverses their position: οἱ μίν εἰς ἐριθίας . . . μοῦ οἱ δὲ εἰς ἀγάπης . . . καὶ μαίνει, against decisive testimony. A transposition intended to produce uniformity with ver. 10. — Instead of ἵγείρει (Griesb., Lachm., Tisch.) Elz. has ἵγείρει, which is defended by Matth. and Scholz, and vindicated by Reiche. But

1. The Philippians are also called ἱλαστήσις by Steph. Byz., ἱλαστήσις by Polyb. (according to Steph. Byz.), ἱλαστήσις in the Corp. Inscript.
iγις is decisively attested by the preponderance of uncials (including Ν) and vss.; ἵππεις, instead of which Theophylac. ms. has προψήφεις, is an ancient gloss. — Ver. 18. τελή Β has δέτι; A F G P Ν, min. some vss. and Fathers: τελή δέτι. So Lachm. and Tisch. 8. But the reference of the τελή not being understood, it was explained by the δέτι written on the margin, which has in some cases (B) supplanted the τελή, and in others passed into the text along with it. — Ver 21. χρηστός χρηστός was so isolated and weak in attestation (Ar. pol.), that it should not have been recommended by Griesb., following earlier authority. — Ver. 23. Elz. has γάρ instead of δέ, against decisive testimony. The γάρ after πολλαπλάσιον is neither critically nor exegetically to be rejected. See Reiche, Comm. crit. — Ver. 24. εἰν τῇ σαρκί εἰν is wanting in A C P Ν, min. Clem. Or. Petr. alex. Cyr. Chrysost. Wrongly condemned by Griesb. and Tisch. 8; for εἰν might easily be absorbed by the final syllable of σαρκισμόν, especially as it is frequently used elsewhere with the simple dative. — Ver. 25. σαρκισμόν[ε] Lachm. and Tisch. 8 read σαρκισμόν, which Griesb. also approved of, following A B C D* F G Ν, min. A neglect of the doubly compound verb, attested certainly more weakly, but yet by D*** E K L P, Chrys. al. and many min., which took place all the more readily, because the word does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., and even its meaning might be offensive. — Ver. 27. Instead of ἄχιον, Lach. and Tisch. 8 read ἄχον, but without a preponderance of testimony in its favour. — Ver. 28. ἵσιν αὐτοῖς] Elz. has αὐτοῖς μὲν ἵσιν, against decisive testimony. — ὅτι A B C** Ν, min. vss. Aug. read ἵσιν. So Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; the dative is a mechanical alteration in accordance with the preceding αὐτοῖς and the following ὅτι. — Ver. 30. Elz. has οὗτος. But οὗτος is attested by A C D* E* Ν, min. and Fathers, and was supplanted by οὗτος through Itacism.

Contents.—After the greeting to his readers (vv. 1, 2), Paul assures them of his gratitude towards God on account of their condition as Christians (vv. 3–5), while as regards the future also he has confidence, in accordance with his heartfelt love towards them, as to the continued work of God in their case (vv. 6–8). His prayer is, that their love may increase yet more and more on behalf of Christian perfection to the glory of God (vv. 9–11). He then declares how his present position redounds to the furtherance of the gospel, to which even the preaching of those who are actuated by impure motives contributes.
(vv. 12–18), because Christ in fact is preached, which must tend to his—the apostle’s—salvation, since now nothing else but the glorification of Christ in his case will be the result, whether he remains alive in the body or not (vv. 19–21). Which of the two he should prefer, he knows not; since, however, the former is more needful for the sake of his readers, he is convinced that it will be the case for their furtherance and joy (vv. 22–26). Only their conduct should be in conformity with the gospel, in order that he, if he should come again to them, or should be absent, might learn their Christian unity and fearlessness (vv. 27–30).

Vv. 1, 2. Καὶ Τιμόθ. not as amanuensis, although he may have been so (comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 21; 2 Thess. iii. 17; Col. iv. 18; and see on Gal. vi. 11), for from Rom. xvi. 22 we must assume that the amanuensis as such is not included in the superscription; nor yet merely as taking part in the greeting (Estius, Weiss), for ver. 1 is the address of the epistle, and as such names those from whom it emanates; but as subordinate joint-writer of the letter (comp. on 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; Philem. 1), who, as a distinguished helper of the apostle, and well known to the readers, adopts the teachings, exhortations, etc. of the letter, which the apostle had previously discussed with him, as his own. At the same time, the apostle himself remains so completely the proper and principal writer of the epistle, that so early as ver. 3 he begins to speak solely in his own person, and in ii. 19 speaks of Timothy, who was to be sent to them, as a third person. Nevertheless this joint mention of Timothy must have been as accordant with the personal relation existing between the latter and the readers (Acts xvi. 10 ff., xix. 22), as it was serviceable in preparing the way for the intended sending of Timothy (ii. 19), and generally edifying and encouraging as a testimony of the intimate fellowship between the apostle and his subordinate fellow-labourer.¹ — Ἰουνία Ἐ. Φ.] The fact that

¹ In general, when Paul names others besides himself in the address, the ground for it must be sought for in the relation in which those named—who were then present with Paul—stood to the churches concerned, and not in any wish on his part to give by that means to the epistles an official and public cha-
Paul does not expressly assert his apostolic dignity by the side of Timothy (as in 2 Cor. i. 1, Col. i. 1), may be explained by the intimate and cordial relation in which he stood to the Philemians; for in regard to them he saw no external cause, and felt no internal need, for making this assertion; and we may assume the same thing in Philem. 1. The non-mention of his apostolic dignity in the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians is, considering the early date at which they were composed, to be similarly explained (see Lünemann on 1 Thess. i. 1). In their joint designation as δουλος Ἰ. Χ. (see on Rom. i. 1),—a designation resulting from the deep consciousness of the specific vocation of their lives (1 Cor. iv. 1),—both the apostleship of Paul and the official position of Timothy (comp. Rom. xvi. 21: Τιμόθ. ὁ συνεργός μου; Col. iv. 12) are included. Compare σύνδουλος, Col. i. 7, iv. 7. — τοῖς ἀγίοις ἐν Χ. Ἰ. see on Rom. i. 7, and on ηγιασμένος ἐν Χ. Ἰ., 1 Cor. i. 2. — σὺν ἐπισκ. κ. διακόν.] along with overseers and deacons. Paul writes to all the Christians at Philippi (comp. Rom. i. 7), bishops and deacons being expressly included (σὺν, racter (Huther on Col. p. 45, with whom Corn. Müller agrees, Commentat. de loc. quibusd. ep. ad Phil., Hamb. 1843, p. 5); for in that case the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians would least of all bear the apostle’s name alone. To him, too, with his personal consciousness of his high apostolic standing (Gal. i. 1), the need of any confirmation or corroboration by others must have been an idea utterly foreign. Lastly, this very Epistle to the Philippians bears less of the official and more of the familiar character than any of the others.

The fact, moreover, that in almost all the epistles, in the superscription of which Paul does not name himself alone, Timothy is mentioned with him (Silvanus being named with the latter in 1 and 2 Thessalonians), is a proof that Timothy was the apostle’s most intimate companion, and was highly esteemed among the churches. In 1 Corinthians only, Sosthenes, and not Timothy, is mentioned along with Paul in the address.

1 For all had, in fact, by their common readiness in offering given occasion to the apostolic letter. Thus the decorum of reply naturally gave rise to the insertion of the otherwise superfluous ἔτι, without its implying any special design of not putting to shame those who possibly had not contributed (van Hengel). And when Paul still further in this Epistle makes mention repeatedly and earnestly of all his readers (i. 4, 7 f., 25, ii. 17, 26, iv. 25), the simple and natural explanation is to be sought in the feeling of special all-embracing love, by which he was attached to this well-constituted church not divided by any factions. Hence there is no ground for seeking further explanation, as e.g. de Wette does, by suggesting erroneously that “Paul wished to manifest his impartiality with regard to the dissension in the church.”
comp. Acts xiv. 5). As official designations, the words did not require the article (Kühner, ad. Xen. Anab. iii. 5. 7: ὁρασιοὶ δὲ καὶ λογισμοὶ), although particular persons are meant (in opposition to Hofmann), who are regarded, however, just as office-bearers. The reason why the latter are specially mentioned in the salutation, in a way not found in any other epistle, must be sought in the special occasion of the letter, as the aid which had been conveyed to Paul could not have been collected without the guidance, and co-operation otherwise, of these office-bearers. They might even have transmitted to him the money by means of an accompanying letter in the name of the church (Ewald; compare Hofmann); there is, however, no trace elsewhere of this. Arbitrary suggestions are made by Cornelius a Lapide and Grotius: that he thus arranged the salutation with reference to Epaphroditus, who was one of the ἐπισκόποι; by Matthias: that the ἐπισκόποι and διάκονοι had specially distinguished themselves among the Philippians by their zeal and energy; by Rilliet and Corn. Müller: that the intention was to describe the church as a regularly constituted one, or as an undivided whole (Rheinwald), a collective body organized into unity (Hofmann) (which, in fact, other churches to whom Paul wrote were also); or that, with the view of preventing disunion, Paul wished to suggest to them the recognition of the office as an antidote to self-exaltation (Wiesinger). Other expositors have given yet other explanations.—The writing of the words as one: σωτερισκόποι (B** D*** K, Chrysost. Theophyl. min.) is to be rejected, because σῶς would be without appropriate reference, and the epistle is addressed to the whole community. See already Theodore of Mopsuestia.—As to the bishops, called from their official duty ἐπισκόποι (Acts xx. 28; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 7), or figuratively ποιμένες (Eph. iv. 11), and after the Jewish-theocratic analogy πρεσβύτεροι, see on Acts xx. 28, Eph. iv. 11. And how much the plural is at variance with the

1 There is therefore the less ground for Baur bringing forward the mention of bishops and deacons in this passage to help the proof of a post-apostolic composition of the epistle, as is also done by Hirsch in the passage specified. See, against this, Hilgenfeld in his Zeitachr. 1873, p. 178 f.
Catholic doctrine of the episcopate, see in Calovius. The absence also of any mention of presbyters¹ strikingly shows that the latter were still at that time identical with the bishops. Comp. particularly Acts xx. 17, 28; and see Ritschl, altkath. Kirche, p. 400 ff.; also J. B. Lightfoot, p. 93 ff., and Jul. Müller, dogmat. Abh. p. 581. Mistaken view in Döllinger’s Christenthum u. Kirche, p. 308, ed. 2, who makes out of σέβασμα συνόνοιε the bishop κατ’ ἐξοχήν. As to the διακονία, the care of the poor, sick, and strangers, comp. on Rom. xii. 7, xvi. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 28. We may add that the placing of the officials after the church generally, which is not logically requisite, and the mere subjoining of them by σύν, are characteristic of the relation between the two, which had not yet undergone hierarchical dislocation. Comp. Acts xv. 4; Heb. xiii. 24. Cornelius a Lapide, following Thomas Aquinas, sagely observes, that “the shepherd who rules goes behind the flock!” — χάρις ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.] See on Rom. i. 7.

Ver. 3 f. Comp. Rom. i. 9; 1 Cor. i. 4; Eph. i. 16; 1 Thess. i. 2; Philem. 4; Col. i. 3. — ἐνὶ πάσῃ τῷ μνείᾳ ὑμ. not: in every recollection, but, as the article requires: in my whole recollection of you, so that the sense is not: as often as I remember you (so usually, following Chrysostom and Luther), but: my remembrance of you in its entire tenor and compass is mingled with thankfulness towards God. On ἐνὶ with the dative, comp. ii. 17. Maldonatus, Homberg, Peirce, Michaelis, Bretschneider, Hofmann, are mistaken in making ὑμῶν genitive of the subject (and ἐνὶ as stating the ground, 1 Cor. i. 4): “that ye are constantly mindful of me,” or “on account of your collective remembrance” (Hofmann), which is supposed to imply and include the aid transmitted to him as a single μνείᾳ. That for which Paul thanks God—and it is here, as in the openings of the other epistles, something of a far higher and more general nature—does not follow until ver. 5. — μνείᾳ is to be rendered in the usual sense of remembrance (comp. 1 Thess.

¹ In the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, ὑπεραρχηγὴς and ἱάνων are spoken of as existing in Philippi, but no ἱεραρχὴς. See especially chap. v. 6. Therefore even at this later period bishops and presbyters were identical in Philippi.
iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 3), and not, as by van Hengel, in that of mention, which it only obtains in the passages—certainly otherwise corresponding—Rom. i. 9, Eph. i. 16, 1 Thess. i. 2, Philem. 4, by the addition of ποιήσας. In this case it is the μνείαν ἔχεω (1 Thess. iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 3; Plut. Legg. vii. p. 798 A), and not the μν. ποιήσας, that is thought of.—πάντοτε] cannot belong to εἰχαριστῶ in such a way that the following ἐπὶ πάση δεήσει κ.τ.λ. should be separated from it and joined to the participial clause, as Hofmann¹ desires. It is true that πάντοτε down to ἵµῶν is closely linked with what precedes; but the connection is of such a character that πάντοτε already finds the befitting limitation through ἐπὶ πάση τ. μνεία ἵµῶν, and now by πάντοτε κ.τ.λ. can be announced, when the εἰχαριστῶ τ. Θ. μ. ἐπὶ π. τ. μν. ὑµ. takes place, namely, “at all times, in every request which I make for you all, thanksgiving towards my God is joined with my entire remembrance of you.” Negatively expressed, the sense up to this point therefore is: “I never (πάντοτε) make my intercessory prayer for you all, without always (πάντοτε, as in Rom. i. 10, Col. i. 4) in it associating thanks towards my God with my entire remembrance of you.” This does not render the πάντων inappropriate, as Hofmann objects, the fact being that the apostle constantly bears all his Philippians upon his heart, and cannot help praying for them all; he feels this, and expresses it. If we should, with Castalio, Beza, and many others, including Weiss, connect as follows: “whilst I at all times in all my praying for you all make the prayer with joy,” the expression ἐν πάσῃ δεήσει τῆν δέησιν ποιήσας, as thus linked together, would be only a burdensome tautology. Instead of μετὰ χαρ. τ. δ. ποιήσας, Paul would have simply and naturally written the mere χαίρων. This applies also to the view of Huther, who (in the Mecklenb. Zeitschr. 1863, p. 400) substantially agrees with Weiss. Hoelemann incorrectly

¹ According to whom Paul is supposed to say that “he thanks his God for their collective remembrance at all times, in each of his intercessory prayers making the request for them all with joy.” Thus, however, the apostle would in fact have expressed himself in a manner extravagant even to falsehood, because implying an impossibility.
connects υπὲρ παντ. ι.μ. with εἰχαριστῶ (Rom. i. 8; Eph. i. 16; 1 Thess. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 3). Against this it may be urged, that the otherwise too general ἐν πάσῃ δέησει μον needs\(^1\) an addition more precisely defining it; and the words μετὰ χαρ. τὴν δέησ. ποιοῦμ. which follow, show that the thought is still occupied with the prayer, and has it as yet in prospect to express the object of the thanks. Lastly, the article in τὴν δέησιν points back to a more precisely defined δέησις, the specification of which is contained in this very ἅπ. τ. ι.μ. Comp. Col. i. 3.—As to the distinction between δέησις and προσευχή (ver. 9, iv. 6), see on Eph. vi. 18.—On the emphatic sequence of πάση, πάντοτε, πάση, πάντων, comp. Lobeck, Paral. p. 56. Paul does not aim at such accumulations, but the fulness of his heart suggests them to him; comp. 2 Cor. ix. 8.—μετὰ χαρᾶς κ.τ.λ.] His heart urges him, while mentioning his prayer for them all, to add: “when I make with joy the (mentioned) prayer (τὴν δ.),”—a feature which is met with in the opening of this epistle only. Ver. 4 is not to be placed in a parenthesis (as by Luther), nor yet from μετὰ χαρ. onwards, for ποιοῦμ. is connected with εἰχαριστῶ (in opposition to Heinrichs), as containing the characteristic definition of mode for δέησις ἅπ. παντ. ι.μ.

Ver. 5 f. Ἐπὶ τῇ κοινω. ι.μ. εἰς τὸ εὐαγγ.] is to be taken together with εἰχαριστῶ, ver. 3 (1 Cor. i. 4), and not with μετὰ χαρ. κ.τ.λ. (Calvin, Grotius, van Hengel, de Wette, Ewald, Weiss, Hofmann); for in that case, with the right explanation of ἐπὶ πάσῃ τ. μν. ι.μ., the specification of the ground for thanks would be entirely wanting, or would at all events result only indirectly, namely, as object of the joy. On account of your fellowship in respect of the gospel; by this Paul means the common brotherly coherence (Acts ii. 42) which united the Philippians together for the gospel (as the aim to which the κοινωνία has reference), that is, for its furtherance and efficiency. The great cause of the gospel was the end at which, in their mutual coherence, they aimed; and this, therefore, gave to their

\(^1\) This applies also in opposition to Ewald, who attaches ἅπ. πάνω στ. ι.μ., and to Hofmann, who at the same time joins is πάσῃ δέησιν, to the participial clause. The participial clause only begins with the emphatically prefixed μετὰ χαρᾶς.
fellowship with one another its specific character of a holy destination. The correctness of this interpretation is confirmed by the context in ver. 9, where that which is here expressed by ἡ κοινωνία ὑμῶν is characterized, under the category of the disposition on which this κοινωνία is based, as ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν. As this view is in full harmony with both words and sense, and is not dependent on anything to be supplied, it excludes divergent interpretations. We must therefore reject not only the explanation which refers κοινωνία to the aid sent to Paul (Zeger, Cornelius a Lapide, Estius, Wetstein, Michaelis, Bisping, and others), so that it is to be taken actively as communication (see Fritzsch, ad Rom. III. p. 81, 287), although it is never so used in the N. T. (comp. on Rom. xv. 26; Gal. vi. 6; Philem. 6), but also the view of Theodoret, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Heinrichs, and others: "quod evangelii participes facti estis," as if it ran τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Theodoret: κοινωνίαν ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τὴν πίστιν ἐκδέλεσε). Chrysostom and Theophylact, who are followed by most of the recent interpreters (including Schinz, Weiss, Schenkel, Huther, Ellicott, J. B. Lightfoot, Hofmann), understand the fellowship of the Philippians with the apostle, that is, ὅτι κοινωνία μου γίνεσθε κ. συμμερισταί τῶν ἐπί τοῦ εὐαγγ. τόνων, Theophylact; consequently, their co-operation with him in spreading the gospel, in which case also a reference to the aid rendered is included. In this case, since the text says nothing about a "service" devoted to the gospel (Hofmann), an addition like μετ' ἐμοῦ (1 John i. 3, et al.), or some other more precise definition, like that in ver. 7, would be an essential element—not arising (as in Gal. ii. 9) out of the context—which therefore must have been expressed, as indeed Paul must have said so, had he wished to be understood as referring to fellowship with all who had the cause of the gospel at heart (Wiesinger). The absolute "your fellowship," if no arbitrary supplement is allowable, can only mean the mutual fellowship of the members of the church themselves.—The article is not repeated after ὑμῶν, because κοινωνία εἰς τὸ εὐαγγ. is conceived as forming a single notion (comp. on κοινωνεῖν εἰς, iv. 15; Plato, Rep. p. 453 A). — ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμ. ἅχρι τοῦ νῦν] is usually connected
with τῇ κοινωνίᾳ κ.τ.λ. This connection is the true one, for the constancy of the κοινωνίᾳ, that has been attested hitherto, is the very thing which not only supplies the motive for the apostle’s thankfulness, but forms also the ground of his just confidence for the future. The connective article (τῇ before έπὶ) is not requisite, as έπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν was construed as έπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμᾶς (Winer, p. 128 [E.T. 171]). It cannot be connected with τ. δέσσαν πωςόμ. (Weiss), unless έπὶ τ. κοινων. κ.τ.λ. is also made to belong hereto. If joined with πεποιθώς (Rilliet, following Lachmann, ed. min.), it would convey an emphatically prefixed definition of the apostle’s confidence, whereas the whole context concerns the previous conduct of the readers, which by the connection with πεποιθ. would be but indirectly indicated. If connected with εἰκαστώ (Beza, Wolf, Bengel), the words—seeing that the expression πάντως εὖ πάση δείξει has already been used, and then in έπὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ κ.τ.λ. a transition has already been made to the object of the thanks—would contain a definition awkwardly postponed.—The first day is that in which he first preached the gospel to them, which was followed by immediate and decided results, Acts xvi. 13 ff. Comp. Col. i. 6.—πεποιθώς] confidence by which Paul knows his εἰκαστώ, vv. 3–5, to be accompanied. Without due ground, Hofmann confuses the matter by making a new prolonged paragraph begin with πεποιθώς.1—αὐτῶ τοῦτο] if taken according to the common usage as the accusative of the object (comp. ver. 25), would not point to what follows, as if it were τοῦτο merely (Weiss), but would mean, being confident of this very thing, which is being spoken of (ii. 18; Gal. ii. 10; 2 Cor. ii. 3). But nothing has been yet said of the contents of the confidence, which are to follow. It is therefore to be taken

1 He makes ver. 6, namely, constitute a protasis, whose apodosis is again divided into the protasis καθότι ἵνα διαμειωθήσεται and the apodosis corresponding thereto. But this apodosis of the apodosis begins with λέγετε ἵνα με, ver. 7, and yet is only continued after the words μετά τοῦ ἧς ἡ παρατηρήσεα, which are a parenthesis, in vv. 8, 9. Such a dialectically involved and complicated, long-winded period would be most of all out of place in this epistle; and what reader would have been able, without Hofmann’s guidance, to detect it and adjust its several parts?
CHAP. I. 7.

as o̖ id ipsum,1 for this very reason (2 Pet. i. 5; Plato, Symp. p. 204 A, and Stallb. ad loc.; Prot. p. 310 E; Xen. Anab. i. 9. 21, and Kühner in loc., also his Gramm. II. 1; p. 267; see also Winer, p. 135 [E. T. 178], and comp. on Gal. ii. 10), namely, because your κοινωνια εἰς τὸ εἰναγγ., from the first day until now, is that which alone can warrant and justify my confidence for the future, διὸ ἐναρξάμενος κ.τ.λ.—διὸ ἐναρξάμενος κ.τ.λ.] God. Comp. ii. 13. That which He has begun He will complete, namely, by the further operations of His grace. The idea of resistance to this grace, as a human possibility, is not thereby excluded; but Paul has not to fear this on the part of his Philippian converts, as he formerly had in the case of the Galatians, Gal. i. 6, iii. 3. — ἐν ὑμῶν] That Paul did not intend to say among you (as Hoelemann holds), but in you, in animis vestris (comp. ii. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 6), is shown by ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν following, by which the language ὁ ἐναρξ. ἐν ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ. expresses a confidence felt in respect to all individuals. — ἐργον ἀγαθόν] without article, hence: an excellent work, by which is meant, in conformity with the context, the κοινωνία ὑμ. εἰς τὸ εἰναγγ. — ἀχρις ἡμέρας 'I. X.] corresponding to the ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρ. ἀχρι τοῦ νῦν, ver. 5, presupposes the nearness of the παρουσία (in opposition to Wiesinger, Hofmann, and others), as everywhere in the N. T., and especially in Paul's writings (Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 297, ed. 2). Comp. ver. 10, iii. 20. The device by which the older expositors (see even Pelagius) gratuitously introduce qualifying statements, "Perseverat autem in illum usque diem, quicunque perseverat usque ad mortem suam" (Estius), whereby is meant not "continuatus usque ad illum diem," but "terminus et complementum perfectionis, quod habituri isto die erimus" (Calovius), is just as un-Pauline as Calvin's makeshift, "that the dead are still in prospectu, because they have not yet reached the goal," and as Matthies' philosophical perverting of it into the continual and eternal Parousia.

Ver. 7. Subjective justification of the confidence expressed in ver. 6. How should he otherwise than cherish it, and that on the ground of his objective experience (αὐτῷ τοῦτο),

1 Hofmann also adopts this explanation of ἀντὶ τοῦτο.
since it was to him, through his love to his readers, a *duty* and *obligation!* *Not* to cherish it would be *wrong.* "Caritas enim omnia sperat," Pelagius.—As to *καθὼς,* which, in the conception of the *corresponding* relation, states the ground, comp. on iii. 17; 1 Cor. i. 6; Eph. i. 4; Matt. vi. 11. —On *δικαίων,* comp. Acts iv. 19; Eph. vi. 1; Phil. iv. 8; Col. iv. 1; 2 Pet. i. 12. A classical author would have written: *δικαίων ἐμὲ τοῦτο φρονεῖν* (Herod. i. 39; Dem. 198. 8; Plat. Symp. p. 214 C), or: *δικαίος εἰμι τὸντο φρ.* (Herod. i. 32; Dem. 1469. 18, and frequently; Thuc. i. 40. 3). — *τοῦτο φρονεῖν*] to have this feeling, this practical bent of mind in favour of you, by which is meant the confidence expressed in ver. 6, and not his striving in prayer for the perfecting of his readers' salvation (ver. 4), which the sense of the word *φρονεῖν* does not admit of (in opposition to Weiss), as it is not equivalent to *ζητεῖν* (comp. on Col. iii. 2). See besides, Huther, l.c. p. 405 f.—On *ὑπέρ,* comp. iv. 10; 2 Macc. xiv. 8; Eur. *Archel. fr. xxv. 2* f.; Plut. *Phil. c. Flam.* 3; on *τοῦτο φρ.,* Gal. v. 10, οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρ. The special reference of the sense of *φρονεῖν:* to be mindful about something, must have been suggested by the context, as in iv. 10; but is here insisted on by Hofmann, and that in connection with the error, that with *καθὼς* the protasis of an apodosis is introduced. The *φρονεῖν* is here perfectly general, *cogitare ac sentire,* but is characterized by *τοῦτο* as a *εὖ φρονεῖν,* which Paul feels himself bound to cherish in the interest of the salvation of all his readers (*ὑπέρ πάντων ὑμῶν).* — *διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς*] An expression of heartfelt love (comp. 2 Cor. vii. 3) on the part of the apostle towards his readers, not on the part of his readers towards him (Oeder, Michaelis, Storr, Rosenmüller, am Ende, Flatt), thus making *ὑμᾶς* the subject; although the sing. *καρδίᾳ* (comp. Eph. iv. 18, v. 19, vi. 5; Rom. i. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 15, and elsewhere) is not against this view, the position of the words is opposed to it, as is also the context, see ver. 8. The readers are present to the apostle in his loving heart. — *ἐν τῇ τοῖς δεσμοῖς κ.τ.λ.*] so that, accordingly, this state of suffering, and the great task which is incumbent on me in it, cannot dislodge you from my heart. See already Chrysostom
and Pelagius. These words, ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς κ.τ.λ., set forth the faithful and abiding love, which even his heavy misfortunes cannot change into concern for himself alone. They contain, however, the two points, co-ordinated by τέ...καὶ (as well...as also): (1) The position of the apostle, and (2) his employment in this position. The latter, which, through the non-repetition of the article before βεβ., is taken as a whole (Buttman, neut. Gr. p. 294 [E. T. 342]), is both antithetical, the defence of the gospel, and also ethical, the confirmation of it, that is, the corroboration of its truth by proof, testimony, etc., its verification; comp. Heb. vi. 16; Rom. xv. 8; Mark xvi. 20; Thucyd. i. 140. 6, iv. 87. 1; Plat. Polit. p. 309 C; Wisd. v. 18. For an instance of this kind of βεβαιώσει during the earliest period of the apostle’s captivity at Rome, see Acts xxviii. 23. Hofmann, taking a groundless objection to our explanation from the use of τέ...καὶ (see, however, Baeumlein, Partik. p. 225), refuses to connect the τέ with the following καὶ; he prefers to connect with the one ἔχειν, namely with the ἔχειν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, another, namely an ἔχειν συγκοινωνίας. This is an artificial conjunction of very different references of the ἔχειν, yielding the illogical formalism: I have you (1) in my heart, and (2) for my companions, etc. The latter would indeed be only a more precise qualitative definition of the former. The question, moreover, whether in τῇ ἀπολ. κ. βεβ. τοῖς ἐναγ. Paul intended to speak of his judicial examination (Heinrichs, van Hengel), or of his extra-judicial action and ministry during his captivity, cannot be answered without arbitrariness, except by allowing that both were meant. For the words do not justify us in excluding the judicial defence (Wieseler, Chronol. d. apostol. Zeitalt. p. 430), since the ἀπολογία might be addressed not merely to Jews and Judaists, but also to Gentile judges. —τοῦ ἐναγ. belongs to τῇ ἀπολ. κ. βεβαιώσει, and not to βεβ. only; the latter view would make τῇ ἀπολ. denote the personal vindication (Chrysostom, Estius, and others), but is decisively opposed by the non-repetition—closely coupling the two words—of the article before βεβ. But to interpret ἀπολογία and βεβαιώσει as synonymous (Rheinwald), or to assume an ἐν διὰ δυν. for ἀπολογία eis βεβαιώσει
(Heinrichs), is logically incorrect, and without warrant in the connection. It is also contrary to the context (on account of τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ) to understand the βεβαιώσεις τ. εὐαγγ. as the actual confirmation afforded by the apostle's sufferings (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Erasmus, and others). — συγκοινωνίας μου κ.τ.λ.] characterizes the ὑμᾶς, and supplies a motive for the ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.: since you, etc. This love to you, unalterable even in my affliction, is based on the real sympathy, which results from all of you being joint-partakers with me in the grace. The emphasis is laid, primarily on συγκ. and then on πάντας, which is correlative with the previous πάντων. The idea of the grace which the apostle had received (τῆς χάριτος) is defined solely from the connection, and that indeed by the two points immediately preceding, ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου and τῇ ἀπολ. κ. βεβ. τοῦ εὐαγγ., namely, as God's gift of grace enabling them to suffer for the gospel (comp. ver. 29 f.; see also Acts v. 41; 1 Pet. ii. 19), and therewith to defend and confirm instead of falling away from and denying it. "Magnus in hac re honos, magna praemia" (Grotius). Paul knew that the experience of this grace—for the setting forth of which the context itself amply suffices, without the need of any retrospective ταύτης (as is Hofmann's objection)—had been vouchsafed not only to himself, but also to all his Philippian converts, who like him had had to suffer for Christ (ver. 29 f.); and thus, in his bonds, and whilst vindicating and confirming the gospel, conscious of the holy similarity in this respect between his and their experience, sympathetically and lovingly he bore them, as his fellow-sharers of this grace, in his heart. He knew that, whilst he was suffering, and defending and confirming the gospel, he had all his readers as συμπάσχοντες, συμπαθολογούμενοι, συμ-βεβαιούμενοι τ. εὐαγγ.τ.λ., and that in virtue of the above-named grace of God, as a manifestation of which he had recognised his bonds, and his activity for the gospel in these bonds. Others interpret it much too generally and vaguely, looking at the tender and special references of the context, as the "gratiosa evangelii donatio" (Hoelemann, comp. Wolf, Heinrichs, de Wette, and others). Likewise without any
more immediate reference to the context, and inappropriate, is its explanation of the apostolic office (Rom. i. 5, et al.), the Philippians being said to be active promoters of this through their faith (see Theodore of Mopsuestia); along with which a reference is introduced to the assistance rendered (Storr, am Ende, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Hofmann; comp. also Weiss)—which assistance has come to be regarded as a κοινωνία εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (but see on ver. 5), as Hofmann expresses it. Those who feel dissatisfied that Paul does not mention at the very beginning of the epistle the assistance rendered to him, prescribe a certain line for the apostle; which, however, he does not follow, but gives expression first of all to his love for the Philippians in subjects of a higher and more general interest, and puts off his expression of thanks, properly so called, to the end of the epistle. Lastly, the translation gaudīi (Vulgate, Itala, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, Primasius, Sedulius) is derived from another reading (χαρᾶς).—The σῶν in συγκοινωνίας refers to μον, my joint-partakers (iv. 14) of the grace, thus combining συγκοινωνία with a double genitive of the person and the thing, of the subject and the object (Kühner, II. 1, p. 288; Winer, p. 180 [E. T. 239]), and placing it first with emphasis; for this joint fellowship is the point of the love in question. —As to the repetition of ὑμᾶς, see Matthiae, p. 1031, and on Col. ii. 13; comp. Soph. O. C. 1278, and Reisig in loc.

Remark.—Whether τινὶ τοῖς δεσμοῖς . . . εὐαγγ. should be connected with the preceding διὰ τὸ ἐξελθὲν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς (Chrysostom, Erasmus, Castalio, Luther, and many; also Huther), or with συγκοινωνίας which follows (Beza, Calvin, Calovius, Cornelius a Lapide, Storr, Flatt, Lachmann, van Hengel, Tischendorf, Wiesinger, Ewald, Weiss, Hofmann, and others), cannot be determined. Still the former, as of a less periodic character, is more in harmony with the fervent tone of feeling. Besides, the repetition of ὑμᾶς betrays a break in the flow of thought after τ. εὐαγγ.

Ver. 8. A solemn confirmation of the preceding assurance, that he had his readers in his heart, etc. Comp., on the connection, Rom. i. 9. Theophylact, moreover, strikingly observes: ὁ χαί ός ἀπιστούμενος μάρτυρα καλεῖ τὸν Θεόν, ἀλλὰ τὴν πολλήν διάθεσιν όυκ ἔχων παραστῆσαι διὰ λόγου. — ός
how much I long after you all, etc., which would not be the case if I did not bear you in my heart (γιντι), as announced more precisely in ver. 7. On ἐπιτεθήκω, comp. Rom. i. 11; Phil. ii. 26; 1 Thess. iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 4. The compound denotes the direction (Plat. Legg. ix. p. 855 F; Herod. v. 93; Diod. Sic. xvii. 101; Ecclus. xxv. 20), not the strength of the προθείω (comp. on 2 Cor. v. 2), which is conveyed by ὡς; comp. Rom. i. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 10. — ἐν σπλαγχνοις Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ] is not, with Hofmann,¹ to be connected with what follows (see on ver. 9); it is an expression of the heartiness and truth of his longing, uttered in the strongest possible terms. ἐν, on account of the sensuous expression which follows (σπλαγχνα, like ὡς), as seat of the affections, especially of heartfelt love, ii. 1; Col. iii. 12; Phil. 7, 12, 20; also in classical authors), is to be taken locally: in the heart of Jesus Christ; that is, so that this longing of mine is not my own individual emotion, but a longing which I feel in virtue of the dwelling and working of Christ in me. Paul speaks thus from the consciousness that his inmost life is not that of his human personality, of himself, but that Christ, through the medium of the Holy Spirit, is the personal principle and agent of his thoughts, desires, and feelings. Comp. on Gal. ii. 20. Filled with the feeling of this holy fellowship of life, which threw his own individuality into the background, he could, seeing that his whole spiritual ζωή was thus the life of Christ in him, represent the circumstances of his ἐπιτεθήκω, as if the viscera Christi were moved in him, as if Christ’s heart throbbed in him for his Philippians. Bengel aptly says: “In Paulo non Paulus vivit sed Jesus Christus; quare Paulus non in Pauli, sed Jesu Christi movetur visceribus.” Comp. Theodoret: οὐκ ἄνθρωποι τὸ φίλτρον, πνευματικῶν. Not doing justice to the Pauline consciousness of the unio mystica which gives rise to this expression, some have rendered ἐν in an instrumental sense, as in Luke i. 78 (Hofmann); others have taken it of the norma: “accord-
to the pattern of Christ's love to His people" (Rosenmüller, Rilliet); and some have found the sense of the norma in the genitival relation: "in animo penitus affecto ut animus fuit Christi" (van Hengel). So also Wetstein, Heinrichs, and earlier expositors; whilst Storr refers ἐν συλ. 1. X. even to the readers (sc. δινασ). For many other interpretations, see Hoelemann and Weiss. The merely approximate statement of the sense, given by Grotius and others: "amore non illo communi, sed vere Christiano," is in substance correct, but fails to give its full development to the consciousness of the Χριστός ἐν ἡμῖν (Gal. ii. 20, iv. 19; Rom. viii. 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 5; Eph. iii. 17); notwithstanding which Hofmann regards the identification of Paul's own heart with the heart of Christ as simply impossible; thus, however, applying to the mysticism of deep pious feeling, and the living immediate plastic form in which it finds expression, a criterion alien to its character, and drawing around it a literal boundary which it cannot bear.

Ver. 9. After having stated and discussed, in vv. 3–8, the reason why he thanks God with respect to his readers, Paul now, till the end of ver. 11, sets forth what it is that he asks in prayer for them. "Redit ad precationem, quam obiter tantum uno verbo attigerat (namely, ver. 4); exponit igitur summam eorum, quae illis petebat a Deo" (Calvin).—καί the simple and, introducing the new part of, and thus continuing, the discourse: And this (which follows) is what I pray,—so that the object is placed first in the progress of the discourse; hence it is καί τούτο προσεύχομαι, and not κ. προσεύχ. τούτο. Hofmann's explanation of the καί in the sense of also, and his attaching ἐν συλ. X. 1. to ver. 9, are the necessary result of

1 The word προσεύχομαι, which now occurs, points to a new topic, the thanksgiving and its grounds having been previously spoken of. Therefore κ. τ. προσεύχ. is not to be attached, with Rilliet and Ewald, to the preceding verse: and (how I pray this. Two different things would thus be joined. The former portion is concluded by the fervent and solemn ver. 8. Jatho also (Br. an d. Phil., Hildesb. 1857, p. 8) connects it with οὕτω, namely thus: and how I pray for this, namely, to come to you, in order that I may edify you. But to extract for τούτο, out of λεγεῖται ἵματι, the notion: "my presence with you," is much too harsh and arbitrary; for Paul's words are not even λεγεῖται διὰ ἵματι, as in Rom. i. 11.
his perverse metamorphosis of the simple discourse, running on from τεσσαράκοντα in ver. 6, into a lengthened protasis and apodosis,—a construction in which the apodosis of the apodosis is supposed to begin with δν σπλάχνη Ἰ.; comp. on ver. 6.—ἔνα] introduces the contents of the prayer conceived of under the form of its design (Col. i. 9; 1 Thess. i. 11; Matt. xxiv. 20), and thus explains the preparatory τοῦτο. Comp. on John vi. 29. “This I pray, that your love should more and more,” etc. — ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν], not love to Paul (van Hengel, following Chrysostom, Theophylact, Grotius, Bengel, and others),—a reference which, especially in connection with ἔτι μᾶλλον κ. μᾶλλον, would be all the more unsuitable on account of the apostle having just received a practical proof of the love of the Philippians. It would also be entirely inappropriate to the context which follows (ἐν ἐπιγνώσει κ.τ.λ.). Nor is it their love generally, without specification of an object for it, as a proof of faith (Hofmann); but it is, in accordance with the context, the brotherly love of the Philippians one to another, the common disposition and feeling at the bottom of that κοινωνία eis τὸ εὐαγγ., for which Paul has given thanks in ver. 5.1 This previous thanksgiving of his was based on the confidence, ἔτι ἡ ἐναρξάμενος κ.τ.λ., ver. 6, and the contents of his prayer now is in full harmony with that confidence. The connection is misapprehended by Calovius and Rheinwald, who explain it as love to God and Christ; also by Matthies (comp. Rilliet), who takes it as love to everything, that is truly Christian; comp. Wiesinger: love to the Lord, and to all that belongs to and serves Him; Weiss: zeal of love for the cause of the gospel,—an interpretation which fails to define the necessary personal object of the ἀγάπη, and to do justice to the idea of co-operative fellowship which is implied in the κοινωνία in ver. 5. — ἔτι μᾶλλον] quite our: still more. Comp. Homer, Od. i 322, xviii. 22; Herod. i. 94; Pind. Pyth. x. 88, Olymp. i. 175; Plat. Euthyd. p. 283 C; Xen. Anab. vi. 6.

1 The idea that “your love” means the readers themselves (Bullinger), or that this passage gave rise to the mode of addressing the hearers that has obtained since the Fathers (very frequently, e.g. in Augustine) in the language of the church (Bengel), is purely fanciful.
35; Diog. L ix. 10. 2. See instances of μᾶλλον καὶ μᾶλλον in Kypke, II. p. 307. With the reading περισσεύη note the sense of progressive development. — ἐν ἐπιγνώσῃ κ. πάση αἰσθήσει] constitutes that in which — i.e. respecting which — the love of his readers is to become more and more abundant. Comp. Rom. xv. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 9 (Elz.), viii. 7; Col. ii. 7; Ecclus. xix. 20 (24). Others take the ἐν as instrumental: through (Heinrichs, Flatt, Schinz, and others); or as local: in, i.e. in association with (Oecumenius, Calvin, Rheinwald, Hoelemann, and others), — περισσ. being supposed to stand absolutely (may be abundant). But the sequel, which refers to the ἐπιγνώσις and αἰσθήσεις, and not to the love, shows that Paul had in view not the growth in love, but the increase in ἐπιγνώσις and αἰσθήσεις, which the love of the Philippians was more and more to attain. The less the love is deficient in knowledge and αἰσθήσεις, it is the more deeply felt, more moral, effective, and lasting. If ἐπιγνώσις is the penetrating (see on 1 Cor. xiii. 12; Eph. i. 17) cognition of divine truth, both theoretical and practical, the true knowledge of salvation,¹ which is the source, motive power, and regulator of love (1 John iv. 7 ff.); αἰσθήσεις (only occurring here in the New Testament), which denotes perception or feeling operating either through the bodily senses ² (Xen. Mem. i. 4. 5, Anab. iv. 6. 13, and Krüger in loc.; Plat. Theaet. p. 156 B), which are also called αἰσθήσεις (Plat. Theaet. p. 156 B), or spiritually ² (Plat. Tim. p. 43 C; Dem. 411. 19, 1417. 5), must be, according to the context which follows, the perception which takes place with the ethical senses,—an activity of moral perception which apprehends and makes conscious of good and evil as such (comp. Heb. v. 14). The opposite of this is the dulness and inaction of the inward sense of ethical feeling (Rom. xi. 8; Matt. xiii. 15, et al.), the stagnation of the αἰσθητήρια τῆς καρδίας (Jer. iv. 19), whereby a moral unsusceptibility, in-

¹ Not a mere knowledge of the divine will (Rheinwald), which leads to the right objects, aims, means, and proofs of love (Weiss; comp. Hofmann). This, as in Col. i. 9, would have been expressed by Paul. Neither can ἐπιγνωσθῇ be limited to the knowledge of men (Chrysostom, Erasmus, and others).

² "Nam etiam spiritualiter datur visus, auditus, olfactus, gustus, tactus, i.e. sensus investigativi et fruitivi" (Bengel).
capacity of judgment, and indifference are brought about. Comp. LXX. Prov. i. 7; Ex. xxviii. 5; Ecclus. xx. 17, Rec. (ἀλθησιν ὀφθή); 4 Macc. ii. 21. Paul desires for his readers every (πάση) αλθησιν, because their inner sense is in no given relation to remain without the corresponding moral activity of feeling, which may be very diversified according to the circumstances which form its ethical conditions. The relation between ἐπίγνωσις and αλθησις is that of spontaneity to receptivity, and the former is the ἡγεμονικόν for the efficacy of the latter. In the contrast, however, mistaking and mis-apprehending are not correlative to the former, and deception to the latter (Hofmann); both contrast with both.

Vv. 10, 11. Eis τὸ δοκιμαζεῖν κ.τ.λ.] states the aim of the πεμισα. ἐν ἐπιγν. κ. π. αἰσθ., and in ἵνα ἔτε εἰλικρ. κ.τ.λ. we have the ultimate design. δοκιμαζεῖν τὰ διαφέροντα is to be understood, as in Rom. ii. 18: in order to approve that which is (morally) excellent. So the Vulgate, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theophylact, Erasmus, Castalio, Grotius, Calovius, Estius, Bengel, Michaelis, Flatt, Rheinwald, Rilliet, Ewald, and others. See on διαφέρειν, praestantiorum esse (Dem. 1466. 22; Polyb. iii. 87. 1; Matt. x. 31), and τὰ διαφέροντα, praestantiora (Xen. Hier. i. 3; Dio Cass. xliv. 25), Sturz, Lex. Xen. I. p. 711 f. Comp. διαφέροντας, εἰσίμι (Plat. Prot. p. 349 D, and frequently). For δοκιμάζειν, comp. Rom. xiv. 22, et al. Others understand it as a testing of things which are morally different (Theodoret, Beza, Grotius, Wolf, and others; also Matthies, Hoelemann, van Hengel, de Wette, Corn. Müller, Wiesinger, Weiss, Huther). In point of usage, this is equally correct; see on δοκιμάζειν, in both senses, 1 Thess. ii. 4. But in our view the sense which yields a definition of the aim of the words πεμισα. ἐν ἐπιγν. κ. π. αἰσθ., as well as the antecedent of the εἰλικρίνεια which follows, seems more consistent with the context. The testing of good and evil is not the aim, but the expression and function, of the ἐπίγνωσις and αλθησις. Looking at the stage of Christian life which must be assumed from vv. 5 and 7 (different in Rom. xii. 2), the former, as an aim, does not go far enough; and the εἰλικρίνεια is the result not of, that testing, but of the
approbation of the good. Hofmann's view is therefore unsuitable, that it means the proving of "that which is otherwise"; otherwise, namely, than that towards which the Christian's love is directed. This would amount merely to the thought of testing what is unworthy of being loved (= *τὰ ἕτερα*)—a thought quite out of keeping with the telic mode of expression.

—*εἰληφθεῖσα*, pure, sincere = καθαρός; Plat. *Phil.* p. 52 D. Comp., on its ethical use, Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 66 A, and Stallbaum in loc., 81 C; 2 Pet. iii. 1; 1 Cor. v. 8; 2 Cor. i. 12, ii. 17; Wisd. vii. 25, and Grimm in loc.—*ἀπρόσκοπτοι* practical proof of the *εἰληφθεῖσα* in reference to intercourse with others (2 Cor. vi. 3): giving no offence; 1 Cor. x. 32; Ignat. *Trau. interpol.* 7; Suicer, *Thes.* s.v. As Paul decidedly uses this word in an active sense in 1 Cor. l.c. (comp. Ecclus. xxxv. 21), this meaning is here also to be preferred to the in itself admissible intransitive,—viz. not offending (Acts xxiv. 16; comp. John xi. 9),—in opposition to Ambrosiaster, Beza, Calvin, Hoelemann, de Wette, Weiss, Huther, Hofmann, and others.—*εἰς ἡμέραν Χ.* to, i.e. for, the day of Christ, when ye are to appear pure and blameless before the judgment-seat. Comp. ii. 16; Eph. iv. 30; Col. i. 22; 2 Pet. ii. 9, iii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 12; also Jude 24 f. These passages show that the expression is not equivalent to the *ἐκ τῆς ἡμέρας Χ.* in ver. 6 (Luther, Erasmus, and others), but places what is said in relation to the decision, unveiling, and the like of the day of the Parousia, which is, however, here also looked upon as near.—Ver. 11. *πεπληρ. καρπὸν δικαίωσ.* modal definition of the *εἰληφθεῖσα* κ. *ἀπρόσκοπον*, and that from the positive side of these attributes, which are manifested and tested in this fruitfulness—i.e. in this rich fulness of Christian virtue in their possessors. *καρπὸς δικαιοσ.* is the fruit which is the product of righteousness, which proceeds from a righteous moral state. Comp. *καρπ. τοῦ πνεύματος*, Gal. v. 22; *κ. τοῦ φωτός*, Eph. v. 9; *κ. δικαιοσύνης*, Jas. iii. 18, Heb. xii. 11, Rom. vi. 21 f., Prov. xi. 30. In no instance is the genitive with *καρπὸς* that of apposition (Hofmann). The *δικαιοσύνη* here meant, however, is not *justitia fidei* (justificatio), as many, even Rilliet and Hoelemann, would make it, but, in conformity
with ver. 10, a righteous moral condition, which is the moral consequence, because the necessary vital expression, of
the righteousness of faith, in which man now καρποφορεῖ τῷ
Θεῷ ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος, Rom. vii. 5 f.; comp. vi. 2,
viii. 2; Col. i. 10. We must observe that the emphasis is
laid not on δικαιοσύνης, but on καρποθεῖ,—which therefore
obtains more precise definition afterwards,—so that δικαιοσύνης
conveys no new idea, but only represents the idea, already
conveyed in ver. 10, of the right moral condition. Comp. on
δικαιοσύνης, Eph. v. 9; Rom. vi. 13, 18, 20, xiv. 17, et al.
—On the accusative of the remote object, comp. Ps. cv. 40,
cxlvi. 14; Ecclus. xvii. 6; Col. i. 9 (not 2 Thess. i. 11);
Winer, p. 215 [E. T. 287]. A classical author would have
used the genitive (Elx.) or the dative. —τὸν διὰ Ἰ. Χ.] se.
διντα, the more exact specific definition of this fruit, the peculiar
sacred essence and dignity of which are made apparent, seeing
that it is produced, not through observance of the law, or
generally by human power, but through Christ, who brings it
about by virtue of the efficacy of the Holy Spirit (Gal. ii. 20,
iii. 22; Eph. iv. 7 f., 17; John xv. 14, et al.). —εἰς δόξαν
κ.τ.λ.] belongs to πεπληρ. κ.τ.λ., not specially to τὸν διὰ Ἰ. Χ.
How far this fruitfulness tends to the honour of God (comp.
John xv. 8), see Eph. i. 6–14. God’s δόξα is His majesty in
itself; ἐπαυσος is the praise of that majesty. Comp. Eph. i. 6,
12, 14. This ἐπαυσος is based on matter of fact (its opposite
is ἄτιμαζεν τ. Θεόν, Rom. ii. 23), in so far as in the Christian
moral perfection of believers God’s work of salvation in them,
and consequently His glory, by means of which it is effected,
are manifested. Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 20. The whole work of re-
demption is the manifestation of the divine δόξα. See John
xii. 27 f. The glory of God is, however, the ultimate aim
and constant refrain of all Christian perfection, ii. 11; 1 Cor.
x. 31; Eph. iii. 31; 1 Pet. iv. 11; Rom. xi. 36.

Ver. 12. See, on vv. 12–26, Huther in the Mecklenb.
Zeitschr. 1864, p. 558 ff.—Paul now proceeds by the δέ of
continuation to depict his own position down to ver. 26. See
the summary of contents.—The element of transition in the
train of thought is that of the notification which Paul now
CHAP. I. 13. 31

desires to bring before them; γινώσκειν is therefore placed first: but ye are to know. It is otherwise in 2 Tim. iii. 1, also 1 Cor. xi. 3, Col. ii. 1. — τις κατ' εἴματι my circumstances, my position, as in Eph. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7; Tob. x. 9; 2 Macc. iii. 40, et al.; Xen. Cyr. vii. 1. 16; Ael. V. H. ii. 20. — μᾶλλον not to the hindrance, but much the contrary. See Winer, p. 228 [E. T. 304]. He points in this to the apprehension assumed to exist, and certainly confirmed to him by Epaphroditus as existing, on the part of his readers, which, before going further, he wishes to relieve. There is no trace even here of a letter received from them with the contribution (Hofmann; comp. Wiesinger); comp. on ver. 1. Hoelemann: "magis, quam antea contingere," but this meaning must have been intimated by a νῦν or ἤδη. — προκοπήν progress, i.e. success. Comp. ver. 25; 1 Tim. iv. 15. As to the later Greek character of this word, see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 85. In consequence of the apostle's fate, the gospel had excited more attention, and the courage of its preachers had increased; see ver. 13 f. As to whether a change had taken place in his condition, which the readers regarded as a change for the worse, as Hofmann requires us to assume, we have no specific hint whatever. The situation of the apostle generally, and in itself, abundantly justified their concern, especially since it had already lasted so long. — ἐνυθην] event, i.e. has redounded. Comp. Acts xix. 27; Wisd. xv. 5; Herod. i. 120; Soph. Aj. 1117 (1138); Plat. Gorg. p. 487 B. So the matter stands; note the perfect.

Ver. 13. [Πόσε κ.τ.λ.] so that my bonds became manifest in Christ, etc. This Πόσε introduces the actual result of that προκοπή, and consequently a more precise statement of its nature.¹ Εἰς Χριστὸν does not belong to τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου, alongside of which it does not stand; but φανερὸς ἐν Χριστῷ is to be taken together, and the emphasis is laid on φανερόν, so that the δεσμοῖ did not remain κρυπτοῖ or ἀποκρύφοι ἐν Χριστῷ, as would have been the case, if their relation to Christ

¹ "Rem, qualis sit, addita rei consequentis significacione definit." Ellendt, Lex. Soph. ii. p. 1012. Hofmann's view, that it stands in the sense of sic τῶν ἐστιν, also amounts to this. But Hoelemann is in error in making it assert the greatness of the προκή. Not the greatness, but the salutary effect, is indicated.
had continued unknown, and if people had been compelled to look upon the apostle as nothing but an ordinary prisoner detained for examination. This ignorance, however, did not exist; on the contrary, his bonds became known in Christ, in so far, namely, that in their causal relation to Christ—in this their specific peculiarity—was found information and elucidation with respect to his condition of bondage, and thus the specialty of the case of the prisoner, became notorious. If Paul had been only known generally as δέσμιος, his bonds would have been οὐκ ἐμφανεὶς ἐν Χριστῷ; but now that, as δέσμιος ἐν κυρίῳ or τοῦ κυρίου (Eph. iv. 1, iii. 1; Phil. 9), as πᾶσχον ὡς Χριστιανός (1 Pet. iv. 16), he had become the object of public notice, the φανερόως of his state of bondage, as resting ἐν Χριστῷ, was thereby brought about,—a φανερόν γνωσθαι, consequently, which had its distinctive characteristic quality in the ἐν Χριστῷ. It is arbitrary to supply δύνας with ἐν Χριστῷ (Hofmann). Ewald takes it as: "shining in Christ," i.e. much sought after and honoured as Christian. Comp. also Calvin, and Wieseler, Chronol. d. apost. Zeitalt. p. 457. But, according to New Testament usage, φανερός does not convey so much as this; in classical usage (Thuc. i. 17. 2, iv. 11. 3; Xen. Cyr. vii. 5. 58, Anab. vii. 7. 22 and Krüger in loc.) it may mean conspicuous, eminent.—ἐν δὲ θῷ πρατηρίῳ] πρατηρίῳ is not the imperial palace in Rome (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Bengel, and many others, also Mynster, Rheinwald, and Schneckenburger in the Deutsch. Zeitschr. 1855, p. 300), which is denoted in iv. 22 by η Καλαβας οἰκία, but was never called praetorium.¹ It could not well, indeed, be so called, as τὸ πρατηρίῳ is the standing appellation for the palaces of the chief governors of provinces (Matt. xxvii. 27; John xviii. 28, xix. 9; Acts xxiii. 35); hence it might and must have been explained as the Procurator's palace in

¹ Act. Thom. § 3, 17, 18, 19, in Tischendorf, Act. apocr. pp. 192, 204 f., cannot be cited in favour of this designation (in opposition to Rheinwald); the πρατηρίον βασιλεία there spoken of (§ 3) are royal castles, so designated after the analogy of the residences of the Roman provincial rulers. Comp. Sueton. Aug. 72; Tit. 39, et al.; Juvenal, x. 161.
Caesarea, if our epistle had been written there (see especially Böttger, Beitr. I. p. 51 f.). But it is the Roman castrum praetorianorum, the barracks of the imperial body-guard (Camerarius, Perizonius, Clericus, Elser, Michaelis, Storr, Heinrichs, Flatt, Matthies, Hoeleman, van Hengel, de Wette, Rilliet, Wiesinger, Ewald, Weiss, J. B. Lightfoot, and others), whose chief was the praefectus praetorio, the στρατωπέδων έσπαρχος, to whom Paul was given in charge on his arrival in Rome (Acts xxviii. 16). It was built by Sejanus, and was situated not far from the Porta Viminalis, on the eastern side of the city. See Suet. Tib. 37; Tac. Ann. iv. 2; Pitiscus, Thesaur. antiqu. III. 174; and especially Perizonius, de orig., signif. et usu voc. praetorii et praetorii, Franq. 1687, as also his Disquisitio de praetorio ac vero sensu verborum Phil. i. 13, Franq. 1690; also Hoeleman, p. 45, and J. B. Lightfoot, p. 97 ff. τὸ πρατωρίον does not mean the troop of praetorian cohorts (Hofmann), which would make it equivalent to οἱ πρατωριανοὶ (Herodian, viii. 8. 14).—The becoming known in the whole praetorium is explained by the fact, that a praetorian was always present with Paul as his guard (Acts xxviii. 16), and Paul, even in his captivity, continued his preaching without hindrance (Acts xxviii. 30 f.). — καὶ τοῖς λαοῖς πάσι not in the sense of locality, dependent on ἐν (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Calvin), but: and to all the others, besides the praetorians. It is a popular and inexact way of putting the fact of its becoming still more widely known among the (non-Christian) Romans, and therefore it must be left without any more specific definition. This extensive pro-

1 Doubtless there was a praetorian guard stationed in the imperial palace itself, on the Mons Palatinus, as in the time of Augustus (Dio. Cass. liii. 16). See Wieseler, Chronol. d. apost. Zeitalt. p. 404, who understands the station of this palace-guard to be here referred to. But it cannot be proved that after the times of Tiberius, in whose reign the castra praetoriana were built in front of the Viminal gate (only three cohorts having previously been stationed in the city, and that sine castris, Suetonius, Octav. 49), anything else than these castra is to be understood by the wanted term praetorium, στρατωρίον, when mentioned without any further definition (as Joseph. Ant. xviii. 6. 7: γιάγε το βασιλείαν).

2 Not even in such passages as Tacitus, Hist. ii. 24, iv. 46; Suetonius, Ner. 7; Plin. H. N. xxv. 2, 6, et al., where the prepositional expression (in praetorium, ex praetorio) is always local.
clamoration of the matter took place in part directly through Paul himself, since any one might visit him, and in part indirectly, through the praetorians, officers of justice, disciples, and friends of the apostle, and the like. 1 Van Hengel, moreover, understands it incorrectly, as if of νουτιοι were specially "hominis exteris," "Gentiles,"—a limitation which could only be suggested by the context, and therefore cannot be established by the use of the word in Eph. ii. 3, iv. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 13. Equally arbitrary is the limitation of Hofmann: that it refers to those, who already knew about him.

Ver. 14. τοῖς πνεομοναῖς] the majority, 1 Cor. x. 5, xvi. 6, et al. It is not to be more precisely specified or limited.—ἐν κυρίῳ belongs not to ἀδελφοῖς (Luther, Castalio, Grotius, Cornelius a Lapide, Heinrichs, van Hengel, de Wette, Ewald, Weiss, and others)—in which case it would not indeed have needed a connecting article (Col. ii. 2, iv. 7), yet would have been entirely superfluous—but to πνεομοναῖς, along with which, however, it is not to be rendered: relying upon the Lord with respect to my bonds (Rheinwald, Flatt, Rilliet, comp. Schneckenburger, p. 301). It means rather: in the Lord trusting my bonds, so that ἐν κυρίῳ is the specific modal definition of πνεομοναί. τοῖς ὑμῖν, which trust is based and depends on Christ. Comp. ii. 24; Gal. v. 10; Rom. xiv. 14; 2 Thess. iii. 4. On the dative, comp. 2 Cor. x. 7; Phil. 21, and the ordinary usage in the classics; in the New Testament mostly with ἐν or ἐν. Ἐν κυρίῳ is placed first as the correlative of the ἐν Χριστῷ, ver. 13. As the apostle's bonds had become generally

1 This suffices fully to explain the situation set forth in ver. 13. The words therefore afford no ground for the historical combination which Hofmann here makes: that during the two years, Acts xxviii. 30, the apostle's case was held in abeyance; and that only now had it been brought up for judicial discussion, whereby first it had become manifest that his captivity was caused, not by his having committed any crime against the state, but by his having preached Christ, which might not be challenged (!) on the state's account. As if what is expressly reported in Acts xxviii. 31 were not sufficient to have made the matter known, and as if that ἐν κυρίῳ ἐν μεταμορφώσει precluded the judicial preparation of the case (ver. 7)! As if the increased courage of the ἀλειμοῖς, ver. 14, were intelligible only on the above assumption! As if, finally, it were admissible to understand, with Hofmann, among these ἀλειμοῖς all those who "even now before the conclusion of the trial were inspired with such courage by it"!
known as *in Christ*, so also *in Christ* (who will not abandon the work of His prisoner that had thus become so manifest) may be found the just ground of the confidence which encourages the brethren, Paul's fellow-Christians in Rome, ἄφοβως τ. λ. λαλεῖν. They trust the bonds of the apostle, inasmuch as these bonds exhibit to them not only an encouraging example of patience (Grotius), but also (comp. iii. 8; Col. i. 24 f.; 2 Tim. ii. 8 f.; Matt. v. 11 f., and many other passages) a practical guarantee, highly honourable to Christ and His gospel, of the complete truth and justice, power and glory of the word, for the sake of which Paul is in bonds; thereby, instead of losing their courage, they are only made all the bolder in virtue of the elevating influence of moral sympathy with this situation of the apostle in bonds. Weiss explains as if the passage ran τῷ φανερώσει τῶν δεσμῶν μου (which would tend to the recommendation of the gospel); while Hofmann thinks that, to guard themselves against the danger of being criminally prosecuted on account of their preaching, they relied on the apostle's imprisonment, in so far as the latter had now shown itself, in the judicial process that had at length been commenced, to be solely on account of Christ, and not for anything culpable. The essential elements, forsooth, are thus introduced in consequence of the way in which Hofmann has construed for himself the situation (see on ver. 13). — περισσότερον] i.e. in a higher degree than they had formerly ventured upon, before I lay here in bonds. Their ἄφοβος in preaching had increased. This, however, is explained by Hofmann, in accordance with the above hypothesis, by the fact that the political guiltlessness of preaching Christ had now been established,—thus referring, in fact, the increase of their fearless boldness to a sense of legal security. But the reason of the increased ἄφοβος lay deeper, in the sphere of the moral idea, which manifested itself in the apostle's bonds, and in accordance with which they trusted those bonds in the Lord, seeing them borne for the Lord's sake. They animated the brethren to boldness through that holy confidence, rooted in Christ, with which they imbued them.—τὸν λόγον

1 Oecumenius well says: εἰ γὰρ μὴ θύμων ἡ, φανέρωσεν, εἰ σημαίνει, ὧν ἂν τ. Παύλου ἀνάγκην ἡ ὑπὸ αὐτῶν διδάσκει. Comp. ver. 16.

Ver. 15. This is not indeed the case with all, that they ἐν κυρίῳ πεποιθότες τοῖς δεσμ. μον περισσοτ. τοιμ. κ.τ.λ. No, some in Rome preach with an improper feeling and design; but some also with a good intention. (Both parties are described in further detail in vv. 16, 17.) In either case—Christ is preached, wherein I rejoice and will rejoice (ver. 18).—τωσ μὲν καὶ διὰ φθόνον κ. ἐρωτίας] These do not form a part of those described in ver. 14 (Ambrosiaster, Erasmus, Calvin, and others, also Weiss, Hofmann, and Hinsch), for these latter are characterized by ἐν κυρίῳ πεποιθ. τοῖς δεσμ. μον quite otherwise, and indeed in a way which excludes the idea of envy and contention (comp. also Huther, l.c.), and appear as the majority to which these τωσ stand in contrast as exceptions; but they are the anti-Pauline party, Judaizing preachers, who must have pursued their practices in Rome, as in Asia and Greece, and exercised an immoral, hostile opposition to the apostle and his gospel. We have no details on the subject, but from Rom. xiv. we see that there was a fruitful field on which this tendency might find a footing and extend its influence in Rome. The idea that it refers to certain members of the Pauline school, who nevertheless hated the apostle personally (Wiesinger, comp. Flatt), or were envious of his high reputation, and impugned his mode of action (Weiss), is at variance with the previous ἐν κυρίῳ, assumes a state of things which is in itself improbable, and is not required by the utterance of ver. 18 (see the remark after ver. 18). See also Schneckenberg, p. 301 f. — καὶ] indicates that, whilst the majority were actuated by a good disposition (ver. 14), an evil motive also existed in several,—expresses, therefore, the accession of something else in other subjects, but certainly not the accession of a subordinate co-operating motive in a portion of the same persons.

1 For the person to whom individually their φίλος and ἰματία (as likewise the subsequent ἰδίων) had reference was self-evident to the readers, and Paul, moreover, announces it to them in ver. 16 f. Without due reason Hinsch finds in this the mark of a later period, when the guarding of the apostle’s personal position alone was concerned. See against this, Hilgenfeld in his Zeitschr. 1873, p. 180 f.
designated in ver. 14 (Hofmann). — διὰ φθόνον κ. ἐρωτευτικόν on account of envy and strife, that is, for the sake of satisfying the strivings of their jealousy in respect to my influence, and of their contentious disposition towards me. Comp. ver. 17. On διὰ φθόνον, comp. Matt. xxvii. 18; Mark x. 10; Plat. Rep. p. 586 D: φθόνος διὰ φιλοτικίαν. — Τώσις δὲ καὶ] But some also; there also are not wanting such as, etc. Observe that the δὲ καὶ joins itself with τώσις, whereas in μὲν καὶ previously the καὶ is attached to the following διὰ φθόνον. The τώσις here are they who in ver. 14 were described as πλειοευτερούς, but are now brought forward as, in contrast to the τώσις μὲν, the other portion of the preachers, without any renewed reference to their preponderance in numbers, which had been already intimated. — δ' εὐδοκίαν] on account of goodwill, that is, because they entertain a feeling of goodwill towards me. This interpretation is demanded by the context, both in the antithesis διὰ φθόνον κ. ἐρωτευτικόν, and also in ver. 16: ἔξω ἀγαπήν. As to the linguistic use of εὐδοκία in this sense (ii. 13), see Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 372. Comp. on Rom. x. 1. Others take it, contrary to the context, as: "ex benevolentia, qua deserunt hominum salutem" (Estius, comp. already Pelagius); or, "quod ipsi id prodarent," from conviction (Grotius, Heinrichs, and others), from taking delight in the matter generally (Huther), or in the cause of the apostle (de Wette), or in his preaching (Weiss).

1 Van Hengel has not taken this into account, when he assumes that in τώσις καὶ Paul had in view only a portion of those designated in ver. 14. It is an objection to this idea, that what is said subsequently in ver. 16 of the τώσις καὶ completely harmonizes with that, whereby the τώσις generally, and not merely a portion of them, were characterized in ver. 14 (λαμ. καὶ τίνας ἐκάθεν). This applies also in opposition to Hofmann, according to whom the two τώσις, ver. 15 f., belong to the τώσις of ver. 14, whom they divide into two classes. Hofmann's objection to our view, viz. that the apostle does not say that the one party preach solely out of envy and strife, and the other solely out of goodwill, is irrelevant. He could not, indeed, have desired to say this, and does not say it; but he could describe in general, as he has done, the ethical antithesis which characterized the two parties. Moreover, ἵστασις means everywhere in the N. T., and especially here in its conjunction with φθόνον (comp. Rom. i. 29; 1 Tim. vi. 4), not rivalry—the weaker sense assigned to it here, without a shadow of justification from the context, by Hofmann ("they wish to outdo him")—but strife, contention. Just as little is ἢστασις to be reduced to the general notion of egotism, as is done by Hofmann; see on ver. 17.
Vv. 16, 17. We have here a more detailed description of both parties in respect to the motives which actuated them in relation to the δεσμολ of the apostle. —οι μεν . . . οι δε] corresponds to the two parties of ver. 15, but—and that indeed without any particular purpose—in an inverted order (see the critical remarks), as in 2 Cor. ii. 16, and frequently in classical authors (Thuc. i. 68. 4.; Xen. Anab. i. 10. 4). In ver. 18 the order adopted in ver. 15 is again reverted to. —οι εξ ἁγάπης] so. οϋσις, a genetic description of the ethical condition of these people: those who are of love, i.e. of loving nature and action; comp. Rom. ii. 8; Gal. iii. 7; John xviii. 37, et al. We must supply what immediately precedes: των Χριστον κηρύσσονων, of which ειδότες κ.τ.λ. then contains the particular moving cause (Rom. v. 3, 6, 9; Gal. ii. 16; Eph. vi. 8 f., et al.). We might also take οι μεν (and then οι δε) absolutely: the one, and then bring up immediately, for εξ ἁγάπης, the subsequent τ. Χριστον καταγγέλλονων (so Hofmann and others). But this would be less appropriate, because the progress of the discourse does not turn on the saying that the one preach out of love, and the other out of contention (for this has been said in substance previously), but on the internal determining motives which are expressed by ειδότες κ.τ.λ. and οιόμενοι κ.τ.λ.; besides, οιχ ἁγών would then follow as merely a weak and disturbing auxiliary clause to εξ ἐρήμων. —στι εἰς ἄποκτον εναγον κείμαι] that I am destined, am ordained of God for (nothing else than) the defence of the gospel—a destination which they on their parts, in consequence of their love to me, feel themselves impelled to subserve. They labour sympathetically hand in hand with me.—κείμαι] as in Luke ii. 34; 1 Thess. iii. 3; comp. Plat. Legg. x. p. 909; Thuc. iii. 45, 2, 47, 2; Ecclus. xxxviii. 29, and other passages in which “κείμαι tanquam passivum verbi ποιεῖσθαι vel τιθέναι videatur,” Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 943. Others render: I lie in prison (Luther, Piscator, Estius, Wolf, am Ende, Huther, and others); but the idea of lying under fetters, which κείμαι would thus convey (comp. Eur. Phoen. 1633; Aesch. Ag. 1492), does not harmonize with the position of the apostle any more than the reference of its meaning thereby introduced: they
know that I am hindered in my preaching, and therefore they "supplement hoc meum impedimentum sua praedicatione," Estius. See, on the contrary, Acts xxviii. 30, 31; Phil. i. 7. Van Hengel also imports (comp. Weiss): "me ad causam rei Christianae, ubi urgetan necessitas, coram judice defendendum hic in miseria jacere." Comp. Hom. Od. i. 46; Soph. Aj. 316 (323); Pflugk, ad Eur. Hec. 496. — oi δὲ ἐξ ἑπιθ. sc. ὑπερτερ, the factious, the cabal-makers. See on Rom. ii. 8; 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20. So also Ignatius, ad Philadelph. 8. It corresponds with the ὕθονον κ. ἐμνη, ver. 15. — τὸν Χ. καταγγ. ὁ ἄγνωσ] belong together. καταγγ. is, in substance, the same as καταγγε-σευ, but more precisely defining it as the announcement of the Messiah (Acts xvii. 3, 23; Col. i. 28, et al.). The words τ. Χριστὸν καταγγέλλουσιν might have been left out, following the analogy of ver. 16, but are inserted to bring out the tragic contrast which is implied in preaching Christ, and yet doing so ὁ ἄγνωσ, non caste, not in purity of feeling and purpose. καθαρὸς is synonymous (Hom. H. in Apoll. 121), also with a mental reference (Hesiod. ἐργα, 339). Comp. Plat. Legg. viii. p. 840 D; 2 Cor. vii. xi. 2; Phil. iv. 8, et al.; 2 Cor. vi. 6. — οἴσμενος κ.τ.λ.] thinking to stir up affliction for my bonds, to make my captivity full of sorrow. This they intend to do, and that is the immoral moving spring of their unworthy conduct; but (observe the distinction between οἴσμενος and εἰδότες in ver. 16) Paul hints by this purposely-chosen word (which is nowhere else used by him), that what they imagine fails to happen. On ὁμαι with the present infinitive, see Pflugk, ad Eur. Hec. 283. The future infinitive would not convey that what is meant is even now occurring. See generally Stallbaum, ad Plat. Crit. p. 52 C; comp. Phaed. p. 116 E. How far they thought that they could effect that injurious result by their preaching, follows from ver. 15 and from εἰ ἐπιθείας; in so far, namely, that they doubtless, rendered the more unscrupulous through the captivity of the apostle, sought by their preaching to prejudice his authority, and to stir up controversial and partisan interests of a Judaistic character against him, and thus thought thoroughly to embitter the prisoner's lot by exciting opponents to vex and wrong him.
This was the *cabal* in the background of their *dishonest* preaching. That by the spread of the gospel they desired to provoke the hostility of the heathen, especially of Nero, against Paul, and thus to render his captivity more severe, is a groundless conjecture imported (Erasmus, Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, and others; comp. already Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Pelagius). — On ἐγείρεω (see the critical remarks) comp. ἐγ. ὄδινας, Plat. Theat. p. 149 C, and similar passages.

Ver. 18. On τί γάρ, scil. ἐστι, comp. on Rom. iii. 3, where, however, γάρ is not, as here, *conclusive* (see on 1 Cor. xi. 22); comp. also Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 245. It is rendered necessary by the πλήν that the mark of interrogation should not be placed (as it usually is) after τί γάρ, but the question goes on to καταγγέλλειαι (comp. Hofmann); and it is to be observed that through πλήν the τί γάρ receives the sense of τί γάρ ἄλλο (see Heindorf, *ad Plat. Soph.* p. 232 C). Hence: *what else takes place therefore* (in such a state of the case) *except that*, etc., *i.e. what else than that by every sort of preaching, whether it is done in pretence or in truth, Christ is proclaimed?* and therein, that it is always *Christ* whom they preach, Ι τρόμοι, etc. How magnanimous is this liberality of judgment as to the existing circumstances in their reference to Christ! By πρόφασις and ἀληθεία is indicated the characteristic difference in the two kinds of preachers, vv. 15–17, and thus παντὶ πρόσπερ receives the more precise definition of its respective parts. As regards the first class, the preaching of Christ was not a matter of sincerity and truth—wherein they, in accordance with their sentiments, were really concerned about Christ, and He was the real *aëria* of their working (see on the contrast between *aëria* and πρόφασις, Polyb. iii. 6. 6 ff.)—but a matter of *pretence*, under the cloak of which they entertained in their hearts envy, strife, and cabal, as the real objects of their endeavours. For instances of the antithesis between πρόφασις and ἀληθ—

1 According to Weiss, γάρ is intended to establish the *aëria* n. c. l., so far as the latter is only an empty imagination. But this is an unnecessary seeking after a very obscure reference. The τι γάρ draws, as it were, the result from vv. 15–17. Hence also we cannot, with Huther, adopt as the sense: *"Is it then so, as they think?"*
CHAP. I. 18.

θεύ or τάληθες, see Raphel, Polyb.; Loesner and Wetstein. To take πρόφασις as opportunity, occasion (Herod. i. 29, 30, iv. 145, vi. 94; Dem. xx. 26; Antiph. v. 21; Herod. i. 8. 16, v. 2. 14),—as, following the Vulgate, Luther, Estius, Grotius ("nam occasione illi Judaei, dum nocere Paulo student, multos pertrahebant ad evang."); and others understand it,—is opposed to the context in vv. 15–17, in which the want of honest disposition is set forth as the characteristic mark of these persons. On πλήν in the sense of η, comp. Kühner, Π. 2, p. 842.—ἐν τούτῳ the neuter: therein, in accordance with the conception of that in which the feeling has its basis. Comp. Col. i. 24; Plat. Rep. x. p. 603 C; Soph. Tr. 1118; Kühner, Π. 1, p. 403. In the Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται lies the apostle's joy.—ἀλλὰ καὶ χαρίσσομαι surpassing the simple χαίρω by a plus, and therefore added in a corrective antithetical form (imo etiam); comp. on 1 Cor. iii. 2; 2 Cor. xi. 1. To begin a new sentence with ἀλλά (Lachmann, Tischendorf), and to sever χαρίσσομαι from its connection with ἐν τούτῳ (Hofmann, who makes the apostle only assert generally that he will continue to rejoice also in the future), interrupts, without sufficient reason, the flow of the animated discourse, and is also opposed by the proper reference of ἀδιάφραγμα in ver. 19. This applies also in opposition to Hinsch, p. 64 f.

REMARK.—Of course this rejoicing does not refer to the impure intention of the preachers, but to the objective result. See, already, Augustine, c. Faust. xxii. 48; c. Ep. Parm. ii. 11. Nor does παντὶ προσώπῳ apply to the doctrinal purport of the preaching (Gal. i. 8), but to its ethical nature and method, to disposition and purpose. See Chrysostom and those who follow him. Nevertheless the apostle's judgment may excite surprise by its mildness (comp. iii. 2), since these opponents must have taught what in substance was anti-Pauline. But we must consider, first, the tone of lofty resignation in general which prevails in this passage, and which might be fitted to raise him more than elsewhere above antagonisms; secondly, that in this case the danger did not affect, as it did in Asia and Greece, in Galatia and Corinth, his personal sphere of apostolical ministry; thirdly, that Rome was the very place in which the preaching of Christ
might appear to him in itself of such prepondering importance as to induce him in the meantime, while his own ministry was impeded and in fact threatened with an imminent end, to allow—in generous tolerance, the lofty philosophical spirit of which Chrysostom has admired—of even un-Pauline admixtures of doctrine, in reliance on the discriminating power of the truth; lastly, that a comparison of iii. 2 permits the assumption, as regards the teachers referred to in the present passage, of a less important grade of anti-Pauline doctrine, and especially of a tenor of teaching which did not fundamentally overthrow that of Paul. Comp. also on iii. 2. All the less, therefore, can the stamp of mildness and forbearance which our passage bears be used, as Baur and Hitzig employ it, as a weapon of attack against the genuineness of the epistle. Comp. the appropriate remarks of Hilgenfeld in his Zeitschr. 1871, p. 314 ff.; in opposition to Hinsch, see on ver. 15. Calvin, moreover, well says: "Quamquam autem gaudebat Paulus evangelii incrementis, nunquam tamen, si fuisset in ejus manu, tales ordinasset ministros."

Ver. 19. Reason assigned not only for the ἀλλὰ καὶ χαρῆσομαι, but for the entire conjoint assertion: ἐν τοῦτῳ χαίρω, ἀλλὰ κ. χαρ. For both, for his present joy and for his future joy, the apostle finds the subjective ground in the certainty now to be expressed. — τοῦτο] the same thing that was conveyed by ἐν τοῦτῳ in ver. 18, this fact of Christ's being preached, from whatever different motives it may be done, — not: my present, τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ (Hofmann). — εἰς σωτηρίαν] is, in conformity with the context, not to be explained of the deliverance from captivity (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Musculus, Heinrichs), or of the preservation of the apostle's life (Oecumenius), or of the triumph over his enemies (Michaelis), or of the salvation multorum hominum (Grotius); nor is it to be more precisely defined as the eternal Messianic redemption (van Hengel, Weiss; comp. Matthies and Hoelemann), or as spiritual salvation (Rheinwald, de Wette). On the contrary, the expression: "it will turn out to my salvation" (comp. Job xiii. 16), will be salutary for me, is, without anticipating the sequel,

---

2 Who thinks that he recognises here an indistinct shadow of Tacitus, Agric. 41: "Optimus quiesque amore et fide, pessimi malignitate et livore."
to be left without any more precise modal definition; for Paul himself only announces, as the discourse proceeds (ver. 20), how far he expects salutary results for himself to arise out of the state of things in question. Bengal aptly remarks: “non modo non in pressuram,” ver. 17. On ἀποθέωσις, will turn out, issue, comp. Luke xxii. 13; Job xiii. 16; 2 Macc. ix. 24; Plat. Lys. p. 206 A; de virt. p. 379 C; Rep. p. 425 C; Dem. 1412. 10.—Through the entreaty of his Philippians, Paul knows, it will be salutary for him (comp. 2 Cor. i. 11; Rom. xv. 31; 2 Thess. iii. 12; Philem. 22), and through supply of the Spirit of Christ, that is, through the Spirit of Christ supplying him with help, strength, courage, light, etc. (comp. on ἐπιχορηγ., Eph. iv. 16). The words διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν δεήσεως... Χριστοῦ, embrace, therefore, two elements which work together and bring about the ἀποθέωσ. εἰς σωτηρ., one of these on the part of the readers themselves (hence ὑμῶν is placed first), the other on the part of the Holy Spirit. After εἰς, διὰ is to be again understood; the article, however, is not repeated before ἐπιχορ., not because the entreaty and the ἐπιχορηγία are to be taken together as one category, which in this passage would be illogical, but because Paul conceived the second member of the clause without the article: supply (not the supply) of the Spirit. τοῦ πνεύματος is the genitive of the subject; as genitive of the object (Wiesinger, in accordance with Gal. iii. 5) the expression would be inappropriate, since Paul already has the Spirit (1 Cor. vii. 40), and does not merely expect it to be supplied, though in his present position he does expect the help, comfort, etc., which the Spirit supplies. Comp. Theodoret: τοῦ θελείν μοι πνεύματος χορηγοῦντος τὴν χάριν. Respecting the πνεύμα Χριστοῦ, see on Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iv. 6; 2 Cor. iii. 17. Paul here designates the Holy Spirit thus, because Jesus Christ forms, in the inmost consciousness of the apostle, the main interest and aim of his entire discourse, ver. 18 ff.

1 Bengal well says: “preeationem in coelum ascendendem; exhibitionem de coelo venientem.” If, however, ἐπιχορηγία is still to be included in dependence on τῆς ὑμῶν (so Buttman, neut. Gr. p. 87 [E. T. p. 100]), the readers would at all events appear as those communicating, which would yield an incongruous idea.
Ver. 20. It will prove salutary for me in conformity with my earnest expectation (see, regarding ἀποκαραδοκία, on Rom. viii. 19) and my hope, that I, etc. (object of the earnest expectation and hope). Others take δὲ as argumentative (Vatablus, Estius, Matthies); but by this interpretation the κατὰ τ. ἀποκ. κ. ἐκπ. μ. seems, after the οἶδα already expressed, to be an addition for which there is no motive, and the flow of the discourse is interrupted. No, when Paul says with δὲ κ.τ.λ. what it is that he earnestly expects and hopes (comp. Rom. viii. 20 f.), he thereby supplies the precise definition of the former merely general expression εἰς σωτηρίαν.—This is neither clumsy nor unsuited to the meaning of ἀποκαράδος, as Hofmann thinks, who goes back with δὲ to the far distant οἶδα, and finds it convenient to co-ordinate it with the first δὲ. Paul would have made this alleged conjunction convenient and at the same time intelligible, only in the event of his having written καὶ δὲ: — ἐν οὐδενὶ αἰσχυνθήσομαι] that I shall in no point (2 Cor. vi. 3, vii. 9; Jas. i. 4), in no respect, be put to shame; that is, in no respect will a result ensue tending to my shame,—a result which would expose me to the reproach of having failed to accomplish my destiny (comp. the sequel). Comp. on αἰσχύνεσθαι, 2 Cor. x. 8, 1 John ii. 28, and the passages of the LXX. in Schleusner, I. p. 98 f.; also Xen. Cyr. vi. 4. 6; Plut. Mor. p. 1118 E. Matthies understands it differently: “in nothing shall I show myself shamefaced and fearful;” comp. van Hengel: “pudore confusus ab officio deflectam.” But the context, in which Paul desires to explain more in detail (comp. ver. 21) the words μοι ἀποστῆσαι εἰς σωτηρίαν, ver. 19, will not harmonize with any other than the above-named purely passive interpretation; not even with the sense that Paul would not “stand dis-graced” (Weiss, comp. Huther), that is, be found unfaithful to his office, or deficient in the discharge of its duties to the glorifying of Christ. The connection requires a description, not of Paul’s behaviour, but of the fate in which the τοῦτο of ver. 19 would issue for him. Hoellemann takes ἐν οὐδενὶ as masculine, of the preachers described in ver. 15 ff., who in their ministry, though actuated by such various motives, “ita
esse versaturos, ut inde non oritur, de quo erubescat et doleat quum ipse, tum etiam in re sua quasi Christus.” This interpretation is opposed both by the context, which from ver. 18 onwards brings forward no persons at all; and also by the sense itself, because Paul, thus understood, would be made to express a confidence in the labours of those teachers which, as regards the malicious portion of them (ver. 17, comp. ver. 15), would not be besetting. The αἰσχύνεσθαι of the apostle was indeed the very object which they had in view; but, he means to say, οὐκ αἰσχύνομαι, toutéōtiv οὐ περιέσονται, Chrysostom.—ἀλλ’ ἐν πάσῃ παρθένῳ κ.τ.λ.] the contrast to ἐν οὐδενὶ αἰσχυνθήσομαι; for the apostle can receive no greater honour and triumph (the opposite to the αἰσχύνεσθαι) than to be made the instrument of glorifying Christ (iii. 7 f.): but with all freeness, as always, so also now, Christ will be magnified in my body. —ἐν πάσῃ παρθένῳ.] ἐν πάσῃ corresponds to the previous ἐν οὐδενὶ, so that every kind of freeness, which is no way restrained or limited (comp. Acts iv. 29, xxviii. 31; 2 Cor. iii. 12), is meant, which amounts substantially to the idea, “une pleine liberté” (Rilliet and older expositors); comp. Wunder, ad Soph. Phil. 141 f. The subject of the freeness is Paul himself, inasmuch as it was in his body that the fearless glorifying of Christ was to be manifested (see below); but he expresses himself in the passive (μεγαλυθήσεται) and not in the active, because, in the feeling of his being the organ of divine working, the μοι ἀποβήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν (ver. 19) governs his conceptions and determines his expression. Hofmann’s view, that ἐν π. παρθένῳ means “in full publicity,” as an unmistakeable fact before the eyes of all, is linguistically erroneous. See, in opposition to it, on Col. ii. 15. — ὡς πάντοτε καὶ νῦν] so that the present circumstances, however inimical they are in part towards me (vv. 15–18), will therefore bring about no other result than this most happy one for me, which has always taken place.—ἐν τῷ σώματι μου] instead of saying: ἐν ἑμοί, he says: in my body, because the decision was now close at hand, whether his body should remain alive or be put to death. But whichever of these possible alternatives should come to pass, he earnestly expected and hoped that the glory of Christ would be thereby secured.
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

(εἴπερ διὰ ζωῆς εἴπερ διὰ θανάτου), in so far, namely, as through his remaining in the body his apostolic labours would be continued to the glory of Christ, and by the slaying of his body there would take place, not the mere closing of his witness for Christ, as Hofmann, in opposition to the text (vv. 21–23), refines away this point, but his union with Christ. Thus, therefore, he will not be put to shame even by his death; but, on the contrary, Christ will be freely glorified by it, namely, practically glorified, inasmuch as Paul, conscious of the great gain which he shall acquire through death (ver. 21), will with unwavering joyfulness—with the frank joyful courage of the martyr who is being perfected—die to the glorifying of Christ. Comp. John xxi. 19. In any case, accordingly, the result must ensue, that in his body, just as it has always hitherto been the living personal instrument of Christ's glory, now also the free glorification of Christ shall be made manifest, whether this result be secured through its being preserved alive or being slain; "nam et corpus loquitur et corpus moritur," Grotius. Hoelemann erroneously refers ἐν πάσῃ παρθῇ to the bold preaching of the various teachers described in vv. 15–18, from which now, as always, the glory of Christ shall result; and that indeed, through the influence which such a fearless working would have on the fate of the apostle, in his body, whether Christ grant to him a longer course of life or death, in either of which cases the Lord will manifest Himself to him as augustissimum auxiliatorem. But against this view it may be urged, that ἐν obdevil does not refer to the teachers (see above); that παρθῇ is the contrast to αἰσχρωθησομαι, so that the subject of the latter must be also the subject of the former; and lastly, that Paul would thus be made to say that the fearless working of others had always shown forth Christ's honour in his body,—an expression which, as regards the last point, might be suited to the present position of the apostle, but not to the ὥς πάντωρα. Rilliet takes μεγαλυθρούσαι not in the sense of praising (Luke i. 46; Acts v. 13, x. 46, xix. 17; Thuc. viii. 81; Xen. Hell. vii. 1. 13), but in the material signification of grandir (Matt. xxiii. 5; Luke i. 58; 2 Cor. x. 15), making it apply to the mental indwelling of Christ.
(Gal. ii. 20; Rom. viii. 10; Gal. iv. 19); so that Paul is made to hope that Christ may grow ever more and more in him, that is, may more and more reveal Himself as the principle of his life, and that this growth will be perfected whether he himself live or die. But ἐν πάσῃ παράγωγῇ would be an inappropriate definition of this idea; and ἐν τῷ σώματί μοι would also be inappropriate, as if Christ would have, even by the apostle's death, to grow in his body; lastly, neither the foregoing nor the subsequent context points to the peculiar mystical idea of a growth of Christ in the human body; while the similar idea in Gal. iv. 19 is there very peculiarly and clearly suggested by the context.

Ver. 21. Justification not of the joy, ver. 18 (Weiss), which has already been justified in ver. 19 f., but of the εἰς διὰ ζωῆς εἰς διὰ θανάτου just expressed: For to me the living is Christ, that is, if I remain alive, my prolonged life will be nothing but a life of which the whole essential element and real tenor is Christ ("quicquid vivo, vita naturali, Christum vivo," Bengel), as the One to whom the whole destination and activity of my life bear reference (comp. on Gal. ii. 20); and the dying is gain, inasmuch as by death I attain to Christ; see ver. 23. Whichever, therefore, of the two may come to pass, will tend to the free glorification of Christ; the former, inasmuch as I continue to labour freely for Christ's glory; the latter, inasmuch as in the certainty of that gain I shall suffer death with joyful courage. Comp. Corn. Müller, who, however, assumes that in the second clause Paul had the thought: "et si mihi moriendum est; moriar Christo, ita etiam morte mea Christus celebratur," but that in the emotion of the discourse he has not expressed this, allowing himself to be carried away by the conception of the gain involved in the matter. This assumption is altogether superfluous; for, to the consciousness of the Christian reader, the reference of

---

1 Not the being dead (Huther, Schenkel). On the combination of the Inf. pres. (continuing) and aor. (momentary), comp. Xen. Mem. iv. 4. 4: ἔρισκεν μᾶλλον τοῖς νύμμις ἔρισκεν ἐπολεμών ἢ παρατηρῶν ζῷ, Eur. Or. 308: ὅποι καὶ λαβάσαν ἄριστος καὶ ζῷ, Epictet. Enchir. 12; 2 Cor. vii. 3. See generally Mätz. ad Antiph. p. 153 f.; Kühner, II. 1, p. 159. The being dead would have been expressed, as in Herod. i. 31, by τρήσων.
the \( \kappa \varepsilon \rho \delta \omicron \varsigma \) to Christ must of itself have been clear and certain. But the idea of \( \kappa \varepsilon \rho \delta \omicron \varsigma \), which connects itself in the apostle's mind with the thought of death, prevents us from assuming that he meant to say that it was a matter of no moment to him personally whether he lived or died (Wiesinger); for on account of the \( \kappa \varepsilon \rho \delta \omicron \varsigma \) in death, his own personal wish must have given the preference to the dying (see ver. 23). Others (Calvin, Beza, Musculus, Er. Schmid, Raphel, Knatchbull, et al.) have, moreover, by the non-mention of Christ in the second clause, been led to the still more erroneous assumption, in opposition both to the words and linguistic usage, that in both clauses Christ is the subject and \( \kappa \varepsilon \rho \delta \omicron \varsigma \) the predicate, and that the infinitives with the article are to be explained by \( \pi \rho \omicron \varsigma \) or \( \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \), so that Christ "tam in vita quam in morte lucrum esse praedicatur." Lastly, in opposition to the context, Rheinwald and Rilliet take \( \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \mu \) as meaning life in the higher, spiritual sense, and \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \) as: and consequently, which latter interpretation does not harmonize with the preceding alternative \( \epsilon \tau \varepsilon \ldots \epsilon \tau \varepsilon \). This explanation is refuted by the very \( \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \iota \) which follows in ver. 22, since \( \epsilon \nu \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \iota \) contains not an antithesis to the absolute \( \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \mu \), but on the contrary a more precise definition of it. Although the \( \delta \iota \alpha \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \alpha \tau \omicron \) and \( \tau \alpha \alpha \pi \omicron \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \epsilon \nu \) contrasted with the \( \varsigma \gamma \mu \), as also ver. 20 generally, afford decisive evidence against the view that takes \( \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \mu \) in the higher ethical sense, that view has still been adopted by Hofmann, who, notwithstanding the correlation and parallelism of \( \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \mu \) and \( \tau \alpha \alpha \pi \omicron \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \epsilon \nu \), oddly supposes that, while \( \tau \alpha \alpha \pi \omicron \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \epsilon \nu \) is the subject in the second clause, \( \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \mu \) is yet predicate in the first. Like \( \tau \alpha \alpha \pi \omicron \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \epsilon \nu \), \( \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \mu \) must be subject also. — \( \epsilon \mu \omicron \) is emphatically placed first: to me, as regards my own person, though it may be different with others. Comp. the emphatic \( \eta \mu \omicron \), iii. 20.— For profane parallels to the idea, though of course not to the Christian import, of \( \tau \alpha \alpha \pi \omicron \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \epsilon \nu \kappa \varepsilon \rho \delta \omicron \), see Wetstein. Comp. Aelian. \( V. H. \) iv. 7; Soph. \( A n t \). 464 f.; Eur. \( M e d. \) 145.

Ver. 22. \( \Delta \epsilon \) carrying onward the discourse to the compari-

\(^1\) Compare also Spiess, \ Logos Spermaticos, \ 1871, p. 330 f.
son between the two cases as regards their desirability. Weiss understands δὲ as antithetic, namely η τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος, and Hofmann as in contrast also to the ἐμοί τὸ ζην Χριστός, but both proceed on an erroneous view of what follows; as does also Huther.—According to the τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος just expressed, the ἀποθανεῖν was put as the case more desirable for Paul personally; but because the ζην, in which indeed Christ is his one and all, conditioned the continuance of his official labours, he expresses this now in the hypothetical protasis and, as consequence thereof, in the apodosis, that thus he is in doubt respecting a choice between the two.—The structure of the sentence is accordingly this, that the apodosis sets in with καὶ τί αἰρήσομαι, and nothing is to be supplied: “But if the remaining in my bodily life, and just this, avails for my work, I refrain from a making known what I should choose.” We have to remark in detail: (1) that εἰ does not render problematical that which was said of the ζην ἐν σαρκί, but in accordance with the well-known and, especially in Paul’s writings, frequent (Rom. v. 17, vi. 15, and often) syllogistic usage (Herbst and Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 5, 1), posits the undoubted certainty (Wilke, Rhetor. p. 258), which would take place in the event of a continuance of life; (2) that Paul was the more naturally led to add here the specially defining ἐν σαρκί to τὸ ζην (comp. Gal. ii. 20; 2 Cor. x. 3), because, in the previously mentioned κέρδος, the idea of life apart from the body (comp. 2 Cor. v. 8) must have been floating in his mind; (3) that τὸ ὑπὸ again sums up with the emphasis of emotion (comp. Rom. vii. 10) the τὸ ζην ἐν σαρκί which had just been said, 1 Cor. vi. 4, and calls attention to it (Bernhardy, p. 283; Kühner, II. 1, p. 568 f.; Fritzsche, ad Matth. p. 219), for it was the remaining in life, just this, this and nothing else (in contrast to the ἀποθανεῖν), which was necessarily to the apostle καρπὸς ζηνοῦν; (4) that καρπὸς is correlative to the preceding κέρδος, and embodies the idea emolumentum (Rom. i. 13, vi. 21, et al.; Wisd. iii. 13), which is more precisely defined by ζηνοῦν: work-fruit, gain of work, i.e. advantage which accrues to my apostolical work; comp. on the idea, Rom. i. 13; (5) that καὶ, at the commencement of the apodosis, is the subjoining also,
showing that if the one thing takes place, the other also sets in; see Hartung, Partikell. I. p. 130 f. ; Baeumlein, Partik. p. 146 ; Nägelsbach, a. Ilias, p. 164, ed. 3 ; comp. on 2 Cor. ii. 2 ; (6) that τι stands in the place of the more accurate πρέπειν (Xen. Cyrop. i. 3. 17 ; Stallbaum, ad Phil. p. 168 ; Jacobs, ad Del. epigr. p. 219 ; Winer, p. 159 [E. T. 211]), and that the future αἰρεῖναι (what I should prefer) is quite in order (see Eur. Hel. 631, and Pflugk in loc. ; and Winer, p. 280 [E. T. 374]), while also the sense of the middle, to choose for himself, to prefer for himself, is not to be overlooked ; comp. 2 Thess. ii. 13 ; Xen. Mem. iv. 2. 29 : οἱ δὲ μὴ εἰδὸτες δὲ τι ποιοῦν, κακῶς δὲ αἰροῦμενοι, Soph. Ant. 551 : σὺ μὲν γὰρ εἶδον ἔρμα ; (7) that οὐ γνωρίσκω is not to be taken, as it usually has been, according to the common Greek usage with the Vulgate, in the sense of ignoro, but, following the invariable usage of the N. T. (comp. also 3 Macc. ii. 6 ; 3 Esr. vi. 12 ; Aesch. Prom. 487 ; Athen. xii. p. 539 B ; Diod. Sic. i. 6), as: I do not make it known, I do not explain myself on the point, give no information upon it. ¹ Comp. van Hengel, Ewald, Huther, Schenkel, also Bengel, who, however, without any ground, adds μὴ. Paul refrains from making and declaring such a choice, because (see ver. 23 f.) his desire is so situated between the two alternatives, that it clashes with that which he is compelled to regard as the better.—The conformity to words and context, and the simplicity, which characterize the whole of this explanation (so, in substance, also Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylass, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, and many others, including Heinrichs, Rheinwald, van Hengel, de Wette, Wiesinger, Ewald, Ellicott, Hilgenfeld),—in which, however, κατηρ. ἔργον is not to be taken as opera pretium (Calvin, Grotius, and others), nor καλ as superfluous (Casaubon, Heinrichs, and others), nor οὐ γνωρίσκω as equivalent to οὐκ οἶδα (see above),—exclude decisively all other interpretations, in which τοῦτο

¹ Not as if Paul intended to say that “he kept it to himself,” a sense which Hofmann wrongly ascribes to this declaration. He intends to say rather that he refrains from a decision regarding what he should choose. The dilemma in which he found himself (comp. ver. 28) caused him to waive the giving of such a decision, in order not to anticipate in any way the divine purpose by his own choice.
and the καὶ of the apodosis have been the special stumbling-blocks. Among these other explanations are (a) that of Pelagius, Estius, Bengel, Matthies, and others (comp. Lachmann, who places a stop after ἐργοῦ), that ἔστι is to be understood with ἐν σαρκί, that the apodosis begins with τὸῦτο, and that καὶ τὸ εἰρ. κ. τ. λ. is a proposition by itself: "if the living in the flesh is appointed to me, then this has no other aim for me than by continuous labour to bring forth fruit," etc. (Huther, l.c. p. 581 f.). But how arbitrarily is the simple ἔστι, thus supplied, interpreted (mīhi constitutum est)! The words τοῦτο μοι καρπὸς ἐργοῦ, taken as an apodosis, are—immediately after the statement ἐμοὶ γὰρ τῷ ζην Ἱησοῦς, in which the idea of καρπὸς ἐργοῦ is substantially conveyed already—adapted less for a new emphatic inference than for a supposition that has been established; and the discourse loses both in flow and force. Nevertheless Hofmann has in substance followed this explanation.1 (b) Beza’s view, that ei is to be taken as whether: "An vero vivere in carne mihi operae pretium sit, et quid eligam ignoror." This is linguistically incorrect (καρπὸς ἐργοῦ), awkward (ei . . . καὶ τὸ), and in the first member of the sentence un-Pauline (vv. 24—26). (c) The assumption of an apopiosis after ἐργοῦ: if life, etc., is to me καρπὸς ἐργοῦ, "non repugno, non aegre fero" (so Corn. Müller), or, "je ne dois pas désirer la mort" (Rilliet). See Winer, p. 557 f. [E. T. 751]; Meineke, Menand. p. 238. This is quite arbitrary, and finds no support in the emotional character of the passage, which is in fact very calm. (d) Hoele mann's explanation—which supplies καρπὸς from the sequel after ζῆν, takes τοῦτο, which applies to the ἄποθανεῖν, as the beginning of the apodosis, and understands καρπὸς ἐργοῦ as an actual fruit: "but if life is a fruit in the flesh (an earthly fruit), this (death) is also a fruit of (in) fact (a substantial, real fruit)—is involved, artificial, and contrary to the genius.

1 If it be life in the flesh, namely, which I have to expect instead of dying (!), then this, namely the life in the flesh, is to me produce of labour, in so far as by living I produce fruit, and thus then (καὶ) it is to me unknown, etc. This interpretation of Hofmann's also is liable to the objection that, if Paul intended to say that he produced fruit by his life, logically he must have predicated of his ζῆν in σαρκί, not that it was to him καρπὸς ἐργοῦ, but rather that it was ἐργοῦ καρποῦ, a work (a working) which produces fruit.
of the language (καρπ. ἔργον!). (e) The explanation of Weiss is that, after ἐν σαρκὶ, κέρδος is to be again supplied as a predicate, so that τοῦτο, which is made to apply to the entire protasis, begins the apodosis: “but if life is a gain, that is a fruit of his labour, because the successes of his apostolic ministry can alone make his life worth having to him” (ver. 24). This supplying of κέρδος, which was predicated of the antithesis of the ζην, is as arbitrary as it is intolerably forced; and, indeed, according to ver. 21, not κέρδος merely would have to be supplied, but ἐμοὶ κέρδος; and, since κέρδος is not to be taken from ἀποθανεῖν, of which it is predicate, we should have to expect an also before τὸ ζῆν, so that Paul would have written: ἐι δὲ (or ἀλλ’ εἰ) καὶ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐμοὶ κέρδος κ.τ.λ.

Ver. 23. Respecting the τι ἀἱρήσομαι οὐ γνωρίζω, Paul expresses himself more fully in vv. 23, 24, proceeding with the explicative δὲ; for δὲ is not antithetical (Hofmann: “on the contrary”), but, in fact, the reading γάρ is a correct gloss, since the situation now follows, which necessitates that relinquishment of a choice. But I am held in a strait (comp. Luke xii. 50; Acts xviii. 5; 2 Cor. v. 14; Wisd. xvii. 11; Dem. 396. 22, 1484. 23; Plat. Legg. vii. p. 791 E, Theaet. p. 165 B; Heind. ad Plat. Soph. 46) of the two points, namely the ἀποθανεῖν and the ζῆν,¹ of which he has just said, τι ἀἱρ. οὐ γνωρ. These δίο are not conceived in an instrumental sense, which is expressed with συνεχ., by the dative (Matt. iv. 24; Luke viii. 37; Acts xviii. 5; Plat. Soph. p. 250 D; Eur. Heralc. 634), but as that from which the συνεχεῖσθαι proceeds and originates (Bernhardy, p. 227 f.; Schoem. ad Is. p. 348; Mützner, ad Antiph. p. 167). — τὴν ἐπιθυμ. ἐχὼν κ.τ.λ.] since my longing is to die. The article denotes, not “votum jam commemoratum” (Hoelemann), for Paul has not

¹ It is therefore more in harmony with the context to refer to τῶν ὅτι to what precedes than to what follows (Luther, Rheinwald, Corn. Müller, and others). Note that the emphasis is laid on συνεχεῖς, which is the new climactic point in the continuation of the discourse. The word συνέχ., itself is rightly rendered by the Vulgate: coaerctor. The mere teneor (Weiss and earlier expositors) is not sufficient according to the context. Paul feels himself in a dilemma between two opposite alternatives.
indeed as yet expressed an ἐπιθυμεῖν, but doubtless the desire, which Paul has. He says that his desire tends towards dying, etc., but that life is more necessary; and therefore he knows that not that for which he longs, but that which is more necessary, will come to pass, and that he will remain alive (ver. 25). Augustine aptly observes: “Non patienter moritur, sed patienter vivit et delectabiliter moritur.” — ἀναλύεισαι comp. 2 Tim. iv. 6; Isa. xxxviii. 12. Dying is conceived as a breaking up (a figure taken from the camp) for the departure, namely, from this temporal life to Christ (comp. ὑπάγειν, Matt. xxvi. 24; ἐκδοθῆσαι, 2 Cor. v. 8 f.; and similar passages); hence the καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἰσὶν immediately added. — πολλῷ γ᾽ μᾶλλον κρείσσον] by much in a higher degree better; a cumulative expression in the strength and vividness of feeling. As to μᾶλλον with the comparative, see on Mark vii. 36; 2 Cor. vii. 13; and Kühner, II. 2, p. 24 f., and ad Xen. Mem. iii. 13. 5; Bornemann, ad Cyrop. p. 137, Goth. If here interpreted as potius (ver. 12), it would glance at the preference usually given to life; but nothing in the context leads to this. The predicate κρείσσον (a much better, i.e. happier lot) refers to the apostle himself; comp. below, δὲ ὑμᾶς. Eur. Hec. 214: θανεῖν μοι ξυντυχία κρείσσον ἐκφρασῖν.

Ver. 24. Ἐπιθυμεῖν involves the idea: to remain still (still further), to stay on, comp. Rom. vi. 1. — ἐν τῇ σαρκί] in my flesh. Not quite equivalent to the idea involved in ἐν σαρκί without the article (ver. 22). The reading without the ἐν (see the critical remarks) would yield an ethical sense here unsuitable (Rom. vi. 1, xi. 22; Col. i. 23). — ἀναγκαῖότ.] namely, than the for me far happier alternative of the ἀναλύεισαι κ. σ. X. εἰσι. The necessity for that is only a subjective want

1 It is thus explained why Paul did not write κεῖ ἀναλύειν (as Origen reads). τεῖ is not dependent on τῆς ἱερ. (ἱερ. is never so construed; comp. Corn. Müller); but τεῖ ἱερ. is absolute, and τεῖ τὰ ἀναλ. expresses the direction of τῆς ἱερ. ἵππος: having my longing towards dying. Comp. Thuc. vi. 15. 2.

2 Bengel: “Deedere sanctis nunquam non optabile fuit, sed cum Christo esse ex novo testamento est.” This Christian longing, therefore, has in view anything rather than a “having emerged from the limitation of personality” (Schleiermacher). — The translation dissolvit (Vulgate, Hilary) is to be referred to another reading (ἀναλύειν).
felt by the pious mind. But the objective necessity of the other alternative has precedence as the greater; it is more precisely defined by "δι' ὑμᾶς," regarded from the standpoint of love. "Vitae suae adjici nihil desiderat sua causa, sed eorum, quibus utilis est." Seneca, ep. 98; comp. ep. 104. — "δι' ὑμᾶς"] applies to the Philippians, who would naturally understand, however, that Paul did not intend to refer this point of necessity to them exclusively. It is the individualizing mode of expression adopted by special love.

Vv. 25, 26. ὁτόνιον πέποιθον] τοῦτο does not belong to οἶδα, but to πέποιθον, and refers to the case of necessity just expressed; having which is the object of his confidence, Paul knows that, etc., so that δή is dependent on οἶδα alone,—in opposition to Theophylact, Erasmus, Calovius, Heinrichs, Flatt, and others, under whose view the οἶδα would lack the specification of a reason, which is given in this very τοῦτο πέποιθον, as it was practically necessary. On the accusative of the object with πέποιθον, comp. Bernhardy, p. 106; Kühner, Π. 1, p. 267; also Wunder, ad Soph. O. T. 259 f. Observe that we may say: πέποιθος πέποιθον, 2 Kings xviii. 19. Comp. on ii. 18. — μενώ] I shall remain; contrast to the ἀναλύσας, which was before expressed by ἐπιμένειν ἐν τ. σαρκί. Comp. John xii. 34, xxi. 22 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 6. The loving emotion of the apostle (ver. 8) leads him to add to the absolute μενώ: καὶ συμπαραμενώ καὶ σαυς ὑμῖν, and I shall continue together with all of you; I shall with you all be preserved in temporal life. From vv. 6 and 10 there can be no doubt as to the terminus ad quem which Paul had in view; and the πασῶν (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 51; Rom. xiii. 11) shows how near he conceived that goal to be (iv. 5). Notwithstanding, Hofmann terms this view, which is both verbally and textually consistent, quixotic, and invents instead one which makes Paul mean by μενώ the remaining alive without his co-operation, and by παραμενῶ, which should (according to Hofmann) be read (see the critical remarks), his remaining willingly, and which assumes that the apostle did not conceive the καὶ παραμενῶ πασῶν ὑμῖν as dependent on δή, but conveys in these words a promise to remain with those, "from whom he could withdraw himself."
What a rationalistic, artificial distinction of ideas and separation of things that belong together! and what a singular promise from the apostle's lips to a church so dear to him: that he will not withdraw himself, but will remain faithful to them (Schneider and Krüger, ad Xen. Anab. ii. 6. 2)!

If παραμενῶ is the true reading, Paul says quite simply: I know that I shall remain (shall not be deprived of life), and continue with you all, i.e. and that I shall be preserved to you all; comp. Heb. vii. 23; Ecclus. xii. 15; Hom. ii. xii. 402; Plat. Menex. p. 235 B; Lucian. Nigr. 30; Herodian. vi. 2. 19.—παραμενῶ, to continue there, just like μενῶ in the sense of in vita manere, Herod. i. 30. Hence συμπαραμένειν (Thuc. vi. 89. 3; Men. in Stob., lxix. 4, 5), to continue there with, to remain alive along with. Thus LXX. Ps. lxxii. 5; Basil, I. p. 49; Gregory of Nazianzus, I. p. 74 (joined with συνδιαιωνίειν). — eius τῆς υμῶν . . . πιστ.] υμῶν, as the personal subject of the προκοπή and χαρᾶ τῆς πλείως, is placed first, with the emphasis of loving interest; the latter genitive, however, which is the real genitive of the subject, belongs to both words, προκοπήν κ. χαρᾶν. Hence: for your faith—furtherance and joy. Both points are to be advanced by the renewed labours of the apostle among them (ver. 26). The blending of them together by an ἐν δια δονῶ (Heinrichs, Flatt) is erroneous. Weiss, however, is also in error in urging that τῆς πιστ. cannot belong to προκοπήν also, because it would be in that case the genitive of the object; the faith also is to be an increasing and progressive thing, 2 Cor. x. 15. — Ver. 26. ίνα τὸ καίχημα κ.τ.λ.] the special and concrete aim of the general proposition eius τῆς υμῶν προκ. κ. χ. τ. πιστ., which is consequently represented as the ultimate aim of the μενῶ καὶ συμπαραμ. πάσο. υμ. Comp. ver. 10. The καίχημα, because υμῶν is placed along with it (comp. 1 Cor. v. 6, ix. 15; 2 Cor. ii. 14, ix. 3), is that of the readers and not of the apostle (Chrysostom: μειδώνος ἤχω καυχάσας υμῶν ἐπιδόντως, Ewald: my pride in you at the last day); nor is it equivalent to καίχημα, gloriatio (Flatt and many others), but it denotes, as it invariably does, materies

1 This applies also against Huther, l.c. p. 585, who, in support of the signification gloriatio, appeals to Pind. Isth. v. 65: καίχημα πανέμορφος ἐγὼ. But
gioriandi (Rom. iv. 2; 1 Cor. v. 6, ix. 15 f.; 2 Cor. i. 14, v. 12; Gal. vi. 4). Hence: that the matter in which you have to glory, i.e. the bliss as Christians in which you rejoice (compare previously the χαρά τῆς πίστεως), may increase abundantly (comp. previously the προκοπή τῆς πίστεως). The ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ that is added expresses the sphere in which the περισσεύειν is to take place, and characterizes the latter, therefore, as something which only develops itself in Christ as the element, in which both the joyful consciousness and the ethical activity of life subsist. If the περισσεύειν took place otherwise, it would be an egotistical, foreign, generally abnormal and aberrant thing; as was the case, for example, with some of the Corinthians and with Judaistic Christians, whose κανόνας was based and grew upon works of the law. The normal περισσεύειν of the καύχημα of the Philippians, however, namely, its περισσεύειν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, shall take place—and this is specially added as the concrete position of the matter—ἐν ἑμῶι διὰ τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας π. πρὸς ὑμᾶς, that is, it shall have in me by my coming again to you its procuring cause; inasmuch as through this return in itself, and in virtue of my renewed ministry among you, I shall be the occasion, impulse, and furtherance of that rich increase in your καύχημα, and thus the περισσεύειν will rest in me. Consequently the ἐν in ἐν Χ. Ἰ., and the ἐν in ἐν ἑμῶι, are differently conceived; the former is the specific, essential definition of περισσεύη, the latter the statement of the personal procuring ground for the περισσο. ἐν Ἰ. Ἰ., which the apostle has in view in reference to the καύχημα of his readers,—a statement of the ground, which is not surprising for the service of an instrument of Christ (Hofmann), and which quite accords with the concrete species facti here contemplated, the personal return and the apostolic position and ministry. The interpretation of Hofmann is thus all the more erroneous, viz. that the increase of their glorying is given to the readers in the person of the apostle, in so far as the having him again among

in this passage also καύχημα means that in which one glories, as the Scholiast has appropriately explained it: τι καὶ τελειὰτα τινὶς Διονυσίων τὰ κατεργασμένα, δρίχια καὶ ουσιολογεῖτε τῇ εἰσπρατή.
them would be a matter of Christian joy and pride to them. Thus would the apostle make himself in fact the object and contents of the καυχάσθαι, which would neither be consistent with the logical relation of the ἵνα to the preceding εἰς τ. ὑμ. προκοπὴν κ.τ.λ., nor with Paul's own deep humility (1 Cor. iii. 21, xv. 9; Eph. iii. 8), which he satisfies also in 2 Cor. i. 14 by the mutual nature of the καίχημα between himself and his friends, and in view of the day of Christ. By many (see Calvin, Heinrichs, Rheinwald, Rilliet, and others) ἐν Χ. ᾽Ι., and by some even ἐν ἑσολ (Storr, Flatt, Huther), are referred, contrary to the position of the words, to τὸ καίχημα ὑμῶν, with various arbitrary definitions of the sense, e.g. Flatt: "so that ye shall have still more reason, in reference to me, to glorify Jesus Christ (who hath given me again to you);" Rheinwald: "If I shall be delivered by the power of Christ, ye will find abundant cause for praising the Lord, who has done such great things for me."—πᾶλων] is connected, as an adjectival definition, with παρους. See on 2 Cor. xi. 23; Gal. i. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 7.

Remark.—From vv. 20–26 we are not to conclude that Paul at that time was in doubt whether he should live to see the Parousia (Usteri, Lehrbegr. p. 355, and others). For in ver. 20 he only supposes the case of his death, and that indeed, in ver. 21, as the case which would be profitable for himself, and for which, therefore, he protests in ver. 23 that he longs. But on account of the need for his life being prolonged (ver. 24), he knows (ver. 25) that that case will not come to pass. This ὅτα (ver. 25) is not to be weakened into a probabiliter sperare or the like (Beza, Calvin, Estius, and many others, also Heinrichs, Rheinwald; comp. Matthies, van Hengel, Rilliet), with which Grotius, from connecting ὅτα πως, even brings out the sense, "scio me haece sperare, i.e. malle;" whilst others fall back upon the argumentum a silentio, viz. that Paul says nothing here of any revelation (see Estius, Matthies, and others), but only expresses an inference in itself liable to error (Weiss). No, although he has supposed the possibility (comp. ii. 17) of his being put to death, he nevertheless knew that he should remain alive; and it must withal be confessed that the result did not correspond to this definite ὅτα, which Bengel even goes so far as to refer to a dictamen pro-
phemeticum. By no means, however, is an imaginary situation to be suspected here (Baur), and just as little can a second imprisonment at Rome be founded on this passage (Chryseostom, Oecumenius, Theodoret, Bullinger, Piscator, Calovius, Estius, Bengel, and many others, also Wiesinger); as to the relation of this passage to Acts xx. 25, see on Acts.—We have further to notice that Paul, according to ver. 23, assumes that, in case he should be put to death, he would go not into Hades, but into heaven to Christ,—a conviction of the bliss attending martyrdom which is found in 2 Cor. v. 8 and in the history of Stephen, Acts vii. 59, and therefore does not occur for the first time in the Apocalypse (vi. 9 ff., vii. 9 ff.). Wetstein's idea is a mere empty evasion, that by ἀναλῦει is doubtless meant the dying, but by ὑπὸ Χ. ἱναῖ only the time following the resurrection (comp. also Witzel, Stud. u. Krit. 1836, p. 954 ff.); as also is that of Grotius, that ὑπὸ Χ. ἱναῖ means: "in Christi custodia esse," and "nihil hinc de loco definiti potest." It is also altogether at variance with the context (see vv. 20, 21), if, with Küscher, we interpret ἀναλῦει as the change that takes place at the Parousia ("ut quasi exieretur carne"). Comp. on the contrary, Polycarp: ad Phil. 9, ἐστὶν ὅτι τὸν δραμένον αὐτῶν τὸν εἰἀ παρὰ τῷ ἔ

1 Hinsch even assigns, Lc. p. 71, to the passage with its vivid emotion the character of a historicocritical reflection. He represents the author of the epistle as having in view the various opinions current in his age regarding the close of the apostle's life, in other words, the question, whether his captivity at that time ended in his being put to death, or in his being set at liberty and beginning a new course of labour. The author addsuces the grounds of both views, putting them in the mouth of the apostle, and in ver. 24 decides in favour of the second; the original, of which the present passage is an imitation, is to be found (as Baur also thinks) in 2 Cor. v. 8, Rom. xiv. 8. See Hilgenfeld, in opposition to Baur and Hinsch.

2 All we can gather from Rom. viii. 10 f. is merely that the life of believers remains unaffected by the death of the body; as at John xi. 25 f. They remain in fellowship with Christ; but as to the mode and place of this fellowship, of which they might indeed be partakers even in Hades (Paradise, Luke xvi. 22 ff., xxiii. 43; Phil. ii. 10), as little is said in that passage as in viii. 38, xiv. 8. But in the passage we are considering, the words εἰς Χ. ἱναῖ point to an actual being with the Lord in heaven (comp. 1 Thess. iv. 14, 17; Acts vii. 59; 2 Cor. l.c.), and do not therefore apply to the state in Hades (in opposition to Güter, Erschein. Chr. wmt. d. Todten, p. 111, and others); see also 2 Cor. v. 8. This union with Christ, however, is not the ζωὴ as the ultimate goal of hope; see iii. 20 f.; Col. iii. 3. To the latter belongs also the bodily transfiguration, which can only take place at the Parousia, 1 Cor. xv. 23. This applies also in opposition to Gerlach, d. letzte Dinge, p. 79 ff., whose distinction between corporeality and materiality [Leiblichkeit und Körperlichkeit] is not in harmony with the New Testament, which distinguishes rather between ρώμα and χαῖ.
Ver. 27. To these accounts regarding his own present position Paul now subjoins certain exhortations to right conduct for his readers. — μόνον] without connecting particle, as in Gal. ii. 10, v. 13. With the above assurance, namely, that he shall continue alive, etc., he, in order that the object of this preserving of his life (ver. 25) may be accomplished in them, needs only to summon them to be in a way worthy of the gospel members of the Christian community (πολιτεύομαι); nothing further is needed. Hofmann, in consequence of his finding previously a promise, finds here, equally erroneously, the only counter-demand made for it. — τοῦ Χριστοῦ] of Christ. See on Mark i. 1.—πολιτεύομαι] comp. on Acts xxiii. 1. See also 2 Macc. vi. 1, xi. 25; 3 Macc. iii. 4; Joseph. Antt. iii. 5, 8, Vit. 2; Wetstein ad loc., and Suicer, Thes. II. p. 709 ff. The word, which is not used elsewhere by Paul in the epistles to express the conduct of life, is here purposely chosen, because he has in view the moral life, internal and external, of the Christian commonwealth, corresponding to the purport of the gospel (πολιτεύομαι, to be citizen of a state, to live as citizen). See the sequel. It is also selected in Acts xxiii. 1, where the idea of the official relation of service is involved (πολιτεύομαι, to administer an office in the state).’ Comp. 2 Macc. vi. 1, xi. 25;
3 Macc. iii. 4. In the absence of such references as these, Paul says περιπατεῖν (Eph. iv. 1; Col. i. 10, with ἀξίως). Comp. however, Clement, Cor. i. 3: πολιτεύεσθαι κατὰ τὸ καθήκον τῷ Χριστῷ, and ch. 54: πολιτευόμενος τὴν ἀμεταμέλητον πολιτείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ch. 21: ἄξιως αὐτοῦ πολιτευόμενοι. — εἴτε ἐλθὼν κ.τ.λ. — a parenthetic definition as far as ἰπών, so that ἀκούσω then depends on τὰ: in order that I —whether it be when I have come and seen you, or during my absence from you—may hear, etc. The two cases εἴτε . . . εἴτε do not refer to the liberation and non-liberation of the apostle; but they assume the certainty of the liberation (ver. 25 f.), after which Paul desired to continue his apostolic journeys and to come again to the Philippians; and indeed trusted that he should come (ii. 24), but yet, according to the circumstances, might be led elsewhere and be far away from them (εἴτε ἰπών). In either event it is his earnest desire and wish that he may come to learn the affairs of the church in their excellence as described by ὅτι στῆκετε κ.τ.λ. It cannot surprise us to find the notion of learning expressed by the common form of the zeugma,1 corresponding to the εἴτε ἰπών; and from the ἀκούσω accordingly employed there naturally suggests itself a word of kindred import to correspond with εἴτε ἐλθὼν κ.τ.λ., such as γνῶ. The rash opinion, repeated even by Hofmann, that ἀκούσω only refers to the second case, does the apostle the injustice of making his discourse “hioloc.” (Calvin), and even grammatically faulty (Hofmann), it being supposed that he intended to write either: “ut sive veniens videam vos, sive absens audiam,” or: “sive quum venero et videro vos, sive absens audiam de statu vestro, intelligam utroque modo,” etc. Calvin allows a choice between these two interpretations; the latter is approved of by de Wette and Weiss (comp. Rilliet and J. B. Lightfoot). Hofmann also accuses the apostle of the confusion of having written εἴτε

1 It is a mistake (notwithstanding Winer, p. 578 [E. T. 777]) to suppose that in a zeugma the directly appropriate verb must be joined to the first member. It can also be joined with the second, as here. Comp. Xen. Anab. vii. 8, 12, and Kühner in loc.; Plat. Rep. p. 599 C, and Stalbaum in loc.; Hom. It. ii. 327, and Fasaki in loc.; generally Nägelsbach, Z. Itin., p. 179, ed. 3; Bremi, ad Lys. p. 48 ff.; Kühner, II. 2, p. 1075 f.
CHAP. I. 27.

ἀπὸν ἀκοῦσω τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν (which words are to be taken together), as if he had previously put εἰτε ἐλθὼν ὑψωμαί ὑμᾶς; but of having left it to the reader mentally to supply the verbs that should have depended on ἵνα, and of which two ¹ would have been needed! The passage employed for comparison, Rom. iv. 16, with its close, concise, and clear dialectic, is utterly a stranger to such awkwardness. Hoelemann finally interprets the passage in a perfectly arbitrary way, as if Paul had written: ἵνα, εἰτε ἐλθὼν κ. ἵνα ὑμᾶς, εἰτε ἀπὸν καὶ ἀκοῦσας τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν, στήκωτε κ.τ.λ., thus making the participles absolute nominatives. — τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν] the object of ἀκοῦσω, so that ὅτι στήκωτε κ.τ.λ., that, namely, ye stand, etc., is a more precise definition arising out of the loving confidence of the apostle, analogous to the familiar attraction οὗτος ἐστιν τῆς εἰ, and the like; Winer, p. 581 [E. T. 781]. It has been awkwardly explained as absolute: "quod attinet ad res vestras" (Heinrichs, Rheinwald, Matthies, and others), while van Hengel not more skilfully, taking εἰτε ἀπὸν ἀκοῦσω τ. τ. ὑμ. together, afterwards supplies ἀκοῦσω again. Grotius, Estius, and am Ende take τὰ even for τὰ αὐτὰ, and Hoelemann makes Paul express himself here also by an anakolouthon (comp. above on εἰτε ἐλθὼν κ.τ.λ.), so that either ὅτι should have been omitted and στήκωτε written, or τὰ should not have been inserted. — εἰ εἰνὶ πνεύματι] is to be joined with στήκωτε, alongside of which it stands, although Hofmann, without any reason, takes it absolutely (2 Thess. ii. 15). It is the common element, in which they are to stand, i.e. to remain stedfast (Rom. v. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 1, xvi. 13); πνεύματι, however, refers not to the Holy Spirit (Erasmus, Beza, and others, also Heinrichs, Rheinwald, Matthies, van Hengel, Weiss), but, as the context shows by μὴ ψυχῇ, to the human spirit; comp. 1 Thess. v. 23. The perfect accord of their minds in conviction, volition, and feeling, presents the appearance of one spirit which the various persons have in common. De Wette well says: "the practical

¹ But why two? He would only have needed to insert μετὰ or γράφω before ἵνα. This would have suited both halves of the alternative discourse, in the confused form in which Hofmann makes it run; and there would be no necessity whatever for two verbs.
community of spirit.” Comp. Acts iv. 32. It is, as a matter of course, plain to the Christian consciousness that this unity of the human spirit is brought about by the Holy Spirit (see on Eph. iv. 3 f., 23), but ἐν τῷ πνεύμ. does not say so. Moreover the emphasis is on this ἐν ἐν πν., and therefore μεῖ ν. is subsequently placed first.—The special mode, which this standing fast in one spirit desired by the apostle is to assume, is contained in the sequel down to ἀντικεῖσθαι με. ψυχῆς συναδελ. κ.τ.λ.] The ψυχῆς, as distinguished from the πνεύμα, is the principle of the individual personal life, which receives its impressions on the one hand from the πνεύμα as the principle of the higher divine ζωή, and on the other hand from the outer world, and is the seat of the activity of feeling and emotion, the sympathetic unity of which in the church is here described (comp. on Luke i. 46 f.). Comp. ἰσόψυχος, ii. 20; σύμψυχοι, ii. 2; Herodian. viii. 5. 15: μεῖ τε γνώμῃ καὶ ψυχῇ, Rom. xv. 6, ὄμοθυμαδόν, 4 Macc. xiv. 20, ὄμοψυχος, 1 Pet. iii. 8, ὄμόφρων. But μεῖ ν. does not also belong to στῆκετι (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Luther, Er. Schmid, and others), for συναιθρ. requires a modal definition in harmony with the context. — συναθλοῦντες] in keeping with στῆκετι, according to the conception of a contest (comp. ver. 30), under which the activity of Christian faithfulness is presented in relation to all hostile powers. Comp. Col. ii. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 2; 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7, et al.; also Soph. Ο. C. 564; Eur. Suppl. 317; Aesch. Prom. 95. The compound, striving together (comp. iv. 3, and συναγωνίζεσθαι, Rom. xv. 30), is not to be overlooked, as if συναθρ., with the dative of the thing expressed merely the entering or stepping into the lists for it (Hofmann). It does not refer, however, to the fellowship of the Philippians themselves (“quasi facto agmine contra hostes evang.”) Grotius; comp. Hoelemann, Rilliet, de Wette, Wiesinger, Weiss, and others, following Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius). Paul looks upon himself as a combatant (ver. 30, comp. ver. 7), and the Philippians as striving with him, and affording him assistance (Diod. iii. 4) as his συναθρ. in defending the faith (objectively viewed), protecting it and rendering it victorious. That they were to
do this with one accord, is stated emphatically by μή ψυχῇ, but is not conveyed by συναγαγεῖν in itself. If, however, Paul is the combatant, the passage cannot be understood in the sense: "adjuvantes decertantem adversus impios evangelii fidei," Erasmus, Paraphr.; comp. Castalio, Michaelis, Mynster, Lightfoot—even apart from the fact that such a personification of πλοτις is unprecedented, and must have been suggested by the text, as in the case of τῇ ἁληθείᾳ, 1 Cor. xiii. 6.—τῇ πλοτις is the dative commodi (comp. Jude 3), not instrumenti (Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, Loesner, Rheinwald, and others), which μὴ ψυχῇ was. As to the genitive of the object with πλοτις, see on Rom. iii. 22.

Ver. 28. On πτυρέσχαι, to become frightened (of horses, Diod. ii. 19, xvii. 34; Plut. Fab. 3;Marc. 6), to be thrown into consternation (Diod. xvii. 37 f.; Plat. Ζαυ. p. 370 A; Plut. Mor. p. 800 C), see Kypke, Η. p. 312. In Gen. xlii. 8 Aquila has καταπτύρεσχαι.—ἐν μηδενί] in no point, nulla ratione, ver. 20; 2 Cor. vi. 3, vii. 9; Jas. i. 4.—The ἄντων ἰκείμενοι (comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 9) are the non-Christian opponents of the gospel among Jews and Gentiles, and not the Jews and their adherents (Flatt), or the malevolent false teachers (Matthies). This follows from ver. 30, since the whole position and ministry of the apostle was a conflict with such adversaries, comp. ver. 7.—ἡμι ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.] which is indeed, etc., refers to the preceding μή πτυρέσχαι ἵππω τῶν ἄντων ἰκείμενοι, to which Paul desires to encourage them. This undauntedness in the συναλθείν, and not the latter itself (Hofmann), is now the leading idea, with which what has further to be said connects itself; hence ημι is not to be taken as referring to the sufferings, as it is by Ewald (comp. 2 Thess. i. 5), who subsequently, although without critical proof, would read ἀπαλλαγή ἡμῶν, ἡμῖν δὲ.—αὐτοῖς] τοῖς ἄντων ἰκείμενοι is to be taken simply as dative of reference: which is to them an indication of perdition. "Ὅταν γὰρ ἤδεσαν, διὰ μαρα τεχνακόμοις οὐδὲ πτύραι ὡμᾶς δύνανται, οὐ δεύχει τὸν σαφῆς ἔξοισιν, διὰ τὰ μὲν αὐτῶν ἀπολοῦνται, τὰ δὲ ἵματε ἵππων καὶ ἀγάλματα καὶ αὐτὸδεν ἔχοντα τὴν σωτηρίαν; Theophylact. The ἦμι involving a reason is just as in Eph. iii. 13.
See on that passage. This would be still more emphatically expressed by ἄνπεσεν γε (Klotz, ad Devar. p. 305). But the fact that the ἀντίκελευον do not recognise in the undauntedness of those persecuted a proof (not: causa, as in the Vulgate; but comp. Rom. iii. 25 f.; 2 Cor. viii. 24; Plat. Ep. vii. p. 341 E; Legg. xii. p. 966 C) of their own perdition, and on the other hand of the salvation of the persecuted (ὑμῶν δὲ σωτηρίας), does not alter the state of the case in itself, that the μη πτώσεσθαι is in reality objectively such an ἐνδείξεις to them. It is, indeed, the σωμάτων of the righteous divine cause, and of its necessary final victory. Perdition and salvation: both without more precise definition; but the reader knew what reference to assign to each, viz. the Messianic perdition and salvation. Comp. on the matter, 2 Thess. i. 5 ff.; Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 12; Luke xii. 32, et al. — kal τόπος ἀπὸ Θεοῦ] and that (see on Rom. xiii. 11) of God, thus certain, therefore, and infallible. It adds force to the encouragement conveyed by ὑμῶν δὲ σωτηρίας; for the context shows by the ὑμῖν which is emphatically placed first in ver. 29,—without making the reading ὑμῖν necessary, however, in ver. 28 (Hofmann); see the critical remarks,—that τοῦτο refers only to this second and main part of ἄνπεσεν κ.τ.λ. (Calvin, Piscator, Calovius, Flatt, and others, also Ewald and Hofmann), and not to both halves of ἄνπεσεν (Beza, Grotius, and many others, also Wiesinger, Weiss, and Ellicott). Entirely foreign to the connection is any purpose of humiliation (Hoelemann and older expositors, following the Greek Fathers). Nor are the words to be attached to what follows (ἐφες, that) (Clemens Alex., Chrysostom, Theodoret, Erasmus, and others, and recently Rilliet); in which case the (preparative) τοῦτο would receive an uncalled-for importance, and yet ἀπὸ Θεοῦ would be obviously intelligible through ἐξαριστηθεὶς.

Ver. 29. "Ὅτι is argumentative. "Kal τοῦτο ἀπὸ Θεοῦ," I say, "since indeed to you it was granted," etc. This grant distinguishing you is the practical proof, that the just expressed ἀπὸ Θεοῦ is indubitably right, and that consequently the ἐνδείξεις of your final salvation which is afforded to the adversaries in your undauntedness is a divine ἐνδείξεις, a
token given by God. Hofmann's view, that ὅτι specifies the reason why God imparts to them what has been before stated, is based upon the erroneous reading ὑμῖν in ver. 28; and is itself erroneous, because ὅτι would introduce merely the self-evident thought that they had not sought out their suffering wilfully, but had had it given to them by God, and because, for the purpose of marking the alleged contrast to the wilfulness, not ὑμῖν, but ἀπὸ Θεοῦ again would have been emphatically prefixed, and consequently Paul must have written: ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ὑμῖν ἐκαρπισθῇ κ.τ.λ. Hofmann curiously explains the emphasized ὑμῖν, as if Paul meant to say that with respect to their sufferings the case stood exactly as with his own. In that case he must at least have written, in prospect of ver. 30, καὶ ὑμῖν, to you also. — ὑμῖν] emphatically put first, corresponding to the previous ὑμῖν δὲ σωτηρίας. — ἐκαρπισθῇ] donatum est; by whom, is self-evident. 1 Cor. ii. 12. — τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ] as if the πάσχειν was immediately to follow. The apostle does not leave this unwritten purposely, in order to bring into prominence in the first place the idea of ὑπὲρ, as Hofmann artificially explains. But here his full heart interposes, after τ. ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, and before he writes πάσχειν, the fresh thought τὸ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτ. πιστεύειν, so that ἀλλὰ καὶ must now be also added; and, on account of the different prepositional relation (εἰς) introduced, the τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ already expressed is again taken up by τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ. Thus τὸ μόνον . . . ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ appears as a parenthesis of more special definition, after which the πάσχειν, which had been prepared for by τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, but is only now introduced, is to be dwelt upon with emphasis: "to you the gift of grace is granted, in behalf of Christ—not only to believe on Him, but also for Him—to suffer." Plat. Legg. x. p. 802 C: εἰ δὲ φανήσεται ψυχῇ πρῶτον, οὗ πῦρ οὐδὲ ἀγρ. ψυχῇ δὲ ἐν πρῶτοις γεγενημένη. See also Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 431; Fritzsche, ad Matth. p. 501. It is an awkward construction, to take τὸ ὑπὲρ Χ. absolutely and (notwithstanding the subsequent ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ) in the sense: as to what concerns Christ (Beza, 

1 At the same time it is to be observed, here also (comp. on ver. 28) that this divine pointing to the final salvation of believers was in fact before the adversaries, and that their non-recognition of it altered nothing in this objective relation.

PHIL.
Camerarius, Calovius, and others, including Matthies and Rilliet). For the conception of suffering for Christ as a high divine distinction, see already Acts v. 41; comp. Matt. v. 11 f. Comp. on ver. 7.

Ver. 30. So that ye have the same conflict, etc., serves to characterize the ὑμῖν ἐχάρ. τὸ ὑπὲρ Χ. πάσχετε just asserted; and Paul’s intention in thus speaking, is to bring home to them the high dignity and distinction of suffering for Christ, which is involved in the consciousness of fellowship in conflict with the apostle. It is impossible, in accordance with the true explanation of what goes before (see on ver. 29), to find in τὸν αὐτῶν, that they have themselves sought their conflict of suffering as little as the apostle had sought his, but, on the contrary, have received it as a gift of grace from God (Hofmann). The participle might have been put by Paul in the nominative (instead of the dative), because ὑμεῖς was floating before his mind as the logical subject of the preceding clause. Comp. on Eph. iii. 18, iv. 2; 2 Cor. i. 7; Col. ii. 2, iii. 16; Phil. iii. 19; Kühner, II. 2, p. 661 f. There is therefore neither a logical nor a grammatical reason, with Bengel, Michaelis, Lachmann, Ewald (comp. also Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 256 [E. T. 299]), to treat ἤπειρος... πάσχετε as a parenthesis,—a construction which would be only an injurious interruption to the flow of the discourse.—τὸν αὐτῶν] namely, in respect of the object; it is the conflict for Christ (ver. 29) and His gospel (ver. 7).—ο λευτερα κ.τ.λ.] as ye have seen it in my person (viz. whilst I was still with you in Philippi; see scenes of this conflict in Acts xvi. 16 ff.; comp. 1 Thess. ii. 2), and now (from my epistle which is read out to you) ye hear in my person. Paul, in his epistle, speaks to the Philippians as if they were listening to him in person; thus they hear in him his conflict, which is made known to them in the statements of the apostle. This explanation is all the less unfitting, as Hofmann terms it (comparing the ἐν ἡμῖν in 1 Cor. iv. 6), since Paul must necessarily have assumed that the statements in the epistle regarding his sufferings would not fail to receive more detailed description in Philippi on the part of Epaphroditus. The rendering de me for the second ἐν ἑμοί, adopted by Peschito, Vulgate, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, and others, including Flatt, is erroneous.
CHAPTER II.

Ver. 1. Instead of έι τι παραμ., D* L, min. have: έι τις παραμ. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Matth. It is nothing, but a mechanical repetition of the preceding έι τις. The same judgment must be passed on the reading: έι τις σπλάγχνα, although this τις (instead of which the Recepta tina is to be restored) has the greatly preponderant attestation of A B C D E F G K L P Ν, min. Bas. Chrys. (?) Damasc. Occ. Theoph., and is adopted by Griesb. Matth. Scholz, Lachm. and Tisch. τίνα (as early as Clem. Al. Strom. iv. p. 604, Pott.; also Theodoret) is, notwithstanding its small amount of cursive attestation, we do not say absolutely necessary,1 but requisite for such an understanding of the entire verse as naturally offers itself to the reader; see the exegetical remarks.—Ver. 3. ἦ] Lachm. and Tisch. read, and Griesb. also recommended: μηδὲ γαρ, following A B C Ν, min. vss. and Fathers. An attempt at interpretation, as are also the readings ἦ γαρ, καὶ γαρ, μὴ γὰρ γαρ. —Ver. 4. Elz. Scholz, have ἵκαστος in both places, which is defended also by Reiche. But ἵκαστον, which is confirmed by preponderating testimony even before εκουσώτες (in opposition to Hofmann), was supplanted by the singular, as only the latter occurs elsewhere in the N. T.—Elz. has εκουσίδες instead of εκουσώτες, against decisive testimony.—Ver. 5. τοῦτο γάρ] A B C* Ν*, min. vss. Fathers, Lachm. and Tisch. 8 have τοῦτο only. But what led to the omission of γάρ was, that, ἵκαστον being subsequently read, the preceding ἵκαστον was looked upon as the beginning of the new sentence (A C Ν). Moreover, the commencement of a lesson at τοῦτο favoured the omission.—[ἔριστο] The reading ἔριστο appears to have decisive attestation from the uncials, of which only C*** K L P favour the Recepta ἔριστο. But it is incredible, if the well-known and very common imperative form ἔριστο was the original reading, that it should have been exchanged for the otherwise

1 Reiche, Comment. crit. p. 213, would read ς instead of τις; but the former is found only in min., and is scarcely susceptible of a forced explanation ("si qua est vobis," or "si quid valet").—The old Latin versions, with their si qua or si quid, leave us uncertain as to their reading. But the Vulg. Lachm. has: si quae.
unusual passive form \( \phi ρωνισθω \), merely for the reason that it was sought to gain a passive form to be supplied with the following words \( υ τι \ iν \ \chi \ ). (where the supplying of \( \theta \) would have been sufficient). And as the very ancient testimony of most Greek authorities since Origen, also of the Goth. Copt. Arm. and nearly all min., is in favour of \( \phi ρωνισθω \), we must retain it as the original, which has been made to give way to the more current \( \phi ρωνιτην \). The latter, however, is adopted by Tisch. 8, following Lachmann.—Ver. 9. Elz. Scholz, Tisch. 7 have \( \delta νομα \) alone instead of \( \tau \ο νομα \), in opposition to A B C \( \eta \), 17, and several Fathers. The article has been suppressed by the preceding syllable.—Instead of \( \iota \chi ο μαλογήσαται \) the future \( \iota \chi ο μαλογήσαται \) is decisively attested.—Ver. 13. The article before \( \Theta ο\) (Elz. Scholz) is condemned by prepouderating testimony.—Ver. 15. \( \gamma ισθε \), A D* E* FG, Vulg. It. Cypr. have \( \eta \). So also Lachm. But the testimony is not decisive, and there is the more reason for defending the \( \textbf{Recepta} \), because \( \gamma ισθε \) might be more readily glossed by \( \eta \) than the converse, both in itself, and also here on account of the following \( \iota ν \ \phi αί \\ νοδι \\ κ α \\ ν λ. — \alpha \muω \muη \gamma \). Lachm. Tisch. 8 have \( \delta νομα \), following A B C \( \eta \), min. Clem. Cyr. But the latter is the prevailing form in the N. T., and readily crept in (comp. \textit{var. 2 Pet. iii. 14}).—\( \iota ν \ \muι \\ σω \), A B C D* F G \( \eta \), min. Clem. have \( \muι \\ σω \). Approved by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; the \( \textbf{Recepta} \) is explanatory.—Ver. 19. \( \textit{κυριώ \} \) Lachmann reads \( \chi ο \\ στι \), upon too weak authority.—Ver. 21. Elz: \( \tau \ \ ο \ υ \ \chi ο ιστε \\ ι \\ πα \\ ο \). But \( \tau \ \ ι \\ πα \\ ο \ \ Χ \). (Tisch.: \( \tau \ \ ο \\ ι \\ \beta \ ι \\ ι \\ ο \ \ Χ \)). has the preponderance of evidence in its favour.—Ver. 26. After \( \iota \muας \), A C D E \( \kappa \), min. vss. and some later Fathers have \( \iota \beta \), which Lachm. places in brackets. To be adopted; because, after i. 8, its omission would be very probable, and there is no reason why it should have got in as a gloss here and not at i. 8.—Ver. 27. Elz: \( \iota \iota \ \lambda ι \\ πι \), against decisive testimony in favour of \( \iota \iota \ \lambda ι \\ πι \).—Ver. 30. \( \tau \ \ ι \\ \γ \\ ο \ \ ο \ \ υ \ \ ο \ \ Χ \\ ιστο \\ ο \). Tisch. 7 reads \( \tau \ \ ι \\ \gamma \\ ο \ \ ο \ \ ο \ \ \). ; following, indeed, only C, but correctly, for the bare \( \tau \ \ ι \\ \gamma \\ ο \ \ ο \ \ ο \ \ \) appeared to need some defining addition, which was given to it by \( \tau \ \ ο \ \ ο \ \ Χ \\ ιστο \) or \( \chi ιστο \) (Tisch. 8), or even by \( \chi ρ \\ ο \ \) (\( \Lambda \ \kappa \)).—\( \pi \ρ \\ α \\ β \\ ο \\ λ \). The form \( \pi \\ α \\ β \\ ο \\ λ \). has preponderant attestation, and is to be preferred. See the exegetical remarks.

Ver. 1. \( \alpha \nu \) infers from i. 30 what is, under these circumstances, the most urgent duty of the readers. If they are engaged in the same conflict as Paul, it is all the more im-
peratively required of them by the relation of cordial affection, which must bind them to the apostle in this fellowship that they should fulfil his joy, etc. Consequently, although connecting what he is about to say with what goes immediately before (in opposition to Hofmann), he certainly, after the digression contained from ἂνινος in ver. 28 onwards, leads them back to the exhortation to unanimity already given in ver. 27, to which is then subjoined in ver. 3 f. the summons to mutual humility. — ei τις κ.τ.λ. four stimulative elements, the existence of which, assumed by ei (comp on Col. iii. 1), could not but forcibly bring home to the readers the fulfilment of the apostle’s joy, ver. 2. With each ἐστι simply is to be supplied (comp. iv. 8): If there be any encouragement in Christ, if any comfort of love, etc. It must be noticed that these elements fall into two parallel sections, in each of which the first element refers to the objective principle of the Christian life (ἐν Χριστῷ and πνεύματος), and the second to the subjective principle, to the specific disposition of the Christian (ἀγάπης and σπλάγχνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοί). Thus the inducements to action, involved in these four elements, are, in equal measure, at once objectively binding and inwardly affecting (πῶς σφοδρῶς, πῶς μετὰ συμπαθείας πολλῆς! Chrysostom). — παρακλ. ἐν Χ. ἐν Χ. defines the παρακλ. as specifically Christian, having its essence and activity in Christ; so that it issues from living fellowship with Him, being rooted in it, and sustained and determined by it. Thus it is in Christ, that brother exhorteth brother. παράκλησις means exhortation (1 Cor. xiv. 3; Rom. xii. 8; Acts iv. 36, ix. 31, xiii. 15, xv. 31), i.e. persuasive and edifying address; the more special interpretation consolatio, admissible in itself, anticipates the correct rendering of the παραμύθιον which follows (in opposition to Vulgate, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Estius, Grotius, Heinrichs, and many others; and recently Hoelemann and Ewald). — ei τι παραμ. ἀγάπ.]

1 Hitzig, z. Krift. Paul. Briefe, p. 18, very erroneously opines that there is here a made excitement, an emphasis in which not so much is felt as is put into the words; and the four times repeated if is to cover the defect,—in connection with which an utterly alien parallel is adduced from Tacit. Agric. 46.
\( \pi \rho \alpha \mu \alpha \nu \theta \iota \omicron \nu \) (see generally Schaefer ad Bos. p. 492; Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 517; Jacobs ad Ach. Tat. p. 708) corresponds to the fourth clause (\( \sigma \tau \lambda \alpha \gamma \chi \eta \kappa \omicron \iota \iota \omicron \tau \)) and for this reason, as well as because it must be different from the preceding element,\(^1\) cannot be taken generally with Calovius, Flatt, Matthies, de Wette, Hoelemann, van Hengel, Ewald, Weiss, J. B. Lightfoot, and Hofmann as address, exhortation (Plat. Legg. vi. p. 773 E, xi. p. 880 A), but definitely as comfort (Thuc. v. 103; Theocr. xxiii. 7; Anth. Pal. vii. 195, 1; Wisd. iii. 18; Esth. viii. 15; comp. \( \pi \rho \alpha \mu \alpha \nu \theta \iota \omicron \nu \), Plat. Axioch. p. 375 A; Luc. Nigr. 7; Ps. lxv. 12; Wisd. xix. 12; 1 Cor. xiv. 3).

\( \Delta \gamma \alpha \nu \pi \eta \zeta \) is the genitive of the subject: a consolation, which love gives, which flows from the brotherly love of Christians. In order to make out an allusion to the Trinity in the three first points, dogmatic expositors like Calovius, and also Wolf, have understood \( \Delta \gamma \alpha \nu \pi \eta \zeta \) of the love of God (to us). — \( \epsilon \lambda \kappa \omicron \kappa \omicron \nu \mu \nu \nu \pi \iota \eta \) if any fellowship of the Spirit (i.e. participation in the Spirit) exists; comp. on 2 Cor. xiii. 13. This is to be explained of the Holy Spirit, not of the animorum conjunctio (Michaelis, Rosenmüller, am Ende, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hoelemann, Wiesinger, Hofmann, and others; Usteri and Rilliet mix up the two), which is inconsistent with the relation of this third clause to the first (\( \epsilon \nu \chi \rho \iota \omicron \tau \omicron \sigma \theta \)) and also with the sequel, in which (ver. 2) Paul encourages them to fellowship of mind, and cannot therefore place it in ver. 1 as a motive. — \( \epsilon \lambda \tau \nu \alpha \varsigma \mu \lambda \kappa \omicron \iota \iota \omicron \tau \) if there be any heart and compassion. The former used, as in i. 8, as the seat of cordial loving affections generally; the latter, specially as misericordia (see on Rom. ix. 15), which has its seat and life in the heart. See also on Col. iii. 12; comp. Luke i. 28; Tittmann, Synon. p. 68 f.—It must further be remarked, with regard to all four points, that the context, by virtue of the exhortation based upon them \( \pi \lambda \rho \omega \sigma \sigma \tau \tau \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \chi \rho \alpha \nu \) in ver. 2, certainly presupposes their existence in the Philippians, but that the

\(^1\) Hofmann erroneously makes the quite arbitrary distinction that \( \pi \rho \alpha \mu \alpha \nu \theta \iota \omicron \nu \) refers to the will, and \( \epsilon \omicron \iota \iota \omicron \tau \) to the feelings. The will, feelings, and intellect are called into exercise by both. Comp., especially on \( \pi \rho \alpha \mu \alpha \nu \theta \iota \omicron \nu \), Stallbaumm, ad Plat. Rep. p. 476 E; Phaed. p. 70 B; Enulhyd. p. 272 B; Thuc. viii. 86, 1.
general expression (if there is) forms a more moving appeal, and is not to be limited by the addition of in you (Luther, Calvin, and others). Hence the idea is: "If there is exhortation in Christ, wherewith one brother animates and incites another to a right tone and attitude; if there is comfort of love, whereby one refresheth the other; if there is fellowship in the Spirit, which inspires right feelings, and confers the consecration of power; if there is a heart and compassion, issuing in sympathy with, and compassion for, the afflicted,—manifest all these towards me, in that ye make full my joy (μου τὴν χαράν)." Then, namely, I experience practically from you that Christian-brotherly exhortation, and share in your comfort of love, and so ye put to proof, in my case, the fellowship in the Spirit and the cordial sympathy, which makes me not distressed, but glad in my painful position.—There is much that is mistaken in the views of those who defend the reading τις before σώλ. (see van Hengel and Reiche), which cannot be got rid of by the assumption of a constructio ad synesis (in opposition to Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 71 [E. T. 81]). Hofmann is driven by this reading, which he maintains, to the strange misinterpretation of the whole verse as if it contained only protases and apodoses, to be thus divided: εἰ τις ὄνων παράκλητος, ἐν Χριστῷ εἰ τι παραμίθουν, ἀγάπης εἰ τις κοινωνία πνεύματος, εἰ τις, σῷλαγχα κ. σικτικοῦ; this last εἰ τις being a repetition of the previous one with an emphasizing of the εἰ. Accordingly the verse is supposed to mean: "If exhortation, let it be exhortation in Christ; if consolation, let it be a consolation of love; if fellowship of the Spirit, if any, let it be cordiality and compassion." A new sentence would then begin with πληρώσατε. Artifices such as this can only serve to recommend the reading εἰ τω.

1 In the application of the general εἰ τις παράκλητος in X., the subjects of this παράκλητος must, following the rule of the other elements, be the Philippians; Paul (Wiesinger, comp. Ewald) cannot be conceived as the παράκλητος.

2 From this interpretation of the whole passage he should have been deterred by the forlorn position which is assigned to the εἰ τις before σῶλαγχα as the stone of stumbling, as well as by the purposelessness and even inappropriateness of an oddly emphasized problematical sense of this εἰ τις. — If it be thought that the reading εἰ τις σῶλ. must be admitted, I would simply suggest the following
Ver. 2. The joy which Paul already feels in respect to the Philippians (i. 4), they are to make full to him, like a measure (comp. John iii. 29, xv. 11, xvii. 13; 1 John i. 4; 2 John 12; 2 Cor. x. 6). For the circumstances of the case, comp. i. 9. The μον represents, as it very often does in the N. T. (e.g. iv. 14; Col. iv. 18; Phil. 20), and in Greek authors, the dative of interest. — ἵνα The mode in which they are to make his joy full is conceived in telic form, as that which is to be striven for in the action of making full; and in this aim of the πληροῖν the regulative standard for this activity was to consist. Paul might quite as fitly have put the τὸ αὑτὸ φρονεῖν in the imperative, and the πληροῖν ὑπὸ χαράν in the telic form; but the immediate relation to himself, in which he had conceived the whole exhortation, induced him to place the πληροῖ τ. χ. in the foreground. — τὸ αὑτὸ φρονήτηρ denotes generally harmony, and that, indeed, more closely defined by the sequel here as identity of sentiment. See Tittmann, Synon. p. 67; Fritzsche, ad Rom. III. p. 87 f.; comp. Herod. i. 60, ix. 54, and the passages in Wetstein. The opposite: ἀμφίς φρ., Hom. Π. xiii. 345; ἀληθ. φρ., hymn. Ap. 469; δικρατοῦν, Plut. Mor. p. 763 E; δικόμητις, Nonn. ev. Joh. xx. 29; and similar forms. Hoelmann interprets τὸ αὑτὸ as illud ipsum, that, namely, which was said in ver. 1, the παρίκλησις ἐν Χ. down to οἰκτηρῳ. This is at variance with the context (see by way of necessary explanation of the passage:—1st, Let the verse be regarded as consisting of a series of four protases, on which the apodeisis then follows in ver. 2; 2d, Let ἡμεῖς ἡμῶν, ἡμέρας, ἡμέρας and ἡμέρας x. εἰσὶν be taken uniformly as predicative specifications; 3d, Let ἡμέρα be again understood with the last εἰς. Paul would accordingly say: "If any exhortation is exhortation in Christ, if any comfort is comfort of love, if any fellowship is fellowship of the Spirit, if any (fellowship) is cordiality and compassion (that is, full of cordiality and compassion) fulfill ye," etc. The apostle would thus give to the element of the ἡμέρα, besides the objective definition of its nature (ἡμέρας, referring to the Holy Spirit), also a subjective one (εἰς x. εἰσίν), and mark the latter specially by the repetition of εἰς εἰς sc. ἡμέρα, as well as designate it the more forcibly by the nominative expression (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ x. εἰσίν, not another genitive), inasmuch as the latter would set forth the ethical nature of such a ἡμέρα (comp. such passages as Rom. vii. 7, viii. 10, xiv. 17) in the form of a direct predicate. The εἰ, moreover, would remain uniformly the syllogistic εἰ in all the four clauses, and not, as in Hofmann's view, suddenly change into the problematic sense in the fourth clause.
the following τ. αὐτ. ἀγάπη. and ἐν φρον., and contrary to the wonted use of the expression elsewhere (Rom. xii. 16, xv. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 2). — τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγ. ἓχ., σύμψην, τὸ ἐν φρον.] Two more precise definitions of that like-mindedness, so far as it is identity of (mutual) love, and agreement of feeling and active impulse, sympathy (σύμψην, only found here in the N. T.; but see Polemo, ii. 54, and comp. on i. 27, also on ἵνα τινες, ver. 20). This accumulation of definitions indicates earnestness; Paul cannot sever himself from the thought, of which his heart is so full. Comp. Chrysostom: βαβαί, ποσάκις τὸ αὐτὸ λέγει ἀπὸ διὰ θέσεως πολλῆς! He also well remarks on τ. αὐτ. ἀγάπη. ἓχ.: τοιοῦτοι ὁμοίως φιλεῖν καὶ φιλεῖσθαι. The following τὸ ἐν φρονοῦντες is to be closely connected with σύμψην, so that σύμψην has the emphasis and adds the more precise definition of the previously mentioned unity of mind: with harmony of soul cherishing the one sentiment. There are therefore only two, and not three, special explanations of the τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε; and ὡς with the article points back to the previous τὸ αὐτὸ, which is now represented by τὸ ἐν without any essential difference in sense. Expositors, not attending to this close connection of σύμψην, with τὸ ἐν φρον. (which Wiesinger, Weiss, Ellicott, and Schenkel have acknowledged), have either made the apostle say the very same thing twice over (Oecumenius: διπλασιάζει τὸ ὁμοφρονεῖν), or have drawn entirely arbitrary distinctions between τὸ αὐτὸ and τὸ ἐν φρον.—e.g. Bengel, who makes the former refer to the same objects of the sentiment, and the latter to the same sentiment itself; Tittmann, i.e., that the former is idem sentire, velle et quaerere, and the latter in uno expetendo consentire; Beza and others, that the former means the agreement of will, the latter the agreement in doctrine; while others put it inversely; Hofmann thinks that ἐν with the article means the one thing, on which a Christian must inwardly be bent (comp. Luke x. 42). It means, on the contrary, the one thing which has just been designated by τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε (as in iv. 2; Rom. xii. 16; and other passages); the context affords no other reference for the article.—It is usual, even in classical authors, for the participle of a verb to stand by the side of the verb itself, in
such a way that one of the two conveys a more precise specification. See Stallb. *ad Plat. Hipp. m.* p. 292 A; Bornemann, *ad Cyrop. viii.* 4. 9; Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 532 f.

Ver. 3 f. Μηδέν κατὰ ἐριθ. ἢ κενοδοξία [sc. φρονοῦντες (not πουοῦντες, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Camerarius, Storr, am Ende, Rheinwald, Flatt, van Hengel, and others); so that, accordingly, what was excluded by the previous requirement τὸ αἰτῶ φρονίτε... φρονοῦντες, is here described. To take, as in Gal. v. 13, μηδέν... κενοδοξίαν as a prohibition by itself, without dependence on φρονοῦντες (see on Gal. i.c.), as J. B. Lightfoot does, is inappropriate, because the following participial antithesis discloses the dependence of the μηδέν κ.τ.λ. on the previous participle; hence also Hofmann's view, that there is an intentional leaving the verb open, cannot be admitted. Hoelemann combines it with ἡγούμη, and takes μηδέν as neutiquam; but incorrectly, for ἡγούμ. κ.τ.λ. affirms the esteeming others better than oneself, which, therefore, cannot take place in a factious (κατὰ ἐριθείαν, see on i. 17) or in a vainglorious (ἡ κενο-

δοξία) way. The κατὰ denotes that which is regulative of the state of mind, and consequently its character, and is exchanged in the antithetic parallel for the dative of the instrument: by means of humility, the latter being by the article set down as a generic idea (by means of the virtue of humility). The mutual brotherly humility (Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12; Acts xx. 19) is the determining principle, by which, for example, Caius is moved to regard Lucius as standing higher, in a moral point of view, than himself, and, on the other hand, Lucius to pronounce Caius to be of a higher moral rank than himself (i.e. ἀλληλος... ἑαυτῶν). Hoelemann erroneously refers τῇ ταπεινοφρ. ἐπερέχει, so that it “excellentiae designet prae sidium,” —a view which the very position of the words should have warned him not to adopt.—κενοδοξία] ostentation, only here in the N. T. Comp. Wisd. xiv. 14; Polyb. iii. 81. 9; Lucian, *D. Mort.* x. 8, xx. 4; and see on Gal. v. 26.—Ver. 4. μη τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἐκαστοι σκοπ.] The humble mind just indicated cannot exist together with selfishness, which has its own interests in view. See instances of σκοπεῖν τὰ τιμω, to be mindful of any one's interests, in Herod. i. 8; *Plat. Phaedr.* p. 232 D;
Thuc. vi. 12. 2; Eur. Supp. 302. Comp. Lucian, Prom. 14: τὰμαυτὸν μόνα σκοπέω. The opposite of τὰ ἑαυτῶν σκ. may be seen in 2 Macc. iv. 5: τὸ δὲ συμφέρον κοινῷ . . . σκοπῶν. Comp. ζητεῖν τὰ ἑαυτῶν, 1 Cor. x. 24, 33, xiii. 5; Phil. ii. 21, where ζητεῖν presents no essential difference in sense. Others consider that the having regard to gifts and merits is intended (Calvin, Hammond, Raphel, Keil, Commentat. 1803, in his Opusc. p. 172 ff., Hoelemann, Corn. Müller), which, after the comprehensive τῇ ταπεινοφρ. κ.τ.λ., would yield a very insipid limitation, and one not justified by the context. — ἐκαστοῖ] It is usually, and in other passages of the N. T. invariably, the singular that is used in this distributive apposition; the plural, however, is not unfrequently found in classical authors. Hom. Od. ix. 164; Thuc. i. 7. 1; Xen. Hell. ii. 4, 38; Herodian, iii. 13, 14.— ἀλλὰ καὶ κ.τ.λ.] a weaker contrast than we should have expected from the absolute negation in the first clause;¹ a softening modification of the idea. In strict consistency the καὶ must have been omitted (1 Cor. x. 24). Comp. Soph. Aj. 1292 (1313): ὀρα μὴ τούμου ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ σῶν; and see Fritzche, ad Marc. p. 788; Winer, p. 463 f. [E. T. 624]. The second ἐκαστοῖ might have been dispensed with; it is, however, an earnest repetition. — The influences disturbing unity in Philippi, disclosed in vv. 2-4, are not, according to these exhortations, of a doctrinal kind, nor do they refer to the strength and weakness of the knowledge and conviction of individuals, as was the case in Rome (Rom. xiv.) and Corinth (1 Cor. viii. and x.)—in opposition to Rheinwald and Schinz;—but they were based upon the jealousy of moral self-estimation, in which Christian perfection was respectively ascribed and denied to one another (comp. ver. 12, iii. 12 ff.). Although this necessarily implies a certain difference of opinion as to the ethical theory, the epistle shows no trace either of any actual division into factions, or of ascetic jealousy (which

¹ In which, in fact, it is not merely the limitation (Hofmann) to one's own that is forbidden, as if μὴν stood along with it. What Hofmann at the same time deduces from the reading ἵσσως (before εὐσεβείας), which he follows, as distinguished from the subsequent ἵσσων (with a here wholly irrelevant comparison of Plat. Apol. p. 39 A), is sophistical, and falls, moreover, with the reading itself.
de Wette assumes as co-operating). But the exhortations to unity are too frequent (i. 27, ii. 2 f., iii. 15, iv. 2 f.) and too urgent to justify us in questioning generally the existence (Weiss) of those disturbances of harmony, or in regarding them as mere ill humour and isolation disturbing the cordial fellowship of life (Hofmann). Comp. Huther, in the Mecklenb. Zeitschr. 1862, p. 640 ff.


¹ Christ's example, therefore, in this passage is one of self-denial, and not of obedience to God (Ernesti), in which, in truth, the self-denial only manifested itself along with other things. It is, however, shown by the very addition of ἀκαίριον that Paul really intended to adduce the example of Christ (in opposition to Hofmann's view); comp. Rom. xv. 3. Christ's example is the moral, ideal, historically realized. Comp. Wutke, Sittenl. II. § 224; Schmid, Sittenl. p. 855 ff.; and as early as Chrysostom.
1871, p. 519 ff.; Grimm in the same Zeitschr. 1873, p. 33 ff. Among the more recent dogmatic writers, Thomasius, II. p. 148 ff.; Philippi, IV. 1, p. 469 ff.; Kahnis, I. p. 458 ff. — φρονεῖν τῶν ἐν ὑμῖν σεντιατūr in animis vestris. The parallelism with the ἐν which follows prohibits our interpreting it intra vestrum caetum (Hoelemann, comp. Matthies). The passive mode of expression is unusual elsewhere, though logically unassailable. Hofmann, rejecting the passive reading, as also the passive supplement afterwards, has sadly misunderstood the entire passage.¹ — ὁ καὶ ἐν X. I. sc. εφρονθήνη. On ἐν, comp. the Homeric ἐνὶ φρεσί, ἐνὶ θυμῷ, which often occurs with φρονεῖν, Od. xiv. 82, vi. 313; II. xxiv. 173. καὶ is not cum maxime, but the simple also of the comparison (in opposition to van Hengel), namely, of the pattern of Christ.

Ver. 6. The classical passage which now follows is like an Epist in calm majestic objectivity; nor does it lack an epic minuteness of detail. — τῷ epegegetical; subject of what follows; consequently Christ Jesus, but in the pre-human state, in which He, the Son of God, and therefore according to the Johanne expression as the λόγος ἀρχικός, was with God.²

¹ Reading φρονεῖν, and subsequently explaining the ἐν Χριστῷ ἑναστᾶ as a frequent expression with Paul for the ethical Christian quality (like ἐν κόριν in iv. 2), Hofmann makes the apostle say that the readers are to have their mind so directed within them, that it shall not be lacking in this definite quality which makes it Christian. Thus there would be evolved, when expressed in simple words, merely the thought: “Have in you the mind which is also the Christian one.” As if the grand outburst, which immediately follows, would be in harmony with such a general idea! This outburst has its very ground in the lofty example of the Lord. And what, according to Hofmann’s view, is the purpose of the significant καὶ? It would be entirely without correlation in the text; for in ἐν οἷς the καὶ would have to be taken as local, and in the ἐν Χριστῷ, according to that misinterpretation, it would have to be taken in the sense of ethical fellowship, and thus relations not at all analogous would be marked.

² That Christ in His Trinitarian pre-existence was already the eternal Principle and Prototype of humanity (as is urged by Besschlag), is self-evident; for otherwise He would have been one essentially different from Him who in the fulness of time appeared in the flesh. But this does not entitle us to refer the pre-existence to His whole divine-human person, and to speak of an eternal humanity,—paradoxes which cannot exegetically be justified by our passage and other expressions such as 1 Cor. xv. 47, Rom. v. 12 ff., viii. 29; Col. i. 15. The Logos pre-existed as the divine principle and divine prototype of humanity; Ὁ ως ἐστὶ λόγος, and this, apart from the form of expression, is also the teaching
The *human* state is first introduced by the words ἑαυτῶν ἐκείνων in ver. 7. So Chrysostom and his successors, Beza, Zanchius, Vatablus, Castalio, Estius, Clarius, Calixtus, Semler, Storr, Keil, Usteri, Kraussold, Hoelemann, Rilliet, Corn. Müller, and most expositors, including Lünemann, Tholuck, Liebner, Wiesinger, Ernesti, Thomasius, Raebiger, Ewald, Weiss, Kahnis, Beyschlau (1860), Schmid, *Bibl. Theol.* II. p. 306, Messner, *Lehre d. Ap.* 233 f., Lechler, Gess, *Person Chr.* p. 80 f., Rich. Schmidt, *I.e.*, J. B. Lightfoot, Grimm; comp. also Hoffmann and Düsterdieck, *Apologet. Beitr.* III. p. 65 ff. It has been objected (see especially de Wette and Philippi, also Beyschlau, 1866, and Dörner in *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1856, p. 394 f.), that the name Christ Jesus is opposed to this view; also, that in vv. 8–11 it is the exaltation of the earthly Christ that is spoken of (and not the return of the Logos to the divine δόξα); and that the earthly Christ only could be held up as a pattern. But Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, as subject, is all the more justly used (comp. 2 Cor. viii. 9; 1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 14 ff.; 1 Cor. x. 4), since the subject not of the pre-human glory alone, but at the same time also of the human abasement¹ and of the subsequent exaltation, was to be named. Paul joins on to σύ the whole summary of the history of our Lord, including His pre-human state (comp. 2 Cor. viii. 9: ἐπτάχευσε πλούσιος ὄν); therefore vv. 8–11 cannot by themselves regulate our view as regards the definition of the subject; and the force of the example, which certainly comes first to light in the historical Christ, has at once historically and ethically its deepest root in, and derives its highest, because divine (comp. Matt. v. 48; Eph. v. 1), obligation from, just what is said in ver. 6 of His state before His human appearance. Moreover, as the context introduces the incarnation only at ver. 7, and introduces it as that by which the subject divested Himself of His divine appearance, and as the earthly Jesus never was in the form of

¹ Hence Philippi’s objection, that φύσις is elsewhere applied to man only, and not to God, is devoid of significance. Unfounded is also Beyschlau’s objection (1860) drawn from the word εἰκόνας; see below.
God (comp. Gess, p. 295), it is incorrect, because at variance with the text and illogical, though in harmony with Lutheran orthodoxy and its antagonism to the Kenosis of the Logos,¹ to regard the incarnate historical Christ, the λόγος ἐνσαρχος, as the subject meant by ὅς (Novatian, de Trin. 17, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Cameron, Piscator, Hunnius, Grotius, Calovius, Clericus, Bengel, Zachariae, Keeler, and others; see the historical details in Tholuck, p. 2 ff., and J. B. Lightfoot). Liebner aptly observes that our passage is "the Pauline ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο;" comp. on Col. i. 15.—ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ἱνάρχων] not to be resolved, as usually, into "although, etc.," which could only be done in accordance with the context, if the ἄρπαγμῶν ἰγεισθαι κ.τ.λ. could be presupposed as something proper or natural to the being in the form of God; nor does it indicate the possibility of His divesting Himself of His divine appearance (Hofmann), which was self-evident; but it simply narrates the former divinely glorious position which He afterwards gave up: when He found Himself in the form of God, by which is characterized Christ's pre-human form of existence. Then He was forsooth, and that objectively, not merely in God's self-consciousness—as the not yet incarnate Son (Rom. i. 3, 4, viii. 3; Gal. iv. 4), according to John as λόγος—with God, in the fellowship of the glory of God (comp. John xvii. 5). It is this divine glory, in which He found Himself as ἵσαρ θεός ὁν and also εἰσὶν θεόν—such also the instrument and aim of the creation of the world, Col. i. 15 f.—and into which, by means of His exaltation, He again returned; so that this divine δόξα, as the possessor of which before the incarnation He had, without a body and invisible to

¹ According to which Christ had the full divine majesty "statim in sua conceptione, etiam in utero matris" (Form. Conc. p. 767). But He had it in His state of humiliation secreteo, and only manifested it occasionally, quoties ipse visum fuerit. In opposition to this, Liebner rightly observes, p. 334: "This is altogether inadequate to express the powerful N. T. feeling of the depth and greatness of our Lord’s humiliation. This feeling unmistakably extends to the unique personal essence of the God-man, and in conformity with this, to the very heart of the act of incarnation itself."
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE PHILIPPITANS.

the eye of man (comp. Philo, de Somn. I. p. 655), the form of God, is now by means of His glorified body and His divine-human perfection visibly possessed by Him, that He may appear at the παρουσία, not again without it, but in and with it (iii. 20 f.). Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15, iii. 4. Μορφή, therefore, which is an appropriate concrete expression for the divine δῶξα (comp. Justin, Apol. I. 9), as the glory visible at the throne of God, and not a "fanciful expression" (Ernesti), is neither equivalent to φύσις or οὐσία (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Augustine, Chemnitz, and many others; comp. also Rheinwald and Corn. Müller); nor to status (Calovius, Storr, and others); nor is it the godlike capacity for possible equality with God (Beyschlag), an interpretation which ought to have been precluded both by the literal notion of the word μορφή, and by the contrast of μορφή δούλου in ver. 7. But the μορφή Θεοῦ presupposes the divine φύσις as ὁμόστολος μορφής (Aesch. Suppl. 496), and more precisely defines the divine status, namely, as form of being, corresponding to the essence, consequently to the homoeousia, and exhibiting the condition, so that μορφή Θεοῦ finds its exhaustive explanation in Heb. i. 3: ἀπανεκασμα τῆς δόξης κ. χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, this, however, being here conceived as predicated of the pre-existent Christ. In Plat. Rep. ii. p. 381 C, μορφή is also to be taken strictly in its literal signification, and not less so in Eur. Bacch. 54; Ael. H. A. iii. 24; Jos. c. Ap. ii. 16, 22. Comp. also Eur. Bacch. 4: μορφήν ἀμείβου ἐκ θεοῦ βροντησίαν, Xen. Cyr. i. 2. 2: φύσιν μὲν δὴ τῆς ψυχῆς κ. τῆς μορφῆς. What is here called μορφή Θεοῦ is εἰδός Θεοῦ in John v. 37 (comp. Plat. Rep. p. 380 D; Plut. Mor. p. 1013 C), which the Son also essentially possessed in His pre-human δόξα (John xvii. 5). The explanation of φύσις was promoted among the Fathers by the opposition to Arius and a

1 Bengel well says: "Ipsa natura divina decorem habebat infinitum, in se, etiam sine ulla creatura illum decorem intuente."—What Paul here designates simply by ἀμορφή Θεοῦ ὑπόστασις is pompously expressed by Clement, Cor. I. 16: τὸ εὐανεῖα τῆς μεγαλοπρεπίς τοῦ Θεοῦ. The forma mentis aeterna, however, in Tacitus, Agric. 46, is a conception utterly foreign to our passage (although adduced here by Hitzig), and of similar import with Propertius, iii. 1, 64: "ingeniо stat sine morte decus."
number of other heretics, as Chrysostom adduces them in triumph; hence, also, there is much polemical matter in them. For the later controversy with the Socinians, see Calovius. — ἰπάρχων] designating more expressly than ὅσον the relation of the subsisting state (iii. 20; Luke vii. 25, xvi. 23; 2 Pet. iii. 11); and hence not at all merely in the decree of God, or in the divine self-consciousness (Schenkel). The time is that of the pre-human existence. See above on δέ. Those who understand it as referring to His human existence (comp. John i. 14) think of the divine majesty, which Jesus manifested both by word and deed (Ambrosiaster, Luther, Erasmus, Heinrichs, Krause, Opusc. p. 33, and others), especially by His miracles (Grotius, Clericus); while Wetstein and Michaelis even suggest that the transfiguration on the mount is intended. It would be more in harmony with the context to understand the possession of the complete divine image (without arbitrarily limiting this, by preference possibly, to the moral attributes alone, as de Wette and Schneckenburger do)—a possession which Jesus (“as the God-pervaded man,” Philippi) had (potentialiter) from the very beginning of His earthly life, but in a latent manner, without manifesting it. This view, however, would land them in difficulty with regard to the following ἦκοτός. ἐκένωσε κ.τ.λ., and expose them to the risk of inserting limiting clauses at variance with the literal import of the passage; see below.—οὐχ ἄρσενον ἑγγείσατο τὸ εἶναι ἵνα Θεοί] In order to the right explanation, it is to be observed: (1) that the emphasis is placed on ἄρσενον, and therefore (2) that τὸ εἶναι ἵνα Θεοί cannot be something essentially different from ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ἰπάρχειν, but must in substance denote the same thing, namely, the divine habitus of Christ, which is expressed, as to its form of appearance, by ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ἰπάρχει, and, as to its internal nature, by τὸ εἶναι ἵνα Θεοί;¹ (3) lastly, that ἄρσενον does not mean praedia, or

¹ An entirely groundless objection has been made (even by Lüne mann) against the view which takes τὰ ἱλας ἵνα Θεοί as not essentially different from ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ἰπάρχει, viz. that Paul would, instead of τὰ ἱλας ἵνα Θεοί, have written merely τῶν, or even nothing at all. He might have done so, but there was no necessity for his taking that course, least of all for Paul! He, on the contrary, distinguishes very precisely and suitably between the two ideas representing...
that which is seized on (which would be ἄρπάγμον, Callim. 
Cer. 9; Pallad. ep. 87; Philop. 79; or ἀρπαγμα or ἄρπασμα, 
and might also be ἄρπαγη), or that which one forcibly snatches 
to himself (Hofmann and older expositors); but actively: 
robbing, making booty. In this sense, which is a priori probable 
from the termination of the word which usually serves to 
indicate an action, it is used, beyond doubt, in the only profane 
passage in which it is extant, Plut. de pueror. educ. 15 (Mor. 
p. 12 A): καὶ τοὺς μὲν Θῆβας καὶ τοὺς Ἡλίσι φευκτον ἐρωτας 
kai ton ek Kritis kaloumenon arpagymon, where it denotes the 
Cretan kidnapping of children. It is accordingly to be ex-
plained: Not as a robbing did He consider the being equal with 
God, i.e. He did not place it under the point of view of making 
booty, as if it was, with respect to its exertion of activity, to 
consist in His seizing what did not belong to Him. In opposi-
tion to Hofmann’s earlier logical objection (Schriftbew. I. 
p. 149) that one cannot consider the being as a doing, comp. 
1 Tim. vi. 5; and see Hofmann himself, who has now recog-
nised the linguistically correct explanation of ἄρπαγμός, but 
leaves the object of the ἄρπάζω indefinitely, though the latter 
must necessarily be something that belongs to others, con-
sequently a foreign possession. Not otherwise than in the 
active sense, namely raptus, can we explain Cyril, de adorat. I. 
p. 25 (in Wetstein): οὐκ ἄρπαγμον τὴν παραίτησιν ὁς ἐξ 
adrapanōs kai ὑδαρετάρας ἔποιεῖτο φρενός; further, Eus. in 
Luc. vi. in Mai’s Nov. Bibl. patr. iv. p. 165, and the passage 
in Possini Cat. in Marc. x. 42, p. 233, from the Anonym. 
Tolos. : οὐκ ἔστιν ἄρπαγμός ἡ τιμή; as also the entirely 
synonymous form ἄρπασμός in Plut. Mor. p. 644 A, and λησυμος 
the same state, by saying that Christ, in His divine pre-human form of life, 
did not venture to use this His God-equal being for making booty. Both, there-
fore, express the very same divine habitus; but the οὐκ ἔστιν 
the general element, which presents itself in the divine μορφή as its substratum and lies at its basis, so that the two designations exhaust the idea of divinity. Comp. 
also Liebner, p. 328.

1 On ἔστιν, in this sense of the mode of regarding, which places the 
object under the point of view of a qualitative category, comp. Krüger on Thuc. 
ii. 44. 3.

2 Lot did not let the refusal of the angels be a making of profit to himself.

3 Where, according to the connection, the sense is: Not a seizing to oneself
in Byzantine writers; also σκυλευμός in Eustathius; comp. Phryn. App. 36, where ἄρπαγμός is quoted as equivalent to ἄρτας. The passages which are adduced for ἄρτας ἡγεῖσθαι or ποιεῖσθαι τι (Heliod. vii. 11, 20, viii. 7; Eus. H. E. viii. 12; Vit. C. ii. 31)—comp. the Latin praedam ducere (Cic. Verr. v. 15; Justin, ii. 5, 9, xiii. 1. 8)—do not fall under the same mode of conception, as they represent the relation in question as something made a booty of, and not as the act of making booty. We have still to notice (1) that this οὐχ ἄρπαγμὸν ἡγεῖσατο corresponds exactly to μὴ τὰ ἐαυτῶν σκοποῦντες (ver. 4), as well as to its contrast ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε in ver. 7 (see on ver. 7); and (2) that the aorist ἡγεῖσατο, indicating a definite point of time, undoubtedly, according to the connection (see the contrast, ἀλλ' ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε κ.τ.λ.), transports the reader to that moment, when the pre-existing Christ was on the point of coming into the world with the being equal to God. Had He then thought: “When I shall have come into the world, I will seize to myself, by means of my equality with God, power and dominion, riches, pleasure, worldly glory,” then He would have acted the part of ἄρπαγμὸν ἡγεῖσθαι τὸ εἶναι ἵνα Θεὸς; to which, however, He did not consent, but consented, on the contrary, to self-renunciation, etc. It is accordingly self-evident that the supposed case of the ἄρπαγμός is not conceived as an action of the pre-existing Christ (as Richard Schmidt objects), but is put as connecting itself with His appearance on earth. The reflection, of which the pre-existent Christ is, according to our passage, represented as capable, even in presence of the will of God (see below, γενόμενος ὑπήκοος), although the apostle has only conceived it as an abstract possibility and expressed it in an anthropopathic mode of presentation, is decisive in favour of the personal pre-existence; but in this pre-existence the Son appears as subordinate to the Father, as He does throughout the entire New Testament, although this is not (as Beyschlag objects) at variance with the Trinitarian equality of essence in the Biblical sense. By the ἄρπαγμὸν ἡγεῖσατο κ.τ.λ., if it had taken place, He would have wished to relieve Himself from this is the position of honour, as among the heathen, but a renouncing and serving after the example of Christ.
subordination.—The linguistic correctness and exact apposite correlation of the whole of this explanation, which harmonizes with 2 Cor. viii. 9,1 completely exclude the interpretation, which is traditional but in a linguistic point of view is quite incapable of proof, that ἀρπαγμός, either in itself or by metonymy (in which van Hengel again appeals quite inappropriately to the analogy of Jas. i. 2, 2 Pet. iii. 15), means praeda or res rapienda. With this interpretation of ἀρπαγμός, the idea of ἔλαια τοια Θεοῦ has either been rightly taken as practically identical with ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, or not. (A) In the former case, the point of comparison of the figurative praeda has been very differently defined: either, that Christ regarded the existenço equal with God, not as a something usurped and illegitimate, but as something natural to Him, and that, therefore, He did not fear to lose it through His humiliation (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Augustine, and other Fathers; see Wetstein and J. B. Lightfoot); comp. Beza, Calvin, Estius, and others, who, however, give to the conception a different turn;2 or, that He did not desire pertinaciously to retain for Himself this equality with God, as a robber his booty, or as an unexpected gain (Ambrosiaster, Castalio, Vatablus, Kesler, and others; and recently, Hoelemann, Tholuck, Reuss,  

1 Rábiger and Wetzel, and also Pfeiderer, l.c., have lately adopted this view; likewise Kolbe in the Luther. Zeitschr. 1873, p. 311 f. Hofmann also now explains the passage in a way not substantially different. But Grimm, l.c. p. 38, very unjustly describes the retention of ἀρπαγμός in the sense which it has in Plutarch, as petty grammatical pedantry. The ideas, spoil, booty, occur in countless instances in all Greek authors, and in the LXX., and are very variously expressed (ἀρπαγῇ, ἀρπαγμα, ἀρπαμα, λαί, καταλυμα, εὐλα, λια), but never by ἀρπαγμί, or any other form of word ending with μί. It is true that various substantives ending in μί may denote the result of the action; not, however, as we may be pleased to assume, but solely in accordance with evidence of empirical usage, and this is just what is wanting for this sense in the case of ἀρπαγμί. Its rejection, therefore, in our passage, is not pedantic, but is simply linguistically demanded. Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 426, ed. 2, erroneously objects to our view of ἀρπαγμί, that, in that case, it would be impossible to conceive of any object, and that thus an utterly empty antithesis to the giving up of Christ’s own possession is the result. As if there were not given in the very notion of ἀρπαγμί its object, viz. that which does not belong to the subject of the action, and this, indeed, in its unrestricted and full compass, just because nothing special is added as an object.

2 Beza: “Non ignoravit, se in ca re (i.e. quod Deo Patri coequalis esset)
Liebner, Schmid, Wiesinger, Gess, Messner, Grimm; comp. also Usteri, p. 314); 1 or, that He did not conceal it, as a prey (Matthies); or, that He did not desire to display it triumphantly, as a conqueror his spoils (Luther, Erasmus, Cameron, Vatablus, Piscator, Grotius, Calovius, Quenstedt, Wolf, and many others, including Michaelis, Zachariae, Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Flatt, Rheinwald); 2 whilst others (Wetstein the most strangely, but also Usteri and several) mix up very various points of comparison. The very circumstance, however, that there exists so much divergence in these attempts at explanation, shows how arbitrarily men have endeavoured to supply a modal definition for ἐπιτρέψω, which is not at all suggested by the text.—(B) In the second case, in which a distinction is made between τὸ ἐλατόν Ἡσαΐα Θεοῦ and ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ἐπάρχειν, it is explained: non rapinam duxit, i.e. non rapiendum sibi duxit, or directly, non rapuit (Musculus, Er. Schmidt, Elsner, Clericus, Bengal, and many others, including am Ende, Martini, Krause, Opusc. p. 31, Schrader, Stein, Rilliet, van Hengel, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ernesti, Raebiger, Schneckenburger, Ewald, Weiss, Schenkel, Philipp, Thomasius, Beyschlag, Kahnis, Rich. Schmidt, and others); that Christ, namely, though being ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, did not desire to seize to Himself the ἐλατόν Ἡσαΐα Θεοῦ, to grasp eagerly
nullam injuriām cuquam facere, sed suō jure uti; nihilominus tamen quasi jure suo cessit. 2 So also Calvin, substantially, only that he erroneously interprets εὐερετῆς as arbitratus est, "Non fuiisset injuria, si sequevia Deo appauisset." Estius: "that He had not recognised the equality with God as an usurped possession, and therefore possibly desired to lay it aside, but had renounced Himself," etc.

1 In this class we must reckon the interpretation of Theodoret (comp. Origen, ad Rom. v. 2, x. 7, Eusebius, and others): that Christ, being God by nature, did not hold His equality with God as something specially great, as those do who attain to honours τὰ ἄξια; but that He, τὸ ἄξιον καταμεμφῆς, chose humiliation. To this comes also the view of Theodore of Mopsuestia: μορφήν γὰρ ἑκατέρου λαβών τὸν ἄξιον ἐλεημονίας ἀντιμενον, τοῦτο τοῖς ἵπποις εἰσα τιμιώτατοι, ἐστὶ ἱπποίτε. —Tholuck compares the German expression: als ein gefundenes Essen (einen guten Fund) ansehen. According to him, the idea of the whole passage is, "Tantum aberat, ut Christus, quatenus ἄξιος est, in gloria atque bestitatur suas acquiescere sibi placere vellet, ut amore erga mortales ductus servi formam induere ac vel infinam sortem subire sine ulia haesitatione sustineret."

2 To this belongs also Pelagius, "Quod erat, humilitate celavit, dans nobis exemplum, ne in his gloriemur, quae forsitan non habemus."
the possession of it.\(^1\) In this view expositors have understood the ἵνα εἰςαὶ Θεῷ as the divine plenitudinem et altitudinem (Bengel); the sessionem ad dextram (L. Bos); the divine honour (Coccioius, Stein, de Wette, Grau); the vitam vitae Dei aequalem (van Hengel); the existendi modum cum Deo aequalem (Lüne- mann); the col et beute vivere ut Deus (Kranse); the dominion on earth as a visible God (Ewald); the divine autonomy (Ernesti); the heavenly dignity and glory entered on after the ascension (Raebiger, comp. Thomasius, Philippi, Beyschlag, Weiss), corresponding to the δόμος τῷ ὑπὲρ πάν δόμοι in ver. 9 (Rich. Schmidt); the nova jura divina, consisting in the κυριότης πάσην (Brückner); the divine δόξα of universal adoration (Schneckenburger, Lechler, comp. Messner); the original blessedness of the Father (Kahnis); indeed, even the identity with the Father consisting in invisibility (Rilliet), and the like, which is to sustain to the μορφή Θεοῦ the relation of a plus, or something separable, or only to be obtained at some future time by humiliation and suffering\(^2\) (ver. 9). So, also, Sabatier, l'apôtre Paul, 1870, p. 223 ff.\(^3\) In order to meet the οὐχ ἀρτὸς ἡγ. (comparing Matt. iv. 8 ff.), de Wette (comp.

---

1 So also Lüne mann, who, in the sense of the divine pre-existence of Christ, paraphrases thus: “Christus, etsi ab eterno inde dignitatem creatoris et dominum omnium frueretur, ideoque divina indutus magnificentia coram patre consideret, nihil tamen minus haud arripidendum sibi esse autumabat existendi modum cum Deo aequalem, sed ultra se exinanivit.” In a sense opposed to the divine pre-existence, however, Beyschlag says, Christol. p. 236 f.: “Christ possessed the μορφή Θεοῦ (that is, ‘the inner form of God’); He might have but stretched out His hand towards the ἵνα θεῖ θεῖ; He disclaimed, however, to seize it for Himself, and chose quite the opposite; therefore it was given Him as the reward of His obedience, etc.” Hilgenfeld, in his Zeitschrift, 1871, p. 197 f., says: the Pauline Christ is indeed the heavenly man, but no divine being; the equality with God was attained by Him only through the renunciation, etc.

2 The lead in this mode of considering the passage was taken by Arius, whose party, on the ground of the proposition καί ἐν ἐλαίτων ὕψος ἦσαν ἐν οἷς ἦν νὰ ὁ Ὠν ὁμοίως μεγίστος. See Chrysostom.

3 He thinks that the divine μορφή of Christ stands to the ἵνα θεῖ θεῖ in the relation of potential to actus. “Christ était des l’origine en puissance ce qu’à la fin il devint en réalité;” the μορφή Θεοῦ denotes the general form of being of Christ, but “une forme vide, qui doit être remplie, c’est-à-dire spirituellement réalisée.” This higher position He had not wished to usurp, but had attained to it “réellement par le libre développement de sa vie morale.”
Hofmann, Schriftbew. p. 151) makes the thought be supplied, that it was not in the aim of the work of redemption befitting that Christ should at the very outset receive divine honour, and that, if He had taken it to Himself, it would have been a seizure, an usurpation. But as ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ἐστι already involves the divine essence,¹ and as ἵνα ἐλθῃ Θεός has no distinctive more special definition in any manner climactic (comp. Pfeiderer), Chrysostom has estimated this whole mode of explanation very justly: εἰ ἦν Θεός, πῶς εἰχεν ἄρτασα; καὶ πῶς οὐκ ἀπερνόθην τοῦτο; τίς γὰρ ἂν εἴποι, ὁτι ὁ δεύτερος ἀνθρώπος ὁν οὐχ ἄρπασε τὸ ἐλθει ἀνθρώπος; πῶς γὰρ ἂν τις ἐπερ ἔστιν, ἄρτασειν. Moreover, in harmony with the thought and the state of the case, Paul must have expressed himself conversely: δὲ ἵνα Θεός ὑπάρχῃ οὐχ ἄρπη. ἥν ἐλθει ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, so as to add to the idea of the equality of nature (ἵνα), by way of climax, that of the same form of appearance (μορφή), of the divine δόξα also.—With respect to τὸ ἐλθει ἵνα Θεός, it is to be observed, (1) that ἵνα is adverbial: in like manner, as we find it, although less frequently, in Attic writers (Thuc. iii. 14; Eur. Or. 880 al.; comp. ὀμοία, Lennep. ad Phalar. 108), and often in the later Greek, and in the LXX. (Job v. 14, x. 10, xi. 12, xiii. 12; Wisd. vii. 3, according to the usual reading). This adverbial use has arisen from the frequent employment, even so early as Homer (II. v. 71, xv. 433; Od. xi. 304, xv. 519 al.), of ἵνα as the case of the object or predicate (see Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 847; Krüger, II. § xlvi. 6. 8). But as ἐλθει, as the abstract substantive verb, does not suit the adverbial ἵνα, pari ratione, therefore (2) τὸ ἐλθει must be taken in the sense of existere; so that τὸ ἐλθει ἵνα Θεός does not mean the being equal to God (which would be τὸ ἐλθει ἵνα ὑπάρχῃ), but the God-equal existence, existence in the way of parity with God.² Paul might have written ἵνα (as mascul.) Θεός (John v. 18), or ἵνα Θεός; but, as it stands, he has more distinctly expressed the metaphysical relation, the divine mode of

¹ Not merely the similarity, from which is there distinguished the equality by ἐλθει ἵνα (in opposition to Martini and others).

² [The German is: nicht das Gottes gleich sein, sondern das gottgleiche Sein, das Sein auf gottgleiche Weise, die gottgleiche Existenz.]
existence, of the pre-human Christ. (3) The article points back to ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ἰσόπαρχον, denoting the God-equal existence manifesting itself in that μορφή; for the μορφή Θεοῦ is the appearance, the adequate subsisting form, of the God-equal existence. (4) Ernesti (in controversy with Baur), who is followed by Kähler, Kahnis, Beyschlag, and Hilgenfeld, entertains the groundless opinion that our passage alludes to Gen. ii. f., the ἵσα εἶναι Θεῶ pointing in particular to Gen. iii. 5. In the text there is no trace of any comparison of Christ with the first human beings, not even an echo of like expression; how different from the equality with God in our passage is the ἔσεσθε ὡς θεῖ in Gen. iii. 5! Certainly, any such comparison lay very remote from the sublime idea of the divine glory of the pre-existent Christ, which was something quite different from the image of God in the first human beings. Comp. also Rich. Schmidt, p. 172; Grimm, p. 42 f.

Ver. 7. 'Ἀλλ' ἐαυτὸν ἑκένωσε] The emphatically prefixed ἐαυτὸν is correlative to the likewise emphatic ἀρπαγμὸν in ver. 6. Instead of the ἀρπάζειν, by which he would have entered upon a foreign domain, He has, on the contrary, emptied Himself, and that, as the context places beyond doubt, of the divine μορφή, which He possessed but now exchanged for a μορφή δυόλου; He renounced the divine glorious form which, prior to His incarnation, was the form of appearance of His God-equal existence, took instead of it the form of a servant, and became as a man. Those who have already taken ver. 6

1 Which, therefore, was not essentially different from that of the Father. The ἵσα ἵσα Θεῶ is the Pauline Θεῖ ἵναι λίγος. Hofmann erroneously, although approved by Thomasius, makes the objection (Schriftden. p. 150) that an existence equal to divine existence can only be predicated of Him, who is not God. It may be predicated also of Him who is not the very same person, but of equal divine nature. Thus it might also be asserted of the Holy Spirit. The appeal by Hofmann to Thuc. iii. 14 is here without any bearing whatever.

2 Ritschl indeed also, Alkath. Kirche, p. 80, requires, for the understanding of our passage, a recognition that Christ, as ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ἰσόπαρχον, is put in comparison with the earthly Adam. But why should Paul, if this comparison was before his mind, not have written, in accordance with Gen. i. 26, ἐν χαρίσμα Θ., or ἐν χαρίσμα Θ., instead of ἐν μορφῇ Θ. ! This would have been most natural for himself, and would also have been a hint to guide the readers.—The passages quoted by Hilgenfeld from the Clementine Homilies affirm the μορφή Θεοῦ of the body of man, and are therefore irrelevant.
as referring to the *incarnate* Christ (see on ἐκεῖνος, ver. 6) are at once placed in a difficulty by *ἐκεῖνος*, and explain away its simple and distinct literal meaning; as, for instance, Calvin: "*supprimendo... deposuit;*" Calovius (comp. Form. Conc. pp. 608, 767): "*veluti (?) deposuit, quatenus eam (gloriam div.) non perpetuo manifestavit atque conservavit*;" Clericus: "*non magis ea usus est, quam si ea destitutus fuisset;*" comp. Quenstedt, Bos, Wolf, Bengel, Rheinwald, and many others. Beyschlag also finds expressed here merely the idea of the self-denial exercised on principle by Christ in His earthly life, consequently substituting the N. T. idea of ἀπαρνεῖσθαι εαυτόν. De Wette, in accordance with his distinction between μορφή Θεοῦ and *ἐλιγαί Ἰσα Θεοῦ* (comp. Schneckenburger, p. 336), referring it only to the latter (so also Corn. Müller, Philippi, Beyschlag, and others), would have this *ἐλιγαί Ἰσα Θεοῦ* meant merely *in so far* as it would have *stood* in Jesus' power, not *in so far* as He actually *possessed* it, so that the *ἐκατ. ἐκέν. amounts only to a renunciation of the *ἐλιγαί Ἰσα Θεοῦ*, which He *might* have appropriated to Himself; while others, like Grotius, alter the signification of *κενόν* itself, some making it mean: *He led a life of poverty* (Grotius, Baumgarten - Crusius), and others: *depressit* (van Hengel, Corn. Müller, following Tittmann, *Opusc.* p. 642 f., Keil, comp. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others). Augustine: "Non amittens quod erat, sed accipiens quod non erat; forma servi accessit, non forma Dei discersit." But *ἐκεῖνος* means nothing but *exinanivit* (Vulgate) (see Rom. iv. 14; 1 Cor. i. 17, ix. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 3; and the passages in the LXX. cited by Schleusner; Plat. *Conv.* p. 197 C, *Rep.* p. 560 D, *Phil.* p. 35 E; Soph. *O. R.* 29; Eur. *Rhes.* 914; Thuc. viii. 57. 1; Xen. *Oec.* 8. 7),¹ and is here *purposely selected*, because it corresponds with the idea of the ἀπαρνημός (ver. 6) all the more, that the latter also falls under the conception of *κενόν* (as *emptioing of that which is affected by the ἀπαρνημός*; comp.

¹ Comp. Hasse in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1858, p. 394 f. (in opposition to Dorner's reference of the idea to that of *ἰεράτης*). Dorner, in the same *Jahrb.* 1856, p. 395, is likewise driven to reduce the idea of the *ἰεράτης* merely to that of the renunciation of the appearance of majesty, which would have been befitting the divine form and parity, this inner greatness and dignity of Jesus Christ.
LXX. Jer. xv. 9; Plat. Rep. p. 560 D; Ecclus. xiii. 5, 7.
The specific reference of the meaning to making poor (Grotius)
must have been suggested by the context (comp. 2 Cor. viii. 9;
Ecclus. l.c.), as if some such expression as ἐν πλοίῳ Θεοῦ ἕπάρχῃ
had been previously used. Figuratively, the renunciation of
the divine μορφή might have been described as a putting it off
(ἐκδύσασθαι).—The more precise, positive definition of the mode
in which He emptied Himself, is supplied by μορφὴν δοῦλον
λαβὼν, and the latter then receives through ἐν ὃμ. ἀνθρ. γενό-
μενος καὶ σχῆμα εὐρ. ὡς ἀνθρ. its specification of mode, correla-
tive to εἰσὶ ἵσα Θεῷ. This specification is not co-ordinate (de
Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Weiss, Schenkel), but subordinate
to μορφὴν δοῦλ. λαβὼν, hence no connecting particle is placed
before ἐν ὃμ., and no punctuation is to be placed before καὶ
σχῆματι, but a new topic is to be entered upon with ἔταπείνω-
σεν in ver. 8 (comp. Luther). The division, by which a stop is
placed before καὶ σχῆματι . . . ἀνθρωπος, and these words are
joined to ἔταπείνωσεν κ.τ.λ. (Castalio, Beza, Bengel, and others;
including Hoelemann, Rilliet, van Hengel, Lachmann, Wies-
inger, Ewald, Rich. Schmidt, J. B. Lightfoot, Grimm), is at variance
with the purposely-chosen expressions σχῆματι and εὐρέθεις,
both of which correspond to the idea of μορφή, and thereby show
that κ. σχ.: εὐρ. ὡς ἀνθρ. is still a portion of the modal defini-
tion of μορφὴν δοῦλον λαβὼν. Nor is the σχῆμα. εὐρ. ὡς ἀνθρ.
something following the κένωσις (Grimm), but the empirical
appearance, which was an integral part of the manner in
which the act of self-emptying was completed. Besides,
ἔταπείνωσεν ἐαυτὸν has its own more precise definition follow-
ing; hence by the proposed connection the symmetry of
structure in the two statements, governed respectively by
ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε and ἔταπείνωσεν ἐαυτὸν, would be unnecessarily
disturbed. This applies also in opposition to Hofmann, who
(comp. Grotius) even connects ἐν ὁμοιόματι ἀνθρ. γενόμ. with
ἔταπείνωσεν ἐαυτὸν, whereby no less than three participial
definitions are heaped upon the latter. And when Hofmann
discovers in ἐν ὁμοιόματι κ.τ.λ. a second half of the relative
sentence attached to Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, it is at variance with the
fact, that Paul does not by the intervention of a particle (or
by δε καί, or even by the bare δε) supply any warrant for such a division, which is made, therefore, abruptly and arbitrarily, simply to support the scheme of thought which Hofmann groundlessly assumes: (1) that Jesus, when He was in the divine μορφή, emptied Himself; and (2) when He had become man, humbled Himself. Comp. in opposition to this, Grimm, p. 46, and Kolbe in the Luther. Zeitschr. 1873, p. 314. — μορφήν δούλου λαβών] so that He took slave-form, now making this lowly form of existence and condition His own, instead of the divine form, which He had hitherto possessed. How this was done, is stated in the sequel. The aorist participle denotes, not what was previous to the εαυτ. εκέν., but what was contemporaneous with it. See on Eph. i. 9. So also do the two following participles, which are, however, subordinated to the μορφήν δούλου λαβών, as definitions of manner. That Paul, in the word δούλου, thought not of the relation of one serving in general (with reference to God and men, Matthies, Rheinwald, Rilliet, de Wette, comp. Calvin and others), or that of a servant of others, as in Matt. xx. 28 (Schneckenburg, Beyschlag, Christol. p. 236, following Luther and others), or, indefinitely, that of one subject to the will of another (Hofmann), but of a slave of God (comp. Acts iii. 13; Isa. liii.), as is self-evident from the relation to God described in ver. 6, is plain, partly from the fact that subsequently the assumption of the slave-form is more precisely defined by ἐν ὀμοιώματι. ἀνθρ. γενόμ. (which, regarded in itself, puts Jesus only on the same line with men, but in the relation of service towards God), and partly from ὑπήκοος in ver. 8. To generalize the definite expression, and one which corresponds so well to the connection, into "miseram sortem, qualis esse servorum solet" (Heinrichs, comp. Hoelemann; and already, Beza, Piscator, Calovius, Wolf, Wetstein, and others), is pure caprice, which Erasmus, following Ambrosiaster (comp. Beyschlag, 1860, p. 471), carries further by the arbitrary paraphrase: "servi nocentis, cum ipsa esse innocentia," comp. Rom. viii. 3. — ἐν ὀμοιώματι. ἀνθρ. γενόμ. κ.τ.λ.] the manner of this μορφ. δούλου λαβέων: so that He came in the likeness of man, that is, so that He entered into a form of existence, which was not different from that which
men have. In opposition to Hofmann, who connects ἐν ὀμοιώματι κ.τ.λ. with ἑταπελώθησεν κ.τ.λ., see above. On γίνεσθαι ἐν, in the sense, to come into a position, into a state, comp. 2 Cor. iii. 7; 1 Tim. ii. 14; Luke xxii. 44; Acts xxii. 17; 1 Macc. i. 27; 2 Macc. vii. 9; Ecclus. xliv. 20; and frequently in Greek authors after Homer (Xen. Anab. i. 9. 1; Herodian, iii. 7. 19, ii. 13. 21); see Nägelsbach, zur Ilias, p. 295 f. ed. 3. This entrance into an existence like that of men was certainly brought about by human birth; still it would not be appropriate to explain γενώμ. by natus (Gal. iv. 4; Rilliet; comp. Gess, p. 295; Lechner, p. 66), or as an expression for the "beginning of existence" (Hofmann), since this fact, in connection with which the miraculous conception is, notwithstanding Rom. i. 3, also thought to be included, was really human, as it is also described in Gal. iv. 4. Paul justly says: ἐν ὀμοιώματι ἄνθρ., because, in fact, Christ, although certainly perfect man (Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 21; 1 Tim. ii. 5), was, by reason of the divine nature (the ἵσα εἶχαί Θεῷ) present in Him, not simply and merely man, not a purus putus homo, but the incarnate Son of God (comp. Rom. i. 3; Gal. iv. 4; and the Johannine ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο), δὲ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ (1 Tim. iii. 16), so that the power of the higher divine nature was united in Him with the human appearance, which was not the case in other men. The nature of Him who had become man was, so far, not fully identical with, but substantially conform (ἐν ὀμοιώμ.) to, that which belongs to man. Comp. on Rom. viii. 3, i. 3 f., and respecting the idea of ὀμολογία, which does not convey merely the conception

Our passage contains no trace of Docetism, even if Paul had, instead of ὁσιφύς, used the singular, which he might just as well have written here as ὁσιφύς in the sequel, in place of which he might also have used ὁσιφύς. This applies in opposition to Lange, apost. Zeitalt. I. p. 181, and Lechner, p. 66. Even Philippi, Glaubens. IV. 1, p. 472, is of opinion that the above-named interpretation amounts to Docetism. But Christ was in fact, although perfect man, nevertheless something so much more exalted, that the phrase ἐν ὀμοιώμ. ἄνθρ. must have vindicated itself to the believing consciousness of the readers without any misconception, and especially without that of Docetism, which Baur introduces into it (neuest. Theol. p. 269), particularly when we consider the thoroughly ethical occasion and basis of the passage as an exhibition of the loftiest example of humility (comp. Rich. Schmidt, p. 178). Nevertheless, Boyenschlag has repeated that objection.
of analogy, see on Rom. i. 23, v. 14, vi. 5, viii. 3. The expression is based, not upon the conception of a quasi-man, but upon the fact that in the man Jesus Christ (Rom. v. 15) there was the superhuman life-basis of divine ἵστη, the εἶναι ἵνα Θεῷ not indwelling in other men. Justice, however, is not done to the intentionally used ὁμοίωματι (comp. afterwards σχήματι), if, with de Wette, we find merely the sense that He (not appearing as divine Ruler) was found in a human condition,—a consequence of the fact that even ver. 6 was referred to the time after the incarnation. This drove also the ancient dogmatic expositors to adopt the gloss, which is here out of place, that Christ assumed the accidentales infirmitates corporis (yet without sin), not ex naturae necessitate, but ex oἰκουμενίας libertate (Calovius). By others, the characteristic of debile et abjectum (Hoelemann, following older expositors) is obtruded upon the word ἀνθρώπων, which is here to be taken in a purely generic sense; while Grotius understood ἄνθρωπος as referring to the first human beings, and believed that the sinlessness of Jesus was meant. It is not at all specially this (in opposition also to Castalio, Lünemann, Schenkel, and others), but the whole divine nature of Jesus, the μορφή of which He laid aside at His incarnation, which constitutes the point of difference that lies at the bottom of the expression ἐν ὁμοίωματι (διὰ τὸ μὴ ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι, Theophylact, comp. Chrysostom), and gives it to the definite reference of its meaning. The explanation of the expression by the unique position of Christ as the second Adam (Weiss) is alien from the context, which presents to us the relation, not of the second man to the first man, but of the God-man to ordinary humanity. — καὶ σχῆμα, εἰρ. ὃς ἄνθρωπον] to be closely connected with the preceding participial affirmation, the thought of which is emphatically exhausted: “and in fashion was found as a man,” so that the divine nature (the Logos-nature) was not perceived in Him.

1 To this also amounts the not so precisely and methodically expressed explanation of Philippi: Since Christ remained in the divine form, His assumption of the slave-form consisted “in the withdrawal of the rays of the divine glory which continued to dwell in His flesh, and which He only veiled and subdued with the curtain of the flesh.” Thus also does Calvin depict it: the carnis humilitas was instar veli, quo divina majestas tegebatur.
σχήμα, habitus, which receives its more precise reference from
the context (Přulkg, ad Eur. Hec. 619), denotes here the entire
outwardly perceptible mode and form, the whole shape of the
phenomenon apparent to the senses, 1 Cor. vii. 31; comp. τὸ τῆς
θεοῦ σχῆμα κ. ἀγαλμα, Plat. Crit. p. 110 B; τύραννον σχῆμα,
Soph. Ant. 1154; Eur. Med. 1039; Plat. Polit. p. 267 C:
σχήμα θαυμιστικόν, p. 290 D: τῶν ἱερεῶν σχήμα; Dem. 690.
21: ὑπηρέτου σχήμα; Lucian, Cyn. 17: τὸ ἐμὸν σχῆμα τὸ δ’
ὑμέτερον; also, in the plural, Xen. Mem. iii. 10. 7; Lucian,
D. M. xx. 5. Men saw in Christ a human form, bearing,
language, action, mode of life, wants and their satisfaction,
etc., in general the state and relations of a human being, so that
in the entire mode of His appearance He made Himself known
and was recognised (εἰφέθη) as a man. In His external
character, after He had laid aside the divine form which He
had previously had,¹ there was observed no difference between
His appearance and that of a man, although the subject of His
appearance was at the same time essentially divine. The ὁσ
with ἄνθρωπος does not simply indicate what He was recognised
to be (Weiss); this would have been expressed by ἄνθρωπον alone;
but He was found as a man, not invested with other qualities.
The Vulgate well renders it, "inventus ut homo." This
included, in particular, that He presented and manifested in
Himself the human σάρξ, human weakness and susceptibility
doing death (2 Cor. xiii. 4; Rom. vi. 9; Acts xxvi. 23).

Ver. 8. Ἐκτεινόμενον] is placed with great emphasis at the
head of a new sentence (see on ver. 7), and without any con-
necting particle: He has humbled Himself. Ἐκτεινόν is not
prefixed as in ver. 7; for in ver. 7 the stress, according to the
object in view, was laid on the reflexive reference of the action,
but here on the reflexive action itself. The relation to ἐκτεινόμενον
is climactic, not; however, as if Paul did not regard the self-
renunciation (ver. 7) as being also self-humiliation, but in so
far as the former manifested in the most extreme way the cha-

¹ Comp. Test. XII. Patr. p. 644 f.: ἔξεστι Θεόν ἵνα ὁ σχήματι ἄνθρωπον. Comp.
p. 744: τοῖς βασιλεῖ τῶν εὐρέων, τοῖς λεὶ γὰς φασίντα ἵνα μερῶς ἐλθόντων τεσσαράκτων. How these passages agree with the Nazarene character of the book, is not a point for discussion here.
racter of ταπείνωσις in the shameful death of Jesus. It is a climactic parallelism (comp. on iv. 9) in which the two predicates, although the former in the nature of the case already includes the latter (in opposition to Hofmann), are kept apart as respects the essential points of their appearance in historical development. Bengel well remarks: "Status exinanitionis gradatim profundior." Hoelemann, mistaking this, says: "He humbled Himself even below His dignity as man." —γενόμ. ἵπτεος] The aorist participle is quite, like the participles in ver. 7, simultaneous with the governing verb: so that He became obedient. This ἵπτεος is, however, not to be defined by "capientibus se, damnantibus et interficientibus" (Grotius); nor is it to be referred to the law, Gal. iv. 4 (Olshausen), but to God (Rom. v. 19; Heb. v. 8 f.), whose will and counsel (comp. e.g. Matt. xxvi. 42) formed the ground determining the obedience. Comp. ver. 9: διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ. The expression itself glances back to μορφ. δοῦλου; "obedientia servum decent," Bengel. —μέχρι θανάτου] belongs to ἵπτεκ. γενόμ., not to ἔταν. ἐαντ. (Bengel, Hoelemann)—which latter connection is arbitrarily assumed, dismembers the discourse, and would leave a too vague and feeble definition for ἔταν. ἐαντ. in the mere ἵπτεκ. γενόμ. By μέχρι death is pointed out as the culminating point, as the highest degree, up to which He obeyed, not merely as the temporal goal (van Hengel). Comp. 2 Tim. ii. 9; Heb. xii. 4; Acts xxii. 4; Matt. xxvi. 38. This extreme height reached by His obedience was, however, just the extreme depth of the humiliation, and thereby at the same time its end; comp. Acts viii. 33; Isa. liii. 8. Hofmann groundlessly takes ἵπτεκ. γινεσθαι in the sense of showing obedience (comp. on Gal. iv. 12). The obedience of Christ was an ethical becoming (Heb. v. 8). —θανάτου δὲ σταυρ.] τούτῳ τοῦ ἐπικαταράτου (comp. Gal. iii. 13; Heb. xii. 2), τοῦ τοῦς ἀνομοῖος ἀφωρισμένοις, Theophylact. The δὲ, with the repetition of the same word (comp. Rom. iii. 22, ix. 30), presents, just like the German aber, the more precisely defined idea in contradistinction to the idea which is previously left without this special definition: unto death, but what kind of death? unto the most shameful

REMARK 1.—According to our explanation, vv. 6–8 may be thus paraphrased: Jesus Christ, when He found Himself in the heavenly mode of existence of divine glory, did not permit Himself the thought of using His equality with God for the purpose of seizing possessions and honour for Himself on earth: No, He emptied Himself of the divine glory, inasmuch as, notwithstanding His God-equal nature, He took upon Him the mode of existence of a slave of God, so that He entered into the likeness of men, and in His outward bearing and appearance manifested Himself not otherwise than as a man. He humbled Himself, so that He became obedient unto God, etc. According to the explanation of our dogmatic writers, who refer vv. 6–8 to the earthly life of Christ, the sense comes to this: “Christum jam inde a primo conceptionis momento divinam gloriam et majestatem sibi secundum humanam naturam communicatum plena usurpatione exscreve et tangan Deum se gerere potuisse, sed abdicasse se plenario ejus usu et humilem se exhibuisse, patrique suo coelesti obedientem factum esse usque ad mortem crucis” (Quenstedt). The most thorough exposition of the passage and demonstration in this sense, though mixed with much polemical matter against the Reformed and the Socinians, are given by Calovius. The point of the orthodox view, in the interest of the full Deity of the God-man, lies in the fact that Paul is discoursing, not de humiliacione incarnationis, but de humiliacione incarnati. Among the Reformed theologians, Calvin and Piscator substantially agreed with our [Lutheran] orthodox expositors.

REMARK 2.—On a difference in the dogmatic understanding of vv. 6–8, when men sought to explain more precisely the doctrine of the Church (Form. Conc. 8), was based the well-known controversy carried on since 1616 between the theologians of Tübingen and those of Giessen. The latter (Feuerborn and Menzer) assigned to Jesus Christ in His state of humiliation the χρυσις of the divine attributes, but denied to Him their χρυσις, thus making the κυνωνια a renunciation of the χρυσις. The Tübingen school, on the other hand (Thummius, Luc. Osiander, and Nicolai), not separating the χρυσις and χρυσις, arrived at the conclusion of a hidden and imperceptible use of the divine attributes, and consequently made the κυνωνια a χρυσις της
χρήσις. See the account of all the points of controversy in Dorner, II. 2, p. 661 ff., and especially Thomasius, Christi Pers. u. Werk, II. p. 429 ff. The Saxon Decisio, 1624, taking part with the Giessen divines, rejected the χρήσις, without thoroughly refuting it, and even without avoiding unnecessary concessions to it according to the Formula Concordiae (pp. 608, 767), so that the disputed questions remained open and the controversy itself only came to a close through final weariness. Among the dogmatic writers of the present day, Philippi is decidedly on the side of the Giessen school. See his Glaubensl. IV. 1, p. 279 ff. ed. 2. It is certain that, according to our passage, the idea of the χρήσις is clearly and decidedly to be maintained, and the reducing of it to a χρήσις rejected. But, since Paul expressly refers the τιμωρίας to the μορφή Θεου, and consequently to the divine mode of appearance, while he makes the εἰναὶ τον Θεον to subsist with the assumption of the μορφή θαυματουργή, just as subsequently the Incarnate One appears only as ὁ υἱὸς του θεοῦ, and as σοφία του τότε αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλοῦμαι; and since, further, in the case of the χρήσις of the divine attributes thus laid down, the non-use of them—because as divine they necessarily cannot remain dormant (John v. 17, ix. 4)—is in itself inconceivable and incompatible with the Gospel history; the χρήσις and the χρήσις must therefore be inseparably kept together. But, setting aside the conception of the χρήσις as foreign to the N. T., this possession and use of the divine attributes are to be conceived as having, by the renunciation of the μορφή Θεου in virtue of the incarnation, entered upon a human development, consequently as conditioned, not as absolute, but as theanthropic. At the same time, the self-consciousness of Jesus Christ necessarily remained the self-consciousness of the Son of God developing Himself humanly; or (according to the Johannine phrase) of the Logos that had become flesh, who was the μορφή Θεου; see the numerous testimonies in John's Gospel, as iii. 13, viii. 58, xvii. 5, v. 26. "Considered from a purely exegetical point of view, there is no clearer and more certain result of the interpretation of Scripture than the proposition, that the Ego of Jesus on earth was identical with the Ego which was previously in glory with the Father; any division of the Son speaking on earth into two Egos, one of whom was the eternally glorious Logos, the other the humanly humble Jesus, is rejected by clear testimonies of Scripture, however intimate we may seek to conceive the marriage of the two during the earthly life of Jesus;" Liebner in the Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol. 1858, p. 362. That which the divine Logos laid aside in the incarnation was, according to

PHIL.
our passage, the μορφή Θεοῦ, that is, the divine ἔξω as a form of existence, and not the ἀνα Θεοῦ essentially and necessarily constituting His nature, which He retained, and to which belonged, just as essentially and necessarily, the divine—and consequently in Him who had become man the divine-human—self-consciousness. But as this cannot find its adequate explanation either in the absolute consciousness of God, or in the archetypal character which Schleiermacher assigned to Christ, or in the idea of the religious genius (Al. Schweitzer), or in that of the second Adam created free from original sin, whose personal development proceeds as a gradual incarnation of God and deification of man (Rothe), so we must by no means say, with Gess, v. d. Pers. Chr. p. 304 ff., that in becoming incarnate the Logos had laid aside His self-consciousness, in order to get it back again only in the gradual course of development of a human soul, and that merely in the form of a human self-consciousness. See, in opposition to this, Thomasius, Christi Pers. u. Werk, II. p. 198 f.; Schoeberlein in the Jahrb. f. D. Th. 1871, p. 471 ff., comp. the latter's Geheimnisse des Glaubens, 1872, 3. The various views which have been adopted on the part of the more recent Lutheran Christologists, diverging from the doctrine of the Formula Concordiae in setting forth Christ's humiliation (Dorner: a gradual ethical blending into one another of the divine and human life in immanent development; Thomasius: self-limitation, i.e.

2 Paul agrees in substance with the Logos doctrine of John, but has not adopted the form of Alexandrine speculation. That the latter was known to him in its application to the Christology, may at least be regarded as probable from his frequent and long intercourse with Asia, and also from his relation to Apollonius. His conception, however, is just as little Apollinarian as that of John; comp. on Rom. i. 3 f.; Col. i. 15.
3 Schenkel's ideal transference of Christ's pre-existence simply into the self-consciousness of God, which in the person of Christ found a perfect self-manifestation like to humanity, boldly renounces all the results of historical exegesis during a whole generation, and goes back to the standpoint of Lössler and others, and also further, to that of the Socinians. Comp. on John xvii. 5. Yet even Beyerl's Christology leads no further than to an ideal pre-existence of Christ as archetype of humanity, and that not as a person, but merely as the principle of a person;—while Keerl (d. Gottmensch. das Ehrbild Gottes, 1866), in unperceived direct opposition to our passage and to the entire N. T., puts the Son of God already as Son of man in absolute (not earthly) corporeality as pre-existent into the glory of heaven. From 1 Cor. xv. 47 the conception of the pre-existence of Christ as a heavenly, pneumatic man and archetype of humanity (Holsten, Biedermann, and others) can only be obtained through misapprehension of the meaning. See on 1 Cor. i.c., and Grimm, p. 51 ff.

—According to Schoeberlein, the Son of God, when He became man, did not give up His operation in governing the world in conjunction with the Father and the Holy Spirit, but continued to exercise it with divine consciousness in heaven. Thus the dilemma cannot be avoided, either of supposing a dual personality of Christ, or of assuming, with Schoeberlein, that heaven is not local. Not only the former, however, but the latter view also, would be opposed to the entire N. T.

Ver. 9. The exaltation of Christ,—by the description of which, grand in its simplicity, His example becomes all the more encouraging and animating.—*Sid.] for a recompense, on account of this self-denying renunciation and humiliation in obedience to God (καὶ, also, denotes the accession of the corresponding consequence, Luke i. 35; Acts x. 29; Rom. i. 24, iv. 22; Heb. xiii. 12). Comp. *Matt.* xxiii. 12; *Luke* xxiv. 26. Nothing but a dogmatic, anti-heretical assumption could have recourse to the interpretation which is at variance with linguistic usage: *quo facto* (Calvin, Calovius, Glass, Wolf; and others). The conception of recompense (comp. Heb. ii. 9, xii. 2) is justified by the voluntariness of what Christ did, vv. 6–8, as well as by the ethical nature of the obedience with which He did it, and only excites offence if we misunderstand the Subordinationism in the Christology of the apostle. Augustine well says: “Humilitas claritas est meritum, claritas humilitatis praemium.” Thus Christ’s saying in *Matt.* xxiii. 12 was gloriously fulfilled in His own case. — ὑπερήψασθαι] comp. Song of Three Child. 28 ff.; *LXX.* Pa. xxxvi. 37, xcvi. 10; Dan. iv. 34; Synes. *Ep.* p. 225 Α; it is not found elsewhere among Greek authors, by whom, however, ὑπερήψην ἄλος, exceed-
tingly high, is used. *He made Him very high, exceedingly exalted,* said by way of superlative contrast to the previous ἐκπρεποῦς, of the exaltation to the fellowship of the highest glory and dominion, Rom. viii. 17; 2 Tim. ii. 12; Eph. i. 21, al.; John xii. 32, xvii. 5. This exaltation has taken place by means of the ascension (Eph. iv. 10), by which Jesus Christ attained to the right hand of God (Mark xvi. 19; Acts vii. 55 f.; Rom. viii. 34; Eph. i. 20 f.; Col. iii. 1; Heb. i. 3, viii. 1, x. 12, xii. 2; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 22), although it is not this local mode, but the exaltation viewed as a state which is, according to the context, expressed by ἐκπρεπὴς. It is quite unbiblical (John xvii. 5), and without lexical authority, to take ἐκπρεπο from the point of view of the subordination, on which also what follows (κύριος . . . εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πατρός) is based. Even Christ receives the recompense as God’s gift of grace, and hence also He prays Him for it, John xvii. 5. The glory of the exaltation did not stand to that possessed before the incarnation in the relation of a plus, but it affected the entire divine-human person, that entered on the regnum gloriae. — τὸ ὅνωμα is here, as in Eph. i. 21, Heb. i. 4, to be taken in the strictly literal sense, not as dignitas or gloria (Heinrichs, Hoelemann, and many others), a sense which it might have ex adjuceto (see the passages in Wetstein and Hoelemann), but against which here the following ἐν τῷ ὅνωμα Ἰησοῦ is decisive. The honour and dignity of the name of Jesus are expressed by τὸ ὑπερ πᾶν ὅνωμα, but are not implied in τὸ ὅνωμα of itself. Nor is it to be understood of an appellative name, as some have referred it to κύριος in ver. 11 (Michaelis, Keil, Baumgarten-Crusius, van Hengel, Schneckenburger, Weiss, Hofmann, Grimm); others to νῦν Θεοῦ (Theophylact, Pelagius, Estius); and some even to Ὁ θεός (Ambrosiaster, Oecumenius, and again

1 In the conception of the “exaltation” Paul agrees with John, but does not convey expressly the notion of the return to the Father. This is not an inconsistency in relation to the doctrine of pre-existence (in opposition to Pfeiderer, l.c. p. 517), but a consequence of the more dialectically acute distinction of ideas in Paul, since that change of condition affected the entire Christ, the God-man, whereas the subject of the pre-existence was the Logos.
Schultz; but see on Rom. ix. 5). In accordance with the context—ver. 11, comp. with ver. 6—the thought is: "God has, by His exaltation, granted to Him that the name 'Jesus Christ' surpasses all names in glory." The expression of this thought in the form: God has granted to Him the name, etc., cannot seem strange, when we take into account the highly poetic strain of the passage.

Ver. 10 f. "Iva] This exaltation, ver. 9, was to have, in accordance with the divine purpose, general adoration and confession as its result,—a continuation of the contrast with the previous state of self-renunciation and humiliation. In the mode of expression there may be detected a reminiscence of Isa. xliv. 23 (Rom. xiv. 11).—The ἐν τῷ ὑψώμ. 'I., emphatically prefixed, affirms that, in the name of Jesus, i.e. in what is involved in that most glorious name "Jesus Christ," and is present to the conception of the subjects as they bend their knees, is to be found the moving ground of this latter action (comp. Ps. lxiii. 5; 1 Kings xviii. 24; 1 Chron. xvi. 10, al.; 1 Cor. vi. 11; Eph. v. 20; Col. iii. 17; 1 Pet. iv. 14, 16; Jas. v. 14). The bowing of the knee represents adoration, of which it is the symbol (Isa. xliv. 23; Rom. xiv. 11, xi. 4; Eph. iii. 14; 3 Esdr. viii. 73; 3 Macc. ii. 1; and in Greek writers from Homer onward), and the subject to be adored is, according to the context (ἐν τῷ ὑψώμ. 'I., and comp. ver. 11), none other than Jesus, the adoring worship of whom has its warrant in the fellowship of the divine government and of the divine δόξα to which He is exalted (comp. the habitual ἐπικαλεσθαι τῷ ὑψωμα κυρίου, Rom. x. 12 f.; 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 22; Acts vii. 59, ix. 14, 21, xxii. 16), but has also at the same time its peculiar character, not absolute, but relative, i.e. conditioned by the relation of the exalted Son to the Father (see Lücke, de invocat. Jes. Ch. Gott. 1843, p. 7 f.; comp. Ernesti, Urspr. d. Sünde, I. p. 218),—a peculiarity which did not escape the observation of Pliny (Ep. x. 97: "Christo quasi Deo"), and was, although only very casually and imperfectly, expressed by him. This adoration (comp. ver. 11, εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πατρός) does not infringe that strict monotheism, which could ascribe absolute deity to the Father only.
(John xvii. 3; Eph. iv. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 6, viii. 6; 1 Tim. vi. 15 f.); the Father only is ὁ ἐν ἑπτὰ πάνω Θεός, Rom. ix. 5 (comp. Ignat. Tars. interp. 5), ὁ Θεὸς absolutely, God also of Christ (see on Eph. i. 17), the Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ (2 Cor. vi. 18; Rev. i. 8, iv. 8, al.); and the Son, although of like nature, as συνθρόνος and partaker of His δόξα, is subordinate to Him (1 Cor. xi. 3, xv. 27 f.), as in turn the Spirit is to the Son (2 Cor. iii. 18); the honour which is to be paid to the Son (Rev. v. 8 ff.) has its principle (John v. 22 f.) and aim (ver. 11) in the Father, and therefore the former is to be honoured as the Father, and God in Christ fills and moves the consciousness of him who prays to Christ. According to van Hengel, it is not the adoration of Jesus which is here intended, but that of God under application of the name of Jesus; and de Wette also thinks it probable that Paul only intended to state that every prayer should be made in the name of Jesus as the Mediator (κύριος). Comp. also Hofmann: "the praying to God, determined in the person praying by the consciousness of his relation to Jesus as regulating his action." Instead of this we should rather say: the praying to Jesus, determined by the consciousness of the relation of Jesus to God (of the Son to the Father), as regulating the action of the person praying. All modes of explaining away the adoration as offered to Jesus Himself are at variance not only with the context generally, which has to do with the honour of Jesus, making Him the object of the adoration, but also with the word ἐπουρανίων which follows, because the mediatorship of Jesus, which is implied in the atonement, does not affect the angels as its objects (comp., on the contrary, Heb. i. 4, 6). The two sentences may not be separated from one another (in opposition to Hofmann); but, on the contrary, it must be maintained that the personal object, to whom the bowing of the knee as well as the confession with the tongue applies, is Jesus. Linguistically erroneous is the view which makes ἐν τῷ ὑμῷ. equivalent to εἰς τῷ ὑμῶν, for the glorification of His dignity (Heinrichs, Flatt, and others), or as a paraphrase for ἐν Ἰησοῦ (Estius; Rheinwald leaves either of the two to be chosen); while others, by the interpretation "quoties auditur
nomen," brought out a sense which is altogether without analogy in the N. T. See, in opposition to this, Calvin: "quasi vox (the word Jesus) esset magica, quae totam in sono vim haberet inclusam." —ἐστοίχων κ.τ.λ. every knee of heavenly beings (those to be found in heaven), and those on earth, and those under the earth, is to bow, none is to remain unbent; that is, every one from these three classes shall bow his knees (plural). ἑπτεῖμ. includes the angels (Eph. i. 20 f., iii. 10; Heb. i. 4, 6; 1 Pet. i. 22); ἐνυγ. the human beings on earth (comp. Plat. Ax. p. 368 B: ἐνύγεος ἄνθρωπος); and καταχθ. the dead in Hades (comp. Hom. II. ix. 457: Ζεύς καταχθόνιος, Pluto: καταχθόνιος δαίμονες, the Manes, Anthol. vii. 333). Comp. Rev. v. 13; Ignat. Trall. 9, and the similar classical use of ἕποχθόνιος, ἐπό ραίαν (Eur. Hec. 149, and Pfugk in loc.). The adoration on the part of the latter, which Grotius and Hofmann misinterpret, presupposes the descensus Ch. ad inferos, Eph. iv. 9, in which He presented Himself to the spirits in Hades as the κύριος. Our passage, however, does not yield any further particulars regarding the so-called descent into hell, which Schweizer has far too rashly condemned as "a myth without any foundation in Scripture." Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erasmus, and many others, including Baumgarten-Crusius and Wiesinger, have

1 Erasmus, Castalio, Beza, Bretschneider, and others, arrived at this interpretation simply by understanding is εἰς nomen (comp. Grotius: "natio nominis") but Hoelemann, with forced subtlety, by the analysis: "quasi circumonitum appellatione nominis."

2 To transfer, with Grotius, Hofmann, and Grimm, the genuflexion of the dead to the period after the resurrection, so that, according to Hofmann, the καταχθόνιον "sleep below and await their resurrection and shall then adore and confess," would be entirely erroneous, mixing up with the direct, poetically plastic description of the apostle a remotely suggested reflection. He views the bowing of the knee, as it has been done and is continuously being done, and not as it will be done by an entire class only in the future, after the Parousia. Wiesinger, however, has also placed the realization of the ἐστοίχων κύριως καταχθόνιος at the end of the world, when the knees, which hitherto had not willingly bent, would be forced to do so (1 Cor. xv. 25 f.). On this point he appeals to Rom. xiv. 11, where, however, the whole text is dealing with the last judgment, which is not the case here. Besides, εἰς nomen is far from leading us to the idea of an adoration partially forced; it rather presupposes the faith, of which the bowing of the knee and the confession which follows are the free living action; comp. Rom. x. 9.
incorrectly understood by καταχθό. the Daemones, which is an erroneous view, because Paul does not regard the Daemones as being in Hades (see, on the contrary, at Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12). There is an arbitrary rationalizing in Heinrichs, who takes the words as neuters: "omnes rerum creatarum complexus" (comp. Nösselt and J. B. Lightfoot), and already in Beza: "quaecunque et supra mundum sunt et in mundo." We meet with the right view as early as Theodoret. The Catholics referred καταχθο to those who are in purgatory; so Bisping still, and Döllinger, Christenth. u. Kirche, p. 262, ed. 2.—As regards the realization of the divine purpose expressed in ἱνα κ.τ.λ., respecting the ἐνυγέλων, it was still in progress of development, but its completion (Rom. xi. 25) could not but appear to the apostle near at hand, in keeping with his expectation of the near end of the αἰῶν οὐρων. Observe, moreover, how he emphasizes the universality of the divine purpose (ἵνα) with regard to the bowing the knees and confession with the tongue so strongly by πάν γόνυ and πάσα γλῶσσα, that the arbitrary limitation which makes him mean only those who desire to give God the glory (Hofmann) is out of the question.

Ver. 11 appends the express confession combined with the adoration in ver. 10, in doing which the concrete form of representation is continued, comp. Rom. xiv. 11; Isa. xlv. 23; hence γλῶσσα is tongue, correlative to the previous γόνυ, not language (Theodoret, Beza, and others). — ἐξουμολ.] a strengthening compound. Comp. on Matt. iii. 6. Respecting the future (see the critical remarks) depending on ἱνα, see on Gal. ii. 4; Eph. vi. 3; 1 Cor. ix. 18. — κύριος] predicate, placed first with strong emphasis: that Lord is Jesus Christ. This is the specific confession of the apostolic church (Rom. x. 9; 2 Cor. iv. 5; Acts ii. 36), whose antithesis is: ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς; 1 Cor. xii. 3. The κύριον εἶναι refers to the fellowship of the divine dominion (comp. on Eph. i. 22 f., iv. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 27 f.); hence it is not to be limited to the rational creatures (Hoelmann, following Flatt and others), or to the church (Rheinwald, Schenkel). — εἰς δὲξ. Θεοῦ πατρ.] may be attached to the entire bipartite clause of purpose (Hofmann). Since, however, in the second part a modification of the expression is intro-
duced by the future, it is more probably to be joined to this portion, of which the telic destination, i.e. the final cause, is specified. It is not to be connected merely with κύριος 'I. X., as Bengel wished: “J. Ch. esse dominum, quippe qui sit in gloria Dei patris,” making eis stand for ἐν, for which the Vulgate, Pelagius, Estius, and others also took it. Schneckenburger also, p. 341 (comp. Calvin, Rheinwald, Matthies, Hoelemann), joins it with κύριος, but takes eis δόξαν rightly: to the honour. But, in accordance with ver. 9, it was self-evident that the κυριότης of the Son tends to the honour of the Father; and the point of importance for the full conclusion was not this, but to bring into prominence that the universal confessing recognition of the κυριότης of Jesus Christ glorifies the Father (whose will and work Christ’s entire work of salvation is; see especially Eph. i.; Rom. xv. 7–9; 2 Cor. i. 20), whereby alone the exaltation, which Christ has received as a recompense from the Father, appears in its fullest splendour. Comp. John xii. 28, xvii. 1. The whole contents of ver. 9 f. is parallel to the ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, namely, as the recompensing re-elevation to this original estate, now accorded to the divine-human person after the completion of the work of humiliation. Complicated and at variance with the words is the view of van Hengel, that ἐξομολογεῖται δόξαν Θεοῦ is equivalent to ἐξομολογεῖται Θεῷ, to praise God (Gen. xxix. 34, al.; Rom. xv. 9; Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21), and that θριᾷ is quod; hence: “laudibus celebrarent, quod hunc filium suum principem fecerit regni divini.”

Remark.—From vv. 6–11, Baur, whom Schwengel follows, derives his arguments for the assertion that our epistle moves in the circle of Gnostic ideas and expressions,¹ and must therefore belong to the post-apostolic period of Gnostic speculation. But with the true explanation of the various points these arguments² fall to pieces of themselves. For (1) if τῷ ἱνῷ ἱσα Θεῷ be related

¹ Its idea is, that Christ “divests Himself of that which He already is, in order to receive back that of which He has divested Himself, with the full reality of the idea filled with its absolute contents,” Baur, Neutest. Theol. p. 265.
² Hinsch, Lc. p. 76, does not adopt them, but yet thinks it un-Pauline that the incarnation of Christ is represented detached from its reference to humanity. This, however, is not the case, as may be gathered from the connection of the passage in its practical bearing with ver. 4 (ὡς ἐπίφαν).
to ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ἦν as the essence to its adequate manifestation, and if our explanation of ἄρταγμάς be the linguistically correct one, then must the Gnostic conception of the Αἰων Σοφία—

which vehemently desired to penetrate into the essence of the original Father (Iren. Haer. i. 2. 2), and thus before the close of the world’s course (Theol. Jahrb. 1849, p. 507 ff.) wished to usurp forcibly something not de jure belonging to it (Paulus, II. p. 51 ff.)—be one entirely alien and dissimilar to the idea of our passage. But this conception is just as inconsistent with the orthodox explanation of our passage, as with the one which takes the ἐν τῷ Θεῷ as something future and greater than the μορφῇ Θεοῦ; since in the case of the μορφῇ, as well as in that of the τῷ, the full fellowship in the divine nature is already the relation assumed as existing. Consequently (2) the ἰαυτῷ ἐκεῖνος cannot be explained by the idea, according to which the Gnostics made that Αἰων, which desired to place itself in unwarranted union with the Absolute, fall from the Πλερομα to the κίνωμα—as to which Baur, in this alleged basis for the representation of our passage, lays down merely the distinction, that Paul gives a moral turn to what, with the Gnostics, had a purely speculative signification ("Whilst, therefore, in the Gnostic view, that ἄρταγμάς indeed actually takes place, but as an unnatural enterprise neutralizes itself, and has, as its result, merely something negative, in this case, in virtue of a moral self-determination, matters cannot come to any such ἄρταγμάς; and the negative, which even in this case occurs, not in consequence of an act that has failed, but of one which has not taken place at all, is the voluntary self-renunciation and self-denial by an act of the will, an ἰαυτῷ κεῖται instead of the γενόσχη ἐν κεῖται"). (3) That even the notion of the μορφῇ Θεοῦ arose from the language used by the Gnostics, among whom the expressions μορφῇ, μορφῶν, μόρφωσις, were very customary, is all the more arbitrarily assumed by Baur, since these expressions were very prevalent generally, and are not specifically Gnostic designations; indeed, μορφῇ Θεοῦ is not once used by the Gnostics, although it is current among other authors, including philosophers (e.g. Plat. Rep. p. 381 C: μόνει ἀι ἀπλῶς ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ μορφῇ, comp. p. 381 B: ἡπιστοῦ ἐν πολλές μορφάς ἰσχοῖ ὁ Θεὸς). Further, (4) the erroneousness of the view, which in the phrases ἐν ἁμώματι ἀνθρώπων and σχήματι εἰρήνης ὡς ἄνδρ., discovers a Gnostic Docetism, is self-evident from the explanation of these expressions in accordance with the context (see on the passage); and Chrysostom and his successors have rightly brought out the essential difference between what the apostle says in ver. 7 and the Docetic conceptions (Theophylact:
Ver. 12. To this great example of Jesus Paul now annexes another general admonition, which essentially corresponds with that given in i. 27, with which he began all this Hortatory portion of the epistle (i. 27—ii. 18). — ēsēte] itaque, draws an

1 Linden, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1860, p. 750, attempted a new explanation of vv. 12—14. According to this, μὴ ἡς is to stand for ἡς μὴ, κατάρρητη, to be indicative, μὴ ἡς .. κατάρρητη. to belong to the protasis, ver. 13 to be treated as a parenthesis, and, finally, the apodosis to follow in ςάντη s. c. l. Against this view may be simply urged the fact, that μὴ ἡς (2 Thess. iii. 15; Philem. 14; 2 Cor. ix. 5) cannot be equivalent to ἡς μὴ, and that there must have been used not even ἡς μὴ, but, on account of the negation of a purely actual relation, ἡς ὑπά; to say nothing of the involved construction, and of the so special tenor of the alleged apodosis after a preparation of so grand and general a nature by the alleged protasis.
inference from the example of Christ (vv. 6–11), who by the path of self-renunciation attained to so glorious a recompense. Following this example, the readers are, just as they had always been obedient, etc., to work out their own salvation with the utmost solicitude. Ἁπνεύοντε is not, indeed, correlative with ἔλαλον in ver. 8 (Theophylact, Calovius, Bengel, and others), as the latter was in what preceded only an accessory definition; but the σωτηρία is correlative with the exaltation of Christ described in ver. 9, of which the future salvation of Christians is the analogue, and, in fact, the joint participation (Rom. viii. 17; Eph. ii. 6; Col. ii. 12f., iii. 3f.). Since, therefore, ὅσε has its logical basis in what immediately precedes, it must not be looked upon as an inference from all the previous admonitions, i. 26 ff., from which it draws the general result (de Wette). It certainly introduces the recapitulation of all the previous exhortations, and winds them up (on account of the new exhortation which follows, see on ver. 14) as in iv. 1; 1 Thess. iv. 18; Rom. vii. 12; 1 Cor. iii. 21, iv. 5, v. 8, xi. 33, xiv. 39, xv. 58, but in such a way that it joins on to what was last discussed. It is least of all admissible to make, with Hofmann, ὅσε point backwards to πληρώσατε μου τ. χαρᾶν in ver. 2, so that this prayer “is repeated in a definitive manner” by the exhortation introduced with ὅσε. In that case the apostle, in order to be understood, must at least have inserted a resumptive ὅσον after ὅσε, and in the following exhortation must have again indicated, in some way or other, the element of the making joy. — καθος πάντοις Ἁπνεύοντε] whom? is neither a question to be left unanswered (Matthies), nor one which does not require an answer (Hofmann). The context yields the supplement here, as well as in Rom. vi. 16, Philem. 21, 1 Pet. i. 14; and the right supplement is the usual one, viz. mihi, or, more definitely, meo evangelio, as is plain, both from the words which follow μὴ ὅσο ἄποντολα μου, and also from the whole close personal relation, in which Paul brings home to the hearts of his readers his admonitions (from i. 27 down till ii. 18) as their teacher and friend. On πάντοις, comp. ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας ἀχρι τοῦ νῦν (i. 5). We cannot infer from it a reference to earlier epistles which have been lost
(Ewald). — \( \mu \eta \ \dot{o} \xi \ldots \dot{o} \pi \nu \nu o \lambda \varepsilon \mu o \nu \) belongs not to \( \iota \pi \nu \kappa o \iota \sigma \alpha t e \) (Luther, Wolf, Heumann, Heinrichs, and others), as is evident from \( \mu \eta \ \dot{o} \xi \) and \( \nu \nu \), but to \( \kappa a t e r g \dot{a} \zeta e \sigma \theta e \), so that the comma before \( \mu e t \alpha \ \phi \beta o \nu \) is, with Lachmann, to be deleted. Comp. Grotius.—\( \dot{o} \xi \) had to be inserted, because Paul would not and could not give an admonition for a time when he would be present. Not perceiving this, B, min., vss., and Fathers have omitted it. If \( \dot{o} \xi \) were not inserted, Paul would say: that they should not merely in his presence work out their salvation. But with \( \dot{o} \xi \) he says: that they are not to work out their own salvation in such a way as if they were doing it in His presence\(^1\) merely (neglecting it, therefore, in His absence); nay, much more now, during His absence from them, they are to work it out with fear and trembling. There is nothing to be supplied along with \( \dot{o} \xi \), which is the simple modal \( \mu \eta \), since \( \mu \eta \ \dot{o} \xi \) is connected with the governing verb that follows in the antithesis (\( \tau . \ \varepsilon a u t . \ \sigma o \tau . \ \kappa a t e r g \dot{a} \zeta e \sigma \theta e \)) as its prefixed negative modal definition: not as in my presence only (not as limiting it to this only) work out your salvation. And the \( \alpha l \lambda \) is the antithetic much more, on the contrary, nay. Erasmus, Estius, Hoelemann, Weiss, Hofmann, and others, incorrectly join \( \mu \dot{o} n o v \) with \( \mu \eta \), and take \( \dot{o} \xi \) in the sense of the degree: not merely so, as ye have done it, or would do it, in my absence; comp. de Wette, who assumes a blending of two comparisons, as does also J. B. Lightfoot. It is arbitrary not to make \( \mu \dot{o} n o v \) belong to \( \epsilon v \tau . \ \pi a r . \ \mu o n \), beside which it stands; comp. also Rom. iv. 16 (where \( \tau \dot{o} \ \epsilon k \ \tau o u \ \nu o \mu o n \) forms one idea), iv. 23; 1 Thess. i. 5. Still more arbitrary is it to hamper the flow of the whole, and to break it up in such a way as to insert the imperative \( \iota \pi \kappa o \iota \varepsilon \) after \( \iota \pi \nu \kappa o \iota \sigma \alpha t e \) and then to make \( \mu e t \alpha \ \phi \beta o \nu \kappa \tau . \lambda . \) a sentence by itself (Hofmann). Moreover, in such a case the arrangement of the words in the alleged apodosis would be illogical; \( \nu o \nu \) (or, more clearly, \( \kappa a l \ \nu o \nu \)) must have begun it, and \( \mu \dot{o} n o v \) must have stood immediately after \( \mu \eta \). — \( \tau o l l o f \ \mu \alpha l l o n \) than if I were present; for

\(^1\) The word \( \pi a r o u s i a \) does not contain, any more than in i. 26, a reference to the Parousia of Christ, which Kähler ("'ye know what this word would properly tell us") reads between the lines.
now (νῦν), when they were deprived of the personal teaching, stimulus, guidance, and guardianship of the apostle, moral diligence and zealous solicitude were necessary for them in a far higher measure, in order to fulfil the great personal duty of working out their own salvation. That εαυτῶν, therefore, cannot be equivalent to ἄλληλον (Flatt, Matthies, and older expositors), is self-evident. — μετὰ φόβου κ. τρόμου] that is, with such earnest solicitude, that ye shall have a lively fear of not doing enough in the matter. Comp. on 1 Cor. ii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 15; Eph. vi. 5. Δει γὰρ φοβεῖσθαι κ. τρέμειν ἐν τῷ ἐργάζεσθαι τὴν ἰδίαν σωτηρίαν ἐκαστόν, μὴ ποτε ἱπποκέλωθεις ἐκπέτει αἰτίας, Oecumenius. Ave before the presence of God (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius), before the future Judge (Weiss), the feeling of dependence on God (de Wette), a reverential devotion to God (Matthies, comp. van Hengel), and similar ideas, must be implied in the case, but do not constitute the sense of the expression, in which also, according to the context, we are not to seek a contrast to spiritual pride (Schinz, Rilliet, Hoelemann, Wiesinger), as Augustine, Calvin, Bengel, and others have done. — κατηγοράσθε] bring about, peragite (Grotius), "usque ad metam" (Bengel), expressing, therefore, more than the simple verb (comp. Eph. vi. 13; Dem. 1121. 19; Plat. Legg. vii. p. 791 A; Eur. Her. 1046: πόλει σωτηρίων κατηγοράσθαι; and see on Rom. i. 26). The summons itself is not at variance with the principle that salvation is God's gift of grace, and is prepared for, predestined, and certain to believers; but it justly claims the exercise of the new moral power bestowed on the regenerate man, without the exertion of which he would fall away again from the state of grace to which he had attained in faith, and would not actually become partaker of the salvation appropriated to him by faith, so that the final reception of salvation is so far the result of his moral activity of faith in the καυτήν ζωῆς. See especially Rom. vi. 8, 12 ff., and 2 Cor. vi. 1. Our passage stands in contrast, not to the certitudem salutis, but to the moral securitas, into which the converted person might relapse, if he do not stand fast (iv. 1; 1 Cor. x. 12), and labour at his sanctification (1 Thess. iv. 3, 7; 2 Cor. vii. 1; 1 Tim. ii. 15),
etc. Comp. Wuttke, *Sittenl.* II. § 266. The demand is expressed all the more earnestly, the more that the readers have conflict and suffering to endure (i. 27–30).

Ver. 13. *Ground of encouragement* to the fulfilment of this precept, in which it is not their own, but God’s *power*, which works in them, etc. Here Θεὸς is placed first as the subject, not as the predicate (Hofmann): *God* is the agent. It is, however, unnecessary and arbitrary to assume before γὰρ (with Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, and others) an unexpressed thought (“be not terrified at my having said: with fear and trembling”). Bengel gratuitously supplies with Θεὸς the thought: “praesens vobis iam absente me” (comp. also van Hengel), while others, as Calvin, Beza, Hoelemann, Rilliet, Wiesinger, who found in μετὰ φόβ. κ. τρ. the antithesis of pride (see on ver. 12), see in ver. 13 the motive to humility; and de Wette is of opinion that what was expressed in ver. 12 under the aspect of fear is here expressed under the aspect of confidence. In accordance with the unity of the sense we ought rather to say: that the great moral demand μετὰ φόβ. κ. τρ. τὸν ἐαυτῶν σωτ. κατεργάζεσθαι, containing as it did the utmost incentive to personal activity, needed for the readers the support of a confidence which should be founded not on their own, but on the divine working. According to Ewald, the μετὰ φόβον κ. τρόμον is to be made good by pointing to the fact that they *work before God*, who is even already producing in them the right tendency of will. But the idea of the ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ was so familiar to the apostle, that he would doubtless have here also directly *expressed* it. Kähler (comp. Weiss) imports a hint of the divine *punishment*, of which, however, nothing is contained in the text. So also Hofmann: with fear *in presence of Him who is a devouring fire* (Heb. xii. 28 f.), who will not leave unpunished him who does not subordinate his own will and working to the divine. As if Paul had hinted at such thoughts, and had not, on the contrary, himself excluded them by the ἱρὰ τῆς εὐδοκίας which is added! The thought is rather “* dulcisima sententia omnibus piis mentibus,*” *Form. Conc.* p. 659.—Calvin (comp. Calovius) rightly observes on the *subject-matter*: “intelligo
gratiam supernaturalem, quae provenit ex spiritu regenerationis; nam quatenus sumus homines, jam in Deo sumus et vivimus et movemur, verum hic de alio motu disputat Paulus, quam illo universali." Augustine has justly (in opposition to the Pelagian rationalizing interpretation of a mediate working: "velle operatur suadendo et praemia promittendo"), in conformity with the words, urged the efficaciter operari, which Origen, de Princ. iii. 1, had obliterated, and the Greeks who followed qualified with synergistic reservations.—ἐν ὑμῖν not intra coetum vestrum (Hoelemann), but in animis vestris (1 Cor. xii. 6; 2 Cor. iv. 12; Eph. ii. 2; Col. i. 29; 1 Thess. ii. 13), in which He produces the self-determination directed to the κατεργάζεσθαι of their own σωτηρία, and the activity in carrying out this Christian-moral volition.¹ This activity, the ἐνεργεῖν, is the inner moral one, which has the κατεργάζεσθαι as its consequence, and therefore is not to be taken as equivalent to the latter (Vulgate, Luther, and others, including Matthies and Hoelemann). Note, on the contrary, the climactic selection of the two cognate verbs. The regenerate man brings about his own salvation (κατεργάζεται) when he does not resist the divine working (ἐνεργεῖν) of the willing and the working (ἐνεργεῖν) in his soul, but yields steady obedience to it in continual conflict with the opposing powers (Eph. vi. 10 ff.; Gal. v. 16; 1 Thess. v. 8, al.); so that he περιπατεῖ, not κατὰ σάρκα, but κατὰ πνεῦμα (Rom. viii. 4), is consequently the child of God, and as child becomes hoìr (Rom. viii. 14, 17, 23). According, therefore, as the matter is viewed from the standpoint of the human activity, which yields obedience to the divine working of the θέλειν and ἐνεργεῖν, or from that of the divine activity, which works the θέλειν and ἐνεργεῖν, we may say with equal justice, either that God accomplishes the good which He has begun in man, up to the day of Christ; or, that man brings about his own salvation. "Nos ergo volumus, sed Deus in nobis operatur et velle; nos ergo operamur, sed Deus in nobis operatur et operari," Augus-

¹ "Velle quidem, quatenus est actus voluntatis, nostrum est ex creatione: bene velle etiam nostrum est, sed quatenus volentes facti per conversionem bene volumus," Calovius.
tine. How wholly is it otherwise with the unregenerate in Rom. vii. ! — The repetition by Paul of the same word, ἐνέργεια, τὸ ἐνέργεια, has its ground in the encouraging design which he has of making God’s agency felt distinctly and emphatically; hence, also, he specifies the two elements of all morality, not merely the ἐνέργεια, but also its premiss, the θέλειν, and keeps them apart by using καὶ twice: God is the worker in you, as of the willing, so of the working. From His working comes man’s working, just as already His willing. — ἐνέργεια τῆς ἐνδοκλασίας] for the sake of goodwill, in order to satisfy His own benignant disposition. On the causal ἐνέργεια, which is not secundum, comp. Rom. xv. 8; Kühner, II. 1, p. 421; Winer, p. 359 [E. T. p. 480]; and on ἐνδοκλασία, which is not, with Ewald, to be taken in a deterministic sense, comp. i. 15; Rom. x. 1. Theodoret aptly says: ἐνδοκλασία ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ προσηγόρευε τῇμα τῇθελεὶ δὲ πάντας ἀνθρώπους σωθήναι κ.τ.λ. The explanation: “for the sake of the good pleasure, which He has in such willing and working” (Weiss), would amount to something self-evident. Hofmann erroneously makes ἐνέργεια τῆς ἐνδοκλασίας belong to πάντα ποιεῖτε, and convey the sense, that they are to do everything for the sake of the divine good pleasure, about which they must necessarily be concerned, etc. In opposition to this view, which is connected with the misunderstanding of the previous words, the fact is decisive, that τῆς ἐνδοκλασίας only obtains its reference to God through its belonging to ὅ ἐνέργεια κ.τ.λ.; but if it be joined with what follows, this reference must have been marked, and that, on account of the emphasized position which ἐνέργεια τῆς ἐνδοκλασίας would have, with emphasis (as possibly by ἐνέργεια τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐνδοκλασίας).

Ver. 14. With ver. 13 Paul has closed his exhortations, so far as the matter is concerned. He now adds a requisition in respect to the mode of carrying out these admonitions, namely, that they shall do everything (which, according to the admonitions previously given, and summarily comprised in ver. 12,

1 This is God’s creative moral action in salvation, Eph. ii. 10. Comp. Thomasius, Chr. Pers. u. Werk, I. p. 287. Incorrectly, however, the Reformed theologians add: “quae prohiberi non potest.”

2 Hofmann groundlessly compares Luke ii. 14 (but see on that passage) and even Ecclus. xv. 15, where Fritzsche, Handb. p. 74 f., gives the right view.
they have to do, 1 Cor. x. 31) willingly and without hesitation,—an injunction for which, amidst the temptations of the present (i. 27–30), there was sufficient cause. — χωρίς γογγυσμόν. without (far removed from) murmuring. The γογγυσμός (Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 358), that fault already prevalent in ancient Israel (Ex. xvi. 7 ff.; Num. xiv. 2), is to be conceived as directed against God, namely, on account of what He imposed upon them both to do and to suffer, as follows from the context in vv. 13 and 15; hence it is not to be referred to their fellow-Christians (Calvin, Wiesinger, Schneckenburger), or to their superiors (Estius), as Hoelemann also thinks. Comp. on 1 Cor. x. 10.— διαλογισμοί not: without disputes (Erasmus, Beza, and many others, including Schneckenburger), de imperatiscum imperatoribus (Hoelemann, comp. Estius), or among themselves (Calvin, Wiesinger), and that upon irrelevant questions (Grotius), and similar interpretations, which, although not repugnant to Greek usage generally (Plut. Mor. p. 180 C; Ecclus. ix. 15, xiii. 35), are at variance with that of the N. T. (even 1 Tim. ii. 8), and unsuitable to the reference of γογγυσμόν to God. It means: without hesitation, without your first entering upon scrupulous considerations as to whether you are under any obligation thereto, whether it is not too difficult, whether it is prudent, and the like. Comp. Luke xxiv. 38, and on Rom. xiv. 1; Plat. Aæ. p. 367 A: φροντίδες. . . καὶ διαλογισμοί, Tim. p. 59 C: οὐδὲν πιστὰν ήτις διαλογισθείσαι. Ecclus. xl. 2. The Vulgate renders it rightly, according to the essential sense: “haesitationibus.” The γογγυσμόλ would presuppose aversion towards God; the διαλογισμοί, uncertainty in the consciousness of duty.

Ver. 15. If to their obedience of the admonitions given down to ver. 13 there is added the manner of obedience prescribed in ver. 14, they shall be blameless, etc. This, therefore, must be the high aim, which they are to have in view in connection with what is required in ver. 14.— ἀμεμπτοὶ κ. ἄθραμοι] blameless and sincere; the former represents moral integrity as manifesting itself to the judgment of others; the latter represents the same as respects its inner nature (comp. on Matt. x. 16 and Rom. xvi. 19). — τέκνα Θεοῦ ἁμώμ.] com-
prehending exegetically the two former predicates. *Children of God* (in virtue of the *viōbecola* that took place in Christ, Rom. viii. 15, 23; Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5) they are (Rom. viii. 16, ix. 3). They are to become such children of God, as have nothing with which fault can be found; which in children of God presupposes the inward moral ἀκεραιότης, since they are led by the Spirit of God (Rom. viii. 14). This ethical view of the *viōbecola*, prominent throughout the N. T., and already implied in the mode of contemplating Israel as the people of adoption (Rom. ix. 4) in the O. T. and Apocrypha, necessarily involves, in virtue of the ideal character of the relation, the moral development towards the lofty aim—implies, therefore, in the *being* the constant task of the becoming; and hence the sense of *showing themselves* is as little to be given, with Hofmann, to the γένοςθε here as in Matt. x. 16, John xv. 8, et al.; comp. also on Gal. iv. 12. Ἀμώμητος, qui vituperari non potest, occurring elsewhere in the N. T. only at 2 Pet. iii. 14 (not equivalent to ἄμωμος or ἄμεμπτος), but see Hom. II. xii. 109; Herod. iii. 82; frequently in the Anthol. Its opposite is: τέκνα μόμητα, Deut. xxxii. 5; the recollection of this latter passage has suggested the subsequent words, which serve as a recommendation of the condition to be striven for by contrasting it with the state of things around. — μέσων (see the critical remarks) is adverbial, in the midst of (Hom. II. xii. 167; Od. xiv. 300; Eur. Rhes. 531 (μέσα); LXX. Num. xxxv. 5). — σκολιάς κ. διεστραμμ. [crooked and perverted] a graphic figurative representation of the great moral abnormality of the generation. Comp. on σκολιός, Acts ii. 40; 1 Pet. ii. 18; Prov. iv. 24; Wisd. i. 3; Plat. Legg. xii. p. 945 B, Gorg. p. 525 A; and on διεστραμμ., Matt. xvii. 17; Deut. xxxii. 20; Polyb. viii. 24. 3, v. 41. 1, ii. 21. 8; also Διάστροφος, Soph. Aj. 442. — ἐν οἷς i.e. among the people of this γένεα; see Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 242 [E. T. p. 282]; Bremi, ad Isocr. I. p. 213 f.; Kühner, II. 1, p. 49 f.— φαίνεσθε] not imperative (Cyprian, Pelagius, Ambrosiaster, Theophylact, Erasmus, Vatablus, Calvin, Grotius, and others, including Storr, Flatt, Rheinwald, Baumgarten-Crusius), but the existing relation, which constitutes the essential distinctive character of the Christian state as con-
trasted with the non-Christian, Eph. v. 8, al. The aim of the ἐν οἷς φαίνεσθε κ.τ.λ. is, by means of an appeal to the true Christian sense of honour (the consciousness of their high Christian position towards them that are without), to assist the attainment of the end in view; this is misunderstood by Bengel, when he suggests the addition of "servata hac admonitione," a view in which he is followed by Hofmann. The meaning is not luccis (so usually), but (comp. also Weiss, Schenkel, and J. B. Lightfoot): ye appear, come into view, apparatus (Matt. ii. 7, xxiv. 27; Jas. iv. 14; Rev. xviii. 23; Hom. Π. i. 477, xxiv. 785, 788, Od. ii. 1, Π. ix. 707; Hes. Oper. 600; Plat. Rep. p. 517 B; Xen. Hell. iv. 3, 10; Polyb. ix. 15. 7; Lucian, D. D. iv. 3; also Xen. Symp. i. 9, Anab. vii. 4. 16; hence τὰ φωνάμενα, the heavenly appearances). Luccis (Vulgate) would be φαίνεται, John i. 5, v. 35; 1 John ii. 8; 2 Pet. i. 19; Rev. i. 16, xxi. 23; 1 Macc. iv. 40; Plat. Tim. p. 39 B; Arist. Nub. 586; Hes. Oper. 528; Theoc. ii. 11. — φωστήρες] light-givers (Rev. xxi. 11), here a designation, not of torches (Besa, Cornelius a Lapide) or lamps (Hofmann), which would be too weak for ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, and without support of linguistic usage; but, in accordance with the usage familiar to the apostle in the LXX., Gen. i. 14, 16, of the shining heavenly bodies; Wisd. xiii. 2; Ecclus. xliii. 7; Heliod. 87; Anthol. xv. 17; Constant. Rhod. ep. in Paralip. 205. — ἐν κόσμῳ] is to be taken in reference to the physical world, and closely connected with φως. As light-bearers in the world (which shine in the world, by day the sun, by night the moon and stars), the Christians appear in the midst of a perverted generation. Comp. Matt. v. 14; also classical expressions like πάτρας φέργεα (Anthol. vi. 614, 2), etc. If φαίνεσθε be rightly interpreted, ἐν κόσμῳ cannot be joined with it (de Wette, Weiss, who takes κόσμῳ in the ethical sense), or be supplemented by φαίνονται (Hoelemann,

1 So also Homer, II. i. 200, which Hofmann compares and brings out for our passage the sense: "stand in the light proper to them." Comp., however, II. xix. 16, xxii. 28, and I. c.; Duncan, Lex. ed. Rost. p. 1148 f. In the former passage, i. 200, the sense is: her eyes (Athene's) appeared terrible. Comp. Nägelsbach, p. 87, ed. 3. The same sense, according to another explanation, is found in Faesi.
Rilliet, van Hengel). It is erroneous, further, to make ἐν κόσμῳ mean in heaven (Clericus, Rheinwald¹), and also erroneous to attach a pregnant force to ἐν, making it mean "within the world," in contrast to the lights of heaven shining from above; thus Hofmann, connecting it with λόγος ζωῆς ἐπέχω, and bringing out with emphasis something quite self-evident. On κόσμος without the article, see Winer, p. 117 [E. T. p. 153].


Paul, however, has put φωστήρες without the article, because he has conceived it qualitatively.

Ver. 16. Λόγον ζωῆς ἐπέχωνες] a definition giving the reason for φαίνεσθε ὡς φωστ. ἐν κ.: since ye possess the word of life. This is the Gospel, ἐπειδὴ τὴν αἰωνίον προβέβηκεν ζωὴν, Theodoret. See Rom. i. 16; comp. John vi. 68; Acts v. 20; it is the divinely efficacious vehicle of the πνεύμα τῆς ζωῆς which frees from sin and death (see on Rom. viii. 2), and therefore not merely "the word concerning life" (Weiss). Christ Himself is the essential λόγος τῆς ζωῆς (1 John i. 1). His servants are ὴσμη ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν (2 Cor. ii. 16), therefore the word preached by them must be λόγος ζωῆς in the sense indicated. Paul does not elsewhere use the expression. As to ζωὴ without the article, of eternal life in the Messiah's kingdom (iv. 3), see Kaever, de ζωῆς al. not. p. 73 f. As possessors of this word, the Christians appear like φωστήρες in a world otherwise dark; without this possession they would not so present themselves, but would be homogeneous with the perverted generation, since the essence of the gospel is light (Eph. v. 8; Col. i. 12; 1 Thess. v. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 9; Luke xvi. 8; Acts xxvi. 18, al.), just as Christ Himself is the principal light (John i. 4, 5, iii. 19, viii. 12, xii. 35, al.); but the element of the unbelieving ἄνεω, whose image is the κόσμος in itself devoid of light, is darkness (2 Cor. iv. 6, vi. 14; Eph. v. 8, vi. 12; Col. i. 13; John i. 5, iii. 19).

¹ The designation of the heavens by αἰῶνας, first used by Pythagoras (see Bremi, ad loc. Paneg. p. 90), did not enter into the Biblical usus logendi.
² Hofmann erroneously pronounces against this, representing that ἔπεχον could
to have in possession, at disposal, and the like; see Herod. i. 104, viii. 35; Xen. Symp. viii. 1; Thuc. i. 48. 2, ii. 101. 3; Anth. Pal. vii. 297. 4; Polyb. iii. 37. 6, 112. 8, v. 5, 6; Lucian, Necym. 14. Not: holding fast (Luther, Estius, Bengel, and others, including Heinrichs, Hoelemann, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald, Schneckenburger); nor yet: sustinentes (Calvin), so that the conception is of a light fixed on a candlestick. Others understand it similarly: holding forth (Beza, Grotius, and others, including Rheinwald, Matthies, Wiesinger, Lightfoot), namely, "that those, who have a longing for life, may let it be the light which shall guide them to life," as Hofmann explains more particularly; comp. van Hengel. This would be linguistically correct (Hom. ii. ix. 489, xxii. 43; Plut. Mor. p. 265 A; Pind. Ol. ii. 98; Poll. iii. 10), but not in harmony with the image, according to which the subjects themselves appear as shining, as self-shining. Linguistically incorrect is Theodoret's view: τῷ λόγῳ προσέχουσας (attendentes), which would require the dative of the object (Acts iii. 5; 1 Tim. iv. 16; Ecclus. xxxi. 2; 2 Macc. ix. 25; Job xxx. 26; Polyb. iii. 43. 2, xviii. 28. 11). Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact take ἐπέχει correctly, but understand λόγον ζωῆς as equivalent to στέρμα ζ., or ἐνέχυρα ζ., and indicate, as the purpose of the words: οὕτω εἰδέως τίθησι τὰ ἐπαθήματα (Chrysostom). This view is without sanction from the usus loquendi. Linguistically it would in itself be admissible (see the examples in Wetstein), but at variance with the N. T. mode of expression and conception, to explain with Michaelis, Storr, Zachariae, and Flatt: supplying the place of life (in the world otherwise dead), so that λόγον ἐπέχει would mean: to hold the relation. Comp. Syr. — εἰς καύχημα κ.τ.λ. — the result which the γνώσθαι ἀμέμπτως κ.τ.λ. on the part of the readers was to have for the apostle; it was to become for him (and what an incitement this must have been to the Philippians!) a matter of glorying (i. 26) for the day of Christ (see on i. 10), when he should have reason to glory, that he, namely (ὅτι), had not laboured in only be thus used in the sense of having under one's control. Compare, in opposition to this, especially such passages as Thuc. iii. 107. 4, where the word is quite synonymous with the parallel simple ἐκχωρ.; also Anth. Pal. vii. 276. 6.
vain, of which the excellent quality of his Philippian converts would afford practical evidence, ὃτι τοιούτος ὑμᾶς ἐπαιδεύσα, Theophylact. Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 19 f.; 2 Cor. i. 14. Thus they were to be to him on that day αἱ στέφανοι κακήσσεσοι (1 Thess. i.a). Paul cannot mean a present κακήσσεσαι in prospect of the day of Christ (Hofmann), for εἰς κακήσσα κ.τ.λ. cannot be the result accruing for him from the ἐν εἰς φαίνεσθε κ.τ.λ. (since by it the position of the Christians generally is expressed), but only the result from the ethical development indicated by ἵνα γένητο ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ. Hence also ὅτι cannot be a statement of the reason (Hofmann); it is explicative: that. — The twofold yet climactic, figurative description of his apostolical exertions (on ἐδραμαμ, comp. Gal. ii. 2; Acts xx. 24; on ἐκοπλάσσα, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 10; Gal. iv. 11), as well as the repetition of εἰς κενῶν (see on Gal. ii. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 1; Polyc. Phil. 9), is in keeping with the emotion of joy, of triumph.

Ver. 17. The connection of ideas is this: What Paul had said in ver. 16: εἰς κακήσσα κ.τ.λ., presupposed, in the first place, that he himself would live to see the further development described in ver. 15: ἵνα γένητο ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ. Now, however, he puts the opposite case, so as to elevate his readers to the right point of view for this also, and says: "But even if I should be put to death in my vocation dedicated to your faith," etc. Van Hengel finds in these words the contrast to the hope of living to see the Parousia. But this hope is not expressed in what precedes, since the result εἰς κακήσσα κ.τ.λ. was conditioned, not by the apostle's living to see the Parousia, but only by his living to see the described perfection of his readers; inasmuch as, even when arisen at the Parousia, he might glory in what he had lived to see in the Philippians. Many others are satisfied with making these words express merely a climax (in relation to ἐκοπλάσσα) (see especially Heinrichs and Matthies); but this is erroneous, because ἐκοπλάσσα in the preceding verse is neither the main idea, nor specially indicative of tribulation. Arbitrary and entirely unnecessary is, further, the assumption of an opponent's objection ("at vero imminent tristissima!") to which Paul replies;

1 Comp. Anthol. Pal. xi. 56. 2: μὴ ἐχίνε, μὴ κακεῖα.
or the explanation of ἄλλα by the intervening thought: "non, ie n'ai pas travaillé en vain, mais au contraire," etc., Rilliet; comp. also Erasmus, Paraphr. In a similar but direct way Hofmann gains for ἄλλα the explanation, but on the contrary, by connecting it antithetically with the preceding negative clauses ὅτι οὐκ εἰς κενὸν κ.τ.λ., which, with the right explanation of the following words, is impossible. According to de Wette (comp. also Storr and Flatt), ver. 17 connects itself with i. 26, so that ἄλλα forms a contrast to ver. 25, and all that intervenes is a digression. But how could any reader guess at this? The suggestion is the more groundless, on account of the χαίρω in ver. 17 corresponding so naturally and appositely with the καίξημα in ver. 16. — εἰ καί κ.τ.λ.] if I even (which I will by no means call in question) should be poured out, etc. On the concessive sense of εἰ καί (1 Cor. iv. 7; 2 Cor. iv 3, 16, v. 16, vii. 8, al.), see Herm. ad Viger. p. 832; Klotz, ad Devar. p. 519. The case supposed is thus rendered more probable than by the reading of E G, καί εἰ (even assuming that I). Stallbaum, ad Plat. Ap. S. p. 32 A; Gorg. p. 509 A; Schmalf. Syntax d. Verb. sec. 99 f. The protasis beginning with ἄλλα εἰ καί extends to τ. πίστ. ὑμῶν. As in ver. 12, so also here Hofmann makes the violent assumption that the apodosis already begins at ἐπὶ τ. θυσία κ.τ.λ. with σπένδομαι again to be supplied, whilst at the same time there is imputed to this ἐπὶ τ. θυσία κ.τ.λ., in order to give an appropriate turn to the assumed antithesis for ἄλλα, a tenor of thought which the words do not bear; see below. — σπένδομαι] I become offered as a libation, poured out as a drink-offering (2 Tim. iv. 6, frequently in all classical writers; see also Schlesmer, Thes. V. p. 79; Suicer, Thes. II. p. 993). The sense stripped of figure is: if even my blood is shed, if even I should be put to death. Paul represents his apostolic exertions for the faith of the Philippians as an offering (comp. Rom. xv. 16); if he is therein put to death, he is, by means of the shedding of his

1 This (since the time of Chrysostom) unanimous interpretation of the figurative expression has been abandoned by Otto, Pastor albor. p. 214 f., who explains it as referring, not to the shedding of blood, but to the severance of the apostle's life in his vocation from intercourse with the world by his imprisonment. An abortive suggestion, the forced result of incorrect assumptions.
blood in this sacrifice, made a libation, just as among the Jews (Num. xxviii. 7, xv. 4 ff.; Joseph. Antt. iii. 9. 4; see generally, Ewald, Alterth. p. 46 f.; Saalschütz, M. R. p. 314 f.) in the sacrifices, together with meat-offerings, libations of wine were made, which were poured upon the ground from sacred vessels (σπονδεία) at the altar. As to the Hellenic sacrificial libations, see Hermann, Gottesd. Alterth. § 25, 15 f. On the figurative representation of the shedding of blood as a σπονδή, comp. Anthol. ix. 184. 6: ἔξος αὐτὰ τυράννων ἐσπέδευεν, Ignatius, Rom. 2; σπονδεῖσθαι θεῷ ὡς ἐτι θυσιαστήριον ἐτοιμὰν ἔστι. —The present tense is used, because Paul has strongly in view his present danger (i. 20 ff.); Kühner, II. 1, p. 119 f. Rilliet (comp. Wetstein) takes the passive erroneously: I am besprinkled (which also does not correspond with the present tense), making Paul say, "que la libation préparatoire du sacrifice a coulé sur sa tête." Confusion with κατασπένδεσθαι, Plut. Alex. 50, de def. orac. 46; Strabo, iv. p. 197; Eur. Or. 1239; Antip. Sid. 73 (Anthol. vii. 27). —ἐτι τ. θυσ. κ. λειτ. τ. τ. ἕμ.] at the sacrifice and priestly service of your faith, that is, whilst I present your faith as a sacrifice and perform priestly service in respect to it; the sense of this, stripped of the figure, is: whilst I, by furtherance of your faith in Christ, serve God, as by the offering and priestly ministration of a sacrifice. τῆς πιστ. is the object which is conceived as sacrificed and undergoing priestly ministration; θυσία and λειτουργία have one article in common, and are thereby joined so as to form one conception. But λειτουργία (priestly function, comp. Luke i. 23; Heb. viii. 5, ix. 21, and frequently in the LXX.; see Schleusner, Thes.; comp. also Diod. Sic. i. 21, and, for the figurative use of the word, Rom. xv. 16, 27) is added by the apostle as a more precise definition, because the mere θυσία would leave it uncertain whether he was to be considered as a priest, whereas Paul desires expressly to describe himself as such. θυσία, as always in the N. T., is sacrifice, so that the idea is: at the sacrifice and priestly service of your faith; hence there is no necessity for taking it as sacrificing, or the act of sacrifice (Herod. iv. 60, viii. 99; Herodian, viii. 3. 5, i. 36. 12, al.). The ἐνθ, however, is simply to be taken as at, as in i. 3 and
frequently; not as to, in addition to (Beza, Raphael, Matthies, de Wette, Weiss, and many others; comp. also Hofmann), or with the Vulgate as supra (Heinrichs, Hoelemann, van Hengel), in the sense of the (heathen) mode of the libation, an interpretation which should have been precluded by the addition of the abstract κ. λειτουργ. Finally, although Paul's official activity concerned the faith of all his churches, he says ἵματον with the same right of individualizing reference as in δὲ ἵματον at i. 24 and many other passages. The passage is peculiarly misunderstood by Hofmann, who holds that ἐνι has the sense in association with; that τῆς πίστεως ἵματον is the genitive of opposition to θυσία and λειτουργ. That the sacrificing and ministering subject is not the apostle, but the Philippian church, which, when it became believing, had presented its own sacrifice to God, and has been constantly honouring Him with its own work of service. Accordingly Paul says that, even though his labours should end in a violent death, yet the shedding of his blood would not be an isolated drink-offering, but would associate itself with their sacrifice. But this would only make him say, with artificial mysteriousness, something which is perfectly self-evident (namely: after that ye became believers, and whilst ye are believers). Moreover, ἐνι would thus be made to express two very different relations, namely, with τῇ θυσίᾳ after, after that, and with the λειτουργ. at, during. And how could a reader discover from the mere ἐνι k.t.l. the alleged antithetical reference of an isolated drink-offering, especially as no antithesis of the persons is even indicated by ἵματον being placed first (immediately after ἐνι)? The entire explanation is a forced artificial expedient in consequence of the mistaken assumption that an apodosis begins after σπένδομαι, and a new section sets in with χαιρε.\(^1\) —

\(^1\) On this mode of libation rests the expression ἰναιστίαιν, to pour a libation over something (Herod. ii. 39, iv. 60. 62, vii. 167; Aesch. Ag. 1395; Plut. Rom. 4).

\(^2\) In which χαιρε καὶ εὐχαίρετο σῶσαι ἵματον are supposed to serve merely as an introduction for the exhortation which follows; thus Paul would be made to say, that even for that supposed case of the εὐδιστεία, he is in a joyful mood, and he rejoices with any person in the church whose heart is joyful (all this is supposed to be implied in σώσαι ἵματον).
χαίρω] Apodosis down to ἧμιν: I rejoice, not at the θυσία κ. λειτουργία τῆς πιστ. ὕμ. (Chrysostom, who connects ἐπὶ τ. θυσ. κ.τ.λ. with χαίρω; comp. Occumenius; so also Rilliet), for it is mere arbitrariness to separate the sacrificial expressions σπένθομαι and ἐπὶ τ. θυσία κ.τ.λ. and attach them to different parts of the sentence, and because χαίρω, as the point of the apodosis, would have been placed before ἐπὶ τ. θυσ. κ.τ.λ.; but at the σπένθομαι: I rejoice to be employed for so sacred a destination. Theophylact appropriately remarks: οἷς ὡς ὁ ἀπεθανόμενος λυποῦμαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαίρω... δτὶ σπονδὴ γίνομαι, and Theodoret: ταῦτα δὲ λέγει ψυχαγωγῶν αὐτοῦ κ. διδάσκαλος τοῦ μαρτυρίων τὸ μέγεθος. Comp. Grotius, Heinrichs. The ground of the apostle's joy, assumed by many (including Flatt, Hoelemann, Matthiœ, de Wette): because my death will tend to the advantage of the gospel (i. 20), and also the interpretation of Weiss: that joy at the progress of the Philippians towards perfection is intended, are both quite gratuitously imported into the passage. The explanation of it as referring generally to inward joyfulness of faith (Wiesinger) or divine serenity (Ewald), does not correspond with the protasis, according to which it must be joyfulness in the prospect of death. “Even if I am compelled to die in this sacrificial service, I rejoice therein,” and that, indeed, now for the case supposed; hence not future.—καὶ συνχ. πάσιν ὧμιν] is wrongly explained by most commentators: “and I rejoice with you all” (so Chrysostom, Theophylact, Luther, Calvin, Heinrichs, Matthiœ, van Hengel, Rilliet, de Wette, Wiesinger, Ewald, Schneckenburger, Weiss, Hofmann, and many others); along with which explanation Chrysostom, Theophylact, and various of the older expositors, bring forward another ground for this joint joy than for the χαίρω (Chrysostom: χαίρω μὲν, ὡς σπονδῆ γίνομαι; σὺν-χαίρω δὲ, ὡς θυσίαν προσενεγκών; comp. Schneckenburger). Decisive against this interpretation is the χαίρετε which follows in ver. 18,—a summons which would be absurd, if συνχ. ὧμ. meant: “I rejoice with you.” The Vulgate already rightly renders: congratulor (comp. Jerome, Beza, Castalio, Grotius, Storr, Flatt, Rheinwald, Hoelemann, Bisping, Ellicott, Lightfoot), I congratulate you all, namely, on the fact that I am
poured out in the service of your faith. Such a martyrdom, namely, for the sake of their faith, how it must have elevated and honoured the readers, their whole church; for such a martyr death concerned them all! Comp. on Eph. iii. 13; it rebounds to their glory, if the apostle sheds his blood on account of their Christian standing established by him. It is in this light that Paul wishes his σπένδεσθαι, should it occur, to be regarded by his readers, and therefore gracefully and ingeniously represents it (though Hofmann holds this to be impossible) as something on which he must congratulate them all. Pauline linguistic usage is not to be urged in objection to this view (Weisse), as Paul employs συγχαίρω elsewhere only in the passages 1 Cor. xii. 26, xiii. 6, and these are balanced by vv. 17 and 18 here. Van Hengel and de Wette have erroneously objected that it would have been συγχαίρομαι (3 Macc. i. 8). The active as well as the middle may convey either meaning, to rejoice along with, or gratulari (Polyb. xxix. 7. 4, xxx. 10. 1; Plut. Mor. p. 231 B; 3 Macc. i. 8). See Valckenaer, Schol. I. p. 54.

Ver. 18. And upon the same (upon my possibly occurring σπένδεσθαι ἐπὶ τ. θυσ. κ.τ.λ., ver. 17) rejoice ye also (because it takes place for the sake of your faith), and congratulate me thereon (on such a sacred destination). The verbs are imperatives. "Postulat enim Paulus parem συμπάθειαν a Philipp.," Beza. The ground of the χαίρετε may not be arbitrarily introduced (Hoffmann: whatever untowardness may occur), but must by logical necessity be the same which, in ver. 17, suggested the συγχαίρω ὑμῖν; and that of the συγχαίρετε μοι must be the same as caused Paul to say χαίρω in ver. 17.¹ The expositors, who do not take συγχαίρεω as gratulari, are here placed in the awkward position of making the apostle summon his readers to a joy which, according to ver. 17, they would already possess. By this impossibility

¹ The difficulty which van Hengel (comp. Hofmann) urges, that the readers "vix aut ne vix quidem induci potuerunt de hujus viri morte violenta gudientes vel gaviari," entirely mistakes the lofty standpoint of the apostle, who looks death in the face with a holy joy (comp. the frequent corresponding sentiments in the epistles of Ignatius), and also attributes to his readers a corresponding mode of looking at the possibility of his death.
CHAP. II. 19.

Weiss, in spite of the τὸ αὐτὸ, allows himself to be driven into taking the joy in ver. 18, not as in ver. 17, but (comp. also Hofmann) quite generally, of a joyful frame of mind. — τὸ αὐτὸ [in the same (on the accusative, comp. Matt. ii. 10) rejoice ye also; see also on i. 25. Hence it is not to be taken as equivalent to ὁσιὰνως (Beza, Storr, Flatt, Heinrichs, Rheinwald, Rilliet, de Wette, Wiesinger, Weiss, Hofmann) (comp. on i. 6), in order thereby to avoid identifying it with the joy mentioned in ver. 17. As to χαλκεῖν with the accusative in classical authors, see generally Lobeck, ad Aj. 131; Kühner, II. 1, p. 255 f.

Ver. 19. The apostle now, down to ver. 24, speaks of sending Timothy¹ to them, and states that he himself trusted to visit them shortly. — διὰ τινῶν δὲ κ.τ.λ.] The progress of thought attaching itself to ver. 17 (not to ver. 12) is: However threatening, according to ver. 17 f., and dangerous to life my situation is, nevertheless I hope soon to send Timothy to you, etc. He hopes, therefore, for such a change in his situation, as would enable him soon to spare that most faithful friend for such a mission. Here also, as in i. 21–26, there is an immediate change from a presentiment of death to a confidence of his being preserved in life and even liberated (ver. 24). The right view of vv. 17, 18 debars us from construing the progress of the thought thus: for the enhancement of my joy, however, etc. (Weiss). Others take different views, as e.g. Bengel: although I can write nothing definite regarding the issue of my case,—an imported parenthetical thought, which is as little suggested in ver. 17 f. as is the antithetical relation to χαλκεῖν κ. συγχαλπ. μου discovered by Hofmann, viz. that the apostle is anxious as to whether all is well in the church. — ἐν κυρίῳ] making the hope causally rest in Christ. Comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 19. — ἰμαῖν] not equivalent to the local πρὸς ἰμᾶς (van Hengel), nor yet the dative commodi ("vestros in usus,

¹ Hofmann's hypothesis, that the church had expressed a desire that the apostle would send them one who should aid them, with word and deed, in their affairs, has no hint of it given at all in the text; least of all in ἵσανον ἵσε, υἱὸς κ.τ.λ. Why should Paul not have mentioned, in some way or another, the wish of the church? — Baur and Hinsch find no motive mentioned for the mission of Timothy. As if the motive of love conveyed by ἵσανον κ.τ.λ. were not enough!
vestra in gaudia," Hoelemann, comp. de Wette and Hofmann), whereby too special a sense is introduced; but the dative of reference (1 Cor. iv. 17; Acts xi. 29), indicating the persons concerned as those for whom the mission generally is intended. — ἐκάψι] I also, as ye through the accounts¹ to be received of me, namely, those which ye shall receive through this epistle, through Epaphroditus, and through Timothy. — εὐφυσεῖς] to be of good courage, occurs here only in the N. T. See Poll. iii. 135; Joseph. Antt. xi. 6. 9. Comp the εὐφυσεῖς in epitaphs (like χαῖρε) in Jacobs, ad Anthol. xii. p. 304. — τὰ πεπλήρωμα] the things concerning you, quite generally, your circumstances. Eph. vi. 22; Col. iv. 8. See Heindorf, ad Plat. Phaed. p. 58 A.

Ver. 20. Reason why Timothy is the person sent. Hofmann erroneously takes it as: the reason why he sends no one at the time. As if νῦν γὰρ or ἄρτι γὰρ οὐκέναια κ.τ.λ. were written. — ἰσόφυσει] like-minded, namely, with me; in what respect, is stated in the sequel. Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Rilliet, Weiss, J. B. Lightfoot, wrongly interpret it: no one who would be so minded as he (Rheinwald combines the two references). As αὐτῷ is not added, the text gives no other reference for ἵσος (in ἰσόφυσει) than to the subject of ἐξω (see also ver. 22); as, indeed, Paul could not give a better reason for the choice of Timothy, and could not more effectively recommend him to his readers, than by setting forth his like-mindedness with himself; comp. Deut. xiii. 6: φιλος ἵσος τῇ ψυχῇ μου. The word occurs only here in the N. T.; see LXX. Ps. lv. 14; Aesch. Agam. 1470. Comp. on the subject-matter, 1 Cor. xvi. 10. — δοτίκεισί κ.τ.λ.] the emphasis is laid on ἐγνωσίως, and δοτὶς, quippe qui, ita comparatum ut, introduces the character of an ἰσόφυσος, such as is not at his disposal. —

¹ There is a delicate compliment implied in this αὐτῷ; for Timothy was to come back again to the apostle (but not Epaphroditus, ver. 25), and thus he hopes to receive the desired news about them which shall make him be of good courage. Hofmann introduces the comparative sense: frearker courage, under the assumption which he reads between the lines, that the apostle is concerned about various things in the church, which Timothy would succeed in settling and arranging. Paul's cordial, loving interest in the welfare of the Philippians is quite sufficient to explain the εὐφυσί.
γνωσιν, in genuine, sincere fashion, with one care without guile (Dem. 1482, 14; Polyb. iv. 30. 2; 2 Macc. xiv. 8), the selfish contrast to which is described in ver. 21. Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 8.—μεριμνήσει] namely, when I shall have sent him. The caring is not to be more precisely defined; it necessarily manifested itself according to the circumstances in watching, correction, encouragement, counsel, and action. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 28.

Ver. 21. Οι πάντες] all (except Timothy), of those whom I now have with me and at my disposal for sending; see ver. 20. We have the less warrant to modify this judgment in any way, expressed, as it is, so very clearly and decidedly by the absolute antithesis τὰ ἐαυτῶν ἄριστον, ou τὰ 'I. X., seeing that we are unacquainted with the circle surrounding the apostle at that particular time, and do not know to what extent the anti-Pauline tendency, i. 15, 17, had then spread in the immediate neighbourhood of the apostle. The only limitation of the general expression, which is in accordance with the text, lies in the fact that Paul does not mean the Christians generally in Rome, but such assistant teachers as would otherwise, if they had been pure and honest, have been qualified for such a mission. The trustworthy ones among these otherwise qualified fellow-labourers must have been absent at the time, especially Luke, who could by no means have been included among οἱ πάντες (in opposition to Wieseler, Chronol. d. apost. Zeitalt. p. 427); hence the Philippians are not saluted specially either by Luke or by any other, and the omission of such salutations by name at the end of this epistle receives in part its explanation from this passage. Consequently, οἱ πάντες cannot be understood as many or the most (Beza, Wolf, Hammond, Drusius, Estius, Grotius, Cornelius a Lapide, and others, including Heinrichs, Rheinwald, Flatt); nor is it: "all, whom I can spare" (Erasmus), or: "who are known to you" (van Hengel). Neither is the negation to be taken relatively: they seek more their own interest, etc. (Erasmus, Calvin, and many others, also Flatt, Hoelemann, comp. the reservations of Weise), to which Hofmann's view also ult-
mately comes; nor is it to be explained by assuming an intention of distinguishing Timothy (Matthies); nor yet is the judgment to be restricted, with Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, to the hardships of the long journey, to which they preferred their own repose. Bengel rightly defends the full seriousness of the utterance, and adds: "subtilissima erat αἰσθήσις, qua hoc percepit Paulus." But Baur erroneously discovers here merely an exaggeration, which arose from the subjectivity of a later author. What an uncalled-for fiction that would have been!

Ver. 22. Contrast, not of the person (which would have run τὴν δὲ αὐτοῦ δοκ. or αὐτοῦ δὲ τὴν δοκ.), but of the qualification, in order further to recommend him, whom he hopes soon to be able to send; not to make up for the disadvantage, that they can in the first instance *only* hope, etc. (as Hofmann artificially explains). *But the approved character* (indoles spectata, comp. Rom. v. 4; 2 Cor. ii. 9, ix. 13) of *him* ye *know*; for Timothy had himself been in Philippi (Acts xvi. 1, 3, xvii. 14); hence γινώσκει is not the imperative (Vulgate, Pelagius, Castalio, Cornelius a Lapide, Clericus, Rheinwald, Hoelemann). — ὅτι κ.τ.λ.] that *he, namely*, etc. — ὃς παρῇ τέκνον] Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 17. The apostle had here ἐδοκεῖσθαι before his mind, but *alters* the conception in such a way, that he thinks upon the service as rendered no longer to *him*, but with *him*, in a humble glance at Christ (ver. 21), whom he himself also serves, so that the apostle's servant is at the same time his σύνδοουλος. See Winer, pp. 393, 537 [E. T. pp. 525, 722]. Hofmann labours without success to remove the incongruity, which cannot be got rid of unless, with Vatablus, we were at liberty to supply σύν before παρῇ. But, however frequently the Greeks put the preposition only once in comparisons (see Bernhardy, p. 204 f.; Kühner, II. 1, p. 479), its omission does not occur in the clause placed *first*. The poetical use of such an omission in the case of words which are connected by their activity, even though it be consecrated to the kingdom of God (!), by special personal aims, instead of devoting themselves *always only* (! οὐ ἐκ τ. X.) to that which is **most advantageous for the cause of Christ** (οὐ ἐκ τ. X.). Thus there is import into the passage what is not at all to be found in it.
kai, τέ, or ἢ (Dissen, ad Pind. Nem. x. 38; Lobeck, ad Aj. 397 ff.) does not concern us here. — εἰς in respect to the gospel (comp. i. 5), the serving in question having reference to the preaching, defence, etc., thereof.

Ver. 23. Ὑπὸ σὺν] σὺν resumes ver. 19, and to the μεν corresponds the ἤ in ver. 24. — ὡς ἄν ἀπίστω κ.τ.λ.] when (of the time, see Klotz, ad Devar. p. 759, that is, as soon as, comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 34; Rom. xvi. 24) I anyhow (by ἄν the matter is left to experience) shall have seen to the end (Jonah iv. 5). The latter, which expresses the perceiving from a distance (Herod. viii. 37; Dem. 1472. 15; Lucian, D. D. vi. 2), denotes the knowledge of the final course of matters to be expected,—only after which could it be decided whether or not he could spare the faithful Timothy for a time. The form ἀπίστω (Lachmann and Tischendorf) in A B* D* F G Ξ is, on account of this weighty evidence, to be considered not as a copyist's error, but as the original, and to be derived from the pronunciation of ἰδεῖν (with the digamma). Comp. on Acts iv. 29, and see Winer, p. 44 [E. T. p. 48]; J. B. Lightfoot ad loc.; Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 7 [E. T. p. 7]. — τὰ περὶ ἐμαύτων] the things about me, that is, the state of my affairs. Substantially not different from τὰ περὶ ἐμαύτων (ver. 19 f.). See Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 1. 20; Winer, p. 379 [E. T. p. 506].

Ver. 24. Καλὰ αὐτῶς] also myself personally. What Paul shall see, therefore, is, as he confidently trusts (not merely hopes), his liberation (comp. i. 25 f.); that it will make it possible for him to come soon. The terminus a quo of the ῥαξέωσις is, as in ver. 19, the then present time, although the sending of Timothy and his return (ver. 19) are to precede his own coming. The ῥαξέωσις as a relative definition of the time is not opposed to this view. But that καλὰ αὐτῶς includes also the case of his coming at the same time with Timothy (Hofmann), is, according to ver. 19 ff., not to be assumed.

Ver. 25 f. About Epaphroditus; the sending him home,

---

1 How could this confidence, which the result did not justify, have been put by any later author into the apostle's mouth? Only Paul himself could have written in such a way as here and in i. 25 f. See, in opposition to Hinsic, Hilgenfeld, 1876, p. 185 f.

PHIL.
and recommendation of him, down to ver. 30. — ἀναγκ. δὲ ἄγγελον ἡμῶν. I have, however, judged it necessary, although Epaphroditus, namely, according to vv. 19–24, might have remained here still, in order to have made his return-journey to you later, either in company with Timothy, or eventually with myself. For the special reason, which Paul had for not keeping him longer with himself in Rome, see vv. 26, 28. — Ἐπαφρόδιτον] otherwise not further known. The name (signifying Venustus) was a common one (Tac. Ann. xv. 55; Suet. Domit. 14; Joseph, Vit. 76; Wetstein in loc.), also written Ἐπαφρόδιτος (Boeckh, Corp. inscr. 1811, 2562); but to regard the man as identical with Ἐπαφρᾶς (Col. i. 7, iv. 12; Philem. 23) (Grotius, Paulus, and others) is all the more arbitrary, since Epaphras was a Colossian teacher.—The grouping together of five predicates which follows, has arisen out of loving and grateful regard for Epaphroditus, as an honourable testimony to him in his relation to the apostle as well as to the church. — ἀδελφ. συνεργ. συνοπτρ. a climactic threefold description of companionship, advancing from the most general category, that of Christian brotherhood (ἀδελφός), to a twofold more special relation. On συνοπτρ., which sets forth the joint working (συνεργ.) in relation to the hostile powers, comp. Philem. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 3. — ὑμῶν δὲ ἀποστ. κ. λειτουργ. τ. χρ. μου.] still belonging to τὸν; hence ὑμῶν, placed in contrast to the μου, belongs to λειτουργ. τ. χρ. μ. as well (in opposition to de Wette and others). Ἀπόστολος here means delegate (2 Cor. viii. 23), and not apostle (Vulgate, Hilarius, Theodoret, Luther, Erasmus, Calovius, Wetstein: “mei munieris vicarium apud vos,” am Ende, and others), which would necessitate the genitive ὑμῶν being taken as in Rom. xi. 13, against which the context, by the union with λειτουργ. τ. χρ. μ., is decisive; as, indeed, Paul uses ἀποστ. as an official designation only in the sense of the actual apostolic rank, based upon a direct call by Christ, in its narrower and wider reference (comp. on Gal. i. 19; Rom. xvi. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 7), and hence there is no necessity to seek even an allusion to his “quasi”-apostolic position towards the Philippians (Matthies). — κ. λειτουργ. τ. χρ. μ.] the sacrificial minister of my need, ὁς
tā par' autōn ápostaleínta komísansta χρήmata, Theodoret.
By sending aid they had cared for the apostle's need (iv. 16);
and that gift of love being regarded as a sacrifice offered to
God, Epaphroditus, who had been entrusted by them with the
conveying of it, was the λειτουργός in the matter, that is, he
who performed the priestly service in the bringing of this
offering (comp. ver. 17). Such is also the conception in
2 Cor. ix. 12. On τῆς χρείας μ. comp. iv. 16; Rom. xii. 13.—
πέμψαι] as also in Greek authors frequently, in the sense of
dimittere domum, to send home,1 consequently equivalent to
ἀποτέμπεσαι or ἀναπέμπεσαι (Philem. 12); Xen. Hell. ii. 7. 9;
Sop. O. R. 1518; Polyb. v. 100. 10; and frequently in
Homer. See especially Od. xv. 74: χρὴ ἥξιον παρέοντα
φιλεῖν, ἐθελοντα δὲ πέμπεσαι.
Ver. 26. State of mind (ἡν with participle) of Epaphroditus,
which supplied the motive for the ἀναγι. ἡγισ. κ.τ.λ.2—The
imperfect is used (ἡν), because Paul transports himself to the
time when the readers shall receive this epistle. Then is
Epaphroditus again among them; but he was previously longing,
etc.—ἀδημονοῦν] in anxiety. Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 37.—
δι' ἡσθ.] that he was sick. How the Philippians received this
information, remains an open question, as also how Epaphro-
ditus learned that they had heard it.

Ver. 27. Confirmation of that ἠκούσατε, δι' ἡσθ. — καὶ γὰρ
κ.τ.λ.] for he has also (really, see Hartung, Partikell. I. p. 132;
Baemlein, p. 150) been sick. — παραιτεῖ θεράτω] adds the
specification of the mode: in a way almost equivalent to death.
There is neither an ellipsis (de Wette: ἀφλεῖσθαι or some such

1 That Paul, however, here writes πέμψαι πρὶς ἡμᾶς, and, on the other hand,
πρὶς ἡμᾶς in ver. 19, is an accidental and undesigned variation. Hofmann thinks
that by πρὶς ἡμᾶς is meant the sending of a representative of the apostle to the
Church, and by πρὶς ἡμᾶς the sending of a representative of the Church to the
apostle. This distinction is involved in the state of the case, but has nothing to
do with the difference between the ἡμᾶς and πρὶς ἡμᾶς. Comp. 1 Cor. iv. 17;
Eph. vi. 22; Col. iv. 8; Tit. iii. 12; 2 Cor. xii. 17.

2 The supposition that Paul, in specifying this ground, wished to prevent the
so speedy return of the man from being interpreted to his disadvantage (Hof-
mann), assumes the existence of a certain distrust, for which there is no basis in
the text. Besides, Epaphroditus had in fact accomplished the purpose of his
mission.
word is to be understood before παραπλ.; comp. van Hengel) nor a solecism (van Hengel); παραπλ. is adverbal (equivalent to παραπλησίας, see Polyb. iv. 40. 10, iii. 33. 17; Lucian, Cyn. 17; comp. παραπλησιατέρον, Plat. Polit. p. 275 C), and the dativus congruentiae (instead of which the genitive might also have been used, Bernhardy, p. 148) is governed by it. — λύπην ἐπὶ λύπην] grief upon grief (super-added). LXX. Ezra vii. 26; Ps. lxix. 27; Isa. xxviii. 10. Comp. expressions with the dative (as Ecclus. xxvi. 15) in classic Greek, e.g. δρακην ἐπὶ δρακην (Hom. Od. vii. 120), ἐσκαὶ ἐπὶ ἐσκαί (Pind. Ol. viii. 84), φῶνος ἐπὶ φῶνο (Eur. Iph. T. 197); Polyb. i. 57. 1. See also Eur. Hec. 586: λύπη τις ἄλη διάδοχος κακῶν κακοῖς, Soph. El. 235: ἄγαν ἄγαν, Eur. Troad. 175: ἔπὶ ἄγαν εἰς ἄγαν φθοῖρο. The first λύπη refers to the dreaded death of his friend; the second, to the apostle’s affliction over the painful position in which he found himself, as a prisoner, and also through the doings of the adversaries (ver. 20 f., i. 15, 17, 30), not over the sickness of Epaphroditus (Chrysostom, Occumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Estius, and others, also Weiss), to which would be added that for his death. Ἀλυπότερος in ver. 28 is fatal to the latter view, for it appears that, even after Epaphr. had been sent away, a λύπη still remained, which, therefore, could not be referred to the latter’s sickness. Van Hengel errs in understanding the affliction as pain concerning this sickness, and the first λύπη as “cogitation anxietatis vestrae.” See, in opposition, on ver. 28. Calvin’s remark suffices to justify the double λύπη: “Non jactat Stoicorum ἄұδειμα, quasi ferreus esset et immunit ab humanis affectibus.” Comp. John xi. 35 f. — σχῶ] not optative. See Winer, p. 270 [E. T. p. 359].

Ver. 28. The more urgently, therefore (in consequence of this sickness which he had had and recovered from, of which ye received tidings, vv. 26, 27), I have brought about his return, which otherwise I would still have delayed. — πᾶν] belongs to χαρᾶτε, as Paul usually places it before the verb, or, at least, makes it follow immediately after. See Gersdorf, Beitr. p. 491 f., and van Hengel. And the context affords no ground for departing from the usual mode, and for joining it
with ἱδόντες αὐτῶν (Beza, Grotius, and others, also Baumgarten-Crusius and de Wette). — καγὼ ἀλυπότ. ἐδὲ ἐδόξα ὑμεῖς χαρῆτε, καὶ ἐγὼ χαίρω, Oecumenius. He is not ἀλυπότος for he is in captivity and surrounded by adversaries; but the joy which he is aware is already prepared for his beloved Philippians by the return of Epaphroditus, lessens his λύπη. This tender interweaving of his own alleviation with the rejoicing of his readers is lost, if we refer ἀλυπότος to the removal of the vexation of seeing the recovered one so full of longing and so uneasy (Hofmann), which, regarded as λύπη, would be sentimental. According to Weiss, Paul intends to say: still more ἀλυπότος, than I have already become in consequence of Epaphroditus' recovery. An unsuitable idea, because the comparative necessarily presumes a certain degree of the λύπη still remaining. In the consciousness of this Paul has written ἀλυπότος; if it had been otherwise, he would perhaps have used, as in ver. 19, καγὼ εὐνυχῶ οὐ καγὼ χαίρω.

Ver. 29 f. Οὖν] Let, then, the reception which he meets with among you be in accordance with my purpose in accelerating his return (ἐν ἱδόντες κ.π.λ.); receive him with all joy. — ἐν κυρίῳ] denotes, as in Rom. xvi. 2, the Christian character of the προσδέχεσθαι, the nature and action of which have their distinctive quality in Christ, in whose fellowship Christians live and move. — μετὰ πάσαν χαρὰν] excludes every kind of sullen or indifferent temper and expression: "with all joyfulness." — καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους κ.π.λ.] and the people of such a sort, etc. "Ἡμίν μὴ δῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ μόνῳ χαρίζεσθαι, κοινῶς παρανεῖ πάντας τῶν τίνων αὐτῶν ἀρετήν ἐπιδεικνυμένους τιμᾶν, Theophylact. But Epaphroditus is in his view, as in the given case, the person belonging to the class thus to be held in honour.¹

Ver. 30. δὲ τὸ ἔργον] emphatically prefixed: on account of nothing else than for this great sacred aim. The work (see the critical remarks) is, according to the context (comp. Acts

¹ There is no ground for the reference, which Hofmann discovers here, to an assumed inclination, on the part of the Philippians, to hold in honour people of another sort (such as are described in chap. iii.) more than the τοιούτους. For this assumption there would, at the most, be occasion only if Paul had used the comparative instead of ἱδόνες. Besides, the emphasis is not on τοιούτους (Hofmann), but on ἱδόνες, correlative to the preceding μετὰ πάσαν χαρὰν.
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XV. 38), obvious, namely, that of labour for the gospel; the addition in the Rec. τοῦ Χριστοῦ is a correct gloss, and it is this ἔργον κατ' ἐξοχήν (comp. ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὄνοματος, Acts v. 41) in the service of which Epaphroditus incurred so dangerous an illness, namely, when he, according to the testimony of the predicates in ver. 25, as the συνεργός and συντραπατής of the apostle, with devotedness and self-sacrifice, united his exertions for the gospel and his striving against the movements of its adversaries (i. 15, 17, 30, ii. 20) with a similar activity on the part of the apostle. The interpretation which refers ἔργον to the business of conveying the bounty (de Wette, following older expositors, comp. Weiss), does not suffice for the more special characteristic description; and the reference to the enmity of Nero against Paul, the dangers of which Epaphroditus had shared, in order to reach the apostle and to serve him, finds no warrant either in the context or in Acts xxviii. (in opposition to Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, comp. Theodoret). — μέχρι θαν. ἡγγ. as in Ps. cvii. 18: ἡγγισαν ἐν τῷ τηλω τοῦ θανάτου, Ecclus. li. 6: ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, Rev. xii. 11. The expression with μέχρι is more definite than the dative would be (as in Ps. lxxxviii. 3: ἦ ζωή μου τῷ ἐξηγγεσε), or εἰς θάνατ. (Job xxxiii. 22); he came near even unto death.—παραβολ. τῇ ψυχ. Such is the Text. Rec., which Bengel, Matthaei (vehement in opposition to Wetstein and Griesbach), Rinck, van Hengel, Reiche, and others defend, and Tischendorf still follows in the 7th ed. Justly, however, Scaliger, Casaubon, Salmasius, Grotius, Mill, Wetstein, and others, including Griesbach, Lachmann, Scholz, Tischendorf, ed. 8, Rheinwald, Matthies, Rilliet, Winer, Ewald, Weiss, J. B. Lightfoot, Hofmann, and others, have preferred παραβολ. τ. ψ. The latter has the authority of A B D E F G, 177, 178, 179 in its favour, as well as the support of the Itala by "parabolatus est de anima sua," and of Vulgate, Aeth., Pelagius, by "tradens (Ambrosiaster: in interitum tradens) animam suam." Since βολεῖσθαι was unknown to the copyists, whilst βουλεῖσθαι was very current, instead of the one ἐπαξ λεγόμ. another crept in, the form of which, on account of the prevalence of the simple word, had nothing offensive. παρα-
βολεύεσθαι, which is nowhere certainly preserved (in opposition to Wetzstein's quotations from the Fathers, see Matthiae, ed. min. p. 341 f., and Reiche, Comment. crit. p. 220 f.), is formed from the very current classical word παράβολος, putting at stake, venturesome, and is therefore equivalent to παράβολον εἶναι, to be venturesome, to be an adventurer, as περιπερεύεσθαι equivalent to πέρπερον εἶναι (1 Cor. xiii. 4), ἀλογεύεσθαι equivalent to ἄλογον εἶναι (Cic. Att. vi. 4), ἀποσκοπεῖν and ἐπισκοπεῖν (see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 591), κομικεύεσθαι (Luc. Philop. 22). See more such verbs in Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 67, and comp. generally Kühner, I. p. 695, II. 1, p. 98. Hence the παραβολευσόμενος κ.τ.λ., which is to be regarded as a modal definition to μ. θαν. ἡγμος, means: so that he was venturesome with his soul (dative of the more definite reference), i.e. he hazarded his life,1 in order to supply, etc. In this sense παραβάλλεσθαι is current among Greek authors, and that not merely with accusative of the object (Hom. Π. ix. 322; so usually, as in 2 Macc. xiv. 38), but also with dative of reference (Polyb. ii. 26. 6, iii. 94. 4; Diod. Sic. iii. 35: ἐκριμαν παραβαλ·

1 The matter is conceived as staking a price or forfeit. Comp. παραβιλευσθαι in Poll. viii. 63, Phrynich. p. 238. On the subject-matter comp. also πρειτεύει τήν ψυχήν (Pausanias, iv. 10. 3); the animae magae prodigus of Horace (Od. i. 12. 37); and the viam profundere pro patria of Cicero (de Off. i. 24).
by the context (ver. 25), and conceived of as a sacrificial service,—with which Epaphroditus had been commissioned by the Philippians in respect to Paul (πρὸς μεν). All explanations are therefore to be rejected, which either expressly or insensibly connect ὑμῶν with λειτουργία, and take the latter in the general sense of rendering service (διακονεῖν). We must reject, consequently, Chrysostom’s explanation (comp. Theophylact, Theodoret, Pelagius, Castalio, Vatablus, and others): τὸ οὖν ισοτέρημα τῆς ισοτέρας λειτουργίας ἀνεπλήρωσεν . . . ὡπερ ἔχερν πάντας ποιήσαι, τούτο ἐπράξεν αὐτός;¹ also the similar view taken by Erasmus and many others (comp. Grotius, Estius, Heinrichs, Rheinwald, van Hengel, Rilliet): “quo videlicet pensaret id, quod ob absentiam vestro erga me officio videbatur deesse;” the arbitrary explanation of Matthies: “in order that he might perfect the readiness of service which you have shown on various occasions;” and several other interpretations. Hoelemann, also, in opposition to the simple literal sense, takes τὸ ὑμῶν ἴσοτέρ αὐτῷ, as defectus cui subvenir. and τῆς πρὸς με λειτουργία: as: verum necessiarum ad me subministrando deferendarum. No; of the two genitives, referring to different things (comp. ver. 25, and see Winer, p. 180 [E. T. p. 239]), by which τὸ ἴσοτέρημα is accompanied, the first conveys who were wanting (ὑμῶν, ye were wanting, ye yourselves were not there, comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 17), and the second to what this want applied. Consequently the passage is to be explained: in order to compensate for the circumstance, that ye have been wanting at the sacrificial service touching me; that is, for the circumstance, that this sacrificial service, which has been made through your love-gifts in my support, was completed, not jointly by you, but without you, so that only your messenger Epaphroditus was here, and not ye yourselves in person. How delicate and winning, and at the same time how enlist-

¹ Hofmann substantially reverts to this. He takes ὑμῶν as the subject, which had allowed something to remain lacking in the service, namely, in so far as the church had only collected the aid, but not conveyed it. How indelicate would such a thought have been! Besides, it was, in fact, an impossibility for the church to have come personally: Hence the church was wanting, indeed, at the transmission of the bounty, but it did not thereby allow anything to be wanting in the latter.
ing their grateful sympathy in the fate of Epaphroditus, was it to represent the absence of the Philippians as something that had been lacking in that λευτουργία, and therefore, as something which Paul had missed, to supply which, as representative of the church, the man had (as his deadly sickness had actually shown) hazarded his life! He did not therefore contract the illness on his journey to Rome (de Wette, Weiss, and older expositors), as Hofmann thinks, who represents him as arriving there in the hot season of the year; but through his exertions διὰ τὸ ἐγγὺς in Rome itself during his sojourn there, when his sickness showed that he had risked his life in order to bring the offering of the Philippians, and thus compensate the apostle for the absence of the church. On ἀναπλ. τὸ ὑμ. ὑστέρ., comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 17. The compound verb is appropriately explained by Erasmus: “accessione implere, quod plenitudini perfectae deerrat.” See on Gal. vi. 2.

—It was a foolish blunder of Baur to hold the entire passage respecting Timothy and Epaphroditus as merely an imitation of 2 Cor. viii. 23 f. Hinsch very erroneously, because misconceiving the delicate courtesy of the grateful expression, thinks that in ver. 30 the aid is described as a duty incumbent on the readers,—which would be un-Pauline; iv. 10 is far from favouring this idea.
CHAPTER III

VER. 3. Instead of Θεῷ Elz. has Θεῷ, against decisive testimony, although again defended by Reiche. A clumsy emendation in order to complete the λατρ. — Ver. 6. ἥλιος Lachm. and Tisch. read ἥλιος, following A B D E F G K*. A copyist’s error; comp. the exeg. remarks on 2 Cor. ix. 2. — Ver. 8. Instead of μίν ὀν Elz. and Tisch. 8 have μενοῦγις, which, although supported by A P K, is opposed by very preponderating testimony. — The second εἰςai is wanting in B D E F G K*, 17, Arm. Vulg. It. Lucif., et al. Suspected by Griesb., omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8. But how readily it, otherwise superfluous, have been left out before the similar εἰς! — Ver. 10. The second τὴν is wanting in A B K*; omitted by Lachm.; overlooked as unnecessary. — Instead of συμμορφεῖται (so Lachm. and Tisch.), which Griesb. approves, Elz. and Scholz have συμμορφεῖται. But the former has in its favour A B D* E P K*, min. Or. ms. Bas. Macar., as also συμμορφεῖται in F G It. Lucif. Ir. The Recepta substitutes an analogous form more familiar. — Ver. 11. τῶν κεκρ. A B D E P K*, min., and many vss. and Fathers, have τὴν κεκρ., which is recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Scholz, Lachm., and Tisch. But Paul always uses ἀνάστασις with merely the genitive τῶν κεκρ., or only κεκρ. The κεκρ. was written on the margin here to explain the word ἐκκαθαρ., which does not occur elsewhere in the N.T., and subsequently the erroneous insertion of this κεκρ. (so still F G) produced the reading τὴν κεκρ. — Ver. 12. The χριστοῦ alone (Elz. gives τοῦ Χ. Ἰησοῦ) has preponderant evidence. — Ver. 14. ἵσι] Lachm. and Tisch. read ἵσι, following A B K, min. Clem. Aeth. Rightly; ἵσι is explanatory. — Ver. 16. After στοχεῖ, Elz., Scholz have καὶν, τὸ αὐτῶν φρονή, which is wanting in A B K*, min. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Hilar. Aug., et al. There are, besides, several variations, and differences in the arrangement of the words. The Recepta has arisen from glosses (following Gal. vi. 16; Phil. ii. 2), and has far too little homogeneousness in a critical point of view, to enable it to be defended on the ground of homoio-teleuton (so Matth. and Rinck). — Ver. 21. After ἡμῶν, Elz. has τοῦ γυνιὸν αὐτῷ, which (although defended by Matth.) is omitted by decisive authorities. An ancient supplement.
CHAP. III. 1.

Following A B D* F G K P* min. Eus. Theophyl., αὐτῷ is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be read; ἡμῖν is a more precise definition.

In iii. 1 Paul seems already preparing to close his epistle; but at this point his attention is directed, perhaps by some special momentary occasion, to the party of anti-Pauline teachers, against which he at once breaks forth with vehemence and irony in ver. 2, warning his readers against them; and thereafter, from ver. 4 to 14, he sets forth in detail his own bearing as contrasted with the character of those false teachers.

Ver. 1. Ὠτοι λουτρόν] introduces what is still to be done by the readers in addition to what has been hitherto communicated; see on Eph. vi. 10. Hence it is of frequent occurrence towards the close of the epistles, as bringing in a further request, exhortation, etc. Comp. iv. 8; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; 1 Thess. iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 1. To the closing address thus introduced, but at once abandoned again in ver. 2, Paul would have attached his giving of thanks for the aid sent to him (comp. iv. 8, 10 ff.). This is contrary to the view of Schinz and van Hengel, who, from the fact that Paul has not yet expressed his thanks, conclude that he did not at this point desire to proceed to the closing of the letter. We need not search for a connection with what precedes (Chrysostom: ἔχετε Ἐπαφρόδιτον, δὲ δὲ ἡλεγέτε, ἔχετε Ὁμόθεον, ἑρχόμαι καίγω, τὸ εὐφρένιον ἐπιδίωκων, τὸ ὅμων λείπει λουτρόν; comp. Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Michaelis, and others). The preceding topic is closed, and the exhortation beginning with Ὠτοι λουτρόν which now follows stands by itself; so that we are not even justified in saying that Paul here passes from the particular to the general (Schinz, Matthies), but must simply assume that he is proceeding to the conclusion, which he desired to commence with this general encouragement. — ματια ἐν κυρίῳ] is a summons to Christian joyfulness, which is not κατὰ κόσμον (see Chrysostom), but has its ground in Christ, and is thereby specifically defined, inasmuch as Christ—through the Holy Spirit—rules in the believing heart; hence the χαρὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου (1 Thesa.
i. 6) or ἐν πνεῦματι ὀφλή (Rom. xiv. 17) are in substance not different from this (comp. Gal. v. 22). The subsequent double repetition of this encouragement (iv. 4) is the result of the apostle’s special love for his readers, and of the whole tone of feeling pervading the epistle. Moreover, in ἐν κυρίῳ we are not to seek for a new special element, preparing the way for the transition to the explanations which follow (Weiss, Hofmann); for Paul could not in what went before mean any other joy, either on his own part (i. 18) or on the part of his readers (ii. 17 f., 28), and in other passages also he does not add to χαίρετε the self-evident definition ἐν κυρίῳ (2 Cor. xiii. 11; 1 Thess. v. 16). Another joy in the Christian life he knew not at all. — τὰ αὕτα ὑνάφειν] “Hic incipit de pseudo-apostolis agere,” Calvin. After χαίρ. ἐν κ. there is a pause; Paul breaks off. τὰ αὐτά has been erroneously referred to χαίρ. ἐν κ., and in that case the retrospective reference which Paul had in view is either not explained at all (Bengel, Zachariae), or is believed to be found in ii. 18 (van Hengel, Wiesinger), or in i. 27 f. (Matthies, Rilliet), or in i. 27–ii. 16 (Storr). This view is at variance, not indeed with the plural τὰ αὐτά (see, on the contrary, Stallbaum, ad Plat. Apol. p. 19 D; Mätzner, ad Antiph. p. 153; Kühner II. 1, p. 60), but with the facts, first, that there is no express summons whatever to Christian joyfulness generally, given in the previous portion of the epistle (not even in ii. 18); secondly, that so simple and natural a summons—which, moreover, occurs again twice in iv. 4—would certainly have least of all given rise to an apology for repetition; and lastly, that ἀσφαλέται, in accordance with its idea (without danger), points not to the repetition of a summons of this kind, but to a warning, such as follows immediately in the context.¹

The accusation of poverty of thought (Baur) is therefore all the more groundless here. And as the altogether vague reference of Theodoret and Erasmus (Annotat.) to the numerous

¹ The expedient to which Wiesinger has recourse is gratuitously introduced, when he connects the χαίρειν ἐν κ. more closely with the warning that follows by imagining that, in χαίρ. ἐν κ., he detects already the idea on which the sequel is based, namely the οὕτως ἐν κυρίῳ, iv. 1.
exhortations contained in the epistle generally, or to the fundamental tone of the letter hitherto (Weiss), is simply at variance with the literal import of the words, τὰ αὐτά cannot be interpreted as applicable to anything but the subsequent warning against the false teachers. This warning, however, has not occurred previously, either at i. 15 f., or indirectly in i. 27, as Lünemann thinks, or in i. 27–ii. 18, as Ewald assumes. Hence many have caught at the explanation: “eadem repetere, quae praesens dixeram” (Pelagius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, so also Erasmus, Paraphr., Calvin, Beza, Balduin, Estius, Calovius, Wolf, Schrader, and others; de Wette undecidedly). But this quae praesens dixeram is quite gratuitously imported; it must at least have been indicated by τὰ αὐτά καὶ γρ. ὑμ. or in some other way. The same objection applies against Wieseler (Chronol. d. apost. Zeitalt. p. 458 f.), who takes τὰ αὐτά as contrasted with the oral communications, which would be made to the readers by Epaphroditus and especially by Timothy. The only correct explanation, therefore, that remains is the assumption (which, however, is expressly rejected already by Theodoret) that Paul had already written what follows in an earlier epistle to the Philippians which is not preserved, and that he here repeats the same. So Aegidius Hunnius, Haenlein, Bertholdt, Flatt, Köhler, in the Annot. d. ges. Theol. 1834, III. 1, p. 18 f.; Feilmoser, Bleek, Jatho, Schenkel, Bisping, Hilgenfeld, Hofmann; de Wette undecidedly. It must remain uncertain, however, whether this repetition covers ver. 2 only, or ver. 3 also, or a still larger portion of the sequel; as also, how far the repetition is a literal one, which seems to be the case with ver. 2 from its peculiar character. — ἕκαστον irksome, matter of scruple (Dem. 777. 5; Theocr. xxiv. 35; Pind. Nem. xi. 28; Herodian vi. 9, 7; Soph. O. R. 834), comp. οὐκ ἕκαστον, Polyb. i. 14. 7, also Plat. Ep. Π. 310 D: τἀληθὴ λέγειν οὔτε ἕκνησο οὔτε αἰσχυνομαί. — ἀσφαλές] safe, so that ye will the more firmly rely thereon for the determination of your conduct. Comp. Acts xxv. 26; Heb. vi. 19; Wisd. vii. 23; Plat. Rep. 450 E; Phaed. p. 100 D E; Dem. 372. 2, 1460. 15. Hofmann,

1 Comp. also Credner, Einl. i. p. 333.
without any precedent of usage, assigns to ἀκνηρόν the sense of indolent cowardice, and takes ἄσφαλες as prudent, which linguistically is admissible (Heind. ad Plat. Soph. p. 231 A), but would be unsuitable to the ὑμῖν. The apostle wishes to say, that the repetition is for himself not irksome (ἐκνος, hesitatio), and is for his readers an ἄσφαλες τεκμήριον (Eur. Rhes. 94.) to be attended to.

Note.—This exegetical result, that, previously to our epistle, Paul had already written another to the Philippians,1 is confirmed by Polycarp,2 who, ad Phil. 3, says: τοῦ μακαρίου Χ. ἰδιάτου Παύλου, δι’ γνώμονα εἰς ὑμᾶς κατὰ προσωπον τῶν τούτων ἀνθρώπων ἐκδιάζειν ἄριστον τὸν καρπὸν ἄληθείας λόγον, δι’ αἷς και ἄγων ὑμᾶς ἵγιαν ἐκπολιτάζει, εἰς δὲ ἰδίων ἐγκύνηται, δυνάσθησθi δικαιομεθάναι κ.τ.λ. It is true that the plur. in this passage (ἐκπολιτάζει, εἰς αἷς) is usually explained as referring to one epistle (see Cotelerius in loc.; and Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. II. p. 914 f.; Hilgenfeld, Apost. Verer, p. 210; J. B. Lightfoot, p. 138 f.), just as it is well known that also in profane authors ἐκπολιταί (comp. literae) is used of one despatch (Thuc. i. 132. 6, viii. 39. 2), sometimes generally in a generic sense as plural of the category, and sometimes specially of commissions and orders. See Schaefer, Plut. VI. p. 446; Blomf. and Stanl. ad Aesch. Prom. 3.; Retzig, Quaest. Phil. II. p. 37 f. But there is the less ground for assuming this construction here, since doctrinal epistles, both in the N. T. and also in the apostolic Fathers, are always described by the singular when only one epistle is intended, and by the plural (as in 1 Cor. xvi. 3; 2 Cor. x. 9–11; 2 Pet. iii. 16; comp. Acts ix. 2, xxii. 5) if more than one are meant,—a practice from which there is no exception (not even in 1 Cor. xvi. 3), as, in fact, Polycarp, in regard to ἐκπολιταί, elsewhere very definitely distin-

1 Ewald also acknowledges the composition of more than one epistle to the Philippians, but finds traces of them not here, but at ii. 12, iii. 18.
2 I cannot at once accept the view that the passages in question, ch. iii. and xi., are interpolated (Ritschl, altkath. Kirche, p. 588 ff.). The interpolations in the Ignatian epistles are at any rate of another kind. Besides, we have from Polycarp only the one epistle; and we have therefore no sufficient objective standard of comparison, in the absence of which a judgment founded on taste is very uncertain. But even assuming the interpolation, we should still have the result that the interpolator was acquainted with several epistles of Paul to the Philippians. Otherwise he would have had no reason for using the plural, especially as it was already distinction enough for the church to have had one epistle addressed to it by the apostle.
guishes between the singular and plural. See ch. xiii. : τὰς ἱπτολότας ἵνα τὰς συμφώνας ἥμιν ἵνα αὐτοῖς καὶ ἅλλας ὅσας ἑξάχρησαν παρ' ἡμῖν, ἵπτιμ-φασίν ἧμιν, καθὼς ἢπτιμεθηθείν ἀτιτος ὑποτιγμαν-μέναι εἰδο ζῇ ʹπισολὴ ταῦτη. In order to prove that Polycarp in ch. iii. did not mean more than one epistle to the Philippians, an appeal has been made to ch. xi., where, in the Latin version, which alone has been preserved, it is said: “Ego autem nihil tale sensi in vobis vel audiivi, in quibus laboravit beatus Paulus, qui estis (non-genuine addition: laudatis) in principio epistolae ejus; de vobis enim gloriatur in omnibus ecclesiis, quæ Deum solae tunc cognoverant, nos autem nondum novemamus.” But epistolae ejus cannot here be the epistle to the Philippians, for the idea: “ye are in the beginning of his epistle,” would be simply absurd; epistolae is, on the contrary, the nominative plural, and the sense is: “Ye are originally his epistles,” that is, his letters of recommendation, in which phrase allusion is made to 2 Cor. iii. 1 ff.1 The correctness of this explanation, which Wieseler has substantially adopted, is corroborated by the sequel: de vobis enim gloriatur, etc.—It is, moreover, à priori intelligible and likely enough that Paul should have corresponded with this church—which enjoyed his most intimate confidence, and the founding of which marked his entrance on his European labours—at an earlier period than merely now, almost at the close of his life. And Polycarp was sufficiently close to the time of the apostle, not merely to have inferred such a correspondence from our passage,

1 Hofmann also explains the expression from 2 Cor. iii. 1 ff., but errs in taking epistolae as the genitivus; he makes this epistle to be the whole of the Christians gathered by Paul, and thus represents Polycarp as declaring, in reference to the Philippian church, that it stands first in this epistle, because it is reckoned among his earliest acquisitions. According to this interpretation, a vast aggregate of churches would be depicted as one epistle, in which one church would stand written first, and others after it, each therefore being marked by name in the order of its date. What a different picture this would yield from that presented in 2 Cor. iii., and one, too, delineated singularly enough! And how unsuitable would such a precedence, as to time, be for the church at Philippi! By how long a period had the establishment of all the churches of Asia preceded it! Hofmann’s objection to our view, viz. that the present estis would be unsuitable, does not apply, since Polycarp realizes the state of matters as it stood with the church in principio (ἐκ ἀρχῆς, i.e. in the earliest times of the gospel), as present; hence also he subsequently says gloriatur (not gloriatum). The conception is this: Paul in all the churches of that early Christian age boasts of the excellent Philippian church, and so this church serves him as so many letters of recommendation, which by his gloriari he communicates, and as it were reads before, those other churches.
but to have had a historical knowledge of it (in opposition to Hofmann).

Ver. 2. This is now the τὰ αὐτὰ which he had previously written, and probably in the very same words. At least this seems to be indicated by the peculiar expressions in themselves; and not only so, but it serves also to explain the relation of contrast, which this vehement "fervor piæ zeli" (Calvin) presents to the tender and cordial tone of our epistle. That lost epistle had probably expressed the apostle's mind at length, and with all the warmth of controversy, for the warning of his readers as to the Judaizing false teachers. How entirely different is the tone in which, in the present epistle, he speaks (i. 15 ff.) of teachers likewise of an anti-Pauline type, and labouring, indeed, at that time in his immediate neighbourhood! Comp., moreover, the remark after i. 18. Those who refer τὰ αὐτὰ to the χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ, labour in very different ways to establish a connection of thought with βλέπετε κ.τ.λ.; as, for instance, Wiesinger: that Paul wished to suggest, as a ground for the reiterated summons to joy in the Lord, the danger which was threatening them from the men described; Weiss: that the readers were to learn e contrario, on what the true Christian joy was, and on what it was not, based.—βλέπετε] not: be on your guard against, etc. (which would be βλ. ἄνα, Mark viii. 15, xii. 38), but as a calling attention to: behold! (1 Cor. i. 26, x. 18), with a view, however, to warn the readers against these men as pernicious, by pointing to the forbidding shape in which they present themselves. — τοὺς κίνασ] a term of reproach among the Jews and the Greeks (frequently in Homer, who, however, also uses it without any dishonourable reference; see Duncan, Lex. ed. Rost. p. 674); used by the latter specially to denote impudence, furious boldness (Hom. Íl. viii. 239; Od. xvii. 248; Anth. Pal. ix. 302), snappishness (Pollux, On. v. 65), low vulgarity (Lucian, Nigr. 22), malice and cunning (Jacobs, ad Anthol. VI. p. 18), and the like, see generally Wetstein; used also among the Jews in similar special references (Isa. lvi. 10 f.; Deut. xxiii. 18; Rev. xxii. 15, et al.), and, because
dogs were *unclean* animals, generally to denote the *profane, impure, unholy* (Matt. vii. 6; Ps. xxi. 17; Rev. xxii. 15; Schoettgen, *Hor.* I. p. 1145); hence the Gentiles were so designated (see on Matt. xv. 26). In this passage also the *profane* nature and demeanour of the false teachers, as contrasted with the holy character of true Christianity, is to be adhered to as the point of comparison (Chrysostom: οὐκέτι τέκνα Ἰουδαίων . . . ἀνεπέρ οἱ ἑθικοὶ καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἄλλωτροι ἔσαν, οὗτο καὶ οὗτοι γεγόνασι νῦν). Any more special reference of the term—as to *shamelessness* (Chrysostom and many others, including Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald), *covetousness* (both combined by Grotius), *snappishness* (Rilliet, and older expositors, following Ambrosiaster, Augustine, and Pelagius), *envy*, and the like; or to the *disorderly wandering* about in selfishness and animosity towards those who were living peaceably in their Christian calling (Hofmann), to which Lange fancifully adds a *loud howling* against Paul,—is not furnished by the context, which, on the contrary, follows it up with yet another *general* designation, subjoining, namely, to that of the low, unholy *character* (*κόμα*ς) that of the *evil working* : τοῦ κακοῦ ἔργατ. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 13. The opposite: 2 Tim. ii. 15; Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 57. Ἐργάζονται μὲν, φησιν, ἀλλ’ ἵπτε κακῶ, καὶ ἀργίας πολλῆς χειρόν ἔργων, ἀναστάτωντες τὰ καλὰς κελέμενα, Chrysostom; comp. Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact. They, in fact, *laboured in opposition* to the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith.—τὴν καταργομήν] the cutting in pieces (Theophr. *H.* *pl.* iv. 8. 12), a word formed after the analogy of *περιτομή*, and, like the latter in ver. 3, used in a *concrete* sense: *those who are cut in pieces!* A bitter *paronomasia*, because these men were circumcised merely as regards the *body*, and placed their confidence in this fleshly circumcision, but were wanting in the *inner, spiritual* circumcision, which that of the body typified (see ver. 3; Rom. ii. 28 f.; Col. ii. 11; Eph. ii. 11; Acts vii. 51). Comp. Gal. v. 11 f. In the absence of this, their characteristic consisted simply in the bodily mutilation, and that, from the ideal point of view which Paul here occupies, was not *circumcision*, but *concision*; whilst, on the other hand, *circumcision*, as respected its moral idea, was
entirely independent of the corporeal operation, ver. 3. Comp. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 439, ed. 2. This *qualitative* distinction between *περιτ* and *καταρ* has been misunderstood by Baur, who takes the climax as *quantitative*, and hence sees in it a warped and unnatural antithesis, which is only concocted to give the apostle an opportunity of speaking of his own person. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact justly lay stress on the *abolition of the legal circumcision* as such brought about through Christ (the end of the law, Rom. x. 4)—a presupposition which gives to this antinomistic sarcasm its warrant. A description of *idolatry*, with allusion to Lev. xxi. 5, 1 Kings xviii. 28, *et al.* (Storr, Flatt, J. B. Lightfoot; comp. Beza), is quite foreign to the context. It is erroneous also to discover here any indication of a *cutting off of hearts from the faith* (Luther's gloss), or a *cutting in pieces of the church* (Theodoret, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Hammond, Clericus, Michaelis, Zachariae, and others), against which the necessary (comp. ver. 3) *passive* significance of the word (not *cutters in pieces*, but *cut in pieces*) is decisive.—The *thrice repeated* *βλέψη* belongs simply to the *ἐπιγνώση* of earnest emotion (*Dissen, ad Dem. de cor.* p. 315; Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 341 [E. T. 398]), so that it points to the *same* dangerous men, and does not, as van Hengel misconceives, denote three *different classes* of Jewish opponents, viz. the apostate, the heretical, and the *directly inimical*. The passage quoted by him from Philostr., *Vit. Soph.* ii. 1, does not bear upon the point, because in it the three repetitions of *ἐξέβλητε* are divided by μὲν . . . δέ. Weiss also refers the three designations to three different categories, namely: (1) the unconverted *heathen*, with their immoral life; (2) the self-seeking *Christian* teachers, i. 15–17; and (3) the unbelieving

1 Luther's works abound in sarcastic *paronomasiae*. Thus, for instance, in the preface to his works, instead of *Decret* and *Decretal*, he has written "Dréket" and "Dréketal" [Germ. Dreck = dreg, filth]; the *Legenden* he calls *Légenen*, the *Jurisperitos* he terms *Jurisperditos*; also in proper names, such as Schwenfeld, whom he called "Stenfeld." In ancient authors, comp. what Diog. L. vi. 2, 4 relates of Diogenes: τὸν Ἐκλείδεν τῷ μετας ἀλεπικτόν, τὸν ἐπὶ Πλάτωνος ἐκείνην καταγείρειν. *Thuc.* vi. 76. 4: εἰς ἄδειπνον *κακοπηστικόν*. *See* also *Arc.* ad *Plat.* *Phaedr.* p. 276; Jacobs, *Delect.* *epigr.* p. 188. For the Latin, *see* Kühner, *ad Cic.* *Tusc.* p. 291, ed. 3.
Jews, with their carnal conceit. But the first and third categories introduce alien elements, and the third cannot be identified with those mentioned at i. 15–17, but must mean persons much more dangerous. In opposition to the whole misinterpretation, see Huther in the *Mecklenb. Zeitschr.* p. 626 ff. All the three terms must characterize one class of men as in three aspects deserving of detestation, namely the Judaizing false teachers. As is evident from τ. κατατομήν and ver. 3 ff., they belonged to the same fundamentally hostile party against which Paul contends in the Epistle to the Galatians. At the same time, since the threefold repetition of the article pointing them out may be founded upon the very notoriety of these men, and yet does not of necessity presuppose a personal acquaintance with them, it must be left an open question, whether they had already come to Philippi itself, or merely threatened danger from some place in its vicinity. It is certain, however, though Baur still regards it as doubtful, that Paul did not refer to his opponents in *Rome* mentioned in i. 15 ff. (Heinrichs), because in the passage before us a line of teaching must be thought of which was expressly and in principle anti-Pauline, leading back into Judaism and to legal righteousness; and also because the earnest, demonstrative βλέπετε, as well as ἀσφαλές (ver. 2), can only indicate a danger which was visibly and closely threatening the readers. It is also certain that these opponents could not as yet have succeeded in finding adherents among the Philippians; for if this had been the case, Paul would not have omitted to censure the readers themselves (as in the Epistle to the Galatians and Second Corinthians), and he would have given a very different shape generally to his epistle, which betrays nothing but a church as yet undivided in doctrine. His language directed against the false teachers is therefore merely warning and precautionary, as is also shown in ver. 3.

Ver. 3. Justification of the preceding τ. κατατομήν; not, however, "an evident copy" of 2 Cor. xi. 18 f. (Baur), but very different from the latter passage amidst the corresponding resemblances which the similarity of subject suggested; in both cases there is Pauline originality. — ἦμείς] with emphasis: we,
not they. The κατατομὴ being not the unconverted Jews, but Christian Judaizers, the contrasted ἡμεῖς cannot mean the Christians generally (Weiss), but only those who, in the apostle’s sense, were true and right Christians, whose more definite characterization immediately follows. The ἡμεῖς are the Ἰσραήλ τοῦ Θεοῦ of Gal. vi. 15 f., the members of the people of God in the sense of the Pauline gospel, and not merely Paul and the true teachers of the gospel (Hofmann),—a restriction which the exclusiveness of the predicate, especially furnished as it is with the article, does not besit; in iii. 17 the context stands otherwise.— ἤ περιτομῆ If this predicate belongs to us, not to those men, then, in regard to the point of circumcision, nothing remains for the latter but the predicate κατατομὴ! As the ἡμεῖς, among whom the readers also were included, were for the most part uncircumcised (Gal. ii. 9, iii.; Eph. ii. 11), it is clear that Paul here takes περιτομὴ purely in the antitypical spiritual sense, according to which the circumcision are those who, since the reception of baptism, are regenerated by the Holy Spirit, and therefore members of the true people of God; the investiture with their new moral condition is typically prefigured by the legal bodily περιτομὴ of the Jewish theocracy. Comp. Rom. ii. 29, iv. 10 f.; Eph. ii. 11; Col. ii. 11; Acts vii. 51. Whether the bodily circumcision was present or not, and whether, therefore, the subjects were Jewish or Gentile Christians, was in that case matter of indifference, 1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. iii. 28, v. 6. Comp. the further amplification of the thought in Barnab. Ep. 9.—οἱ πνεῦματε Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.] We who serve through the Spirit of God, in contrast to the external, legal λατρεία (Rom. ix. 4).¹ Comp. Heb. ix. 10, 14; Rom. xii. 1 f. With this λατρεία, wrought by the Holy Spirit,² there takes place on the part of man (comp. Rom. i. 9), but in virtue of that very working of the Holy Spirit, the worship which is required in John iv. 24.

¹ True Christianity is, according to Paul also, the true continuation of Judaism, and that not merely of the promise given in it, but also of the law; the latter, however, according to the idea of the αὐλονίων, Matt. v. 17, in which the letter has yielded to the spirit.

² If we adopt the reading πνεύματι Θεοῦ, πνεύματε must be understood as in Rom. i. 9. See Reiche, Comment. crit. p. 229 ff.
The article οἱ extends also to the two participles which follow; and the artthrous participles (quippe qui colimus, etc.) contain the experimental proof that the ἡμεῖς are the πεποιθημένοι. The dative πνεύματος denotes neither the standard (van Hengel) nor the object (Hilgenfeld), which latter view would amount to the conception, foreign to the N. T., of a worship of the Holy Spirit—but is instrumental, expressing the inward agent (Rom. v. 5, viii. 14 f., et al.): vi spiritus divini (Rom. viii. 13, et al.). On the absolute λατρεύειν, to render divine worship, comp. Luke ii. 37; Acts xxvi. 7; Heb. ix. 9, x. 2; Rom. ix. 4; 3 Esdr. iv. 54. — καυχόμεν. εν X. 'I.] and who glory in Christ Jesus (as Him through whom alone we have attained righteousness, etc., see ver. 9; comp. Gal. vi. 14), not in our own privileges and legal performances, as those false teachers do, who place their confidence in what is fleshly, i.e. in that which belongs to material human nature and has nothing in common with the divine blessings of the Christian (such as circumcision, descent, outward observance of the law, comp. vv. 4—6). Hence the contrast: καὶ οὐκ εν σαρκί πεποιθότες, with which the disposition of mind contrary to the καυχάσθαι εν X. 'I. (from which disposition the καυχάσθαι, opposed to that Christian καυχάσθαι, of itself results) is negatived; so that this contrast is pregnant, belonging, however, by way of antithesis, to the second statement, and not containing a separate third one (Hofmann). If κ. οὐκ εν σ. πεπ. were merely a more precise definition of purport added to καυχ. εν X. 'I. (Weiss), it must have been added without καὶ. As to οὐκ in the passage, referring to concrete persons and a definite fact, and negativing not merely the εν σαρκί (Hofmann), but the actual position εν σ. πεποθ., see Winer, p. 451 f. [E. T. 609]; Baeumlein, Partik. p. 276 f.

Ver. 4. By the οὐκ εν σαρκί πεποθ., which he had just used, Paul finds himself led to his own personal position; for he was, in fact, the proper organ of the anti-Judaizing tendency expressed in ver. 3, and the real object against which the whole conflict with it was ultimately directed. Hence, by the words οὐκ εν σαρκί πεποθ., he by no means intends to concede that he is destitute of that πεποθησις which was
founded on externals;\(^1\) no, in this respect also he has more to show than others, down to ver. 6.\(^2\) So no one might say that he was despising what he himself did not possess. — The classical kal\(\nu\)p with the participle (only used here by Paul; and elsewhere in the N. T. only in Heb. v. 8, et al.; 2 Pet. i. 12), adds to the adversative sentence a limiting concessive clause (Baumlein, Partik. p. 201 f.), and that in such a way, that from the collective subject of the former the apostle now with emphasis singles out partitively his own person (\(\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\)).\(^3\) If, following the Homeric usage, he had separated the two particles, he would have written: \(\kappa\alpha\lambda\ \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ \pi\epsilon\rho\); if he had expressed himself negatively, he would have said: \(\pi\delta\delta\epsilon\rho\pi\ \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ \omega\nu\ \dot{\epsilon}\chi\omega\nu\). — The confidence also in flesh, i.e. in such circumstances as belong to the sphere of the materially human, is in \(\dot{\epsilon}\chi\omega\nu\) (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 4) conceived as a possession; he has this confidence, namely, from his personal position as an Israelite—a standpoint which, laying out of view for the moment his Christian transformation, he boldly adopts, in order to measure himself with his Judaistic opponents on their own ground of proud confidence, and thereupon in ver. 7 ff. yet again to abandon this standpoint and to make those Israelitish advantages vanish into nothing before the light of his vital position as a Christian. Hence the \(\pi\epsilon\pi\omega\lambda\theta\eta\sigma\iota\iota\varsigma\), his possession of which he in the first instance urges, is not \(\textit{fiduciae argumentum}\) (Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Estius, and others, including Flatt, Hoelemann, and Weiss); nor is the possession of it to be viewed as something which he \(\textit{might}\) have (Storr, Rilliet, Matthies, Ewald); nor is it to be referred to the \(\textit{pre-Christian}\) period of the apostle's life (van Hengel). The latter is also the view of Hofmann, who holds \(\dot{\epsilon}\chi\omega\nu\) (and then \(\delta\iota\omega\kappa\omega\nu\) also) as the \(\textit{imperfect}\) participle, and gives to the whole passage the involved misinterpretation: \(\textit{that kal\(\nu\)p introduces a protasis, the apodosis}\)

\(^1\) \(\text{na}i\ \text{to} \text{\(\epsilon\gamma\pi\iota\iota\)},\ \text{namely, in addition to the higher Christian relations, on which I place my confidence.}\)

\(^2\) \(\text{Only a comma is to be placed after \(\text{\(\epsilon\omega\mu\omega\nu\iota\iota\varsigma\)}\) in ver. 3; but after \(\text{\(\epsilon\gamma\pi\iota\iota\)}\) in ver. 4 a full stop; and after \(\text{\(\dot{\epsilon}\mu\mu\mu\nu\iota\iota\varsigma\)}\) in ver. 6 another full stop. So also Lechmann and Tischendorf. In opposition to Hofmann's confusing construction of the sentence, see below.}\)

\(^3\) \(\text{Comp. Kühner, II. I, p. 248. 8.}\)
of which follows with ἄλλα in ver. 7. In accordance with this view, ver. 4 is supposed to mean: "Although I possessed a confidence, and that, indeed, based on such matters as are flesh, if any other ventures to trust in such things, I for my part possessed confidence in a higher degree." This is erroneous; first, because the familiar ἄλλα of the apodosis is used indeed after καὶτος (with finite tense; Stallbaum, ad Plat. Phaed. p. 68 E; Parm. p. 128 C), but not after the common καὶτερ with particle, attaching itself to a governing verb; secondly, because καὶ before εὐ σαρκὶ means nothing else than also, which does not suit the interpretation of Hofmann, who desires to force upon it the here inappropriate sense, and that indeed; thirdly, because the present δοκεῖ presupposes the present sense for ἔχων also; and lastly, because with ἔγω μᾶλλον the present (in accordance with the preceding δοκεῖ), and not the imperfect, again suggests itself as to be supplied. And how awkward would be the whole form of expression for the, after all, very simple idea! — τίς . . . ἄλλας] quite generally: any other person, but the intended application to the above-mentioned Judaizers was obvious to the reader. See the sequel. The separation by δοκεῖ lays all the stronger stress on the τίς. — δοκεῖ] not: "thinks to be able to confide" (de Wette and many others); nor yet: "si quis alius videtur" (Vulgate), since it is a matter depending not upon the judgment of others, but upon his own fancy, according to the connection. Hence: if any one allows himself to think, if he presumes. Just in the same way, as in the passage parallel also in substance, Matt. iii. 9. Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 16. — ἔγω μᾶλλον] sc. δοκῶ πεπ. εὐ σαρκὶ, I for my part presume it still more. This mode of expression implies a certain boldness, defiance; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 21.

Vv. 5, 6. Predicates of the ἔγω, by which that ἔγω μᾶλλον is justified.—If those Judaizers were, as may be inferred from our passage, partly proselytes (to these the πεπερ. ὄκτασσ. stands in contrast), partly persons whose Jewish descent was not so noble and pure as that implied in ἐν σαρκὶ. . . . Ἐβραῖοι, and if they could not boast of any such law-strictness, zealous activity, and righteousness, as is described in κατὰ νόμου . . . ἄμεμπτος; and if, on the other hand, there were found con-
joined in the case of Paul the elements here adduced of ancient theocratic legitimacy and perfection; the ἐγὼ μᾶλλον in ver. 4 was completely made good. — περιτομή δεκτήμ. in respect to circumcision an eighth-day-one, not older, as were the proselytes who were only circumcised at a later period of life. The eighth-day character in the relation specified by περιτομή is conceived as a quality of the persons concerned, which distinguishes them from those circumcised later.¹ The reading περιτομή as nominative (some min. and Fathers, Erasmus, Vatablus, Cornelius a Lapide, Mill, Bengel, Matthies, Heinrichs, and others, also Elz. 1624, 1633, not 1641), so that it would stand in the concrete sense (circumcisus), is erroneous, because this usage occurs only collectively. — ἐκ γένους Ἰσρ. that is, a descendant of Jacob, not, therefore, possibly of Idumaean blood. The theocratic name Ἰσρ. corresponds entirely with the design of the passage. Comp. on Eph. ii. 12. On what follows, comp. 2 Cor. xi. 22; Rom. xi. 1. — φυλής Βέναμ. therefore not, possibly, an Ephraimite (Ezra iv. 1); a climactic more precise definition of the ἐν γένεια; ἐν γένεια γὰρ ἡ φύσις καὶ ἐν γένεια, Soph. Phil. 862 (874). For its fuller exhibition Paul finally specifies the last feature of his lineage: Ἐβραῖος ἐκ Ἐβρ., that is, a Hebrew born of Hebrew parents, so that his mother also was a Hebrew woman. His lineage is not carried further back in respect to both parents, because it was not the custom to trace back the genealogy of the wives. Inappropriate to the context is the rendering of Michaelis, following Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact: “one speaking Hebrew, born of Hebrew-speaking parents.” It is also erroneous, following the Greek Fathers, to take Ἐβρ. of the tota majorum series (Beza, Grotius, Storr, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others), because this was after the two previously specified points self-evident. If, among his ancestors, Paul had had one who was a non-Hebrew, he would not have been descended from Jacob and Benjamin, but from the non-Hebrew and his forefathers. For instances of expressions quite similar to Ἐβρ. ἐκ Ἐβρ., used to denote the

¹ For instances of the personal use of such nomina dialex, see especially Wetstein on John xi. 39; comp. generally Kühner, II. 1, p. 234 f.
identity, as conditioned by birth, of a man's position with that of his parents, see Wetstein and Kypke; they occur very frequently in classic authors. — κατὰ νόμου κ.τ.λ.] After his Jewish εὐγενεία there now follows his distinguished personal position in Judaism, set forth in a threefold climactic gradation: (1) In respect of the law (of Moses) a Pharisee. Comp. Acts xxvi. 5, xxii. 6. The Pharisees stood in the closest and strictest relation to the law, as they with their traditions were regarded as the most orthodox expositors, defenders, and observers of it. The interpretation of νόμον, not in its habitual historic sense, but generally as regular rule (Beza) or disciplina (ἀδερφὸς) (Castalio, Wolf, Grotius, Storr, Heinrichs, Rheinwald, Hoelemann, and others), is all the more erroneous, since the validity of the Mosaic law in Christianity was the very principle upheld by those Judaizers; see also below, δικαιον. τ. ἐν νόμῳ. (2) In respect of zeal (zealous maintenance and championship of the law-religion, 1 Macc. ii. 58; Acts xxii. 20; Gal. i. 14), a persecutor of the church. Comp. Gal. i. 13 f. The present participle is used as a substantive, comp. on Gal. i. 23. What Paul, to his deep grief, had been (1 Cor. xv. 8 f.; 1 Tim. i. 13), he, with a bitter recalling of his former distinction in Judaism, throws, by way of confronting the Jewish zealots, into the scale, as a characteristic predicate not yet extinct. And precisely thus, unaccompanied by any ποτέ as in Gal. i. 23, it carries from the standpoint to which he has now attained very strong weight (in opposition to Hofmann, who holds the present sense to be impossible here). (3) In respect to righteousness, which is grounded on the law, having become blameless (ii. 15), having carried it so far (not: having borne myself so, as Hofmann renders it; comp. on ii. 15), that human judgment finds nothing in me to blame in this respect! That which is here denoted by δικ. ἡ ἐν νόμῳ is not substantially different from δικ. ἡ ἐκ νόμου in ver. 9; comp. Rom. x. 5. It has its basis in the law, so far as it consists in the accordance of its nature with the character and the rules of that institute (Gal. iii. 11, v. 4), and proceeds from the law, so far as it is produced by the precepts of the latter which man follows. In opposition to the correlation with ver. 9
de Wette interprets: "the righteousness valid in the state of law (comp. Rom. ii. 12)." Calvin appropriately observes that Paul means "totam justitiam legis," but "communi hominem existimatione;" that it is not, therefore, the real moral fulfilment of the law, but its justitia externa literalis. Comp. J. Müller, v. d. Sünde, I. p. 59, ed. 5.

Ver. 7. Now, with the antithetic ἀλλά, the apostle comes again to his real standpoint, far transcending any πεπόιηθαι ἐν σαρκί, and says: Νῦ! everything that was gain to me, etc. — ἀνωτάτως, the category of the matters specified in vv. 5 and 6.¹ The emphasis is to be placed on this word; comp. ταῦτα subsequently. — ἦν μοι κέρδη] μοι is not the dative of opinion (Erasmus, Beza, and many others, including Heinrichs, Rheinwald, Hoelemann, Matthies, de Wette, Hofmann; comp. van Hengel, who takes κέρδη as luca opinata); but such things were to the apostle in his pre-Christian state really gain (κατὰ σάρκα). By means of them he was within the old theocracy put upon a path which had already brought him repute and influence, and promised to him yet far greater honours, power, and wealth in the future; a career rich in gain was opened up to him. The plural κέρδη denotes the various advantages dependent on such things as have been mentioned. Frequently used also in the classical writers. — ταῦτα emphatically: these very things. — διὰ τὸν Χ. for the sake of Christ, who had become the highest interest of my life. Paul explains himself more particularly in vv. 8, 9, explanations which are not to be here anticipated. — ἐγχείριον as harm, that is, as disadvantageous (the contrast to κέρδος; comp. Plat. de luci cup. p. 226 E, Leg. viii. p. 835 B), because, namely, they had been impediments to the conversion to Christ, and that owing to the false moral judgment and confidence attaching to them. Comp. Form. Conc. p. 708; Calvin on ver. 8. This one disadvantage he has seen in everything of which he

¹ The later heretical enemies of the law appealed to this passage, in which also, in their view, the law was meant to be included. On the other hand, Chrysostom and his successors asserted that the law was meant only in comparison with Christ. Estius, however, justly observes: "non de ipso lege loquitur, sed de justitia, quae in lege est."
is speaking; hence the *plural* is not again used here as previously in *κόρης*. The *ἡγημα* (*perfect*), however, has occurred, and is an accomplished fact since his *conversion*, to which the apostle here glances back. On *ἡγείσθαι* *ἡγείσθαι*, comp. Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* II. p. 454; Lucian, *Lexiph.* 24; on the relation of the *singular* to the plural *κόρη*, *Eur. Cyc.* 311: *πολλοί λιτινα *κόρη* ποιηρα* *ἡγείσθαι* *ἡμείσςατο*.

Ver. 8. *Ἀλλά* is the climactic *but, still, much more*, giving a *corrective* reference of the sense, signifying that with the previous *ἀρνακ...* *ἡγείσθαι* there has not yet been enough said. Comp. on 2 Cor. vii. 11. In the *μὲν οὖν* it is implied, that "*μὲν* rem praesentem confirmet, *οὖν* autem conclusionem ex rebus ita comparatis conficiat," Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 663. Hence *ἀλλὰ* *μὲν οὖν*: *quidem igitur*. The *καὶ* before *ἡγοῦμαι* (after *ἀλλὰ* *μ. οὖν*) serves also to help the *climactic* sense, outbidding what has been said previously: *etiam*, i.e. *adeo*. It is consequently to be explained: *but, accordingly, I am even of opinion that everything* (not merely what was meant by *ἀρνακ* in ver. 7) *is a disadvantage*. It is clear, withal, from the following διὰ τὸ *ὑπερέχον κ.τ.λ.* that *πάντα* is meant indeed *without restriction*, of all things, goods, honours, etc. (comp. also Hofmann), but in so far as they are not made subordinate to the *knowledge of Christ*. The explanation of others, according to which *ἀλλὰ* *μὲν οὖν* is intended to oppose the *present* *ἡγοῦμαι* by way of correction to the *perfect* *ἡγημα* (Calvin and others, including Winer, p. 412 [E. T. 552], and the explanation hitherto given by me), is incorrect, because *ἡγημα*, and not the aorist *ἡγοῦμαι*, was employed previously, and the perfect already involves the continuance of the opinion in the present, so that no contrast of the *tenses* would logically be elicited. The climactic contrast lies rather in the fact that the second *ἡγείσθαι* *ἡγείσθαι* is a *much more comprehensive* one than the first, in fact, *one without exception* (*πάντα*). — διὰ τὸ *ὑπερέχον κ.τ.λ.* *on account of the surpassingness of the knowledge of Christ*; that is, because this knowledge, to which I have attained, is a possession which excels in value everything else; the eminent quality of a possession attained is the *ground* (διὰ) for estimating other possessions according to their relation to
that one, and consequently, if they stand to the latter in a relation hindersome to us, for looking upon them no longer as something advantageous, but as hurtful. As to the neuter adjective used as a substantive with the genitive, in order to the more prominent setting forth of the attribute, see Bernhardy, p. 155 f.; Winer, p. 220 [E. T. 294]. — Χριστός Ἰησοῦς ὁ κυρίος μου; this is the fundamental sum of the whole contents of Christian knowledge. This saving knowledge is the necessary intelligence of faith (comp. on John viii. 32), and grows with the experience of faith (ver. 10; Eph. iii. 16 ff.). — δί διν] for the sake of whom, i.e. for the sake of possessing Him; comp. afterwards ἵνα Χριστὸν ... αὐτῷ. — τὰ πάντα] the whole, not general like πάντα previously (Hofmann), but: which I possessed, vv. 5-7. This more precise definition by the article results from ἐξημωθην, in connection with which the aorist is to be noted, by which Paul denotes that great historical turning-point in his life, the event of his conversion; through that event he has lost all his (pre-Christian) valued possessions,¹ and thenceforth he has them no more. Luther erroneously interprets: “considered as harm;” and the emotion and force of the expression are only weakened by the frequently given reflexive sense (see Beza, Calvin, Heinrichs, Flatt, Hoelemann, van Hengel, and many): I have made myself lose,—a meaning, besides, which cannot be shown to belong to the passive form of the aorist of this verb (not even in Luke ix. 25). The future passive form ἐξημωθησόμαι (see Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. iii. 9. 12, Thuc. iii. 40. 2) is invariably danno officiar. — καὶ ἧγομαν κ.τ.λ. not to be taken as independent (de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Weiss), but, in keeping with the climactic flow of the discourse, as still in continuous connection with δι' ἰν τ. κ.τ.λ.; hence δι' ἰν τ. π. ἐξημ. is not, with van Hengel, to be put in a parenthesis. Paul had become loser of all these things for Christ’s sake, and he holds them as not worthy of possession.

¹ Observe here, also, the shrewdly contrived correspondence of ἐξημα in ver. 7 f., and ἐξημωθην in ver. 8, in which the former expresses the idea of damnum, detrimentum, and the latter: I have become loser of. It might be reproduced in Latin: “etiam censeo omnia detrimentum (i.e. detrimentos) esse... propter quem omnium detrimentum (i.e. jacturam) passus sum censeoque ea esse quisquillas.”
but as rubbish! σκύψαλον, refuse (such as sweepings, dung, husks, and the like); Ecclus. xxvii. 4; Plut. Mor. p. 352 D; and see Wetstein ad loc.; frequently in the Anthol., see Jacobs, Arch. Tat. p. 522, ad Anthol. VII. p. 173, IX. p. 208. Comp. the similar figurative expressions περικάθαρμα and περιψήμα, 1 Cor. iv. 13. — ἐνα X. κερδή] The design in the ἄγονας σκύψαλον [eivas: in order to gain Christ, not the aim of τὰ πάντα εἰζημωθήν (Hofmann), there being no reason for such a retrospective reference. The gaining of Christ, i.e. the appropriation of Him by means of the fellowship brought about through faith, is that, which for him is to take the place of those former κέρδη which he has lost, and so he looked to this gain in his ἄγονας σκύψαλον eivas; it is present to his view as the one and highest gain at which he has to aim. It is true that Paul has Christ already long ago (Gal. ii. 20; Eph. iii. 17; 2 Cor. xiii. 3); nevertheless, this κερδάλεων is from its nature a development, the completion of which still lies before him. Comp. vers. 12 ff.

Ver. 9. Καὶ εἰρεθῶ ἐν αὐτῷ] and to be found in Him. The emphasis, which previously lay upon Χριστόν, is laid not upon εἰρεθῶ (Hofmann), but upon the εἰρεθῶ placed first for that reason, and introducing a new feature of the relation aimed at, annexing to the (subjective) gaining of Christ the (objective) moulding of life corresponding to it. The apostle desires to be found in Christ, as in the element of his life; by this he means (comp. Ignatius, Eph. 11) the whole perceptible manifestation of his Christian being and nature; so that εἰρ. must neither be limited to the judicium Dei (Beza, comp. Flatt), nor taken as sim (Grotius and others). Calvin erroneously makes εἰρεθῶ active: Paulum renuntiasse omnibus quae habebat, ut recuperaret in Christo.—μη ἔχων κ.τ.λ.] Specific modal definition to εἰρ. ἐν αὐτῷ: so that I, in accordance with this design, may not have, etc. Van Hengel erroneously connects (Lachmann, also, and Tischendorf have omitted the comma after αὐτῷ) μη ἔχων κ.τ.λ. immediately with εἰρ. ἐν αὐτῷ: et deprehendam in communione ejus non meam qualem-

1 Not to be derived from εἷς κυνίς βαλλειν, quod canibus projectur, but from εἰς (εἰς). See Lobeck, Pathol. p. 92.
cunque habere probitatem. Thus, indeed, ἐν αὐτῷ would be utterly superfluous! The subjective negation μὴ flows from the conception of design (今生), see Baeumlein, Partik. p. 295; Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 302 [E. T. 351]; and ἔχων is the simple habens, possessing, not: holding fast (am Ende, Rheinwald, Baumgarten-Crusius). — ἐμὴν διὰ τὴν ἐκ νόμου] See on ver. 6; comp. Rom. x. 3. It is the righteousness acquired as a self-achievement (ἐμὴν), which proceeds from the law by means of a justifying compliance with it (Rom. ii. 13). As to the nature of this righteousness, and the impossibility of attaining it, comp. Gal. ii. 16, iii. 10; Rom. iii. 19 f., iv. 4, vii. 7 ff., ix. 31, et al. — τὴν διὰ πίστευ. Χριστὸν] contrast to ἐμὴν: that procured by faith in Christ (as the causa apprehendens). The causa efficiens is God (His grace, see Eph. ii. 8); hence, for the complete exhaustion of the matter, τὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ διὰ is added, in which ἐκ Θεοῦ, correlative to the preceding ἐκ νόμου, expresses the causal issuing from God. As to the way in which this ἐκ Θεοῦ takes place, namely, by God’s imputing faith as righteousness,9 see Rom. i. 17, iii. 24 f., iv. 3 ff.; 2 Cor. v. 19; Gal. iii. 6. — ἔπει τῇ πίστει] on the ground of faith (Acts iii. 16), added at the end with solemn emphasis, and dependent on ἔχων, which is again to be supplied after ἀλλὰ. So also Weiss. The repetition of ἔχων after ἔπει τῇ πίστει, which Hofmann feels the want of in this explanation, would be simply superfluous and clumsy. Ἐπεὶ τῇ πίστει is usually attached to δικαιοσύνην (“justitiam superstructam fidei,” Hoelemann, Wiesinger), some having taken ἔπει as “in fide” (Vulgate, Calvin), or in fide sitam (Castalio); others as “per fidem” (Beza, Grotius); others, for the sake of faith (de Wette); others, upon the condition of faith (Storr, Flatt, Matthies, Rilliet, van Hengel, J. B. Lightfoot). But it may be urged against this connection, first, that, in accordance with the previous definitions, we could not but expect the repeti-

1 On the genitive of the object with σέρνην, comp. i. 27. Against taking it as the genitive suctoris, see on Rom. iii. 22.
2 In this passage also, therefore, justification by faith is the basis and presupposition of further Christian development up to the blessed consummation, ver. 11. Comp. Köstlin, in the Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol. 1856, p. 121 f.
tion of the article; secondly, that δικαιοσύνη with ἐπὶ nowhere occurs in the N. T.; and lastly, that δικαιοσύνη in its quality as righteousness of faith was already distinctly designated by τὴν διὰ πίστειν Ἡμῶν, so that the same attribute of it would be expressed twice, and, on the other hand, the ἔχον which is to be repeated after ἀλλὰ (the basis of which is still ἐπὶ τ. π.) would be without any more precise definition. In opposition to Hofmann, who makes ἐπὶ τ. πίστει belong to the following infinitive clause, see on ver. 10.

Ver. 10. Telic definition of the relation expressed by μὴ ἔχον κ.τ.λ. in ver. 9. Paul has not the righteousness of the law, but the righteousness of faith, in order to know, etc. This knowledge would fail him if, on the contrary, instead of the righteousness of faith, he had that of the law. So he reverts to a more detailed illustration of τὸ ἐπερέχεσθαι τῆς γνώσεως Ἡμῶν, ver. 8, expressing, in the first place, again generally the great personal contents of the knowledge accruing from the righteousness of faith (τοῦ γνώναι αὐτῶν), and next, more particularly, the most important—especially to the apostle in his position infinitely important—matters which were its objects (τὴν δύναμιν κ.τ.λ.), developing them from his own richest experience, which had thus brought home to his deepest consciousness the ἐπερέχεσθαι τῆς γνώσεως Ἡμῶν. The τοῦ γνώναι might also be conceived as dependent on ἐπερεθεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ (Wiesinger, Schneckenburger, Schenkel); but the more precise definition of this ἐπερεθεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ by μὴ ἔχον κ.τ.λ. is so important, earnest, and solemn, that it most naturally carries with it also the statement of aim which follows. Chrysostom joins ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει to ver. 10: τί δὲ ἔστιν ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ γνῶναι αὐτῶν; ἀρα διὰ πίστεως ἡ γνώσις, καὶ πίστεως ἄνεν γνῶναι αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔστι. So also Theodoret and Erasmus, and recently Hofmann (comp. also his Schriften. I. p. 618), who, in doing so, takes ἐπὶ in and by itself correctly as on the ground of faith. But such cases of emphatic prefixing, while they are certainly found with ἧν (see on Gal. ii. 10; Eph. iii. 18), are not found before the genitive of the infinitive with the article, which represents the expression with ἧν, but in such infinitive clauses only between article and infinitive; hence Paul would
have written τοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει γνώναι. Comp. Rom. viii. 12; 1 Cor. xvi. 4. Hofmann improperly appeals, not any longer indeed to Rev. xii. 7, but, doing violence to the position of the words in the LXX., to 2 Sam. vi. 2; Isa. x. 32. According to Castalio, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, and others, the genitive τοῦ γν. is meant to depend on τῇ πίστει; "describit vim et naturam fidei, quod scilicet sit Christi cognitio" (Calvin). But πίστει is never joined with the genitive of the infinitive with the article; and, besides, not the nature, but the object of the faith (ver. 9) would be denoted by the genitive (Col. ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 13, et al.). Nor is τοῦ γνώναι αὑτῶν to be regarded as parallel with Ἰνα Χ. κεφήσω κ. εἰρ. ἐν αὑτῷ (Estius, Storr, Heinrichs, and others, including Rheinwald, Hoelemann, Rilliet, de Wette, Winer), since it is in itself arbitrary to despise the appropriate dependence on what immediately precedes, and to go back instead to ἤγοημαι σκι- βάλα ἑνας; and since in Ἰνα Χριστῶν κερδ. κ. εἰρέθω ἐν αὑτῷ two elements are given, a subjective and an objective one, so that thus there would be presented no parallel corresponding with the subjective τοῦ γνώναι κ.τ.λ. Moreover, Paul is in the habit of introducing two parallel clauses of design with a double Ἰνα (Rom. vii. 13; Gal. iii. 14; 2 Cor. ix. 3). — The γνώναι, which both conditions the faith and also in fuller development follows it (see on ver. 8), is not the discursive, or generally theoretical and speculative knowing, but the inwardly salutary, experimental becoming-acquainted-with (“qui expertus non fuerit, non intelliget,” Anselm), as is plain from τὴν δύναμιν κ.τ.λ. Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 8, viii. 2; Gal. iv. 9, et al.; frequently so used in John. See also Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 421, ed. 2.— καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς ἀναστ. αὐτοῦ καὶ τ. κοινον. τ. παθ. αὐτ.] and (that is, and especially) the power of His resurrection and the fellowship of His sufferings. The δύναμ. τ. ἀναστ. αὐτ. is not the power by which He has been raised (Vatablus, Grotius; comp. Matthies), which would be quite unsuitable to the context, but the power which the resurrection of Christ has, its vis et efficacia in respect to believers. The special point that Paul has in view, is supplied by the context through what is said immediately before of the
righteousness of faith, to which τοῦ γινώσκει κ.τ.λ. refers. He means the powerful guarantee of justification and salvation which the resurrection of Christ affords to believers; see Rom. iv. 25, v. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 17; Acts xiii. 37, 38. This power of the resurrection is experienced, not by him that is righteous through the law, but by him that is righteous through faith, to whom the resurrection of the Lord brings the constant energetic certainty of his reconciliation procured by Jesus' death and the completion of eternal life (Rom. viii. 11; 1 Cor. vi. 14; Col. iii. 1 ff.; Phil. iii. 21). Comp. also Rom. viii. 34, where this δύναμις τῆς ἀναστ. is triumphant in the apostle. As a matter of course, this power, in virtue of which the resurrection of Christ, according to 1 Cor. xv. 17, Rom. iv. 25, might be described as "complementum redemptionis" (Calvin), is already in regeneration experimentally known, as is Christ generally (αἵρός); but Paul speaks from the consciousness that every element of the regenerate life, which has τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει, is an ever new perception of this power. The view which understands it of the moral power of awakening (Beza and others, also van Hengel; comp. Rilliet), according to Rom. vi. 4, Col. ii. 12, or the living power of victory, which lies for the believer in the resurrection of Christ, according to 2 Cor. iv. 10, Gal. ii. 20, Phil. iv. 13,—by means of which the Christian, "through his glorified Lord, himself also possesses an infinite new power of acquiring victory over the world and death" (Ewald, comp. de Wette, Schneckenburger, Wiesinger, Schenkel; substantially also Hofmann),—does not accord either with the words themselves (for so understood it would be the power of the risen Christ, not the power of His resurrection), or with the following κ. τὴν κοινωλαν τῶν παθημ. αἵρος, which, in a logical point of view (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 10–12), must either have gone before, or have been expressed by ἐν τῇ κοινωλίᾳ κ.τ.λ. The certainty of our own resurrection and glory (Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Storr, Heinrichs, Hoelemann, and others; comp. Pelagius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Theophylact) is necessarily included also in the δύναμις, without, however, being exclusively meant. By the series ser-
monis Bengel (comp. Samuel Crelil) has allowed himself to be misled into explaining ἀνάστασις, not of the resurrection at all, but of the exortus or adventus of the Messiah. References of various kinds are mixed up by Rheinwald, Flatt, Schinz, Usteri, and others. — καὶ τὴν κοινων. τῶν παθημ. αὐτοῦ] In these words Paul intends to express—and he does so by the repetition of the article with a certain solemnity—a second, highly valuable relation, conditioned by the first, to the experimental knowledge of which the possession of the righteousness of faith was destined to lead him, namely, the fellowship of the sufferings of Christ, in which he sees a high proof of divine grace and distinction (i. 29, ii. 17 f.). Comp. Col. i. 24. Suffering for the sake of Christ's cause is a participation in Christ's sufferings (a συμπάσχεω, Rom. viii. 17), because, as respects the characteristic kind and way of suffering, one suffers the same that Christ suffered (according to the ethical category, drinks of the same cup which Christ drank, Matt. xx. 22). Comp. 1 Pet. iv. 13, and see on 2 Cor. i. 5, Col. i. 24; also on τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, 2 Cor. iv. 10. The explanation which makes it: suffering with such a disposition of mind as He suffered (as stedfastly, etc.), given by Flatt and others, is imported from a rationalistic point of view; and the view which takes it in the sense of: the believing appropriation of the merit of Christ (Calovius, Rheinwald, and others), is opposed to the words, and at variance with the habitual conception of a real συμπάσχεω with Christ, under which the sufferings of Christian martyrs were regarded. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, have already in substance the correct view. Observe, moreover, that Paul has not written τὴν δύναμιν τῆς κοινωνίας κ.τ.λ. (Hoelemann: “vim ac pondus;” de Wette: “all that this fellowship involves;” comp. Corn. a Lapide: “dulcedinem ac sanctitatem”); the γνώνας, on the contrary, relates to the matter itself, to the knowledge of which only those righteous by faith can attain, whilst to those righteous by the law it remains an unknown element; the subjectivity for it is wanting to the latter, though the objective suffering is present. It was otherwise with the previous element; for the resurrection of Christ
in itself—the fact as such—is known also by him who is righteous through the law, but not so its δύναμις, of which only the righteous through faith is aware. The knowledge of this δύναμις, in virtue of which he experiences in the resurrection of Christ the abiding divinely effectual guarantee of his justification and eternal life, makes him capable also of recognising in his sufferings for the sake of the gospel a fellowship in the sufferings of Christ; the latter knowledge is conditioned by the former; he would not have it without the former, because he would be driven to look upon his faith as vain and idle, and upon himself, so far as he suffers, as ἐλεημόσυνα τῶν ἀνθρώπων (1 Cor. xv. 14, 17, 19). The enthusiastic feeling of drinking the cup of Christ is not possible, unless a man bears in his heart the mighty assurance of salvation through the resurrection of the Lord. — συμμορφοφυζόμενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὑτοῦ] denotes the corresponding situation (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 10), in which Paul was conscious that he should know, as one righteous by faith, the κωνονόλαυ τῶν παθ. Χριστοῦ: inasmuch as I am made like to His death; for his position then was such that he saw himself threatened with martyrdom, consequently (comp. ii. 17) his state of suffering developed itself into similarity to the death of Christ. This present state of development of the being made like to Christ is indicated by the present participle. The interpretation, which takes it of the fellowship in suffering generally, which is here more precisely described (Calvin, Estius, and others; also Wiesinger and Weiss), does not satisfy the progression from the general παθηματῶν to the definite θανάτῳ. And the sense: "non detrectando mortem ejus morti similem" (Vatablus; comp. Matthies and de Wette) is imported into the words, which by Grotius, van Hengel, Rilliet, Schneckenburger, and others, are interpreted quite in opposition to the context, as referring to the ethical dying to the world, its lusts, etc. (Rom. vi.; Gal. ii. 19). The nominative συμμορφοφυζόμενος, which is to be explained as dependent, not in a clumsily complicated fashion on εἰρέθω (Grotius, Hoelemann, Hofmann, and others), but on τοῦ γνώναι κ.τ.λ., refers to its logical subject. See Eph. iv. 2.

Ver. 11. Ἐν τῷ if possibly, designating the aim, the attain-
ment of which is before the apostle’s mind in the συμμορφικό-
μενος τῷ θαν. αὐτοῦ. In this case, however, the deliberative
form of expression (comp. Rom. i. 10, xi. 14; Kühner, Π. 2,
p. 1034) bears the impress, not of doubt that he will attain to
the resurrection of the dead (in case, namely, he should not live
to see the Parousia), but of humility under the conception of
the greatness of the bliss, and of the moral condition to which, on
man’s part, it is subject; ὦ θαρρῷ γάρ, φησιν, οὕτως οὕτως ἔταπενοφρόνει,
ὅπερ ἀλλαχοῦ λέγει: ὡς δοκῶν ἐστάναι, βλεπέτω μὴ πέσῃ, Theophylact : comp. Chrysostom. This suffices also
in opposition to Baur’s doubt (Paulus, Π. p. 79 f.) whether
Paul could have expressed himself in this way at all. The
expression excludes moral security, but not the certitude
salutis in itself, as, following Estius and other Catholic ex-
positors, Bisping still thinks. The certainty of salvation is
founded on God’s decree, calling (Rom. viii. 29 f.), promise,
and attestation by the Spirit (Rom. viii. 10), in faith on
the saving facts of redemption (Rom. viii. 32 f.). Comp.
Calovius.—The reader could not feel any doubt as to what
ἐξανάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν Paul means, namely, the first, in which
οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ (1 Cor. xv. 23) shall
arise. Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 16. It is the resurrection of the
dead καὶ ἐξοχήν, not different from the ἀνάστασις τῶν δικαλων.
See on Luke xiv. 14. Nevertheless, we must not find this
resurrection denoted by the double compound ἐξανάστη, the
ἐξ in it conveying the idea ἐκ τῆς γῆς εἰς τὸν ἀέρα (Theophy-
lact). This ἐξ is simply to be explained by the conception
ἐκ τῆς γῆς, so that neither in the substantial meaning nor even
in style (Bengel: “Paulinus enim stylius Christo adscribit
ἀνάστασιν, ἐξανάστασιν Christianis”) is ἐξανάστη. to be dis-

1 It is incorrect to acribe to the apostle the idea that none but believers will
rise at the resurrection, and that unbelievers will remain in Hades (Weiss). The
resurrection of all, as Christ Himself unquestionably taught it (see on John
v. 23 f.; Luke xiv. 14), is also in Paul’s view the necessary premiss of the judg-
ment of all, of believers and also of unbelievers (of the κινήσεως, Rom. iii. 6; 1 Cor.
vi. 2, xi. 32). That view, moreover, is at variance with the apostle’s distinct
declaration in Acts xxiv. 15, comp. xvii. 31. Gerlach properly declares himself
(Letate Dinge, p. 147 ff.) opposed to Weiss, but still limits the final judgment,
at p. 101 ff., as regards the persons subjected to it, in a way that is exegetically
altogether unjustifiable.
ttinguished from *ἀνάσα*; but the former is to be explained solely from the more vividly imaginative view of the event which the apostle has before him. Comp. on 1 Cor. vi. 14. The double compound *substantive* does not occur elsewhere in the N. T. (the *verb*, Mark xii. 19; Luke xx. 28; Acts xv. 5); but see Polyb. iii. 55. 4, ii. 21. 9, ii. 35. 4; Gen. vii. 4. Compl. We may add, that while it has been explained, at variance with the context, as referring to the *ethical* resurrection, Rom. vi. 4 f. (Flacius, Balduin, Coccejus, and others; comp. Schrader), it is also erroneous to find in it the sense: "if perchance I should remain alive until the resurrection of the dead" (van Hengel, Hilgenfeld); since, on the contrary, essentially the same meaning is expressed as in Luke xx. 34 by *οἱ καταχωθέντες ... τὴν ἀνασάσεως*, and it is conceived as a possible case (comp. i. 20 ff., ii. 17) that Paul will not remain alive until the Parousia.¹ *καταφέρει εἰς* (comp. Eph. iv. 13) denotes the attaining to a *goal* (frequently in Polybius, see Schweighäuser, *Lex.* p. 332; see also the passages from the LXX. and Apocr. in Schleusner, *III.* p. 234 f.), which, however, is here not a *point of time*, but a *bliss* which is to be attained. Comp. Acts xxvi. 7.

Vv. 12–14. Protest, that in what he had said in vv. 7–11 he had not expressed the fanciful idea of a Christian perfection already attained; but that, on the contrary, his efforts are still ever directed forward towards that aim — whereby a mirror for self-contemplation is held up before the Philippians in respect to the moral conceit which disturbed their unity (ii. 2–4), in order to stir them up to a like humility and diligence as a condition of Christian perfection (ver. 15).

Ver. 12. *οὐχ ἐστιν* By this *I do not mean to say that*, etc. See on 2 Cor. i. 24, iii. 5; John vi. 46. Aken, *Lehre v. Temp. u. Mod.* p. 91 ff. He might encounter such a misconception on the part of his opponents; but "in summo fervore sobrietatem spiritualem non dimittit apostolus," Bengel. — *ηδον ἔλαβον* that *I have already grasped it*. The object is not named by Paul, but left to be understood of itself from the

¹ This also applies against the view of Otto, *Pastoralbr.* p. 283, who has altogether misunderstood vv. 11 and 12.
context. The latter represents a prize-runner, who at the goal of the σταυροδρομία grasps the βραβεῖον (ver. 14). This βραβεῖον typifies the bliss of the Messiah's kingdom (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8), which therefore, and that as βραβεῖον, is here to be conceived as the object, the attainment of which is denied to have already taken place. And accordingly, ἔλαβον is to be explained of the having attained in ideal anticipation, in which the individual is as sure and certain of the future attainment of the βραβεῖον, as if it were already an accomplished fact. What therefore Paul here denies of himself is the same imagination with which he reproaches the Corinthians in 1 Cor. iv. 8 (see in loc.). The reference to the βραβεῖον (so Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Bengel, Heinrichs, Rilliet, and others) is not proleptic;\(^1\) on the contrary, it is suggested by the idea of the race just introduced in ver. 12, and is prepared for by the preceding κατανίκεω εἰς τὴν εὐανάστασιν τ. νεκρ., in which the Messianic σωτηρία makes its appearance, and the grasping of the βραβεῖον is realized; hence it is so accordant with the context that all other references are excluded. Accordingly, we must neither supply metam generally (Beza, comp. Ewald); nor τὴν αὐνάστασιν (Rheinwald); nor τὸν Χριστὸν (Theodoret; comp. Weiss); nor moral perfection (Hoelemann, following Ambrosiaster and others); nor the right of resurrection (Grotius); nor even "the knowledge of Christ which appropriates, imitates, and strives to follow Him" (de Wette; comp. Ambrosiaster, Calvin, Vatablus, van Hengel, Wiesinger); nor yet the καταντᾶν of ver. 11 (Matthies). — ἦν ἔδω τετελεῖσθαι or—in order to express without a figure that which had been figuratively denoted by ἦν ἔλαβον—were already perfected.\(^2\) For only the ethically perfected Christian, who has entirely become and is (observe the perfect) what he was intended to become and be, would

---

\(^1\) As also Hofmann objects, who finds the notion of the verb alone sufficient for expressing what is to be negated, but yet likewise ultimately comes to eternal life as a supplement; for that which is not yet attained is one and the same with that which is one day to be attained.

\(^2\) This being perfected is not the result of the ἔλαβον (Wiesinger, Weiss), but the moral condition of him who can say ἔλαβον. Note that ἦ is used, and not ναι; ναι might have been taken as annexing the result.
be able to say with truth that he had already grasped the \( \beta \varphi \alpha \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota \omega \nu \), however infallibly certain might be to him, looking at his inward moral frame of life, the future \( \sigma \omega \tau \rho \nu \pi \lambda \). He who is not yet perfect has still always to run after it; see the sequel. The words \( \dot{\eta} \, \dot{\eta} \, \nu \dot{\eta} \, \delta \varepsilon \iota \mu \kappa \alpha \omega \mu \alpha \varsigma \), introduced in considerable authorities before \( \dot{\eta} \), form a correct gloss, when understood in an ethical sense. For instances of \( \tau \varepsilon \lambda \iota \omega \upsilon \upsilon \theta \alpha \varsigma \)—which is not, with Hofmann, to be here taken in the indefinite generality of being ready—in the sense of spiritual perfection (comp. Heb. ii. 10, v. 9, xii. 23), see Ast, Lex. Plat. III. p. 369; comp. Philo, Alleg. p. 74 C, where the \( \beta \varphi \alpha \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota \omega \nu \) are adjudged to the soul, when it is perfected. To be at the goal (Hammond, Wolf, Loesner, Heinrichs, Flatt, Rilliet, and others), is a sense, which \( \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon \alpha \) might have according to the context. In opposition to it, however, we may urge, not that the figure of the race-contest only comes in distinctly in the sequel, for it is already introduced in ver. 12, but that Paul would thus have expressed himself quite tautologically, and that \( \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon \alpha \iota \) in ver. 15 is correlative with \( \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon \alpha \varepsilon \omega \mu \alpha \varsigma \).—\( \delta \varepsilon \omega \kappa \nu \, \delta \dot{e} \) but I pursue it, i.e. I strive after it with strenuous running; see ver. 14. The idea of urgent haste is conveyed (Abresch, ad Aesch. Sept. 90; Blomfield, Gloss. Pers. 86). The \( \delta \dot{e} \) has the force of an \( \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \) in the sense of on the other hand; Baenumlein, Partik. p. 95, and comp. on Eph. iv. 15. We must understand \( \tau \beta \varphi \alpha \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota \omega \nu \) as object to \( \delta \varepsilon \omega \kappa \nu \), just as in the case of \( \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \beta \nu \) and \( \kappa \tau \alpha \alpha \lambda \beta \omega \); hence \( \delta \varepsilon \omega \kappa \nu \) is not to be taken absolutely (Rilliet; comp. Rheinwald, de Wette, Hofmann), although this in itself would be linguistically admissible (in opposition to van Hengel), see on ver. 14. Phavorinus: \( \delta \varepsilon \omega \kappa \nu \, \varepsilon \iota \nu \tau \tau \tau \tau \, \alpha \rho \lambda \alpha \omega \nu \).—\( \varepsilon \iota \) \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \kappa \alpha \lambda \beta \omega \)\] This \( \varepsilon \dot{i} \) is, as in \( \varepsilon \iota \, \pi \omega \), ver. 11, deliberative: if I also, etc., the idea of \( \sigma \kappa \tau \sigma \iota \epsilon \iota \nu \) or some similar word being before his mind; the compound \( \kappa \tau \alpha \alpha \lambda \beta \omega \) is more (in opposition to Weiss) than \( \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \beta \nu \), and denotes the apprehension which takes possession; comp. on Rom. ix. 30, 1 Cor. ix. 24, where we have the same progression from \( \lambda \alpha \beta \nu \) to \( \kappa \tau \alpha \alpha \lambda \beta \mu \beta \); Herod. ix. 58: \( \delta \omega \kappa \tau \tau \tau \, \varepsilon \iota \tau \iota \), \( \varepsilon \dot{i} \) \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \kappa \alpha \lambda \beta \omega \)\] and \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \) implies: I not merely grasp (\( \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \beta \nu \)), but also actually appre-
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 hend. — ἐφ' ὅ καὶ κατελήφθην ὑπὸ Χ. Comp. Plat. Tim. p. 38 D: δεδομαται καταλαμβάνοι τε καὶ καταλαμβάνονται, 1 Cor. xiii. 12: ἐπηγνώσωμαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπηγνώσθην, Ignatius, Rom. 8: θελήσατε, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς θελήσητε, Trall. 5: πολλὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν λείπει, ἵνα Θεοῦ μὴ λευτόμεθα: because I was also apprehended by Christ. This is the determining ground of the διόκω, and of the thought thereto annexed, ei καὶ καταλάβω. Theophylact (comp. Chrysostom and Theodoret) aptly remarks: δείκνυς, ὅτι ὁφειλή ἐστι τὸ πράγμα, φησί διότι καὶ κατελήφθη. ὑπὸ Χ. Otherwise, in fact, this having been apprehended would not have been responded to on my part. Respecting ἐφ' ὅ, on the ground of this, that, i.e. propter quod, see on Rom. v. 12; 2 Cor. v. 4. The interpretation: for which, on which behalf (Oecumenius, Beza, Grotius, Rheinwald, Rilliet, Weiss, and others), just as in iv. 10, is indeed linguistically correct and simple; but it assigns the conversion of Paul, not to the general object which it had (Gal. i. 16), but to a personal object. In this case, moreover, Rilliet, de Wette, Wiesinger supply τοῦτο previously, which is not in accordance with the objectless δειλαβον. More artificial are the explanations:whereunto, in the sense of obligation (Hoelemann); under which condition (Matthies); in so far as (Castalio, Ewald); in the presupposition, that (Baur); which is certain from the fact, that (subjective ground of knowledge; so Ernesti, Urspr. d. Sünde, II. p. 217). According to Hofmann, Paul desires to give the reason why, and for what purpose, he contemplates an apprehension. But thus the reference of ἐφ' ὅ κ.τ.λ. would be limited to ei κ. καταλάβω, although the positive leading thought has been introduced in διόκω δὲ. Ἐφ' ὅ κ.τ.λ. serves this leading thought along with that of its accessory definition ei κ. καταλάβω. — καὶ also, subjoins to the active καταλάβω the ingeniously corresponding passive relation κατελήφθην. And by κατελήφθη. Paul expresses what at his

1 2 Tim. iv. 7 does not conflict with our passage, but is the confession at the end of the course, "exemplum accipientis jam jamque," Bengel.

2 Paul is conscious that, being apprehended by Christ, he may not and cannot do otherwise. Comp. Bengel: quoniam; sensus virtutis Christi ascendit Christianum.
conversion he experienced from Christ (hence the aorist); there is no need for suggesting the idea, foreign to the context, of an apprehended fugitive (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Theodoret, and others, including Flatt and van Hengel). The fact that at that time Christ laid hold of him on his pre-Christian career, and took him into His power and gracious guidance as His own, is vividly illustrated by the figure, to which the context gave occasion, κατελήφθη. ἐπὶ Χ.

Vv. 13, 14. Once more, and with loving earnestness (ἀδελφοί), Paul says what he had already said in ver. 12 with υἱὸν δότι . . . καταλάβω; and in doing so, he brings more into relief in the first portion the element of self-estimation, which in his own case he denies; and, in the second part, he sets forth more in detail the idea: διόνυσον δὲ εἰ κ. καταλ. — ἔγω ἐμαυτόν] ego me ipsum, an emphatic mode of indicating one’s own estimation, in which one is both subject and object of the judgment. Comp. John v. 30 f., vii. 17, viii. 54; Acts xxvi. 9, et al. A reference to the judgment of others about him (Bengel, Weiss, and others; comp. also Hofmann) is here out of place.

— λογικομαί] I judge, I am of opinion,1 Rom. iii. 28, viii. 18, xiv. 14; 2 Cor. xi. 5, et al.; Xen. Anab. ii. 2. 13; Dem. lxiii. 12.— ἐν δὲ] Comp. Anthol. Pal. vii. 455: ἐν δὲ ἄντι πάντων, also the frequent ἐν μόνον; see Stallbaum, ad. Plat. Symp. p. 184 C, Rep. p. 548 C. It is here usually supplemented by ποιῶ (Chrysostom appears to have understood ποιῶν). So also Winer, Buttmann, de Wette, Wiesinger, Ellicott. But how arbitrarily, seeing that the context by what immediately precedes suggests simply the supplying of λογικομαί (not λογις. κατεληφέναι, Oecumenius, Weiss), and this is in perfect harmony with the sense! Hence we take it thus: “but one thing I think, unam censeo.” This one thing which Paul thinks regarding the matter in question, in contrast to the previous negative (δὲ, as in ver. 12), is then directly expressed by all that follows from τὰ μὲν ὄπλωσι τοῖς Χ. Ι. Nearest to this contextual supplement comes the Syriac, which has added σώζει, and Luther, who has added λέγω. The supplying of

1 οὗ belongs to λογικομαί. The erroneous reference to κατεληφέναι produced the reading σώζω (A D Μ min. vss. and Fathers), which Tischendorf 8. has adopted.
λογιζόματι is confirmed by the cognate φρονῶμεν, ver. 15. Without supplying anything, ἦν δὲ has either been connected with διώκει (thus Augustine, Serm. de divers. i. 6, Pierce, Storr, van Hengel, and others), or has been taken absolutely: "unum contra!" see Hoelemann, comp. Rheinwald. But the former is to be rejected, because the subsequent διώκει carries its own complete definiteness; and the latter would render the discourse abrupt without reason, since it is not written under emotional excitement, and would, withal, require a supplement, such as Beza gives by ἐστὶ. Hofmann also comes at length in substance to this latter supplement, mixing up an imaginary contrast to that which the adversaries imputed to the apostle: over-against this, his conduct subsequently described was the only thing which was quite right (?). — τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω what is behind, cannot be referred to what has been mentioned in vv. 5 and 6 and the category of those pre-Christian advantages generally (so in substance, Pelagius; τινὲς in Theodoret, Vatablus, Zeger, Wolf, and others, also Ewald and Hofmann); this would be at variance with the context, for τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω ἐπιλανθ. corresponds to the negation of the having already attained or being perfect in ver. 12, and must therefore apply to the previous achievements of the Christian life, to the degrees of Christian moral perfection already reached, which are conceived as the spaces already left behind in the stadium of the runner still pressing forward; and not to what had belonged to his pre-Christian conduct (Hofmann). Comp. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact. — ἐπιλανθάνω.] forgetting, like the runner who dismissions from his mind the space already traversed, and fixes his thoughts only on what still lies before him. This is surely no break in the internal connection (as Hofmann objects); on the contrary, like the runner pressing forward, Paul in his continuous restless striving overlooks the degree of moral perfection already attained, which he would not do, if he reckoned it already as itself perfection. ἐπιλανθάνοντος is joined with the genitive and accusative; the simple verb, on the contrary, only with the genitive. See Kühner, II. 1, p. 313. On the use of the word in the sense of intentional forgetting, comp. Herod. iii. 75, iv. 43; 1 Macc. i. 49.
It thus amounts to the sense of *nullam rationem habere* (Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* II. p. 294). — τοῦ; δὲ ἐξυποθετεὶν ἐπεκτεινόμου] but stretching myself out towards that which is before. The dative is governed by the verb compounded with ἐπὶ (Krüger, § 48. 11. 5; Nägelsbach, *zur Ilias*, p. 30, ed. 3), the ἐπὶ intimating the direction. In the case of such an one running “prono et quasi praecipiti corpore” (Beza), “oculus manum, manus pedem praeverit et trahit,” Bengel. On the verb, comp. Strabo, xvii. p. 800; Aristot. *Poet.* 21; Plut. *Mor.* p. 1147 A. Ῥὰ ἐμπρ. represent the higher stages of Christian perfection not yet attained.¹ — καὶ δὲ ἐκτὸς ἐκὼ I hasten towards the goal, therefore in a straight course towards the prize of victory. The opposite: ὠκὺ ἐκτός, Hom. *Od.* xi. 344, xxii. 6; Plat. *Theaet.* p. 179 C, *Tim.* p. 25 E; Xen. *Conv.* ii. 10; Lucian, *Iacrom.* 2; and παρὰ ἐκτός, Pind. *Ol.* xiii. 144. On ἐκὼ without an accusative of the object (in opposition to van Hengel), comp. Xen. *Anab.* vii. 2. 20, vi. 5. 25 (δρόμῳ ἐκών); Aesch. *Sept.* 89; Buttmann, *Lexil.* p. 219; Jacobs, *Ad Anthol.* IX. p. 213. Comp. on ver. 12. The prize of victory (τὸ βραβεῖον, see on 1 Cor. ix. 24; Clem. Cor. I. 5; Schol. min. *ad Soph.* El. 680; Oppian, *Cyneg.* iv. 196; Lycophr. 1154) represents the salvation of the Messiah’s kingdom (see on ver. 12), to which God has called man. Hence: τῆς ἄνω κληρον, a genitive which is to be taken not as appositional (de Wette, Schenkel), but as the genitive of the subject: the βραβεῖον, to which the calling relates. Comp. Luther: “which the heavenly calling holds out.” This is therefore the object of the ἐλπὶς τῆς κλήρως (Eph. i. 18, iv. 4; comp. the Platonic καλὸν τὸ ἄθλον καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς μεγάλη, *Phaed.* p. 114 C). — ἡ ἄνω κληρον τοῦ Θεοῦ is the calling which issued from God above in heaven (on ἄνω, comp. Col. iii. 2, Gal. iv. 26; and on the subject-matter, Heb. iii. 1), by which He has called us to the σωτηρία of His kingdom. The general form of expression, not even limited

¹ Ῥὰ ἐμπρ. is thus conceived by the apostle as that which still lies further in prospect after every advance in the ethical course; not as that which lay before him in consequence of his conversion (contrasting with his pre-Christian efforts), as Hofmann thinks. It is the ever new, greater, and loftier task which he sees before him, step after step.
by a pronoun (such as τῆς ἐμῆς), does not allow us to think only of the miraculous calling of the apostle himself; this is rather included under the general category of the ἄνω κλήσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, which in the individual cases may have taken historically very different forms. The ἄνω, which in itself is not necessary, is added, because Paul is thoroughly filled with the consciousness of the divine nature of the κλήσεως in its exaltedness above everything that is earthly. Lastly, the κλήσεως itself is, as always (even in 2 Thess. i. 11), the act of calling; not that wherefore one is called (de Wette), or “le bonheur céleste même” (Rülliet); and the general currency of the idea and expression forbids us also, since no indication of the kind is given, to conceive of God as βραβευτής or βραβεύω, as the judge of the contest (Pollux, iii. 145; Blomf. Gloss. ad Aesch. Pers. 307), who through the herald summons the runners to the race (Grotius, Wolf, Rosenmüller, am Ende, Hoelemann, van Hengel, Wiesinger); τῆς ἄνω κλ. τ. Θ. serves to define more accurately that which is figuratively denoted by βραβεύω, but does not itself form a part of the allegory. — ἐν X. 'Ι.] is rightly (so also Weiss) joined by Chrysostom to διώκω: ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τούτο ποιῶ, φησίν. οὐ γὰρ ἐν χορφί τῆς ἐκείνου ῥοπής τοσοῦτον διέλθειν διάστημα. Comp. Theodoret and Oecumenius. This thought, that the διώκειν just described is done by him in Christ, as the great upholding and impelling element of life in which amidst this activity he moves, is emphatically placed at the end as that which regulates all his efforts. The usual connection of these words with τ. ἄνω κλήσεως τ. Θεοῦ, in which the calling is understood as brought about through Christ (rather: having its causal ground in Christ), yields a superfluous and self-obvious definition of the κλήσεως already so accurately defined; although the connecting article would not be necessary, since, according to the construction καλεῖν ἐν Χ. (1 Cor. vii. 22; 1 Pet. v. 10), ἐν X. 'Ι. might be joined with κλήσεως so as to form one idea; comp. Clem. Cor. I. 46. A contrast to the calling issued to Israel to be God's people on earth, is groundlessly suggested by Hofmann.

Ver. 15. Application of the passage vv. 12–14 for the benefit of the Philippians, down to ver. 17. — τέλειον] denotes
not perfection, like τετελεσμένος in ver. 12, but the moral ripeness which, with differences of degree in the case of individuals, belongs to the true Christian state that has advanced beyond the novitiate—that Christian maturity in which one is no longer νήπιος ἐν Χριστῷ; comp. on 1 Cor. ii. 6, iii. 1; Eph. iv. 13. The τετελεσμένος is the ideal goal of the development of this τέλειον εἶναι, contradistinguished from the νηπίωτης. The special aspect of this maturity, which Paul had in view in using τέλειος, is to be regarded, not as theoretical knowledge,—the doctrine of righteousness by faith being conceived to be specially referred to (Erasmus, Wolf, Rheinwald, and others),—but as the moral character and striving of believers, as appears from ver. 13 f., along with which the corresponding relation of practical insight is self-evident as a necessary presupposition (comp. Col. iv. 12, i. 28); although there is no reason to suppose that particular questions in this domain (such as those relating to sacrificial flesh, fasts, feasts, and the like) had arisen in Philippi and occasioned division, of which no trace exists. The jealousy and partial disunion in the church arose from a moral conceit, which was prejudicial to mutual humility (ii. 3 ff.) and to personal genuine striving after holiness (ii. 12 ff.). In using ὅσοι—with which we are to supply sumus simply, and not volumus esse—Paul leaves it to the conscientious judgment of every reader whether he, on his part, belongs to the number of the τέλειος; but by including himself in this predicate, and yet having previously negativèd the ἡδύ τετελεσμένος in his own case (ver. 12), the apostle removes all idle misunderstanding and abuse of his words which might tend to moral pride, and then by τότε φρονῶμεν leaves room only for the consciousness: ὡς τέλειον τὸ μὴ νομίζων ἐαυτὸν τέλειον εἶναι, Chrysostom. A tone of irony (Schenkel) is utterly alien to the heartfelt character of the whole discourse, which is, moreover, in this application, ver. 15, so expressed as to include the apostle in common with his readers. To the Catholic fictions of a state of perfection the passage is in direct opposition. — τότε φρονῶμεν] let us have this frame of mind, namely, which I, in ver. 13 f., have just expressed as mine; the frame of humble self-
estimation, and at the same time incessant pressing forward. Grotius holds quite arbitrarily that Paul reverts to what he had said in ver. 3. But it is also wrong to seek the reference of τοῦτο φρον. in the passage from ver. 4 onwards: "renunciandum esse splendidis virtutibus Judd. (vv. 4–7), contra in solo Christo acquiescendum (vv. 8–10) et ad victricem palmam studio indefesso anittendum (vv. 12–14)," Hoeleman; comp. Calvin, Wolf, Heinrichs, and others, including Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, Rilliet, and Reiche; similarly Hofmann, who makes it refer to the entire presentation—joining on to ver. 3—of a frame of mind which is opposed to the disposition of those against whom they are to be on their guard. Vv. 4–11 are certainly said by way of warning against the false teachers, and are opposed to these; but this opposition is of a dogmatic nature, for the upholding of the Pauline fundamental doctrine against Judaism, and it is only ver. 12 that begins what has regard to the moral progress of the Church in the right way pressing onward to the goal, in which respect Paul desires to serve for their model (ver. 17), as which he has sketched himself in ver. 13 f., when he begins with ἀδελφός and introduces his ἐγώ. Besides, the φρονώμεν, which is correlative with the λογιζομαι, does not point back beyond ver. 13 f. Therefore, not even the appropriation of Christ, vv. 8–11, is to be included in the reference of the τοῦτο (in opposition to de Wette and Wiesinger). Van Hengel is inclined to refer τοῦτο to τὸ βραβεῖον; but the readers needed the exhortation to the right mode of striving after the βραβεῖον, and not the summons generally, that they should have the βραβ. in view. This applies also against the similar, although more exact, interpretation of Fritzsche (Diss. II. in 2 Cor. p. 92): "haec mente simus ut τὸ βραβ. τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως consectetur." — καλ εἶ τι ἐτέρων φρον. and if as to any point (ἥ, accusative of the object) ye be otherwise minded, take up another way of thinking, varying, namely, from that specified in τοῦτο φρονώμεν. A man may, forsooth, have in general the same frame of mind which Paul has represented in himself, and to which he has summoned his readers; but at the same time an isolated concrete case
(τι) may occur, which a man cannot fit into the φρονεῖν in question, and regarding which he is of opinion that he ought to be differently minded, so that in such a state of things he becomes morally inconsistent in his frame of mind, inasmuch as he lacks the besetting ἐτέρως and ἀλοθής εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν κ.τ.λ., i. 9, in the moral judgment which determines the φρονεῖν. Hofmann arbitrarily limits the τι to some matter independent of the essential disposition of the Christian life. This sense would have required a more precise definition, in order to be found. And the hope which is uttered in the apodosis, is in perfect harmony with the prayer in i. 9 f.; hence Hofmann’s objection, that the readers must have themselves corrected the fault which according to our view here emerges, is quite groundless. The subject addressed is the readers generally (see ver. 17), not the ντηρία (Hunnius, Wolf, Bengel, Storr, and others, including Flatt, Rheinwald, Hoelemann, Rilliet, Reiche), whom several expositors have regarded as those who had not yet raised themselves to the pure righteousness of faith excluding the law (see Rheinwald and Reiche), or who had allowed themselves to be led away by false teachers (see Hunnius, Grotius, Storr). But setting aside the arbitrariness generally with which this contrast is introduced, it is opposed by the fact, that Paul does not assume any thorough and essential diversity in the φρονεῖν, but only such a variation as might affect some one or other isolated point (τι), and that not in the doctrinal, but in the moral province of Christian conduct. Moreover, if persons led astray were here in question, nothing would be less in harmony with the character of the apostle than the hopeful tolerance which is expressed in the words καὶ τοῦτο . . . ἀποκαλύψει. Lastly, the change of person (in opposition to Bengel) was necessary, because Paul, speaking of a partial ἐτέρως φρονεῖν, could not include himself. — In ἐτέρως, otherwise (not occurring elsewhere in the N. T.), there is implied, according to the context, an unfavourable sense, the notion of incorrectness, secius quam oportet. Comp. Hom. Od. i. 234; Dem. 298. 22, 597. 3; Eustath. ad Od. p. 1448. 2; Soph. Phil. 503; Valckenaer, Diatr. p. 112; just as ἐτέρως (comp.
on ἀλλο, Gal. v. 10) may denote even that which is bad or hostile (Wisd. xix. 3; Dissen. ad Pind. Nem. viii. 3, Pyth. iii. 54; Wyttenbach, ad Plat. Phaed. p. 321). It is here the ἐκποδοξεῖν (Plat. Theoct. pp. 190 E, 193 D), as frame of mind. This has not been attended to by van Hengel, when he takes with equal unsuitableness τὶ in an emphatic sense, and φρονεῖν as to strive for: "si quid boni per aliam viam expetitis, quam ego persequor." — καὶ τοῦτο ὃ Θεὸς ὑμ. ἀποκ. Expression of the hope that such variations will not fail to be rectified, on the part of God, by His revealing operation. Certainly, therefore, the variations, which Paul so forbearingly and confidently and without polemical handling commits to revealing correction on the part of God, were not on matters of principle or of an anti-Pauline character. — καὶ τοῦτο] this also, like other things which He has already revealed unto you; so that in καὶ is contained the idea also still (Hartung, Partikell. I. p. 135). Hofmann erroneously says that καὶ implies: there, where the disposition is present, which I require. It in fact belongs to τοῦτο. This τοῦτο, however, is not: that ye (Oecumenius, Grotius, Cornelius a Lapide, Fritzsche, l.c. p. 93), but what ye wrongly think; the frame of mind in question, as it ought to be instead of the ἐκποδοξεῖν, not: "whether you are right or I" (Ewald). Calvin aptly says: "Nemo ita loqui jure posset, nisi cui certa constat suae doctrinae ratio et veritas." The passage is very far from betraying uncertainty or want of firmness (Baur). — The ἀποκαλύψει, which is to be taken as purely future, is conceived by Paul as taking place through the Holy Spirit (see Eph. i. 17; Col. i. 10), not by human instruction (Beza). He might also have written διδάξει (comp. θεοδ. δακτος, 1 Thess. iv. 9; also John vi. 45), by which, however, the special kind of instruction which he means would not have been indicated. This is the inward divine unveiling of ethical truth, which is needed for the practical reason of him who in any respect otherwise φρονεῖ than Paul has shown in his own example; for οὗ περὶ δογμάτων ταῦτα εἴπηται, ἀλλὰ περὶ βίου τελειώτητος καὶ τοῦ μὴ νομίζειν ἑαυτοῦ τελειός εἶναι, Chrysostom. Wherever in this moral respect the right frame of mind is not yet completely present in one or the other, Paul
trusts to the disclosing operation of God Himself, whose Spirit rules and works in the Church and its individual members (1 Cor. ii. 14, iii. 16; Eph. i. 17, ii. 21 f.; Rom. viii. 9, 15, 26; Gal. v. 22, 25, et al.).

Ver. 16. A caution added to the precept given in ver. 15, and the promise coupled with it: Only let there be no deviation in the prosecution of the development of your Christian life from the point to which we have attained! Neither to the right nor to the left, but forward in the same direction! This warning Paul expresses briefly and precisely thus: "Only whereeto we have attained,—according to the same to direct your walk!"—that is, "however ye may be in some point otherwise minded and, therefore, may have to await further revelation, at all events ye ought not to deviate—this must in every case be your fundamental rule—from that whereeto we have already attained in the Christian life; but, on the contrary, should let the further direction of your moral walk be determined by that same."

Such a general precept addressed to the Philippians conveys an honourable testimony to the state of their moral constitution on the whole, however different in individuals we may conceive the point to be from which Paul says εἰς ἀφθονίαν, as is evident from the very fact that he includes himself in the εἰς ἀφθονίαν, which could not but honour and stimulate the readers. On πρότερον, nisi quod, comp. i. 18; on φθανέω εἰς, to attain to anything, comp. Matt. xii. 28; Luke xi. 26; 1 Thess. ii. 16 (ἐπτεύομαι); Rom. ix. 31; Dan. iv. 19; Tob. v. 18; Plut. Mor. p. 338 A; Apollod. xii. 242. It denotes the having come forward, the having advanced. Ewald takes it: if we had the advantage (see 1 Thess. iv. 15, and the common classical usage), that is: "in what we already possess much better and higher than Judaism." But this reference to Judaism is not given in the text, which aims to secure generally their further progress in the development of Christian life. On στοιχεῖον with the dative of the rule: to advance (march) according to something, that is, to direct oneself in one's constant conduct by something, see on Gal. v. 16, 25. The infinitive, however, as the expression of a briefly measured wish or command, without supplying λέγω, δεῖ, or the like (which Buttmann requires, PHIL. M
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Neut. Gr. p. 233 [E. T. 272], stands in place of the imperative, as in Rom. xii. 15; see Hom. II. i. 20, and Nagelsbach in loc.; Stallbaum, ad Plat. Rep. p. 473 A.; Pfugk, ad Eur. Heracl. 314; Fritzsche, ad Rom. III. p. 86. Fritzsche, however, Diss. II. 2 Cor. p. 93, has erroneously made the infinitive dependent on ἄποκαλύψει: "praeterea instituet vos, ut, quam ego consecutus sum τῷ βραβεῷ τῆς ἀνώ κλήσεως intentam mentem, ejusdem participes fieri ipsi annitamini." Comp. Oecumenius. Decisive against this view is the plural ἐφθάσαμεν, which, according to the context (ver. 15), cannot apply merely to Paul, as well as the fact that the antithesis of persons (ego...ipsa) is gratuitously introduced. Michaelis, who is followed by Rilliet, closely unites ver. 16 with the sequel, but in such a way that only an awkward arrangement of the sentences is attained, and the nervous vigour of the concise command is taken away.—The εἰς δὲ ἐφθάσα—,—which cannot in accordance with the context denote the having attained to Christianity, to the being Christian (Hofmann's view, which yields a meaning much too vague and general)—has been rightly explained by Chrysostom and Theophylact as relating to the attainments in the Christian life, which are to be maintained, and in the further development of which constant progress is to be made (δ κατωρθώσαμεν, κατέχωμεν, Theophylact). Comp. Schinz and van Hengel. This view is corroborated by the sequel, in which Paul represents himself as model of the walk; and therefore it is not to be referred merely to the measure of the right frame of mind attained (Weiss). Most expositors understand the words as signifying the measure of Christian knowledge acquired (so also Heinrichs, Flatt, Rheinwald, Matthies, Hoelemann, de Wette, Wiesinger), in conformity with which one ought to live. In connection with this, various arbitrary definitions of the object of the knowledge have been suggested, as, for instance, by Grotius: "de cir-

1 This is thrown out as a suggestion also by Hofmann, according to whom the infinitive clause ought "perhaps more correctly" to be coupled with ἐνμυθημένων, and taken as a prefixed designation of that in doing which they are to be his imitators and to have their attention directed to those, etc. Thus the infinitive would come to stand as infinitive of the aim. But even thus the whole attempt would be an artificial twisting of the passage without reason or use.
Cumcisione et ritibus;” Heinrichs and de Wette: concerning the main substance of the Christian faith apart from secondary matters; Schneckenburger: “that man is justified by faith, and not by the works of the law;” along with which de Wette lays stress on the point that it is not the individual more or less perfect knowledge (so usually; see Flatt, Rheinwald, Matthies) that is meant, but the collective conviction, the truths generally recognised. But the whole interpretation which refers it to knowledge is not in keeping with the text; for ἐφθάσαμεν, correlative with στοιχεῖα, presents together with the latter a unity of figurative view, the former denoting the point of the way already attained, and τῷ ἄντρῳ στοιχεῖα, perseverance in the direction indicated by that attainment. Therefore, if by στοιχεῖα there is clearly (see ver. 17) intended the moral conduct of life, this also must be denoted by εἰς ὃ ὑπὸ, as respects its quality attained up to the present time. Moreover, if εἰς ὃ ὑπὸ is to be understood as referring to knowledge, there would be no motive for the prominence given to the identity by τῷ ἄντρῳ.

REMARK.—What Paul means in ver. 16 may be illustrated thus:

\[ A \quad B \quad \text{D} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{E} \]

Here B is the point of the development of Christian life εἰς ὃ ὑπὸ ἐφθάσαμεν, which, in the case of different individuals, may be more or less advanced. The τῷ ἄντρῳ στοιχεῖα takes place when the path traversed from A to B is continued in the direction of C. If any one should move from B in the direction of either D or E, he would not τῷ ἄντρῳ στοιχεῖα. The reproach of uncertainty which Wiesinger brings against this canon, because a ἐπίθες γροῦ may take place which does not lie in the same direction, and generally because the power of sin might hinder the following out of this direction, would also apply in opposition to every other explanation of the εἰς ὃ ὑπὸ, and particularly to that of the knowledge attained; but it is altogether unfounded, first, because the ἐπίθες γροῦ only refers to one or another concrete single point (τι), so that the whole of moral attainment—the collective development—which has been reached is not thereby disturbed; and, secondly, because Paul in this case has to do with a
church already highly advanced in a moral point of view (i. 5 ff.),
which he might, at all events generally, enjoin to continue in the
same direction as the path in which they had already travelled.
Very groundless is also the objection urged by Hofmann, that
the ἵπται must necessarily be one and the same for all. This
is simply to be denied; it is an utterly arbitrary assumption.

Ver. 17. In carrying out this command they are to follow
his example, which he has previously held up to their view,
especially from ver. 12 onwards. — συμμεμηταί co-imitators,
is a word not elsewhere preserved. Comp., however, συμμε-
μούμενοι, Plat. Polit. p. 274 D. σῶν is neither superfluous
(Heinrichs, comp. Hofmann), nor does it refer to the imitation
of Christ in common with the apostle (Bengel, Ewald),—a
reference which cannot be derived from the remote i. 30–ii. 8,
and which would be expressed somewhat as in 1 Cor. xi. 1;
1 Thess. i. 6. Neither does it refer to the obligation of his
readers collectively to imitate him (Beza, Grotius; and others,
including Matthies, Hoelemann, van Hengel, de Wette), so
that "omnes uno consensu et una mente" (Calvin) would be
meant; but it means, as is required by the context that follows:
"una eum aliis, qui me imitantur" (Estius; comp. Erasmus,
Annot., Vatablus, Cornelius a Lapide, Wiesinger, Weiss, Ellicott,
and others). Theophylact aptly remarks: συγκολλή αυτοῖς
τοῖς καλῶς περιπατοῦσι, whereby the weight of the exhortation
is strengthened. — σκοπεῖτε direct your view to those who, etc.,
namely, in order to become imitators of me in like manner as
they are. Other Christians, not Philippians, are meant, just
as ver. 18 also applies to those of other places. — καθώς] does
not correspond to the ὅμως, as most expositors think, but is
the argumentative "as" (see on i. 7), by which the two previous
requirements, συμμεμηταί κ.τ.λ. and σκοπεῖτε κ.τ.λ., are estab-
lished: in measure as ye have us for an example. This
interpretation (which Wiesinger and Weiss adopt) is, notwith-
standing the subtle distinction of thought which Hofmann
suggests, required both by the second person ἔχετε (not ἔχοντε)
and by the plural ἡμᾶς (not ἡμεῖς). This ἡμᾶς refers not to the
apostle alone (so many, and still de Wette; but in this case, as
before, the singular would have been used), nor yet generally
to the apostle and his companions (van Hengel, Baumgarten-Crusius, Lightfoot), especially Timothy (Hofmann), or to all tried Christians (Matthies); but to him and those ὄσα (in this manner, imitative of me) περπαταούνται. This view is not at variance with τὸν in the singular (de Wette); for the several τοῖς of individuals are conceived collectively as τῶν. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 7 (Lachmann, Lünemann); see also 2 Thess. iii. 9; comp. generally, Berhardy, p. 58 f.; Kühner, II. 1, p. 12 f. This predicative τῶν, which is therefore placed before ἡμᾶς, is emphatic.

Ver. 18. Admonitory confirmation of the injunction in the verse. 17. — περπαταούσων is not to be defined by κακῶς (Oecumenius), or longe aliter (Grotius; comp. Syr.); nor is it to be taken as circulantur (comp. 1 Pet. v. 8) (Storr, Heinrichs, Flatt), which is at variance with the context in the verse. 17. Calvin, unnaturally breaking up the plan of the discourse, makes the connection: “ambulant terrena cogitantes” (which is prohibited by the very article before ἐπὶ. φρον.), and puts in a parenthesis what intervenes (so also Erasmus, Schmid, and Wolf); whilst Estius quite arbitrarily overleaps the first relative clause, and takes περπᾶ along with δὲ τὸ τέλος κ.τ.λ. Erasmus (see his Annot.) and others, including Rheinwald, van Hengel, Rilliet, de Wette, Wiesinger, and Weiss, consider the discourse as broken off, the introduction of the relative clauses inducing the writer to leave out the modal definition of περπᾶ. Hofmann transforms the simple λέγειν (comp. Gal. i. 9) into the idea of naming, and takes τοὺς ἐχθροῦς as its object-predicate, in which case, however, the mode of the περπατεῖν would not be stated. On the contrary, the construction is a genuine Greek mode of attraction (see Wolf, ad Dem. Lept. 15; Pflugk, ad Eur. Hec. 771; Kühner, II. 2, p. 925; Buttm. Neut. Gr. p. 68 [E. T. 77]), so framed, that instead of saying: many walk as the enemies of the cross, this predicative definition of mode is drawn into the relative clause ὅσι πολλάκις κ.τ.λ.¹ and assimilated to the relative; comp. Plat. Rep.

¹ Hence also the conjecture of Laurent (Neut. Stud. p. 21 f.), that ὅσι πολλάκις . . . ἠκώλυμα is a supplementary marginal note inserted by the apostle, is unwarranted.
p. 402 a., and Stallbaum in loc. It is therefore to be interpreted: *Many, of whom I have said that to you often, and now tell you even weeping, walk as the enemies, etc.* The πολλάκις, emphatically corresponding with the πολλοὶ (2 Cor. viii. 22), refers to the apostle’s presence in Philippi; whether, at an earlier date in an epistle (see on iii. 1), he had thus characterized these enemies of the cross (Flatt, Ewald), must be left undecided. But it is incorrect to make these words include a reference (Matthies) to ver. 2, as in the two passages different persons (see below) must be described.—νῦν δὲ καὶ κλαῖον] διὰ τί; διε ἐπέτεινε τὸ κακὸν, διὰ δακρύων ἄξιοι οἱ τουσώτι... οὕτως ἐστὶ συμπαθητικός, οὕτω φροντιζεί πάντων ἀνθρώπων, Chrysostom. The deterioration of these men, which had in the meanwhile increased, now extorts tears from the apostle on account of their own ruin and of their ruinous influence.—τοὺς ἔχθρ. τ. στ. τ. Χ.] The article denotes the class of men characteristically defined. We must explain the designation as referring, not to enemies of the doctrine of the cross (Theodoret: ἄς διδάσκοντας διὰ δέχα τῆς νομικῆς πολιτείας ἀδύνατον συνεχίας ὑπερθύμ, so in substance Luther, Erasmus, Estius, Calovius, Cornelius a Lapide, Wolf, and many others; also Heinrichs, Rheinwald, Matthies), so that passages such as Gal. v. 11, vi. 12, would have to be compared; but, as required by the context which follows, to Christians of Epicurean tendencies (ἐν ἀνόησις ζωντες κ. τρυφη, Chrysostom; comp. Theophylact and Oecumenius), who, as such, are hostile to the fellowship of the cross of Christ (comp. iii. 10), whose maxims of life are opposed to the παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor. i. 5), so that it is hateful to them to suffer with Christ (Rom. viii. 17). Comp. ver. 10, also Gal. vi. 14. In opposition to the context, Rilliet and Weiss understand non-Christians, who reject Christianity with hostile disdain, because its founder was crucified (comp. 1 Cor. i. 18, 23), or because the preaching of the cross required the crucifixion of their own lusts (Weiss); Calvin interpreted it generally of hypocritical enemies of the gospel. This misunderstanding ought to have been precluded by the very use of the tragic πολλοὶ, the melancholy force of which lies in the very fact that they are Christians, but
Christians whose conduct is the deterrent contrast to that which is required in ver. 17. See, besides, in opposition to Weiss, Huther in the *Mecklenb. Zeitschr.* 1862, p. 630 ff.—We have still to notice that the persons here depicted are not the same as those who were described in ver. 2 (contrary to the usual view, which is also followed by Schinz and Hilgenfeld); for those were teachers, while these πολλοί are Christians generally. The former might indeed be characterized as ἔχθροι τ. σταυροῦ τ. Χ., according to Gal. vi. 12, but their Judaistic standpoint does not correspond to the Epicureanism which is affirmed of the latter in the words δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡ κοίλα, ver. 19. Hoelemann, de Wette, Lünemann, Wiesinger, Schenkel, and Hofmann have justly pronounced against the identity of the two; Weiss, however, following out his wrong interpretation of κώνες in ver. 2 (of the heathen), maintains the identity to a certain extent by assuming that the conduct of those κώνες is here described; while Baur makes use of the passage to deny freshness, naturalness, and objectivity to the polemic attack here made on the false teachers.

Ver. 19. A more precise deterrent delineation of these persons, having the most deterrent element put foremost, and then those points by which it was brought about.—δὲ τὸ τέλος ἀπώλ. By this is meant Messianic perdition, eternal condemnation (comp. i. 28), which is the ultimate destiny appointed (τὸ) for them (τέλος is not: recompense, see Rom. vi. 21; 2 Cor. xi. 15; Heb. vi. 8). For corresponding Rabbinical passages, see Wetstein and Schottgen, *Hor.* p. 801.—δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡ κοίλα] λατρεύουσι γὰρ ὦς Θεῷ ταίτη καὶ πᾶσαν θεραπείαν προσάγουσι, Theophylact. Comp. Rom. xvi. 18; Eur. *Oyl.* 334 f.; Senec. *de benef.* vii. 26; and the maxim of those whose highest good is eating and drinking, 1 Cor. xv. 32. It is the γαστριμαργία (Plat. *Phaed.* p. 81 E; Lucian, *Amor.* 42) in its godless nature; they were κοιλοδαμονες (Eupolis in Athen. iii. p. 100 B), τὰς τῆς γαστρός ἡδονάς τιθέμενοι μέτρου εὐδαιμονίας (Lucian, *Patr. enc.* 10); τῇ γαστρὶ μετροῦντες καὶ τῶν αἰγιλτικῶς τῆν εὐδαιμονίαν (Dem. 524. 24).—καὶ ἡ δόξα κ.τ.λ.] also dependent on δὲ: and whose honour is in their shame, that is, who find their honour in that which redounds to their shame,
as for instance, in revelling, haughty behaviour, and the like, in which the immoral man is fond of making a show. ἡ δόξα is subjective, viewed from the opinion of those men, and τὴν αἰσχύνην is objective, viewed according to the reality of the ethical relation. Comp. Polyb. xv. 23. 5: ἐφ' οίς ἡ χθῆν αἰσχύνεσθαι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν, ἐπὶ τούτοις ὡς καλοῖς σεμνύεσθαι καὶ μεγαλαυχεῖν, and also Plat. Theaet. p. 176 D; ἀγάλλοιται γὰρ τῷ ὦνελεοῦ. On εἶναι ἐν, versari in, to be found in, to be contained in something, comp. Plat. Gorg. p. 470 E: ἐν τούτῳ ἡ πᾶσα εἰδαμονία ἐστὶν, Eur. Phoen. 1310: οὐκ ἐν αἰσχύνῃ τὰ σά. The view, foreign to the context, which refers the words to circumcision, making αἰσχύνη signify the genitals (Schol. Ar. Equ. 364; Ambrosiaster; Hilary; Pelagius; Augustine, de verb. apost. xv. 5; Bengel; Michaelis; Storr), is already rejected by Chrysostom and his successors. — οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες who bear the earthly (that which is on the earth; the opposite in ver. 20) in their mind (as the goal of their interest and effort). Comp. Col. iii. 2. Thus Paul closes his delineation with a summary designation of their fundamental immoral tendency, and he put this, not in the genitive (uniformly with the ὧν), but more independently and emphatically in the nominative, having in view the logical subject of what precedes (comp. on i. 30), and that with the individualizing (ἰς, qui) article of apposition. Comp. Winer, p. 172 [E. T. 228]; Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 69 [E. T. 79].

Ver. 20. After Paul has, by way of confirmation and warning, subjoined to his exhortation given in ver. 17 the deterrent example of the enemies of the cross of Christ in ver. 18 f., he now sketches by the side of that deterrent delineation—in outlines few, but how clear! — the inviting picture of those whom, in ver. 17, he had proposed as τύπος. — γὰρ] The train of thought runs thus: "Justly I characterize their whole nature by the words οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες; for it is the direct opposite of ours; our πολίτευμα, the goal of our aspiration, is not on earth, but in heaven." γὰρ therefore introduces a confirmatory reason, but not for his having said that the earthly mind of the πολλοὶ necessarily involves such a walk (Hofmann); for he has not said this, and what follows would not
be a proof of it. The apostle gives, rather, an experimental proof e contrario, and that for what immediately precedes, not for the remote δυν τὸ τέλος ἄπώλεως (Weiss). — ἡμῶν] emphatically placed first; contrast of the persons. These ἡμεῖς, however, are the same as the ἡμᾶς in ver. 17, consequently Paul himself and the ὁδὸν περιπατοῦντες. — τὸ πολίτευμα] the commonwealth, which may bear the sense either of: the state (2 Macc. xii. 7; Polyb. i. 13. 12, ii. 41. 6; Lucian, Prom. 15; Philo, de opif. p. 33 A, de Jos. p. 536 D); or the state-administration (Plat. Legg. 12, p. 945 D; Aristot. Pol. iii. 4; Polyb. iv. 23. 9; Lucian, Dem. enc. 16), or its principles (Dem. 107. 25, 262. 27; Isoccr. p. 156 A); or the state-constitution (Plut. Them. 4; Arist. Pol. iii. 4. 1; Polyb. v. 9. 9, iv. 25. 7), see generally Raphael, Polyb. in loc.; Schweigh. Lex. Polyb. p. 486; Schoemann, ad Plut. Cleom. p. 208. Here, in the first sense: our commonwealth, that is, the state to which we belong, is in heaven. By this is meant the Messiah’s kingdom which had not yet appeared, which will only at Christ’s Parousia (comp. ἔχειν κ.τ.λ. which follows) come down from heaven and manifest itself in its glory on earth. It is the state of the heavenly Jerusalem (see on Gal. iv. 26; comp. Usteri, Lehrbegr. p. 190; Ritschl, altkath. Kirche, p. 59), of which true Christians are citizens (Eph. ii. 19) even now before the Parousia in a proleptic and ideal sense (ἐφ’ ἐκλείπον τῆς δόξης, Rom. v. 2; comp. viii. 24), in order that one day, at the ἐπιφάνεια τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου (2 Thess. ii. 8), they may be so in complete reality (comp. Heb. xii. 22 f., xiii. 14), as κοινωνική τῆς μεταμόρφωσις ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης (1 Pet. v. 1; Col. iii. 4), nay, as συμβασιλεύνετε (2 Tim. ii. 12; comp. Rom. viii. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 8). Hence, according to the necessary psychological relation, “where your treasure is, there will your heart be also” (Matt. vi. 21), they φρονοῦσιν, not τὰ ἐπιθέμα, but τὰ ἅνω (Col. iii. 1 f.), which serves to explain the logical correctness of the γὰρ in its relation to οἱ τὰ ἐπιθέμ. φρον. Others, following the Vulgate (conversatio), render it: our walk, making the sense, “tota vita nostra quasi jam nunc apud Deum naturasque coelestes puriores versatur, longe remota a τοῖς ἐπιθέματι eorumque captatione” (Hoelemann). So Luther
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(who up till 1528 rendered it "citizenship"), Castalio, Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, and many others, including Matthies, van Hengel, de Wette; while Rheinwald mixes up interpretations of various kinds. This rendering is not justified by linguistic usage, which indeed vouches for πολιτείασθαι (i. 27) in this sense, and for πολυτέλεα (Clem. Cor. I. 54: πολιτείασθαι πολυτέλεα Θεοῦ, Ep. ad Diogn. 5), but not for πολιτεύμα, not even in Eus. H. E. v. prooem. Nor does linguistic usage even permit the interpretation: citizenship. So Luther, in the Postil. Epist. D. 3, post f. pasch.: "Here on earth we are in fact not citizens...; our citizenship is with Christ in heaven... there we are to remain for ever citizens and lords;" comp. Beza, Balduin, Erasimus Schmid, Zachariae, Flatt, Wiesinger, Ewald, Weiss, and others. This would be πολυτέλεα, Acts xxii. 28; Thuc. vi. 104. 3; Dem. 161. 11; Polyb. vi. 2. 12; 3 Macc. iii. 21. Theophyact's explanation, τὴν πατρίδα (which is used also for heaven by Anaxagoras in Diog. L. ii. 7), must be referred to the correct rendering state (comp. Hammond, Clericus, and others\(^1\)), while Chrysostom gives no decided opinion, but Theodoret (τὸν οὐρανὸν φανταξόμεθα) and Occumenius (στρατευόμεθα) appear to follow the rendering conversatio. — εξ οὗ καὶ κ.τ.λ.] And what a happy change is before us, in consequence of our thus belonging to the heavenly state! From the heaven (scil. ἡκοῦτα, comp. 1 Thess. i. 10) we expect, etc. The neuter οὗ, which is certainly to be taken in a strictly local sense (in opposition to Calovius), is not to be referred to πολιτ. (Wolf, Sohoettgen, Bengel, Hofmann); but is correctly rendered by the Vulgate: "unde." Comp. on εξ οὗ, Col. ii. 19, and Bornemann, ad Xen. Anab. i. 2. 20: ἡμέρας τρεῖς, ἐν Φ. — καὶ, also, denotes the relation corresponding to the foregoing (namely, that our πολιτεύμα is to be found in heaven), not a second one to be added (Hofmann). — σωτηρία placed first with great emphasis, and that not as the accusative of the object (Hofmann), but—hence without the article—as predicative accusative: as Saviour, namely, from all the sufferings and conflicts involved in our fellowship with the cross of Christ (ver. 18), not from the ἀπώλεια (Weiss),

\(^1\) The Gothic Version has: "unsara bædins" (that is, building, dwelling).
which, indeed, the ἡμεῖς have not at all to fear. Comp. on the subject—matter, Luke xviii. 7 f., xxi. 28; Tit. ii. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 18. —ἀπεκθηκ& α;] comp. 1 Cor. i. 7; Tit. ii. 13. As to the signification of the word: perseveranter expectare, see on Rom. viii. 19; Gal. v. 5.

Ver. 21. As a special feature of the Lord’s saving activity at His Parousia, Paul mentions the bodily transfiguration of the ἡμεῖς, in significant relation to what was said in ver. 19 of the enemies of the cross. The latter now lead an Epicurean life, whilst the ἡμεῖς are in a condition of bodily humiliation through affliction and persecution. But at the Parousia—what a change in the state of things! what a glorification of these bodies now so borne down!—μετασχημάτισθα shall transform.¹ What is meant is the ἀλλασσόμενον of the body (1 Cor. xv. 51 f.) at the Parousia, which in this passage, just as in 1 Cor. xv. 52, Paul assumes that the ἡμεῖς will live to see. To understand it at the same time of the resurrection of the dead (so most expositors, including de Wette, Wiesinger, Weiss), is inappropriate both to ἀπεκθηκθ& α; and to the definition of the quality of the body to be remodelled: τῆς ταπεινών ἡμῶν, both these expressions being used under the conviction of being still alive in the present state when the change occurs. Moreover, the resurrection is something more than a μετασχημάτισθας; it is also an investiture with a new body out of the germ of the old (1 Cor. xv. 36–38, 42–44. —τῆς ταπεινών. ἡμῶν] Genitive of the subject. Instead of saying ἡμῶν merely (our body), he expresses it with more specific definition: the body of our humiliation, that is, the body which

¹ As to the nature of this transformation, see 1 Cor. xv. 53. The older dogmatic exegeses maintained in it the identity of substance. Calovius: “Ille μετασχηματισθεισιν non substantiam mutationem, sed accidentalem, non rationes quiditatis corporis nostris, sed rationes qualitatem salva quiditatis importat.” This is correct only so far as the future body, although an organism without ε& ο; and η& ή, 1 Cor. xv. 50, will not only be again specifically human, but will also belong to the identity of the person. See 1 Cor. xv. 55 ff. Comp. Ernesti, Uebr. d. Sünde, I. p. 127 f. More precise definitions, such as those in Delitzsch’s Psychol. p. 459 ff., lose themselves in the misty region of hypothesis. The inappropriateness of the expression employed in the Confession: Resurrection of the flesh, has been rightly pointed out by Luther in the Larger Catechism, p. 501.
is the vehicle of the state of our humiliation, namely, through the privations, persecutions, and afflictions which affect the body and are exhibited in it, thereby reducing us into our present oppressed and lowly position; πολλὰ πάσχει νῦν τὸ σῶμα, δεσμεύσαι, μαστικεῖαι, μυρία πάσχει δεινά, Chrysostom. This definite reference of τ. ταπ. ἡμ. is required by the context through the contrast of the ἡμεῖς to the ἐχθροὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τ. Χ., so that the sufferings which are meant by the cross of Christ constitute the ταπείνωσις of the ἡμεῖς (comp. Acts viii. 33); in which case there is no ground for our taking ταπείνωσις, contrary to Greek usage (Plat. Legg. vii. p. 815 A; Polyb. ix. 33. 10; Jas. i. 10), as equivalent to ταπεινότης, lowliness, as in Luke i. 48 (Hofmann). On this account, and also because ἡμῶν applies to subjects distinctly defined in conformity with the context, it was incorrect to explain ταπείνωσις generally of the constitution of our life (Hofmann), of weakness and frailty (Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Estius, and many others; including Rheinwald, Matthies, Hoelemann, Schrader, Rilliet, Wiesinger, Weiss); comparison being made with such passages as Col. i. 22; Rom. vii. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 44. The contrast lies in the states, namely, of humiliation on the one hand and of δόξα on the other; hence ἡμῶν and αὐτοῦ are neither to be joined with σῶμα (in opposition to Hoelemann), nor with τ. σῶμα τ. ταπ. and τ. σ. τῆς δόξης as ideas forming an unity (Hofmann), which Paul would necessarily have marked by separating the genitives in position (Winer, p. 180 [E. T. 239]). — σύμμορφον] Result of the μεταφυσικόν, so that the reading εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτό is a correct gloss. See on Matt. xii. 13 and 1 Cor. i. 8; Fritzsche, Diss. II. in 2 Cor. p. 159; Lübcker, grammatic. Stud. p. 33 f. The thing itself forms a part of the συνδέσμησις, Rom. viii. 17. Comp. also 1 Cor. xv. 48 f.; Rom. viii. 29. We may add Theodoret's appropriate remark: οὐ κατὰ τὴν ποιότητα τῆς δόξης, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν πονίτητα. — τῆς δόξας αὐτοῦ] to be explained like τῆς ταπ. ἡμ.: in which His heavenly glory is shown forth. Comp. ἐνεργεῖται ἐν δόξῃ, 1 Cor. xv. 44. — κατὰ τ. ἐνέργ. κ.τ.λ.] removes every doubt as to the possibility; according to the working of His being able (comp. Eph. i. 19) also to subdue all things unto
Himself; that is, in consequence of the energetic efficacy which belongs to His power of also subduing all things to Himself. Comp. kata τ. ἐνέργ. τῆς δύναμ. αὐτοῦ, Eph. iii. 7, also Eph. i. 19; as to the subject-matter, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 25 f.; as to the expression with the genitive of the infinitive, Onosand. I. p. 12: ἡ τοῦ δύναμας ποιεῖν ἐξουσία. — καὶ adds the general element ἐνεργεῖαι αὐτῷ τὰ π. to the μετασχημ. κ.τ.λ.\(^1\) Bengel aptly says: "non modo conforme facere corpus nostrum suo." — τὰ πάντα] all things collectively, is not to be limited; nothing can withstand His power; a statement which to the Christian consciousness refers, as a matter of course, to created things and powers, not to God also, from whom Christ has received that power (Matt. xxviii. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 27), and to whom He will ultimately deliver up again the dominion (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28). Chrysostom and Theophylact have already with reason noticed the argumentum a majori ad minus.

\(^1\) Hoelemann takes καὶ as and, so that the sense would be, "that Christ can do all things, and subdues all things to Himself." The very aorist ἐνεργεῖαι should have withheld him from making this heterogeneous combination, as it betrays itself to be dependent on δύναμιν.
CHAPTER IV.

Ver. 3. Instead of ρει Elz. has καί, against decisive witnesses.—Instead of σύνων γνήσιος, γνήσιος σύνων should be written, with Lachm. and Tisch., upon preponderating evidence.—On decisive testimony, in ver. 12, instead of οὖν δέ ταῦτ. (Elz.), οὖν καὶ ταῦτ. is to be received. The δέ has taken its rise from the last syllable of οὖν; hence we also find the reading δέ καί.—Ver. 13. After με Elz. has Χριστόφ, in opposition to A B D* Ν, vss. (also Vulgate) and Fathers. Defended by Reiche, but it is an addition from 1 Tim. i. 12, from which passage also are found the amplifications in Or., x. 'Ιησοῦ and x. Ἰ. τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.—Ver. 16. τις wanting in A D* E**, min. vss. and Fathers. Bracketed by Lachm. But after δι, τις might the more readily be omitted, as it seemed superfluous, and might, indeed, on account of the absence of an object for ισιω-ψ., appear offensive.—Ver. 19. With Lachm. and Tisch., the form τῷ πλούτος is to be adopted upon decisive testimony. See on 2 Cor. viii. 2.—Ver. 23. τάντα ιμών] A B D E F G P N***, min. Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. It. Damasc. Ambrosiat. Pel. have τοῖς συνίστατος ιμών. So Lachm. and Tisch. Taken from Gal. vi. 18, whence also in Elz. ἡμῶν has likewise crept in after κυρίου.

Ver. 1. Conclusion drawn from what precedes, from ver. 17 onwards. We are not justified in going further back (de Wette refers it to the whole exhortation, iii. 2 ff., comp. also Wiesinger, Weiss, Hofmann), because the direct address to the readers in the second person is only introduced at ver. 17, and that with ἀδέλφων, as in the passage now before us; secondly, because the predicates ἀγαπητοὶ . . . στέφανος μου place the summons in that close personal relation to the apostle, which entirely corresponds with the words συμμαχηταὶ μου γένεσθε in ver. 17; thirdly, because ἀστεῖ finds its logical reference in that which immediately precedes, and this in its turn is connected with the exhortation συμμαχηταὶ κ.τ.λ. in ver. 17; and lastly, because οὕτω in ver. 1 is correlative to the οὕτω in
iii. 17. — ὁστε] accordingly; the ethical actual result, which what has been said of the ἤμεισ in. iii. 20 f. ought to have with the readers. Comp. ii. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 58. — ἀγαπητοὶ κ.τ.λ.] "blandis appellationibus in eorum affectus se insinuat, quae tamen non sunt adulationis, sed sinceri amoris," Calvin.— How might they disappoint and grieve such love as this by non-compliance! — ἐπιπόθητοι] longed for, for whom I yearn (comp. i. 8); not occurring elsewhere in the N. T.; comp. App. Hist. 43; Eust. Opusc. p. 357. 39; Aq. Ez. xxii. 11 (ἐπιπόθησιν); Ps. cxxxix. 9 (ἐπιπόθημα); Ael. N. A. vii. 3 (ποθητό). — στεφανος] comp. 1 Thess. ii. 19; Ecclus. i. 9, vi. 31, xv. 6; Ez. xvi. 12, xxiii. 42; Prov. xvi. 31, xvii. 6; Job xix. 9. The honour, which accrued to the apostle from the excellent Christian condition of the church, is represented by him under the figure of a crown of victory. Comp. στέφανον εὐκλείας μέγαν, Soph. Aj. 465; Eur. Suppl. 313; Iph. A. 193, Herc. F. 1334; Thuc. ii. 46; Jacobs, ad Anthol. IX. p. 30; Lobeck ad Aj. l.c.; also στεφανοῖν (Wesseling, ad Diad. Sic. I. p. 684), στεφάνωμα, Pind. Pyth. i. 96, xii. 9, στεφανηφορεῖν, Wisd. iv. 2, and Grimm in loc. The reference of χαρά to the present time, and of στέφι to the future judgment (Calvin and others, comp. Pelagius), introduces arbitrarily a reflective distinction of ideas, which is not in keeping with the fervour of the emotion. — οὕτω] corresponding to the τόπος that has just been set forth and recommended to you (iii. 17 ff.). Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Calvin, Bengel, and others, interpret: so, as ye stand, so that Paul "praesentem statum laudando ad perseverantiam eos hortetur," Calvin. This is at variance with the context, for he has just adduced others as a model for his readers; and the exhortation would not agree with συμμ. μ. γίνεσθε, iii. 17, which, notwithstanding all the praise of the morally advanced community, still does not presuppose the existence already of a normal Christian state. — ἐν κυριω] Comp. 1 Thess. iii. 8.

1 In opposition to which Hofmann quite groundlessly urges the objection, that Paul in that case would have written στεφαναίοις instead of στεφάνοι. As if he must have thought and spoken thus mechanically! The στεφάνοι is in fact substantially just a στεφανοῦς which maintains its ground.
Christ is to be the element in which the standing fast required of them is to have its specific character, so that in no case can the moral life ever act apart from the fellowship of Christ. — ἀγαπητοί] "περιπαθῆς haec vocis hujus ἀναφορά." Grotius. In no other epistle so much as in this has Paul multiplied the expressions of love and praise of his readers; a strong testimony certainly as to the praiseworthy condition of the church, from which, however, Weiss infers too much. Here, as always (Rom. xii. 19; 2 Cor. vii. 1, xii. 19; Phil. ii. 12; 1 Cor. x. 14; Heb. vi. 9, et al.), moreover, ἀγαπητοί stands as an address without any more precise self-evident definition, and is not to be connected (as Hofmann holds) with ἐν κυρίῳ.

Ver. 2 f. After this general exhortation, ver. 1, the apostle, still deeply concerned for the community that is so dear to him, finds it requisite to give a special admonition to and for two meritorious women,¹ through whose disagreement, the details of which are unknown to us, but which probably turned on differences of their working in the church, a scandal had occurred, and the στήκειν ἐν κυρίῳ might more or less be imperilled. Whether they were deaconesses in Philippi (as many conjecture), must remain undecided. Grotius has erroneously considered both names, Hammond and Calmet only the second, to be masculine,² and in that case αὐταῖς in ver. 3 is made to apply to others (viz. αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.). For the two feminine names on inscriptions, see Gruter and Muratori. With Tischendorf and Lipsius (Gramm. Unters. p. 31), Ἐντυτυχῇ is to be treated as oxytone. Comp. generally Kühner, I. p.

¹ According to Baur, indeed, they are alleged to be two parties rather than two women; and Schwegler (nachapostol. Zeitalt. II. p. 135) makes out that Euodia represents the Jewish-Christian, and Syntyche the Gentile-Christian party, and that γυναικεῖον applies to Peter! On the basis of Constitut. ap. vii. 46. 1 (according to which Peter appointed an Euodius, and Paul Ignatius, as Bishop of Antioch), this discovery has been amplified with further caprice by Volkmar in the Theol. Jahrb. 1857, p. 147 ff. But exegetical fiction in connection with the two feminine names has been pushed to the utmost by Hitzig, z. Krit. Paulin. Br. p. 5 ff., according to whom they are supposed to have their origin in Gen. xxx. 9 ff.; he represents our author as having changed Aser and Gad into women in order to represent figuratively two parties, and both of them Gentile-Christian.

² Theodore of Mopsuestia quotes the opinion that the two were husband and wife.
256. The *twice used* παρακ.: "quasi coram adhortans seorsum utramvis, idque summa cum aequitate," Bengel. An earnestly individualizing ἐπιμονή (Bremi, *ad Aeschin.* p. 400). — τὸ αὐτὸ φῶν.] see on ii. 2. — ἐν κυρ.] characterizes the specifically Christian concord, the moral nature and effort of which are grounded on Christ as their determining vital principle. Paul does not desire a union of minds *apart from* Christ.—Whether the disunion, which must be assumed, had its deeper root in moral *pride* on account of services in the cause of the gospel (Schinz), is not clear.

Ver. 3. *Indeed, I entreat thee also,* etc. This bringing in of a third party is a *confirmation* of the previous admonition as regards its necessity and urgency; hence the *ναί*; comp. Philem. 20. See also on Matt. xv. 27. — σύζυγος is erroneously understood by Clemens Alexandrinus, Isidorus, Erasmus, Musculus, Cajetanus, Flacius, and others, as referring to the *wife* of the apostle; an idea which, according to 1 Cor. vii. 8, compared with ix. 5, is at variance with history (see, already, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact), and at the same time at variance with grammar, as the adjective must in that case have stood in the feminine (*Test. XII. Patr.* p. 526; *Eur. Alc.* 314, 342, 385). Others understand the husband of one of the two women (so, although with hesitation, Chrysostom, also Theophylact, according to whom, however, he might have been a *brother*, and Camerarius; not disapproved by Beza); but what a strangely artificial designation would "genuine conjux" be! Weiss prefers to leave *undecided* the nature of the bond which connected the individual in question with the two women. But if, in general, a relation to the women were intended, and that apart from the bond of matrimony, by the term σύζυγος Paul would have expressed himself very awkwardly; for the current use of the word σύζυγος, and also of σύζυγης (3 Mac. iv. 8) and σύζυγός (*Eur. Alc.* 924), in the sense of conjux (comp. σύζυγος, Xen. *Oec.* 7. 30; Herodian, iii. 10. 14), must have been well known to the reader. The usual mode of interpreting this passage (so Flatt, Rheinwald, Hoelemann, Matthies, de Wette, following Pelagius and Theodoret) has been to refer it to some dis-
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tinguished fellow-labourer of the apostle, well known, as a matter of course, to the readers of the epistle, who had his abode in Philippi and deserved well of the church there by special services. Some have arbitrarily fixed on Silas (Bengel), and others quite unsuitably on Timothy (Estius), and even on Epaphroditus (Vatablus, Grotius, Calovius, Michaelis, van Hengel, and Baumgarten-Crusius), whom Hofmann also would have us understand as referred to, inasmuch as he regards him as the amanuensis of the epistle, who had therefore heard it dictated by the apostle, and then heard it again when it came to be read in the church, so that he knew himself to be the person addressed. What accumulated invention, in order to fasten upon Epaphroditus the, after all, unsuitable confession before the church that he was himself the person thus distinguished by the apostle! According to Luther's gloss, Paul means "the most distinguished bishop in Philippi." Comp. also Ewald, who compares συμπρεσβύτερος, 1 Pet. v. 1. But how strange would such a nameless designation be in itself! How easily might the preferential designation by γνήσιος have seemed even to slight other fellow-labourers in Philippi! Besides, Paul, in describing his official colleagues, never makes use of this term, σόφυγος, which does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., and which would involve the assumption that the unknown individual stood in quite a special relation to the apostle corresponding to this purposely-chosen predicate. Laying aside arbitrariness, and seeing that this address is surrounded by proper names (vv. 2, 3), we can only find in σόφυγε a proper name, in which case the attribute γνήσιος corresponds in a delicate and winning way to the appellative sense of the name (comp. Philem. 11); genuine Syzygus, that is, thou who art in reality and substantially that which thy name expresses: "fellow-in-yoke," i.e. yoke-fellow, fellow-labourer. We may assume that Syzygus had rendered considerable services to Christianity in Philippi in joint labour with the apostle, and that Paul, in his appellative interpretation of the name, followed the figurative conception of animals in the yoke ploughing or thrashing (1 Cor. ix. 9; 1 Tim. v. 18), a conception which
was suggested to him by the very name itself. The opposite of ὑπῆρξεν would be: ὁιν διπρὸς ἄν (comp. Plat. Polit. p. 293 E), so that the man with his name Ἑσυγγος would not be ἐπώνυμος (Eur. Phoen. 1500; Soph. Aj. 430), Jacobs, ad Del. Epigr. p. 272 f. He bore this his name, however, as δομὸς ἐπώνυμον (Del. Epigr. v. 42). This view of the word being a proper name—to which Wiesinger inclines, which Laurent decidedly defends ¹ in his Neut. Stud. p. 134 ff. and Grimm approves of in his Lexicon, and which Hofmann, without reason, rejects simply on account of the usu locundici of γνήσιος not being proved—was already held by ῥίδες in Chrysostom; comp. Niceph. Call. ii. p. 212 D; Oecumenius permits a choice between it and the explanation in the sense of the husband of one of the two women. It is true that the name is not preserved elsewhere; but with how many names is that the case? Hence it was unwarranted to assume (Storr) a translation of the name Κολληγάς (Joseph. Bell. vii. 3. 4), in connection with which, moreover, it would be hard to see why Paul should have chosen the word σώζειν elsewhere not used by him, and not σωμεργός, or the like.² To refer the word to Christ, who helps every one to bear his yoke (Wieseler), was a mistake. — συλλαμβάνειν αυταίς] lay hold along with them, that is, assist them (Luke v. 7; Herod. vi. 125; Xen. Ages. 2. 31; Wunder, ad Soph. Phil. 280; Lex. Plat. III. p. 294), namely, for their reconciliation and for restoring their harmonious action. — αὐτρίσα] utpote quae, giving the motive, comp. i. 28;

¹ In doing so, Laurent takes the reference of ὁιν contained in the name as general: "helper of all labour in the vineyard of the Lord." More thoughtful, however, is the reference to the apostle himself, whose true yoke-fellow is to supply his place with his former female fellow-strivers (ἐνώτατον μοι); comp. also subsequently ἐνώτατον μοι.

² According to our view, ἐνώτατον is, in fact, taken in no other sense than that which is current in all Greek authors, viz. ἐλπίς, versus, as Hofmann himself takes it. Whether we refer it thus to ἐπώνυμος as an appellative word, or as the appellative contents of a name—is a matter which leaves the linguistic use of ὑπῆρξεν altogether untouched. As is well known, ὑπῆρξε has the same general linguistic usage in the opposite sense (see e.g. Plat. Rep. p. 536 A; Jacobs, ad Del. Epigr. i. 103. 8).

³ This holds at the same time against the view of Pelagius: "Germanus dictus est non sine, qui erat compar officii." He is followed by Lyra.
see on Rom. i. 25, ii. 15, vi. 2, et al.—ἐν τῷ εἰσαγγ.] the domain, in which they, etc. Comp. Rom. i. 9; 1 Thess. iii. 2. It was among women that the gospel had first struck root in Philippi (Acts xvi. 13), and it is to be assumed that the two women named had rendered special service in the spread and confirmation of Christianity among their sex, and therein had shared the conflict of affliction and persecution with Paul (1 Thess. ii. 2). On συνήθλησαν, comp. i. 27.—μετὰ καὶ Κλήμεντος κ.τ.λ.] and in what fellowship, so honourable to them, have they shared my conflict for Christ's sake? in association also with Clement and, etc. The reference of the καὶ is to μοι; their joint-striving with Paul had been a fellowship in striving also with Clement, etc.; they had therein stood side by side with these men also. On καὶ . . . καὶ, the first καὶ meaning also, comp. Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 891; on its rarer position, however, between preposition and noun, see Schafer, Ind. ad Gregor. Cor. p. 1064; Hartung, Partikell. I. p. 143; Kühner, II. 1, p. 480 f. The connection of μετὰ κ. Κλ. κ.τ.λ. with συλλαμβ. αὐταῖς (Cocceius, Michaelis, Storr, Flatt, J. B. Lightfoot, Hofmann) is opposed by the facts, that Paul has committed the service of mediation to an individual, with which the general impression now given to this commission is not in keeping, and that the subsequent δὲ τὰ ὄνοματα κ.τ.λ., in the absence of any specification of the churches, would neither be based on any motive nor intelligible to the readers, and would be strangest of all in the event of Paul's having intended, as Hofmann thinks, to indicate here the presbyters and deacons mentioned in i. 1. The λατρεὺς συμμετοχ., as well as generally the more special circumstances of which Paul here reminds his readers, were—if μετὰ καὶ κ.τ.λ. be joined with συνήθλησαν μοι, beside which it stands—historically known to these readers, although unknown to us.—That Clement was a teacher in Philippī (so most modern expositors; according to Grotius, a presbyter in Philippi, but "Romanus aliquis in Macedonia negotians"), must be maintained in accordance with the context, seeing that with him those two Philippian women laboured as sharing the conflict of the apostle; and of a travelling companion of this name, who had laboured with the apostle in
Macedonia, there is no trace to be found; and seeing that the λοιποί συνεργοί also are to be regarded as Philippians, because thus only does the laudatory expression ὅν τὰ ὄνοματα κ.τ.λ. appear in its vivid and direct set purpose of bespeaking for the two women the esteem of the church. The more frequent, however, in general the name of Clement was, the more arbitrary is the old view, although not yet known to Irenaeus (iii. 3. 3), that Clement of Rome is the person meant. So most Catholic expositors (not Döllinger), following Origen, ad Joh. i. 29; Eusebius, H. E. iii. 15; Epiphanius, Haer. xxvii. 6; Jerome, Pelagius, and others; so also Francke, in the Zeitschr. f. Luth. Theol. 1841, iii. p. 73 ff., and van Hengel, who conjectures Eudia and Syntyche to have been Roman women who had assisted the apostle in Rome, and had travelled with Epaphroditus to Philippi. See generally, besides Lünemann and Brückner, Lipsius, de Clem. Rom. ep. p. 167 ff.; J. B. Lightfoot, p. 166 ff.; and Hilgenfeld, Apost. Väter, p. 92 ff. — ὅν τὰ ὄνομα κ.τ.λ.] refers merely to τῶν λοιπῶν κ.τ.λ., whom Paul does not adduce by name, but instead of this affirm of their names something so great and honourable. God has recorded their names in His book, in which are written down the future partakers of the everlasting Messianic life; so surely and irrevocably is this life assigned to them. What Paul thus expresses by this solemn figure, he knew from their whole Christian character and action, in which he recognised by experience "quasi electionis absconditae sigilla"

1 Nevertheless, upon this hypothesis Baur builds up a whole fabric of combinations, which are intended to transfer the date of our epistle to the post-apostolic age, when the Flavius Clemens known in Roman history, who was a patruelis of Domitian (Suet. Dom. 15), and a Christian (Lami, de erud. apost. p. 104; Baur, II. p. 68), had already become the well-known Clement of Roman tradition. Comp. Volkmar in the Theolog. Jahrb. 1856, p. 309, according to whom the Roman Clement is to be here already assumed as a martyr. Indeed, according to Schwegr and Hitzig, z. Krit. paulin. Br. p. 13, a first attempt is made here to connect this Clement also with Peter (for no other in their view is the εἰς Ἱεραπόλις). Thus, no doubt, the way is readily prepared for bringing down our epistle to the days of Trajan. Round the welcome name of Clement all possible fictions crystallize.

2 The detailed discussion of the question as to the ground of the divine electio here portrayed (the Reformed theologians, "the decretum absolutum;" the Lutherans, "the praesiva fides;" the Catholics, "the praesiva opera") is out of
(Calvin). See, moreover, on Luke x. 20, and Wetstein on our passage; it is different in Heb. xii. 23 (see Lünemann in loc). ἐστὶ must be supplied, not the optative, as Bengel thinks; and it must remain an open question, whether the persons referred to (among whom Ewald reckons Clement) are to be regarded as already dead (Bengel, Ewald), which is not to be inferred from δὲ τὰ ὀνόματα κ.τ.λ.; see Luke x. 20; Hermas, Pastor i. 1. 3. It is at all events certain that this predicate, which Paul nowhere else uses, is an especially honourable one, and does not simply convey what holds true of all Christians (so Hofmann in connection with his erroneous reference of μετὰ καὶ κ.τ.λ.). At Luke x. 20, and Rev. xiii. 8 also, it is a mark of distinction.

Ver. 4 f. Without any particle of transition, we have once more general concluding admonitions, which begin by taking up again the encouraging address broken off in iii. 1, and now strengthened by πάντοτε—the key-note of the epistle. They extend as far as ver. 9; after which Paul again speaks of the assistance which he had received. — πάντοτε] not to be connected with πάλιν ἐρῶ (Hofmann), which would make the πάλιν very superfluous, is an essential element of the Christian χαίρεω; comp. 1 Thess. v. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 10. Just at the close of his epistle the apostle brings it in significantly. Paul desires joyfulness at all times on the part of the believer, to whom even tribulation is grace (i. 7, 29) and glory (Rom. v. 3), and in whom the pain of sin is overcome by the certainty of atonement (Rom. viii. 1); to whom everything must serve for good (Rom. viii. 28; 1 Cor. iii. 21 f.), and nothing can separate him from the love of God (Rom. viii. 38 f.). — πάλιν ἐρῶ] once more I will say. Observe the future, which exhibits the consideration given to the matter by the writer; consequently not equivalent to πάλιν λέγω, 2 Cor. xi. 16; Gal. i. 9. Κατὰ δὲ διαπλασίαν, ἐπειδὴ τῶν πραγμάτων ἡ φύσις λίτην ἐπικε, διὰ τοῦ διαπλασίασμοῦ δεικνυται, διὰ πάντως δεῖ χαίρεω, Chrysostom.—Τὸ εἰπεῖ κεῖς υἱῶν] your mildness

place here. Flacius, Clav. s.v. “liber,” justly observes that it is not fatalis quaedam electio which is pointed to, but ob veram justitiam, qualis Christi est, credentes eo referri et inscribi.
[Lindigheid, Luther], that is, your gentle character, as opposed to undue sternness (Polyb. v. 10. 1: ἡ ἐπιτύχεια καὶ φίλανθρωπια, Lucian, Phal. pr. 2: ἐπιτυχής κ. μέτρως, Herodian, ii. 14. 5, ix. 12; 1 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. iii. 2; Jas. iii. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 18; Ps. Ixxxv. 5; Add. to Esth. vi. 8; 2 Macc. ix. 27). Comp. on 2 Cor. x. 1. The opposite: ἀκρυβοδικαίος, Arist. Eth. Nic. v. 10. 8, σκληρός. As to the neuter of the adjective taken as a substantive, see on iii. 8; comp. Soph. O. C. 1127. It might also mean: your becoming behaviour; see e.g. the passages from Plato in Ast, Leg. I. p. 775. But how indefinite would be such a requirement as this! The general duty of the Christian walk (which Matthies finds in the words) is not set forth till ver. 8. And in the N. T. ἐπιτυχ. always occurs in the above-named special sense.—γνωσθήτω πᾶσιν ἀνθρ. let it be known by all men, through the acquaintance of experience with your conduct. Comp. Matt. v. 16. The universality of the expression (which, moreover, is to be taken popularly: “let no man come to know you in a harsh, rigorous aspect”) prohibits our referring it to their relation to the enemies of the cross of Christ, against whom they should not be hatefully disposed (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact), or to the enemies of Christianitity (Pelagius, Theodoret, Erasmus, and others), or to the Judaists (Rheinwald), although none of these are excluded, and the motive for the exhortation is in part to be found in the outward circumstances full of tribulation, face to face with an inclination to moral pride.—The succession of exhortations without any outward link may be psychologically explained by the fact, that the disposition of Christian joyfulness must elevate men quite as much above strict insisting upon rights and claims as above solicitude (ver. 6). Neither with the former nor with the latter could the Christian fundamental disposition of the χαίρειν ἐν κυρίῳ subsist, in which the heart enlarges itself to yielding love and casts all care upon God.—ὁ κύριος ἔγγυς] points to the nearness of Christ’s Parousia, 1 Cor. xvi. 22. Comp. on ἔγγυς, Matt. xxiv. 32 f.; Luke xxi. 31; Rev. i. 3, xxi. 10; Rom. xiii. 11. The reference to God, by which Paul would bring home to their hearts, as Calvin expresses it, “divinae
provideatiae fiduciam" (comp. Ps. xxxiv. 18, cxix. 151, cxlv. 18; so also Pelagius, Luther, Calovius, Zanchius, Wolf, Rheinwald, Matthies, Billiet, Cornelius Müller, and others), is not suggested in vv. 1, 2, 4 by the context, which, on the contrary, does not refer to God until ver. 6. Usually and rightly, following Chrysostom and Erasmus, the words have been attached to what precedes. If the Lord is at hand, who is coming as the Vindex of every injustice endured and as the σωτήρ of the faithful, how should they not, in this prospect of approaching victory and blessedness (iii. 20), willingly and cheerfully renounce everything opposed to Christian ἐπιθέσει! The words therefore convey an encouragement to the latter. What follows has its complete reference, and that to God, pointed out by the antithesis ἀλλʼ εἰ παντὶ κ.τ.λ.

Ver. 6. The μεριμνάτε is not to be limited in an arbitrary way (as by Grotius, Flatt, Weiss, and others, to anxious care); about nothing (neither want, nor persecution, nor a threatening future, etc.) are they at all to give themselves concern, but on the contrary, etc.; μηδὲν, which is emphatically prefixed, is the accusative of the object (1 Cor. vii. 32 ff., xii. 25; Phil. ii. 20). Comp. Xen. Cyrop. viii. 7. 12: τὸ πολλὰ μεριμνάν καὶ τὸ μη δύνασθαι ἣσυχίαν ἔχειν. Caring is here, as in Matt. vi., the contrast to full confidence in God. Comp. 1 Pet. v. 7. "Curare et orare plus inter se pugnant quam aqua et ignis," Bengel. — εἰ παντὶ opposed to the μηδὲν; hence: in every case or affair (comp. Eph. v. 24; 2 Cor. iv. 8; 1 Thess. v. 18; Plat. Euthyd. p. 301 A), not: at all times (Syriac, Grotius, Bos, Flatt, Rheinwald). — τῇ προσευχῇ κ. τῇ δεησεί] by prayer and supplication. On the distinction between the two (the former being general, the latter supplicating prayer), see on Eph. vi. 18. The article indicates the prayer, which ye make;

1 They do not belong, by way of introduction, to what follows, as Hofmann thinks, who understands "the helpful nearness of the Lord" (Matt. xxviii. 20; Jas. iv. 8) in the present, and consequently the assurance of being heard in the individual case. Comp., rather, on the ἰδίως habitually used of the future θεάν coming, in addition to the above passages, Matt. iii. 2, iv. 17, x. 7; Mark i. 15; Luke xxii. 8, 28; Rom. xiii. 12; Heb. x. 25; Jas. v. 8; 1 Pet. iv. 7; and the ἰδιώς, ταχίς of the Apocalypse. The simply correct rendering is given after Chrysostom by Erasmus ("instant enim adventus Christi"), Grotius, and others.
and the repetition of the article, otherwise not required, puts forward the two elements the more emphatically (Kühner, II. 1, p. 529). — μέτα εἰκασ. belongs to γνωρίζεσθαι τ. Θεού, which, excluding all solicitude in the prayer, should never take place (comp. 1 Thess. v. 18; Col. iii. 17) without thanksgiving for the proofs of divine love already received and continually being experienced, of which the Christian is conscious under all circumstances (Rom. viii. 28). In the thanksgiving of the suppliant there is expressed entire surrender to God’s will, the very opposite of solicitude. — τὰ αἰτήματα ὑμ. what ye desire (Plat. Rep. viii. p. 566 B; Dionys. Hal. Antt. vi. 74; Luke xxiii. 24), that is, in accordance with the context: your petitions (1 John v. 15; Dan. vi. 13; Ps. xix. 6, xxxvi. 4, et al.; Schleusner, Thes. I. p. 100). — γνωρίζεσθαι πρὸς τ. Θεού] must be made known towards God; πρὸς, versus; it is the coram of the direction. Comp. Bernhardy, p. 265; Schoem. ad Is. iii. 25. The expression is more graphic than the mere dative would be; and the conception itself (γνωρίζεσθαι) is popularly anthropopathic; Matt. vi. 8. Bengel, moreover, aptly remarks on the subject—matter: “quí desiderat sua praepostero pudore ac diffidenti modestia . . . velant, suffocant ac retinent, curis anguntur; qui filiali et liberali fiducia erga Deum exromptum, expediuntur. Confessionibus ejusmodi scatent Psalmi.”

Ver. 7. The blessed result, which the compliance with ver. 6 will have for the inner man. How independent is this blessing of the concrete granting or non-granting of what is prayed for! — ἡ εἰρήνη τ. Θεοῦ] the peace of soul produced by God (through the Holy Spirit; comp. χαρά ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ, Rom. xiv. 17), the repose and satisfaction of the mind in God’s counsel and love, whereby all inward discord, doubt, and variance are excluded, such as it is expressed e.g. in Rom. viii. 18, 28. So in substance most expositors, including Rheinwald, Flatt, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hoelemann, Rilliet, de Wette, Wiesinger, Ewald, Weiss, Hofmann, and Winer. This view—and not (in opposition to Theodoret and Pelagius) that explanation of peace in the sense of harmony with the brethren (Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 16), which corresponds to the ordinary use of the
correlative ὁ Θεός τῆς εἰρήνης in ver. 9—is here required on the part of the context, both by the contrast of μεριμνάτε in ver. 6, and by the predicate ἡ ὑπερέχουσα πάντα νοῦν. The latter, if applicable to the peace of harmony, would express too much and too general an idea; it is, on the other hand, admirably adapted to the holy peace of the soul which God produces, as contrasted with the μέριμνα, to which the feeble νοῦς by itself is liable; as, indeed, in the classical authors also (Plat. Rep. p. 329 C, p. 372 D), and elsewhere (Wisd. iii. 3), εἰρήνη denotes the tranquillitas and securitas, the mental γαλήνη (Plat. Legg. vii. p. 791 A) and ἰσνυχία—a rest, which here is invested by τοῦ Θεοῦ with the consecration of divine life. Comp. εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Col. iii. 15; John xiv. 33; and, on the other hand, the false εἰρήνη κ. ἀσφαλεία, 1 Thess. v. 3. It is therefore not to be understood, according to Rom. v. 1, as “pax, quia reconciliati estis Deo” (Erasmus, Paraphr.; so Chrysostom, ἡ κατάλλαλη, ἡ ἀγάπη τ. Θεοῦ; and Theophylact, Oecumenius, Beza, Estius, Wetstein, and others, including Storr, Matthies, and van Hengel), which would be too general and foreign to the context. The peace of reconciliation is the presupposition of the divinely produced moral feeling which is here meant; the former is εἰρήνη πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, the latter εἰρήνη τοῦ Θεοῦ.—ἡ ὑπερέχουσα πάντα νοῦν] which surpasses every reason, namely, in regard to its salutary power and efficacy; that is, which is able more than any reason to elevate above all solicitude, to comfort and to strengthen. Because the reason in its moral thinking, willing, and feeling is of itself too weak to confront the power of the σάρξ (Rom. vii. 23, 25; Gal. v. 17), no reason is in a position to give this clear holy elevation and strength against the world and its afflictions. This can be effected by nothing but the agency of the divine peace, which is given by means of the Spirit in the believing heart, when by its prayer and supplication with thanksgiving it has elevated itself to God and has confided to Him all its concerns, 1 Pet. v. 7. Then, in virtue of this blessed peace, the heart experiences what it could not have experienced by means of its own thinking, feeling, and willing. According to de Wette, the doubting and heart-disquieting νοῦς is meant,
which is surpassed by the peace of God, because the latter is based upon faith and feeling. In opposition to this, however, stands the πάντα, according to which not merely all doubting reason, but every reason is meant. No one, not even the believer and regenerate, has through his reason and its action what he has through the peace of God. Others have explained it in the sense of the incomprehensibleness of the peace of God, “the greatness of which the understanding cannot even grasp” (Wiesinger). So Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, also Hoëlemann and Weiss. Comp. Eph. iii. 20. But the context, both in the foregoing μηδὲν μεριμνάτε and in the φοινήσει κ.τ.λ. which follows, points only to the blessed influence, in respect of which the peace of God surpasses every kind of reason whatever, and consequently is more efficacious than it. It is a ἵπτεκεν τῇ δυνάμει; Paul had no occasion to bring into prominence the incomprehensibleness of the εἰρήνη Θεοῦ.

— On ἵπτεκεν with the accusative (usually with the genitive, ii. 3), see Valckenaeer, ad Eur. Hippol. 1365; Kühner, II. 1, p. 337. — φοινήσει κ.τ.λ.] not custodiat (Vulg., Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact: ἀσφαλσαίτο, Luther, Calovius, Cornelius a Lapide, and others, including Storr, Heinrichs, Flatt), but custodiet (Castalius, Beza, Calvin), whereby protection against all injurious influences (comp. 1 Pet. i. 5) is promised. Comp. Plat. Rep. p. 560 B: οἱ . . . ἄριστοι φρονοῦ τ᾽ ἐκαφλακεί ἐν αὐθέντων θεοφιλῶν εἰς διανοίας. Eur. Suppl. 902: ἐφιβαίνει (πολλοῖς) μηδὲν ἐξαμαρτάνειν. “Animat eos hac fiducia,” Erasmus, Annot. This protecting vigilance is more precisely defined by ἐν Χ. Ἰ., which expresses its specific character, so far as this peace of God is in Christ as the element of its nature and life, and therefore its influence, protecting and keeping men’s hearts, is not otherwise realized and carried out than in this its holy sphere of life, which is Christ. The φοινά which the peace of God exercises implies in Christ, as it were, the φοινπρχλα (Xen. Mem. iv. 4. 17). Comp. Col. iii. 15, where the εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ βραβεῖν in men’s hearts. Others consider ἐν Χ. Ἰ. as that which takes place on the part of the readers, wherein the peace of God would keep
them, namely “in unity with Christ, in His divinely-blessed, holy life,” de Wette; or δυτε μένειν καὶ μὴ ἑκπεισθεῖν αὐτοῦ, Oecumenius, comp. Chrysostom, Theophylact, Luther, Zanchius, and others, including Heinrichs, Storr, Flatt, Rheinwald, van Hengel, Matthies, Rilliet, Wiesinger, Weiss. But the words do not affirm wherein watchful activity is to keep or preserve the readers (Paul does not write τηρήσει; comp. John xvii. 11), but wherein it will take place; therefore the inaccurate rendering per Christum (Erasmus, Grotius, Estius, and others) is so far more correct. The artificial suggestion of Hoelemann (“Christo fere cinguli instar τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ. circumcludente,” etc.) is all the less warranted, the more familiar the idea ἐν Χριστῷ was to the apostle as representing the element in which the life and action, as Christian, move.—The pernicious influencee themselves, the withholding and warding off of which are meant by φρουρήσει κ.τ.λ., are not to be arbitrarily limited, e.g. to opponentes (Heinrichs), or to Satan (Beza, Grotius, and others), or sin (Theophylact), or praevent cogitationes (Calvin), or “omnes insulisus et curas” (Bengel), and the like; but to be left quite general, comprehending all such special aspects. Erasmus well says (Paraphr.): “adversus omnia, quae hic possunt incidere formidanda.” — τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ νοηματ. ὑμᾶν emphatically kept apart. It is enough to add Bengel’s note: “cor sedes cogitationum.” Comp. Roos, Fundam. psychol. ex sacr. script. III. § 6: “causa cogitationum interna eaque libera.” The heart is the organ of self-consciousness, and therefore the moral seat of the activity of thought and will. As to the νοηματα (2 Cor. iii. 14) as the internal products of the theoretical and practical reason, and therefore including purposes and plans (Plat. Polit. p. 260 D; 2 Cor. ii. 11), comp. Beck, bibl. Seelenl. p. 59, and Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 179. The distinction is an arbitrary one, which applies τ. καρδ. to the emotions and will, and τ. νοημ. to the intelligence (Beza, Calvin).

Ver. 8 f. A summary closing summons to a Christian mode of thought and (ver. 9) action, compressing everything closely and succinctly into a few pregnant words, introduced by τὸ λογιστὶν, with which Paul had already, at iii. 1, wished to pass
on to the conclusion. See on iii. 1. This τὸ λογιστὶν is not, however, resumptive (Matthies, Ewald, following the old expositors), or concluding the exhortation begun in iii. 1 (Hofmann), for in that passage it introduced quite a different summons; but, without any reference to iii. 1, it conveys the transition of thought: "what over and above all the foregoing I have to urge upon you in general still is: everything that," etc. According to de Wette, it is intended to bring out what remained for man to do, in addition to that which God does, ver. 7. But in that case there must have been expressed, at least by ἧμες before ἅδελφοι or in some other way, an antithetic statement of that which had to be done on the part of man.—δόσα] nothing being excepted, expressed synthetically six times with the emphasis of an earnest ἐπιμονή. Comp. ii. 1, iii. 2; Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 341 [E. T. 398].—ἀληθὴ] The thoroughly ethical contents of the whole summons requires us to understand, not theoretical truth (van Hengel), but that which is morally true; that is, that which is in harmony with the objective standard of morality contained in the gospel. Chrysostom: ἡ ἀρετὴ φεῦδος δὲ ἡ κακία. Oecumenius: ἀληθὴ δὲ φησι τὰ ἑνάρετα. Comp. also Theophy-lact. See 1 John i. 6; John iii. 21; Eph. v. 9; 1 Cor. v. 8. To limit it to truth in speaking (Theodoret, Bengel) is in itself arbitrary, and not in keeping with the general character of the predicates which follow, in accordance with which we must not even understand specially unfeigned sincerity (Erasmus, Grotius, Estius, and others; comp. Eph. iv. 21; Plat. Phil. p. 59 C: τὸ ἁληθὲς καὶ δ ἡ λέγομεν εἰλικρινὲς), though this essentially belongs to the morally true.—σεμνά] worthy of honour, for it is in accordance with God. Comp. 1 Tim. ii. 2: εὐσεβεῖα καὶ σεμνότητι. Plat. Soph. p. 249 A: σεμνόν καὶ ὑγιὸν νῶν. Xen. Oc. vi. 14: τὸ σεμνὸν ὅνομα τὸ καλὸν τε καὶ γαθόν. Dem. 385. 11; Herodian, i. 2. 6; Ael. V.H. ii. 13, viii. 36; Polyb. ix. 36. 6, xx. 22. 1, xxii. 6. 10.—ἀκαία] upright, as it ought to be; not to be limited to the relations "erγa aλίς" (Bengel, Heumann, and others), so that justice in the narrower sense would be meant (so Calvin: "ne quem laedamus, ne quem fraudemus;" Estius, Grotius, Calovius, and others).
Comp., on the contrary, Theogn. 147: ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ σωλήνῃ πάση ἀρετῇ ἐστι. — ἄγνα] pure, unstained, not: chaste in the narrower sense of the word (2 Cor. xi. 2; Dem. 1371. 22; Plut. Mor. p. 268 E, 438 C, et al.), as Grotius, Calovius, Estius, Heumann, and others would explain it. Calvin well says: "castimoniam denotat in omnibus vitae partibus." Comp. 2 Cor. vi. 6, vii. 11; 1 Tim. v. 22; Jas. iii. 17; 1 Pet. iii. 2; 1 John iii. 3; often so used in Greek authors. Comp. Menand. in Clem. Strom. vii. p. 844: πᾶς ἄγνος ἐστιν ὁ μηθὲν ἡσυχάζων συνιδώ. — προσφιλή] dear, that which is loved. This is just once more Christian morality, which, in its whole nature as the ethical καλόν, is worthy of love;¹ Plat. Rep. p. 444 E; Soph. El. 972: φιλεῖ γὰρ πρὸς τὰ χρηστὰ πᾶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος. "Nihil est amabilis virtute, nihil quod magis allicit ad diligendum, Cic. Lael. 28. Comp. ad Fam. ix. 14; Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 33. The opposite is the aiōχρόν, which deserves hate (Rom. vii. 15). Chrysostom suggests the supplying τοις πιστοῖς κ. τῷ Θεῷ; Theodoret only τῷ Θεῷ. Others, as Calovius, Estius, Heinrichs, and many: "amabilia hominibus." But there is no necessity for any such supplement. The word does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., although frequently in classical authors, and at Ecclus. iv. 8, xx. 13. Others understand kindness, benevolence, friendliness, and the like. So Grotius; comp. Erasmus, Paraphr.: "quaecumque ad alendam concordiam accommoda." Linguistically faultless (Ecclus. i.e.; Herod. i. 125; Thuc. vii. 86; Polyb. x. 5. 6), but not in keeping with the context, which does not adduce any special virtues. — εὐφημα] not occurring elsewhere either in the N. T., or in the LXX., or Apocrypha; it does not mean: "quaecumque bonam famam conciliant" (Erasmus; comp. Calvin, Grotius, Cornelius a Lapide, Estius, Heinrichs, and others, also Rheinwald); but: that which sounds well (Luther), which has an auspicious (faustum) sound, i.e. that which, when it is named, sounds significant of happiness, as, for instance, brave, honest, honourable, etc. The opposite would be: δύσφημα. Comp. Soph. Aj. 362; Eur. Iph. T. 687:

¹ Luther well renders it: "lieblich," and the Gothic: "lēbalek;" the Vulgate: "amabilia."
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εὐθυμία φόνει. Plat. Leg. vii. p. 801 A: τὸ τῆς φονοῦ γένος εὐθυμίαν ἦμιν. Aesch. Suppl. 694, Agam. 1168; Polyb. xxxi. 14. 4; Lucian, Prom. 3. Storr, who is followed by Flatt, renders it: "sermones, qui bene aliis preceantur." So used in later Greek authors (also Symmachus, Ps. lxii. 6); but this meaning is here too special.—εἰ τις κτ.λ.] comprehending all the points mentioned: if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise; not if there be yet another, etc. (de Wette).—ἀπερίδ used by Paul here only, and in the rest of the N. T. only in 1 Pet. ii. 9, 2 Pet. i. 3, 5, in the ethical sense: moral aptitude in disposition and action (the opposite to it, παράλα: Plat. Rep. 444 D, 445 C, 1, p. 348 C). Comp. from the Apocrypha, Wisd. iv. 1, v. 13, and frequent instances of its use in the books of Macc. —ἐπαυως not: res laudabilis (Calvin, Grotius, Estius, Flatt, Matthies, van Hengel, and many others; comp. Weiss), but praise (Erasmus: "laus virtutis comes"), which the reader could not understand in the apostle's sense otherwise than of a laudatory judgment actually corresponding to the moral value of the object. Thus, for instance, Paul's commendation of love in 1 Cor. xiii. is an ἐπαυως; or when Christ pronounces a blessing on the humble, the peacemakers, the merciful, etc., or the like. "Vera laus uni virtuti debetur: Cic. de orat. ii. 84. 342; virtue is καθ' αὐτὴν ἐπαυωτῇ, Plat. Def. p. 411 C. Mistaken, therefore, were such additions as ἐπιστήμης (D* E* F G) or disciplinae (Vulg., It., Ambrosiaster, Pelagius). —ταύτα λόγιζον consider these things, take them to heart, in order (see ver. 9) to determine your conduct accordingly. "Meditatio praecedit, deinde sequitur opus," Calvin. On λόγιζον, comp. Ps. lxi. 2; Jer.

1 We are not entitled to assume (with Beza) as the reason why Paul does not use this word elsewhere, that it is "verbum minimum humile, si cum donis Spiritus Sancti compararet." The very passage before us shows the contrary, as it means no other than Christian morality. Certainly in Paul's case, as with the N. T. authors generally and even Christ Himself, the specific designations of the idea of virtue, which correspond more closely to the sphere of theocratic O. T. ideas, such as ἐκκυρία, ἐκαπνί, ἐκρινθ, ἐκκυρία, ἐκτιμη, κ. τ. λ., too necessarily suggested themselves to his mind to allow him to use the general term for morality, ἀπερίδ, as familiar, however worthily and nobly the Platonic doctrine, in particular, had grasped the idea of it (ἐις τὸν δοκεῖν ἢδρεῖν ἱμανεῖας ὑπή, Plat. Rep. p. 613 A, 500 C, et al.).
xxvi. 3; Nah. i. 9; Ps. xxxv. 4, xxxvi. 4; 3 Macc. iv. 4; Soph. O. R. 461; Herod. viii. 53; Dem. 63, 12; Sturz, Lex. Xen. III. p. 42; the opposite: θυματὶ λογισθοῦν, Anthol. Pal. xi. 56. 3.—Ver. 9. The Christian morality, which Paul in ver. 8 has commended to his readers by a series of predicates, he now again urges upon them in special reference to their relation to himself, their teacher and example, as that which they had also learned, etc. The first καὶ is therefore also, prefixing to the subsequent ταῦτα πρᾶσοτε an element corresponding to this requirement, and imposing an obligation to its fulfilment. "Whatsoever also has been the object and purport of your instruction, etc., that do." To take the four times repeated καὶ as a double as well . . . as also (Hofmann and others), would yield an inappropriate formal scheme of separation. Καὶ in the last three cases is the simple and, but so that the whole is to be looked upon as bipartite: "Duo priora verba ad doctrinam pertinent, reliqua duo ad exemplum" (Estius).—ἐὰν not ὅσα again; for no further categories of morality are to be given, but what they are bound to do generally is to be described under the point of view of what is known to the readers, as that which they also have learned, etc. —παρελάβετε] have accepted. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 1; John i. 11; Polyb. xxxiii. 16. 9. The interpretation: "have received" (Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, and most expositors, including Rheinwald, Rilliet, Hoelemann, de Wette, Weiss, Hofmann), which makes it denote the instruction communicated (1 Thess. ii. 13, iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 23; Gal. i. 9, 12; Col. ii. 6; comp. Plat. Theat. p. 198 B: παραλαμβάνοντα δὲ μανθάνειν), would yield a twofold designation for the one element,1 and on the other hand would omit the point of the assensus, which is so important as a motive; moreover, from a logical point of view, we should necessarily expect to find the position of the two words reversed (comp.

1 Real distinctions have, indeed, been made, but how purely arbitrary they are! Thus Grotius (comp. Hammond) makes ἐπιτ. apply to the primam institutionem, and παρελαβ. to the exactiorum doctrinam. Rilliet explains it differently, making the former denote: "son enseignement direct," and the latter: "les instructions, qu'il leur a transmises sous une forme quelconque."
Gal. i. 12). — ἡκούσατε] does not refer to the proper preaching and teaching of the apostle (Erasmus, Calvin, Elsner, Rheinwald, Matthies), which is already fully embraced in the two previous points; nor does it denote: "audisti de me absente" (Estius and others, including Hoelemann, Rilliet, Hofmann), for all the other points refer to the time of the apostle's presence, and consequently not merely the "de me," but also the "absente" would be purely imported. No, by the words ἡκούσατε and εἶδετε, to both of which ἐν ἑμοί belongs, he represents to his readers his own example of Christian morality, which he had given them when he was present, in its two portions, in so far as they had perceived it in him (ἐν ἑμοί, comp. i. 30) partly by hearing, in his whole oral behaviour and intercourse with them, partly by seeing, in his manner of action among them; or, in other words, his example both in word and deed.—ταῦτα πράσοσετε] these things do, is not related to ταῦτα λογιζεσθε, ver. 8, as excluding it, in such a way that for what is said in ver. 8 the λογιζεσθαι merely would be required, and for what is indicated in ver. 9 the πράσοσεως; on the contrary, the two operations, which in substance belong jointly to the contents of both verses, are formally separated in accordance with the mode of expression of the parallelism. Comp. on ii. 8 and Rom. x. 10.—καὶ ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.] in substance the same promise as was given in ver. 7. God, who works peace (that holy peace of soul, ver. 7), will be with you, whereby is meant the help given through the Holy Spirit; and His special agency, which Paul here has in view, is unmistakeably indicated by the very predicate τῆς εἰρήνης.

Remark.—It is to be noticed that the predicates in ver. 8, ἄληθὲς ... ἐφημα, do not denote different individual virtues, but that each represents the Christian moral character generally, so that in reality the same thing is described, but according to the various aspects which commended it. Comp. Diog. Laert. ii. 106: οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολλοὶ δόμας καλόμενοι. Cic. de fin. iii. 4. 14: "una virtus unum istud, quod honestum appellas, rectum, laudabile, decorum." That it is Christian morality which Paul has in view, is clearly evident from ver. 9 and from the whole preceding PHIL.
context. Hence the passage cannot avail for placing the morality of the moral law of nature (Rom. ii. 14 f.) on an equality with the gospel field of duty, which has its specific definition and consecration—as also, for the reconciled whom it embraces, the assurance of the divine keeping (vv. 7, 9)—in the revealed word (ver. 9), and in the enlightening and ethically transforming power of the Spirit (comp. Rom. xii. 2).

Ver. 10. Carrying on his discourse with δε, Paul now in conclusion adds, down to ver. 20, some courteous expressions, as dignified as they are delicate, concerning the aid which he had received. Hitherto, indeed, he had only mentioned this work of love briefly and casually (ii. 25, 30). In the aid itself Baur discovers a contradiction of 1 Cor. ix. 15, and conjectures that the author of the epistle had 2 Cor. xi. 9 in view, and had inferred too much from that passage. But, in fact, Baur himself has inferred too much, and incorrectly, from 1 Cor. ix. 15; for in this passage Paul speaks of payment for his preaching, not of loving gifts from persons at a distance, which in point of fact put him in the position to preach gratuitously in Achaia, 2 Cor. xi. 8 ff. There is, besides, in our passage no mention of regular sendings of money. — ἐν κυρίῳ as in iii. 1, iv. 4. It was, indeed, not a joy felt apart from Christ; οὐ κοσμικῶς, ἐχάριτι, φησίν, οὐδὲ βιωτικῶς, Chrysostom. — μεγάλως] mightily. Comp. LXX., 1 Chron. xxix. 9; Neh. xii. 42; Polyb. iii. 87. 5; Polyc. Phil. 1. The position at the end is emphatic. See on Matt. ii. 10; and Stallbaum, ad Plat. Phaedr. p. 256 E, Menex. p. 235 A.— οὐ δὴ πορεῖ κ.τ.λ.] is to be rendered: “that ye have at length once again come into the flourishing condition of taking thought for my benefit, in behalf of which ye also took thought, but had no favourable opportunity.” — δὴ πορεῖ taken in itself may mean: already once; or, as in Rom. i. 10: tandem aliquando. The latter is the meaning here, as appears from ἔδρα κ.τ.λ. Chrysostom justly observes (comp. Oecumenius and Theophylact) that it denotes χρόνον μακρόν, when namely that θάλεω had not been present, which has now again (comp. ver. 15 f.) set in. Comp. Baemlein, Partik. p. 140. This view of δὴ πορεῖ is the less to be evaded, seeing that the reproach which some have discovered in
the passage (ἐπιριμματικος, Chrysostom) is not by any means conveyed in it, as indeed from the delicate feeling of the apostle we might expect that it would not, and as is apparent from the correct explanation of the sequel.—ἀνεβάλετε] ye have again become green (restoruisitis, Vulgate), like a tree or an orchard which had been withered, and has again budded and put forth new shoots (βάλλοντι). It cannot be the revival of their care-taking love which is meant, so that the readers would have previously been ἀπομαραθῶσας εἰς τὴν δεμοσίαν (Oecumenius, also Chrysostom, Theophylact, Pelagius, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Bengel, Flatt, Wiesinger, Ewald, and most expositors, who rightly take ἀνεβάλετε as intransitive, as well as all who take it transitively; see below); for how indecent would be such an utterance, which one could not, with Weiss, acquit from implying an assumption that a different disposition previously existed; and how at variance with the ἔφ ο ἐφρονεῖτε κ.τ.λ. which immediately follows, and by which the continuous care previously exercised is attested! No, it is the flourishing anew of their prosperity (comp. Rheinwald, Matthies, van Hengel, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel, Hofmann, and others), the opposite of which is afterwards expressed by ἥκαιρωσας, that is denoted, as prosperous circumstances are so often represented under the figure of becoming green and blooming. Comp. Ps. xxviii. 7: ἀνεβάλετε ὑ σάρξ μου, Wisd. iv. 3 f.; Hes. Op. 231: τέθηλε πόλεις, Pind. Isth. iii. 9: διβρο...θάλλων, Pyth. vii. 22: θάλλωσαν ειδαμονίαν. Plat. Legg. xii. p. 945 D: ἡ πάσα ὀβεωθάλλει τε καὶ εἰδαμονεὶ χώρα κ. πόλις. Of frequent occurrence in the tragedians; comp. also Jacobs, ad Del. Epigr. viii. 97. It is therefore inconsistent, both with delicate feeling and with the context, to take ἀνεβάλετε transitively: “revirescere stevisis solitam vestram rerum mearam procurationem” (Hoelemann; comp. Cocceius, Grotius, Hein-

1 The conjecture, on the ground of this figurative expression, that the Philippians might have sent to the apostle in spring, and that ἄνεμπικη ἃ applies to the winter season (Bengal), is far-fetched and arbitrary. The figurative ἄνεμπικη does not even need to be an image of spring, as Calvin, Estius, Weiss, and others understand it.
riches, Hammond, and others, including Rilliet, de Wette, Weiss), although the transitive use of ἀνεβάλλειν in the LXX. and also in the Apocrypha is unquestionable (Ezek. xvii. 24; Ecclus. i. 16, xi. 20, l. 10; see generally Schleusner, Thes. I. p. 220 f.); and that of θάλλειν is also current in classical authors (Pind. Ol. iii. 24; Aesch. Pers. 622 (608); Jacobs, ad Anthol. VII. p. 103; Kühner, II. 1, p. 265). An unfounded objection is brought against the view which explains it of the revival of prosperity, that it is inappropriate as a subject of joy in the Lord (see Weiss); it is appropriate at all events, when such a use is made of the revived prosperity. — τὸ ἐντὸ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν] is usually, with the correct intransitive rendering of ἀνεβάλλειν, so understood that τὸ is taken together with φρονεῖν, and this must be regarded as the accusative of more precise definition, which is only distinguished by its greater emphasis from the mere exegetical infinitive. See Bernhardy, p. 356; Schmalfeld, Syntax d. Griech. Verb. p. 401 f.; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 222. Comp. van Hengel: "negotium volo mihi consulendi." But the whole view which takes τὸ with φρονεῖν is set aside by the following ἐφ’ ἐμὶ ἐφρονεῖντε; seeing that ἐφ’ ἐμὶ, unless it is to be rendered at variance with linguistic usage by although (Luther, Castalio, Michaelis, Storr), or just as (Vulgate, van Hengel), could only convey in its ἐμὶ the previous τὸ ἐντὸ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν, and would consequently yield the logically absurd conception: ἐφρονεῖντε ἐπὶ τὸ ἐντὸ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν, whether ἐφ’ ἐμὶ be taken as equivalent to ὅ ἐνεκα (Beza) or qua de re (Rheinwald, Matthies, de Wette, Wiesinger, Ewald, and others), or in eo quod (Erasmus), in qua re (Cornelius a Lepide, Hoelemann), or et post id (Grotius), and the like. Recourse has been had, by way of helping the matter, to the suggestion that φρονεῖν ἐπὶ is a thinking without action, and φρονεῖν ἐντὸ a thinking with action (de Wette, Wiesinger; comp. Ewald); but how purely arbitrary is this view! Less arbitrarily, Calvin and Rilliet ("vous pensez bien à moi") have referred ἐμὶ to ἐμοῦ, by which, no doubt, that logical

1 In the transitive interpretation (see, against it, supra) the τὸ φρονεῖν, which would likewise be taken together, would be the accusative forming the object of ἀνεβάλλειν. See Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 226 [E. T. 263]; Kühner, II. 2, p. 603.
awkwardness is avoided; but, on the other hand, the objection arises, that ἐφ' ὃ is elsewhere invariably used by Paul as neuter only, and that it is difficult to see why, if he desired to take up ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ in a relative form, he should not have written ὑπὲρ οὖ, since otherwise in ἐν, if it merely went back to ἐμοῦ, the more precise and definite reference which he must have had in view would not be expressed, and since the progress of the thought suggested not a change of preposition, but only the change of the tenses (καὶ ἐφρονεῖτε). Weiss, interpreting ἐφ' ὃ as: about which to take thought, refers it back to ἀνεθάλετε—a reference, however, which falls to the ground with the active interpretation of that word. Upon the whole, the only right course seems to be to take το ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ together (comp. τὰ πρεπ ὑμῶν, ii. 20; also τὰ πρα ὑμῶν, ver. 18; and see generally, Krüger, § 50. 5. 12; Kühner, II. 1, p. 231 f.), and that as the accusative of the object to ἐφρονεῖ (comp. Bengel, Schenkel, J. B. Lightfoot, Hofmann): “to take into consideration that which serves for my good,” to think of my benefit; on ὑπὲρ, comp. i. 7. Only thus does the sequel obtain its literal, logical, and delicately-turned reference, namely, when ἐφ' ὃ applies to το ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. Taking this view, we have to notice: (1) that ἐν is used in the sense of the aim (Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 475; Kühner, II. 1, p. 435): on behalf of which, for which, comp. Soph. O. R. 559; (2) that Paul has not again written the mere accusative (ὁ καὶ ἐφρ.), because ἐφ' ὃ is intended to refer not alone to κ. ἐφρονεῖτε, but also to the antithesis ἡκαίρειον δὲ, consequently to the entire κ. ἐφρ., ἡκαίρ. δὲ; (3) that the emphasis is placed on ἐφρον as the

1 All the more groundless, therefore, is Hofmann’s objection, that ὑγειαῖεν ἐπὶ ὑμῖν means: to be proud about something. This objection, put thus generally, is even in itself incorrect. For ὑγειαῖεν ἐπὶ ὑμῖν does not in itself mean: to be proud about something, but only receives this signification through the addition of μιαν, μιαν., or some similar more precise definition (Plat. Theaet. p. 149 D, Alc. 1. p. 104 C, Prot. p. 342 D, Synpos. p. 217 A: Dem. 181. 16, 836. 10), either expressly specified or directly suggested by the context. Very artificial, and for the simple reader hardly discoverable, is the view under which Hofmann takes the fact expressed by ὑγειαῖεν ἐπὶ ὑμῖν as the ground, “upon, or on account of, which their re-emergence from an unfavourable position has been a revival unto care for him.” If the reference of ἐπὶ ὃ to το ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ were not directly given in the text, it would be much simpler to take ἐπὶ ὃ as in Rom. v. 12, Phil. iii. 12, 2 Cor. v. 4, in
imperfect, and καὶ indicates an element to be added to the φρονέω which has been just expressed; hence καὶ ἔφη intimates: "in behalf of which ye not only are taking thought (that is, since the ἀνεβάλετε), but also were taking thought (namely, πρὸς θεν, before the ἀνεβάλετε);" lastly, (4) that after ἔφη there is no μὲν inserted, because the antithesis is meant to emerge unprepared for, and so all the more vividly.— ἡκαὶρεῖσθε] ye had no favourable time; a word belonging to the later Greek. Diod. exc. Mai. p. 30; Phot., Suid. The opposite: εἰκαρεῖν, Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 125. Unsuitably and arbitrarily this is explained: "deerat vobis opportunitas mittendi" (Erasmus, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, and others). It refers, in keeping with the ἀνεβάλετε, not without delicacy of description, to the unfavourable state of things as regards means (Chrysostom: οὐκ εἴετε ἐν χερῶν, οὐδὲ ἐν ἀποθελα ἤτε; so also Theophylact; while Oecumenius adds this interpretation alongside of the previous one) which had occurred among the Philippians, as Paul might have learned from Epaphroditus and otherwise. Comp. εἰκαρεῖν τοῖς βλοεισ in Polyb. xv. 21. 2, xxxii. 21. 12; and also the mere εἰκαρεῖν in the same sense, iv. 60. 10; εἰκαρία: xv. 31. 7, i. 59. 7; ἡκαιρία: Plat. Legg. iv. p. 709 A; Dem. 16. 4; Polyb. iv. 44. 11.

Ver. 11. Obviating of a misunderstanding. — οὐχ ὅτι] as in iii. 12: my meaning is not, that I say this in consequence of want, that is, this my utterance of joy in ver. 10 f. is not meant as if it were the expression of felt want, from which your aid has delivered me. On κατά, secundum, in the sense of propter, see Kühner, II. 1, p. 413, and ad Xen. Mem. i. 3. 12. According to van Hengel's interpretation: "ut more receptum est penuriae, s. hominibus penuria oppressis," κατά could not have been united with an abstract noun (Rom. iii. 5, et al.).— ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔμαθον κ. τ. ἑλ.] for I, as regards my part (although it may be different with others), have learned in the

the sense of propter a quod, and that as a graceful and ingenious specification of the reason for the great joy of the apostle, that they had flourished again to take thought for his benefit; for their previous omission had been caused not by any lack of the φρονίσ in question, but by the unfavourableness of the times.
circumstances, in which I find myself, to be self-contented, that is, to have enough independently without desiring aid from others. It is evident from the reason thus assigned that in ὧδη καθ’ ὅστ. λ. he has meant not the objective, but the subjective state of need. — ἐγώ[ with noble self-consciousness, there being no need to supply, with Bengel, “in tot adversis.” — ἐμαθὼν] signifies the having learned by experience (comp. Plat. Symp. p. 182 C: ἔρως δὲ τοιοῦτο ἐμαθὼν καὶ οἱ ἐνδέκει τοπανοῦ), and all that accordingly he can, he owes to the strengthening influence of Christ, ver. 13. — ἐν ὧδη καθ’ ὅστ.] in the situation, in which I find myself. See examples in Wetstein and Kypke; comp. also Mätzner, ad Antiph. p. 131. Not merely his position then, but, generally, every position in which he finds himself, is meant, although it is not exactly to be taken as: "in quocumque statu sim" (Raphael, Wetstein, and others), which would be ungrammatically expressed. In opposition to the context (see ver. 12), Luther: among whom (ōδη, masculine) I am. As to αὐτάρκεια as applied to persons, the subjective self-sufficing, by means of which a man does not make the satisfaction of his needs dependent upon others, but finds it in himself, comp. Ecclus. xl 18; Xen. Mem. iv. 7. 1; Dem. 450. 14; Stob. v. 43; and see on 2 Cor. ix. 8.

Ver. 12. Paul now specifies this his αὐτάρκεια (in Plat. Def. p. 412 B, termed τελειώτης κτήσεως ἡμῶν). — ὧδη] I understand hōw (1 Thess. iv. 4; Col. iv. 6; 1 Tim. iii. 5; Matt. vii. 11; Soph. Ἀ. 666 f.; Anth. Pal. vii. 440. 5 ff.); result of the ἐμαθὼν. — καὶ ῥασεν. also to be abased, namely, by want, distress, and other allotted circumstances which place the person affected by them in the condition of abasement. Paul understands this, inasmuch as he knows how to bear himself in the right attitude to such allotted circumstances, namely, in such a way that, independently thereof, he finds his sufficiency in himself, and does not seek it in that which he lacks. We find a commentary on this in 2 Cor. iv. 8, vi. 9, 10. ὧδη καὶ περισσεύειν is to be understood analogously, of the right attitude to the matter, so that one is not led away by

1 It is the moral understanding, having its seat in the character. Comp. Δαμιαν, Ἀνθ. ν. Πολυ. Od. ix. 139.
abundance to find his satisfaction in the latter instead of in himself. Pelagius well says: "ut nec abundantia extollat, nec frangat inopia." — The first καλ adds to the general ἐν οἷς εἰμι the special statement on the one side, to which thereupon the second "also" adds the counterpart. The contrast, however, is less adequate here than subsequently in περισσεύειν καὶ ἱστρείσθαι, for ταπεινοῦσθαι is a more comprehensive idea than the counterpart of περισσεύειν, and also contains a figurative conception. Some such expression as ἰδυουσθαί would have been adequate as the contrast of ταπείνω. (Matt. xxiii. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 7; Phil. ii. 8, 9; Polyb. v. 26. 12). There is a lively versatility of conception, from not perceiving which some have given to this περισσεύειν (to have a superfluity) the explanation excellere (Erasmus, Vatablus, Calvin), or to ταπείνω, the meaning to be poor, to be in pitiful plight, ὀλίγως κεχρησθαί, Theophylact (Estius and others; comp. also Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Rheinwald, Matthies, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Hofmann), which even the LXX., Lev. xxv. 39, does not justify. — In what follows, ἐν παντὶ κ. ἐν πάσι is not to be regarded as belonging to ταπεινοῦσθαι and περισσεύειν (Hofmann), but is to be joined with μεμνήμαι. We are dissuaded from the former connection by the very repetition of the οίδα; and the latter is recommended by the great emphasis, which rests upon ἐν παντὶ κ. ἐν πάσι heading the last clause, as also by the correlative πάντα at the head of the a. 13. Further, no comma is to be placed after μεμνήμαι, nor is ἐν παντὶ ... μεμνήμαι to be explained as meaning: "into everything I am initiated," and then καὶ χρησίζομαι κ.τ.λ. as elucidating the notion of "everything": "cum re qualsecumque omnibusque, tam saturitate et fame, quam abundantia et penuria, tantam constringi familiaritatem, ut rationem teneam 1is bene utendi," van Hengel; comp. de Wette, Rilliet, Wiesinger; so also, on the whole, Chrysostom, Erasmus, Estius, and many others, but with different interpretations of παντὶ and πάσι. This view is at variance with the fact, that μεμνήμαι has that into which one is initiated expressed not by means of ἐν, but—and that most usually—in the accusative (Herod. ii. 51; Plat. Gorg. p. 497 C, Symp. p. 209 E; Aristoph. Plut. 845 (ἐμμεμνήμαι); Lucian,
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Philop. 14), or in the dative (Lucian, Demon. 11), or genitive (Heliod. i. 17; Herodian, i. 13. 16); hence πᾶν κ. πάντα, or παντὶ κ. πᾶσιν, or παντὸς κ. πάντων must have been written (in 3 Macc. ii. 30 it has κατὰ with the accusative). No; Paul says that in everything and in all, that is, under every relation that may occur and in all circumstances, he is initiated into, that is, made completely familiar with, as well the being satisfied as the being hungry, as well the having superfluity as want; in all situations, without exception, he quite understands how to assume and maintain the right attitude to these different experiences, which in ver. 11 he characterizes by the words αὐτάρκης εἶναι. Ἐν παντὶ κ. ἐν πᾶσι is accordingly to be taken after the analogy of ἐν οἷς εἶμι, ver. 11, and therefore as neuter. It was purely arbitrary to render ἐν παντὶ: ubique (Vulgate, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, and many others), or to refer it to time (Chrysostom, Grotius), or to time and place (Theophylact, Erasmus, and others, also Matthies). Luther and Bengel explain παντὶ correctly as neuter, but make πᾶσι (as in 2 Cor. xi. 6) masculine (Bengel: "respectu omnium hominum"). It is not necessary to supply anything to either of the two words; and as to the alternation of the singular and plural, which only indicates the total absence of any exception (comp. analogous expressions in Lobeck, Paral. p. 56 ff.), there is no occasion for artificial explanation.—In German we say: in Allem und Jedem [in all and each]. Comp. on ἐν πᾶσι on Col. i. 18. With strange arbitrariness Hofmann makes ἐν παντὶ κ. ἐν πᾶσι denote everything that is a necessary of life (in detail and in whole). In that case certainly the contrast of χορτάζει and πενεῖν is unsuitable!—μεμυημαί the proper word for the various grades of initiation into the mysteries (Casaubon, Exerc. Baron. p. 390 ff.; Lobeck, Aglaoph. I. p. 38 ff.) is here used in a figurative sense, like initiatum esse, of a special, unusual, not by every one attainable, familiar acquaintance with something. See Munthe, Obs. p. 383; Jacobs, ad Anthol. III. p. 488. The opposite is άμυητος. The climax should here be noticed, ἔμαθον . . . οἶδα . . . μεμυημα. Ver. 13 places beyond doubt to whom the apostle owes this lofty spiritual superiority over all outward circumstances. As
to the later form πενήν instead of πενήν, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 61; Jacobs, *ad Ael. II.* p. 261.

Ver. 13. After the *special* statement, the consciousness of the αὐτάρκεια now finds fresh utterance *generally;* and in the grand brevity of the latter how marked is the assurance, and, at the same time, the humility! — ἵσχυς] of moral strength, homogeneous as to category with ἔμαθον in ver. 11, and with ὀῦδε and μεμονήμας in ver. 12, because these predicates also were *dynamically* meant, of the understanding of ethical practice. There is therefore the less reason for limiting πάντα in any way (van Hengel: "omnia memorata;" comp. Weiss); there is *nothing* for which Paul did not feel himself morally strong; for *every* relation he knew himself to be morally adequate. πάντα is the accusative of the *object.* Gal. v. 6; Jas. v. 16. The opposite to it: μηδὲν ἵσχυσιν, Plat. *Crit.* p. 50 B, Ael. *V. H.* xii. 22, et al. — ἐν τῷ ἔνδον. *με] Not in his own human ability does Paul feel this power, but it has its basis in Christ, whose δύναμις the apostle experiences in his fellowship of life with Him (2 Cor. xii. 9). Comp. 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 1, iv. 17. Thus he is able to do all things ἐν τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχοῦ αὐτοῦ, Eph. vi. 10.

Ver. 14. Πλὴν] *Nevertheless* (1 Cor. xi. 11; Eph. v. 33), apart from the fact that with such moral power I am equal to all emergencies, and therefore, as far as want is concerned, do not need aid (comp. ver. 11). "Caveat, ne fortiter loquendo contemisses ipsorum beneficium videatur," Calvin. Comp. Chrysostom and Theophylact. — καλῶς] in the *moral* sense. — συγκοιν. μοι τῇ θλίψ.] characterizes the work according to its high *ethical* value (ὅρα σοφλαν, πώς ἐπαίρει τὸ πρᾶγμα, Theophylact): that ye became *partakers with me* in *my* affliction. He who renders the aid enters into the relation of a participant in the position of the afflicted one, inasmuch as by his very work of love he, in common with the latter, shares and bears his θλίψις. Comp. Rom. xii. 13. It is a *practical* participation, and not merely that of feeling and emotion. Comp. Eph. v. 11; Rev. xviii. 4, i. 9. By τῇ θλίψ., Paul means his position at the time as a whole, not: *want* (which also in 2 Cor. viii. 13 it does not mean). The *dative* is governed by συγκοιν.
(Eph. v. 11; Rev. xviii. 4; Rom. xii. 13, xv. 27, et al.); and μου is, in accordance with the well-known usage, to be taken as if μοι were in the text (comp on ii. 2; and Stallbaum, ad Plat. Rep. p. 518 C, Symp. p. 215 C). The aorist participle coincides as to time with ἐποιήσατε (see on Eph. i. 9); as to the participle with καλὸς πνεύμα, see Winer, p. 323 f. [E. T. 434].

Ver. 15 f. A courteous recalling of the fact, that in the very beginning of the gospel the Philippians had distinguished themselves by such manifestation of love towards Paul.—δὲ] carrying the discourse onward: But what ye have done connects itself with a relation into which, as ye also know, no other church, but yours only, placed itself to me at the very first!—οἴδατε δὲ κ.τ.λ.] but it is known also to you, Philippians, that, etc. Hofmann very erroneously derives the object of οἴδατε from what precedes, and takes δὲ in the sense of because. He makes the apostle say, namely, to the Philippians: That they had done well in helpfully taking part in his affliction they knew also, as other churches knew that it was well done; by experience they knew it, because it was not the first time that they had sent similar gifts to him, etc. This explanation is erroneous, because invariably where οἴδα (οἴδαμεν, οἴδατε, κ.τ.λ.) is accompanied, not with an accusative of the object, but with δὲ, the latter conveys the contents (that), and not the reason or the cause (because), of the οἴδα (comp. i. 19, 25; Rom. iii. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 16, xii. 2; Gal. iv. 13, and innumerable other passages); secondly, because the previously attested καλὸς ἐποιήσατε, while perfectly suitable to be expressed by the grateful apostle, was not so suited to be transferred to the consciousness of the donors, to which it was self-evident, and to be appealed to by them; thirdly, because the καλὸς in the alleged reference to other churches would be very unsuitable, since the question here concerns merely a work of love of the Philippians, but other churches could only know generally that it was well done to aid the apostle, into which general idea, therefore, Hofmann insensibly transforms the object of οἴδατε, instead of abiding strictly by the concrete καλὸς ἐποιήσατε as its object; finally, it would be strange and not in keeping with the thoughtful manner of the apostle, to
furnish the idea: "ye know that ye did well therein" (which οἴδατε is supposed to convey) with the altogether external specification of a ground for it: "because ye have already formerly and repeatedly supported me." The contents attributed by Hofmann to οἴδατε needed no assignment of a causal ground, or—if any—one internal, ethical, and in harmony with the subtle delicacy of the apostle. — Observe, moreover, in connection with οἴδατε κ. ὑμεῖς, that in that which the readers also know (consequently in δότε κ.τ.λ.) the stress lies upon the negative οὐδεμία κ.τ.λ.—καὶ ὑμεῖς] ye also, as I. Φιλιππ. — addressing them by name, not because he desires to assert something of them which no other church had done (Bengel: for in this case Paul would have written δότε ὑμεῖς, Φιλιππ.), but in his increasing earnestness. Comp. 2 Cor. vi. 11.—ἐν ἀρχῇ τ. εὐαγγ.] glancing back, certainly, to the second missionary journey (Weiss); but the relative expression is used from the standpoint of the time then present, behind which lay the founding of the Macedonian churches about ten years back; a long past which seemed, in relation to the present and to the wider development of the church now attained, as still belonging to the period of the beginning of the gospel. Comp. Clement. Cor. I. 47. An exegetical more precise definition of this expression—which does not betray the hand of a later author (Hirsch)—for the date intended is: δότε ἐξηλθον ἀπὸ Μακεδ., when I departed from Macedonia, Acts xvii. 14. Paul, therefore, immediately on leaving that country, received aid from the infant church, when the brethren τῶν Πατοῦ Εξαπέστειλαν προενέσθαι ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν θᾶλασσαν and ἔγαγον ἔως Ἀθηνῶν, Acts l.c. Doubtless the money which Paul subsequently received in Corinth (see 2 Cor. xi. 9) through Macedonian delegates was sent, if not exclusively, at least jointly by the Philippians, so that they thereby gave continued active proof of the fellowship εἰς λόγον δόσ. κ. λήψ., into which they had entered with the apostle at

1 To express this, Paul was not at all under the necessity of writing οἴδατε ὑμεῖς, as Hofmann objects. The latter would convey a different conception, namely: ye know without my reminding you (Acts ii. 22; 1 Thess. ii. 1, iii. 3; 2 Thess. iii. 7).
his very departure. But this receipt of money at Corinth is
not the fact meant by εἴκοσιάναςων κ.τ.λ., in which case ἔξηλθον
would have to be taken, with Estius, Flatt, van Hengel, de
Wette, Wiesinger, Weiss, Hofmann, and others, in the sense of
the pluperfect (Winer, p. 258 [E. T. 343]); for the latter
would be the more unwarranted in the context, seeing that
Paul himself by ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εἰς gamma. carries them back to the
earliest time possible, and indeed afterwards (ver. 16) to a
period even antecedent to the ὅτε ἔξηλθον. The aorist, how-
ever, has its justification in this purely historical statement of
fact, although the imperfect also, but following a different
conception, might—not, however (in opposition to Hofmann's
objection), must—have been used. — εἴκοσιάναςων εἰς λόγον
δόσεως κ. λήψης] entered into fellowship with me in reference to
account of giving and receiving,—a euphemistic indication,
calculated to meet the sense of delicacy in the readers, of
the thought: "has entered into the relation of furnishing aid
towards me." On κοινωνία εἰς, comp. on i. 5. The analysis
of the figurative description is this: The Philippians keep
an account of expenditure on Paul and income from him; and
the apostle likewise keeps account of his expenditure on the
Philippians and income from them. This mutual account-
keeping, in which the δόσις on the one part, agrees with
the λήψεως on the other, is the κοινωνία εἰς λόγον κ.τ.λ. It is
true that in this case no money-amount is entered in the
account of the Philippians under the heading of λήψεως, or
the account of the apostle under the heading of δόσις; instead
of this, however, comes in the blessing, which the readers were
to receive from their gifts of love, according to ver. 17, as if it
were an income corresponding to this expenditure, and coming
in from it. We are therefore not justified in adopting the view,
that δόσις and λήψης apply to Paul alone (Schrader), or that
δόσις applies to the Philippians and λήψης to Paul ("Ego sum
in vestris expensi tabulis, vos in meis accepti," Grotius; comp.
Erasmus, Camerarius, Casaubon, Castalio, and others, including
Heinrichs, Storr, Flatt, Matthies, van Hengel, Rilliet, Ewald);
for the words require the idea of an account under both
headings on the side of both parties. Others, maintaining
indeed this reciprocity, but arbitrarily introducing ideas from 1 Cor. xi. 11, comp. Rom. xv. 27, consider that the δῶρα on the part of the apostle, and the λήψεις on the part of the Philippians, consisted in the spiritual benefits brought about by the preaching of the gospel (so Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Pelagius, Calvin, Cornelius a Lapide, Zanchius, Zeger, Estius, Hammond, Wiesinger, Weiss, Hofmann, and others); whilst others, again, import into the words the thought: "Quae a Philippensibus acceptit in rationes Dei remuneratoris referunt Paulus" (Wetstein, Rosenmüller; comp. Wolf, Schoettgen, and already Ambrosiaster). Rheinwald finds the λήψεις of the Philippians and the δῶρα of the apostle even in the assumption that he also had assisted them, namely, out of the sums of money collected in the churches,—an error which is at variance with the context, and which ought to have been precluded both by the prominence given to the statement of the date, and also by the exclusion of all other churches, as well as by the inappropriateness of the mention just in this passage of such a λήψεις on the part of the Philippians.—On λόγος, ratio, account, comp. Matt. xii. 36; Luke xvi. 2; Rom. xiv. 12; 1 Macc. x. 40; Dem. 227. 26; Diod. Sic. i. 49; Polyb. xv. 34. 2. The rendering which takes eis λόγον: in respect to (Bengel, Heinrichs, Storr, Matthies, van Hengel, Rilliet, Lünemann), would no doubt be linguistically correct (Dem. 385. 11; 2 Macc. i. 14; and see Krüger on Thuc. iii. 46. 3), but is to be rejected on account of the context, as expressions of accounting follow (comp. Cic. Lael. 16: "ratio acceptorum et datorum"). For instances from Greek writers of δῶρα καὶ λήψεις (Ecclus. xli. 14, xliii. 7) as expenditure and income, see Wetstein. Comp. Plat. Rep. p. 332 A B: ἡ ἀπόδοσις κ. ἡ λήψις. As to the corresponding ἡσσὴ ἄληθεν, see Schoettgen, Hor. p. 804.

Ver. 16. "Or[ ] since, indeed, ye also already in Thessalonica, etc. It is argumentative, namely, outbidding the early definition of date εἰ ἀρχῇ... Μακεδοναὶ, in ver. 15, by one even antecedent, and thus serving more amply to justify that specification of time, for which purpose the δῆμος specifying the

1 If Baur had noticed this correct logical connection, he would not have made an improper use of our passage to fortify his opinion of the affair of the aid
reason was quite sufficient, and (in opposition to Hofmann's objection) no γάρ was necessary. The opinion of Wiesinger, that δή κ.τ.λ. is intended to explain that it was only with the aid sent after Paul at a distance that the readers had entered into such a connection with the apostle as is previously mentioned, is bound up with the untenable interpretation of εἰσῆλθον as pluperfect. The rendering of δή by that (Rheinwald, Matthies, Hoelemann, van Hengel, Rilliet, de Wette, Lüne- mann, Weiss) is to be set aside, because, while the emphatic οἶδατε καὶ οὐκεῖς, ver. 15, accords doubtless with the exclusion of other churches in ver. 15, it does not accord with ver. 16 ("ye also know that ye have sent . . . to me!"), to which it would stand in an illogical relation, even apart from the uncalled-for inversion of the order of time, which would result. Hofmann's explanation, which makes δή in ver. 16 parallel to the δή in ver. 15 and places it in causal relation to οἶδατε, falls with his erroneous view of ver. 15. — The καὶ before εἰν Θεσσαλ., for which Hinsch, following Baur, thinks that he finds a reference in 2 Cor. xi. 9, is the simple also in the sense of also already; a climax as regards time; see Hartung, Partik. I. p. 135; Kühner, II. 2, p. 797. — εἰν Θεσσαλ.] is not used, in the sense of the bearers having arrived, for εἰκ, for there is no certain instance of ἀποστέλλων or πέμπειν with εἰν in this sense (Thuc. vii. 17 must, with Becker and Krüger, be read: εἰς τὴν Σωμαλίαν); but the preposition is used from the standpoint of the receiver: "also at Thessalonica (when I was there) ye sent to me." Thus this sending took place in Thessalonica. Comp. on Matt. x. 16; Poppo and Krüger on Thuc. iv. 27. 1. — καὶ ἄναξ καὶ δέκ] Comp. 1 Thess. ii. 18. The conception is: "when the first aid arrived, the ἐπιμελήθη had taken place once; when the second arrived, it had taken place both once and twice." Paul has not written δέκ merely, nor yet ἄναξ κ. δέκ (1 Macc. iii. 30; Xen. Anab. iv. 7. 10), but by καὶ ἄναξ κ. being an invented incident.—The same assistance which is meant in ver. 15 cannot be meant in ver. 16, as some not attending to the καὶ (comp. Luther, Castalio, and others) have thought. This view is also at variance with the specification of time ἐν ἑξῆς, ver. 15; for Paul abode several weeks in Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 2), and then there still followed his sojourn in Beroea (Acts xvii. 10 ff.), ere he quitted Macedonia and travelled to Athens.
δις he sets forth the repetition of the matter more emphatically, to the praise of his readers (Hartung, Partikell. I. p. 144). Comp. καὶ δις καὶ τρίς, Plat. Phaed. p. 63 D, Phil. p. 59 E; Herod. ii. 121, iii. 148. The opposite: οἷς ἀπαξ εὐδὲ δὶς, Plat. Clit. p. 410 B.— eius t. χρείαν] on behalf of the necessity, in order to satisfy it; comp. ii. 15. The article indicates the necessity that had been existing in Paul’s case. Οπ τέων, used absolutely, comp. Acts xi. 29. What they sent, they knew.

Ver. 17. Just as in ver. 11 Paul anticipated a possible misunderstanding in respect to ver. 10, so here in reference to the praises contained in ver. 14 ff. This, he would say, is not the language of material desire, but, etc.—οἷς ὑμὶ κ.τ.λ.] as in ver. 11: I do not mean by this to convey that my desire is directed towards the gift (the emphasis being laid on τὸ δόμα)—this, namely, taken in and by itself—in which case the article means the donation accruing to him as the case occurred, and the present ἐμπεζεῖν denotes the constant and characteristic striving after (Bernhardt, p. 370): it is not my business, etc. The compound verb indicates by ἐμί the direction. Comp. on ἐπιτοῆς, i. 8, and on Matt. vi. 33; Rom. xi. 7. The view which regards it as strengthening the simple verb (studioso quaero, so Hoelemann and others) is not implied in the context any more than the sense: insuper quaero (Polyb. i. 5. 3); so van Hengel, who indelicately, and notwithstanding the article, explains τὸ δόμα as still more gifts.—ἀλλ’ ἐμπεζεῖν] The repetition of the verb after ἀλλὰ makes the contrast stand out independently with special emphasis; comp. Rom. viii. 15; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Fritzscbe, ad Rom. II. p. 137. — τὸν καρπὸν κ.τ.λ.] This is what Paul desires, towards which his wishes and endeavours are directed: the fruit which abounds to your account; not, therefore, a gain which he wishes to have for himself, but gain for the Philippians. So completely is his ἐμπεζεῖν devoid of any selfish aim,—which, however, would not be the case, if the ἐμπεζεῖν τὸ δόμα were true. This applies against Hofmann’s objection, that the καρπὸς must be something which Paul himself desires to have; the notion of ἐμπεζεῖν is anquirio, appetio, and this indeed applies to personal
possession in the negative half of the sentence; but then the second half expresses the real state of the case, which does away with the notion of selfishness.—The καρπός itself cannot be the fruit of the gospel (Ewald), or of the labour of the apostle (Weiss); but, in accordance with the context, only the fruit of the δῶμα, that is, the blessing which accrues from the gift to the givers; comp. on ver. 15. By this is meant\(^1\) the divine recompense at the judgment (2 Cor. ix. 6), which they will then receive, as if it were the product of their account, for their labour of love (Matt. xxv. 34 ff.). This produce of their δῶμα is figuratively conceived as fruit, which is largely placed to the credit of their account, in order to be drawn by them at the day of harvest (comp. also Gal. vi. 7 ff.). Comp. ver. 19. In substance it is the treasure in heaven that is meant (Matt. xix. 21, vi. 20), which will be received at the Parousia. Comp. on Col. i. 5. The figurative εἰς λόγον ήμῶν, which here also is not to be understood, with Bengel, Storr, Flatt, Rilliet, and others, as equivalent to εἰς ήμᾶς, is the completion of the figure in ver. 15; although there is no need to explain καρπός as interest (Salmasius, Michaelis, who thinks in πλεονάξις of compound interest, Zachariae, Heinrichs), because it is difficult to see why Paul, if he used this figure, should not have applied to it the proper term (τόκος), and because the idea of interest is quite alien to that of the δῶμα (a present). —τ. πλεονάξις. εἰς λόγον ήμῶν] to be taken together (see above); εἰς states the destination of the πλεονάξις. Van Hengel and de Wette needlessly break up the passage by coupling εἰς λόγον ήμων with ἐπίκειτο, because πλεονάξις with εἰς is not used elsewhere by Paul (not even 2 Thess. i. 3). The preposition is in fact not determined by the word in itself, but by its logical reference, and may therefore be any one which the reference requires.

Ver. 18. ΄�] The train of thought is: "not the gift do I

\(^1\) Not the active manifestation of the Christian life (Matthies, Rilliet, Hofmann; comp. Vatablus, Musculus, Piscator, Zanchius; Flatt and Rheinwald mingle together heterogeneous ideas); for only the fruit of the δῶμα can be meant, not the δῶμα itself as fruit, which is produced in the shape of the love-gift (Hofmann).

PHIL.
seek, but the fruit (ver. 17); and as regards what has been received from you in the present instance, I have everything already, and need nothing further." That this refers to the desire of the church to know what he possibly still needed (Hofmann), is a very unnecessary assumption. — ἀπέκχω δὲ πάντα] not: habeo autem omnia (Vulgate); not a mere acknowledgment of receipt (Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Cornelius a Lapide, Heinrichs, and others); nor yet equivalent to περισσεῖμῳ (Rheinwald); but, in keeping with the sense of the compound: I have everything away, so that I have nothing left to desire at your hands. Comp. Philem. 15; Matt. vi. 2, 5, 16; Luke vi. 24; Callim. ep. 22; Arrian. Epict. iii. 2. 13, iii. 24. 17; Jacobs, ad Anthol. VII. pp. 276, 298. Πάντα, therefore, according to the context (ἐπιζητῶ τ. δόμα, ver. 17), is: everything which I could desire, although there is no necessity for introducing specially, with Chrysostom and Oecumenius, τὰ ἐξευθέντα ἐν τῷ παρελθόντι χρόνῳ. The emphasis, moreover, is laid, not on πάντα, but on ἀπέκχω, in contrast to ἐπιζητεῖν.
— καὶ περισσεῖω] and my wants are thus so fully satisfied, that I have over. — πεπλήρωμαι] forms a climax to περισσ.: I am full, I have abundance. The gift must have been ample; but gratitude sets forth in all the stronger a light. To πεπλήρ. is attached δεξάμενος κ.τ.λ. — ὀμην ἐνωδίας κ.τ.λ.] This apposition to τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν, expressing a judgment as to the latter (see on Rom. xii. 1), sets forth, to the honour of the givers, the relation in which the gifts received stand towards God, by whom they are esteemed as a sacrifice well-pleasing to Him. As to ὀμην ἐνωδίας, smell of a sweet savour, τῆν ὑνή (genitive of quality), which is used of free-will offerings, see on Eph. v. 2. It describes the thing according to its effect on God, namely, that it is acceptable to Him; θυσίαν κ.τ.λ., however, describes it according to what it is. — δεκτὴν, ἐυάρεστ.] acceptable, well-pleasing, a vividly asyndetic climax (on the former, comp. Ecclus. xxxii. 7); τῷ Θεῷ, however, applies to the whole apposition ὀμην ἐνωδίας. The asyndetic juxtaposition of several epithets is frequent also in classical authors, from Homer onward (Ameis z. Od. iv., Anth.). As to the view, originating in the O. T., which regards works well-
pleasing to God as ethical sacrifices, see the expositors on Rom. xii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 5; Heb. xiii. 16. Comp. Philo, de vit. Mos. II. p. 151: ἡ γὰρ ἀληθὴς ἱερομνημόνεα τῆς ἀν εἶ ἡ πλὴν πνεῦμας θεοφύλατον ἐνεργεία; passages from the Rabbin in Schoettg. Hor. p. 1006.

Ver. 19. The thought starts from τῷ Ὁσ. But God, to whom your gift stands in the relation of such a sacrifice, will recompense you.—Paul says δὲ Ὁσὸς μου (comp. i. 3), because he himself had been the recipient of that which they had brought as a sacrifice pleasing to God; as his God (to whom he belongs and whom he serves, comp. on Rom. i. 8), therefore, will God carry out the recompense. — πληρώσει used with significant reference to πεπλήρ., ver. 18, according to the idea of recompense. Not, however, a wish (hence also in Codd. and in the Vulgate the reading πληρώσεαι), as Chrysostom, Luther, and others take it, but a promise.—πᾶσαν χρεῖαν ὑμῶν likewise corresponding to the service which the readers had rendered; for they had sent εἰς τὴν χρεῖαν (ver. 16) of the apostle. To be understood as: every need which ye have, not merely bodily (so usually, following Chrysostom, who explains it as the fulfilment of the fourth petition, also van Hengel, de Wette, Wiesinger), and not merely spiritual (Pelagius, Rilliet, also mainly Weiss), but as it stands: every need. It is not, however, an earthly recompense which is meant (Hofmann), but (comp. on ver. 17) the recompense in the Messiah's kingdom, where, in the enjoyment of the σωτηρία, the highest satisfaction of every need (comp. on πληρ. χρεῖαν, Thuc. i. 70. 4, and Wetstein in loc.) shall have set in amidst the full, blessed sufficiency of the eternal ζωή (comp. Rom. viii. 17 f.; Rev. xxi. 4).¹ There are specifications of this satisfaction in the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. v.; comp. especially the χορτασθήσοντες and γελάσετε, Luke vi. 21, also

¹ Hofmann very irrelevantly objects that it is out of place to speak of want in that kingdom. But just, in fact, on that account is the bliss of the kingdom the complete satisfaction of every need. Comp. Rev. vii. 16 f.; 2 Tim. iv. 7 f. Thus also is the perfect then put in the place of that which is in part. Consequently the idea of the satisfaction of every χρεία in eternal life, where man even beholds God, and where He is all in all, is anything but a “monstrous thought.”
the ὦ μὴ διψήθη εἰς τὸν αἴώνα in John iv. 14, and the sarcastic κεκορεσμένοι in 1 Cor. iv. 8. That it is the Messianic satisfaction in the ἕλευθερία τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ (Rom. viii. 21), in the possession of the πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ (Eph. i. 18), which is to be thought of, Paul himself states by ἐν δόξῃ, which is to be taken as instrumental (Eph. i. 23, v. 18) and dependent on πληρ.: with glory, whereby the Messianic is indicated. Hofmann also, though he rejects the instrumental view, comes ultimately to it: "Therewith and thus will God fulfil all their need, in that He gives them glory." Others, who also correctly join the words with πληρ., take them as a modal definition: in a glorious way, that is, amply, splendidly, and the like. See Castalio, Beza, Calvin, and many others, including Hoelemann, van Hengel, Rilliet, de Wette, Wiesinger, Weiss. But what an indefinite yet peculiarly affected, and withheld—by its so habitual reference elsewhere to the final judgment—misleading expression would this be for so simple an idea! And how far would it be from the apostle's mind, considering his expectation of the nearness of the Parousia (comp. 1 Cor. vii. 29, 31), to promise on this side of it a hearty recompense, which was to take place, moreover, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ! An appeal is wrongly made to 2 Cor. ix. 8, where an increase of means for further well-doing, to be granted through God's blessing, and not the recompense, is the point under discussion. Others erroneously join ἐν δόξῃ with τὸ πλοῦτος αὐτοῦ (Grotius, Storr, Flatt, Rheinwald, and others): "pro amplissimis suis divitiis, id est, postestate sua omnia excedente," Heinrichs. It is true that ἐν δόξῃ might be attached without a connecting article (according to the combination πλοῦτεῖν ἐν τιμ., 1 Tim. vi. 8; comp. 1 Cor.

1 In order, however, to bring out of the passage, notwithstanding this to δόξη, the idea of a recompense in this life, Hofmann makes δόξη mean the glory of the children of God which is hidden from the world, and which is the fulfillment of every want only in proportion "as there is lacking in us what, either corporally or spiritually, is necessary for the completion of our divine sonship." Instead of such arbitrary inventions, let us keep clearly before us how great a weight in the very word of promise, which forms the conclusion of the epistle, lies in the fact that the grand aim of all promise and hope, i.e. the glory of eternal life (Rom. v. 2, viii. 18, 21, ix. 28; 1 Cor. xv. 45; 2 Cor. iv. 17; Col. iii. 4; and many other passages), is once more presented to the reader's view.
i. 5; 2 Cor. ix. 11); but Paul always connects πλούτος with the genitive of the thing, and πλούτος τῆς δόξης in particular, said of God, is so constantly used by him, that it seems altogether unwarranted to assume the expression πλούτος ἐν δόξῃ in this passage. See Rom. ix. 23; Eph. i. 18, iii. 16; Col. i. 27. He would have written: κατὰ τὸ πλούτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, comp. Rom. ix. 23.—κατὰ τὸ πλούτος αὐτοῦ[ that is, in conformity with His being so rich, and consequently having so much to give. Comp. Rom. x. 12, xi. 33. This assures what is promised.—ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰσχεί!] definition annexed to πληρώσει . . . δόξῃ; that which is promised has its causal ground in Christ, who by His work has acquired for believers the eternal δόξα. Christ is, in fact, ἡ ἀλήθεια τῆς δόξης, Col. i. 27.

Ver. 20. The conception of the superabundant salvation, which Paul has just formulated from God, forces from his heart a doxology. — παρε[ through Christ, in virtue of our νίκης, Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 5. As to τ. Θεοῦ κ. παρε[ ἡμ. comp. on Gal. i. 5.—ἡ δόξα] sc. εἰν, the befitting glory. See on Eph. iii. 21; Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27, et al. — εἰς τοὺς αἰῶν. τῶν αἰῶν.] Gal. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11, v. 11, and frequently in Rev. As to the analysis of the expression, see on Eph. iii. 21.

Vv. 21–23. Πάντα ἄγιον] every one, no one in the church being excepted,—a point which is more definitely expressed by the singular.¹ —ἐν Χ. Ἰ.] is not to be joined to ἄγιον (so usually, as by Rheinwald, Hoelemann, Matthies, van Hengel, de Wette, Ewald, Weiss, Hofmann), but belongs to ἀστέρας. (comp. Rom. xvi. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 19), denoting the specifically Christian salutation, in conveying which the consciousness lives in Christ. This is the connection adopted by Ambrosiaster, Estius, Heinrichs, Rilliet, Wiesinger, Schenkel, and J. B. Lightfoot, and it is the right one, since with ἄγιον it is self-evident that Christians are meant, and there would be no motive for

¹ Since Paul does not here express, as in other cases (Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12), the conception of mutual salutation (αλλαλοι), he has in ἀστέρας had in view the immediate recipients of the epistle (presbyters and deacons, i. 1). See also 1 Thess. v. 26.
specially expressing this here, as there was, for instance, in the address i. 1, where τοις ἄγιοις ἐν Χ. Ἱ. bears a certain formal character. — oι συν ἔμοι ἀδελφ. is the narrower circle of those Christians who were round the apostle in Rome, including also the official colleagues who were with him, though there is no ground for understanding these alone (Chrysostom; Oecumenius, Theophylact, and many others), Grotius even pointing distinctly to Timothy, Linus, and Clement. The difficulty, which has been raised in this case by a comparison of ii. 20, is unfounded, since, in fact, the expression in ii. 20 excludes neither the giving of a salutation nor the mention of brethren; groundless, therefore, are the attempted solutions of the difficulty, as, for example, that of Chrysostom, that either ii. 20 is meant oὐ περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει, or that Paul oὐ παρανεῖται καὶ τούτους ἀδελφοὺς καλεῖν (comp. Oecumenius, who brings forward the latter as a proof of the οὐκατάχρηστα of the apostle). Misapprehending this second and in itself correct remark of Chrysostom, van Hengel insists on a distinction being drawn between two classes of companions in office, namely, travelling companions, such as Luke, Mark, Titus, Silas, and those who were resident in the places where the apostle sojourned (among whom van Hengel reckons in Rome, Clement, Euodia, Syntyche, and even Epaphroditus), and holds that only the latter class is here meant. The limits of the narrower circle designated by oι συν ἔμοι ἀδ, are not at all to be definitely drawn. Estius well says: "Qui . . . mihi vincio ministrant, qui me visitant, qui mecum hic in evangelio laborant." — πάντες oι ἄγιοι generally, all Christians who are here; comp. on 2 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 Cor. xvi. 20. — μάλιστα δὲ but most of all, pre-eminently; they have requested the apostle to give special prominence to their salutation. Comp. Plat. Critias, p. 108 D: τοὺς τε ἄλλους κλητέον καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα Μημοσύνη. Whether these persons stood in any personal relations to the Philippians, remains uncertain. It is enough to assume that Paul had said to them much that was honourable concerning the church to which he was about to write. — oι ἐκ τῆς Καλαρος οἰκίας] as ἄγιοι, as is plain from the connection with the preceding (in opposition to Hofmann):
those from the emperor’s house (from the Palatium, see Böttger, Beitr. II. p. 49) who belong to the saints. We have to think of probably inferior servants of the emperor (according to Grotius, Hitzig, and others: freedmen), who dwelt, or at least were employed, in the palace. In this way there is no need for departing from the immediate meaning of the word, and taking it in the sense of household (Hofmann). In no case, however, can we adopt as the direct meaning of oikêla the sense of domestic servants, a meaning which it does not bear even in Xen. Mem. ii. 7. 6; Joseph. Ant. xvi. 5. 8; and Tac. Hist. ii. 92;¹ domestic servants would be oikêrêla. Others have taken oikêa, in accordance with current usage, as family (1 Cor. xvi. 15, and frequently), and have understood kinsmen of the emperor, a meaning which in itself seems by no means shown by Philo in Flacc. p. 190 A to be at variance with linguistic usage² (in opposition to Hofmann). So recently Baur, who needed this point for his combinations against the genuineness of the epistle, and van Hengel.³ But apart from the fact that through Nero himself this family was greatly diminished, and that conversions among those related to the emperor were à priori (comp. also 1 Cor. i. 26 ff.) very improbable, doubtless some historical traces of such a striking success would have been preserved in tradition.⁴ Matthies, quite

¹ Where it is said of those who entered the service of the emperor: “in domum Caesaris transgressae.” Comp. Herodian, iii. 10. 9: οἰκῆς τῶν βασιλείων οἰκῆς
² For in Philo L.c. it is said regarding Herod Agrippa: “Even though he were not king, but only one of the emperor’s kinsmen (in τῶν Καισαρίων oikēs), it would still be necessary to prefer and honour him.”
³ Whether Chrysostom and his successors understood here members of the imperial family, is a matter of doubt. At all events Chrysostom does not take the word itself, oikêa, as family, but explains it by τῶν βασιλείων, palace, and finds in the salutation a purpose of encouragement: εἰ γὰρ εἰς τῶν βασιλείων κατοικίας πάντων καταφέρῃς ἐκ τῶν βασιλείων τῶν σώματος, τολµῇ μᾶλλον αὐτοῖς χαῖ τούτω σωτὶ. Comp. Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact.
⁴ Certainly Baur believes that he has found these traces in sufficient number. Flavious Clemens, namely, was a kinsman of Domitian (see on ver. 3). Now, since out of this Clement grew the Clemens Romanus of Christian tradition, the latter also must have been a kinsman of the imperial family, as indeed the Homin. Clement. iv. 7, comp. xiv. 10, designate him as ἐκ τῶν φίλων Καισαρίων Kaisarîos. He, therefore, would be exactly the man, in whom Christianity was
arbitrarily, understands the Praetorians, as if Paul had written: 
οἱ ἐκ τοῦ πρατερίου (i. 13). This also applies, in opposition to Wieseler, Chronol. d. apostol. Zeitalt. p. 420, who, considering the Praetorium to be a portion of the palace (see remark on i. 13), thinks the apostle alludes especially to the Praetorians. Those who transfer the epistle to Caesarea (see Introduction, § 2), suppose the Praetorium of Herod in that place to be intended, and consequently also think of Praetorians, Acts xxiii. 35 (Paulus, Böttger); or (so Rilliet) taking oikía as familia, of administrators of the imperial private domain, called Caesariani or Procuratores—a view against which the plural should have warned them; or even of "the family of the imperial freedman Felix" (Thiersch). What persons, moreover, were meant (various of the older expositors have even included Seneca¹ among them), is a point just as unknown to us, as it was well known to the Philippians or became known to them through Epaphroditus. The general result is, that people from the imperial palace were Christians, and that those could obtain access to the apostle probably represented in the circle of the imperial house itself. "Concluding from one that there were serval, the author of the epistle might make his apostle write earnest salutations to the church in Philippi from believing members of the imperial house in the plural," etc. Thus does criticism, departing from the solid ground of history, lose itself in the atmosphere of subjective inventions, where hypothesis finds no longer either support or limit. Indeed, Baur now goes further beyond all bounds (II. p. 69), and discovers that the mention of Clement even throws a new light over the whole plan of the epistle. With this Clement, namely, and the participation, as attested by him, of the imperial house in the gospel, is given the συμμαραμμένος (i. 12), and with the latter the feeling of joyfulness, which expresses itself throughout the epistle as the ground-tone of the apostle (ii. 17 f., comp. iii. 1, iv. 1, 4, 10), and which is again and again the refrain of each separate section. Only by the preponderance of this feeling is it to be explained that the author makes his apostle even express the hope of a speedy liberation (ii. 24). But with this joy there is also blended, with a neutralizing effect, the idea of a nearly approaching death, i. 20–24, and this divided state of mind between life and death betrays an author "who had already before his eyes an actual fact the end of the apostle, which was so far from harmonizing with all these presuppositions."

with special ease and frequency; hence their *especial* salutation. The question also, whether one or another of the persons saluted in Rom. xvi. should be understood as included here (see especially J. B. Lightfoot, p. 173 ff.), must remain entirely undecided. Calvin, moreover, well points to the working of the divine mercy, in that the gospel "in illam scelerum omnium et flagitiorum abyssum penetraverit." — ἥ χαρὰς τ. κυρ. Ἱ. Χ.] see on Gal. i. 6. — μετὰ πάντων ὑμ.] Comp. Rom. xvi. 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 24; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; 2 Thess. iii. 18; Tit. iii. 15.
THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS.

INTRODUCTION.¹

§ 1. THE CHURCH.

With the exception of the Epistle to the Romans, the letter now before us is the only one of all the epistles of Paul that have been preserved, which is addressed to a church that was neither founded by Paul himself nor even subsequently visited by him in person (see on i. 7, ii. 1), although the Colossian Philemon was his immediate disciple (Philem. 19), and the Book of Acts relates that the apostle passed through Phrygia on two occasions (Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23). There, in Phrygia Magna on the Lycus, was situate Kolossae, or Kolossae (see the critical remarks on i. 2). It is designated by Herodotus, vii. 30, as πόλις μεγάλη, and by Xenophon, Anab. i. 2. 6, as εἰδαίμων κ. μεγάλη; but, subsequently, as compared with the cities of Apamea and Laodicea which had become great (μεγίσται . . . πόλεως, Strabo xii. 8, p. 576), it became so reduced, that it is placed by Strabo, i.e., only in the list of the Phrygian πόλισματα, and by Pliny, N. H. v. 41, only among the oppida, although celeberrima. According to the Eusebian Chronicle and Oros. vii. 7, it also was visited by

the earthquake which, according to Tacit. Ann. xiv. 27, devastated Laodicea. This took place not so late as the tenth year of Nero's reign (Eus. Chron.), or even the fourteenth (Orosius), but, according to Tacitus, in the seventh—about the same time with the composition of our epistle, perhaps shortly afterwards, as the earthquake is not mentioned in it. In the Middle Ages the city was again flourishing under the name Chonae (Theophylact and Oecumenius on i. 2; Constant. Porphyr. Them. i. 3); it is in the present day the village of Chonus (see Pococke, Morgenl. III. p. 114; and generally, Mannert, Geogr. VI. 1, p. 127 f.; Böhmer, Isag. p. 21 ff.; Steiger, p. 13 ff.).

By whom the church—which consisted for the most part of Gentile Christians, i. 21, 27, ii. 13—was founded, is not unknown; Epaphras is indicated by i. 7 f. as its founder, and not merely as its specially faithful and zealous teacher. See the remark after i. 7 f. That it had received and accepted the Pauline gospel, is certain from the whole tenor of the epistle. It may be also inferred as certain from ii. 1 compared with Acts xviii. 23, that the time of its being founded was subsequent to the visit to Phrygia. in Acts xviii. 23. From the address (i. 2) we are not warranted to infer (with Bleek), that the body of Christians there had not yet been constituted into a formal church; comp. on Rom. i. 7. It was so numerous, that it had a section assembling in the house of Philemon (Philem. 2).

§ 2. OCCASION, AIM, TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION, CONTENTS.

The apostle had received through Epaphras, who had come to him (i. 7 f., iv. 12; Philem. 23), detailed accounts of the condition of the church, and of its perils and needs at that time, whereby he found himself induced—and the removal of Epaphras from the church at the moment certainly made the matter appear all the more urgent—to despatch Tychicus, an inhabitant of Asia Minor (Acts xx. 4), to Colossæ, and to send with him this epistle (iv. 7 f., comp. Eph. vi. 21 f.).
Tychicus was also to visit the Ephesians, and to convey the letter written at the same time to them (see on Eph. Introd. § 2). Tychicus was despatched at the same time with Onesimus, the Colossian slave (iv. 9), who had to deliver to his master Philemon the well-known letter from the apostle (Philem. 11 f.). Doubtless Onesimus also—who had come, although still as a heathen, from Colossae to Paul—brought with him accounts as to the state of matters there, as he had been a servant in a Christian household amidst lively Christian intercourse (Philem. 2).

In accordance with these circumstances giving occasion to the letter, the aim of the apostle was not merely to confirm the church generally in its Christian faith and life, but also to warn it against heretical perils by which it was threatened. The false teachers whom he had in view were Jewish-Christians; not, however, such as those who, as in Galatia and in the neighbourhood of Philippi (Phil. iii. 2 ff.), restricting themselves to the sphere of legal requirement and especially of the necessity of circumcision, did away with Christian freedom, the foundation of which is justification by faith,—but such as had mixed up Christian Judaism with theosophic speculation. While they likewise adhered to circumcision (ii. 11), and to precepts as to meats and feasts (ii. 16), to the prejudice of Christ's atoning work (ii. 13 ff.), they at the same time—and this forms their distinctive character—put forward a philosophy as to the higher spirit-world, with the fancies and subtleties of which (ii. 18) were combined, as practical errors, a conceited humility, worship of angels, and unsparing bodily asceticism (ii. 20–23)—extravagancies of an unhealthy Gnosis, that could not fail to find a fruitful soil in the mystico-fanatical character of the Phrygian people, which served as an appropriate abode formerly for the orgiastic cultus of Cybele, and subsequently for Montanism.¹ These theosophists, however, came most keenly into conflict with the exalted rank and the redeeming work of Christ, to whom they did not leave His full divine dignity (as εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ., i. 1 5 ff.), but preferred to assign to

¹ The theosophic tendency, which haunted Colossae, may help to explain the fact that Paul does not make use, as in the Epistle to the Galatians, of arguments derived from the O. T. The epistle contains no quotation from Scripture.
Him merely a rank in the higher order of spirits, while they ascribed to the angels a certain action in bringing about the Messianic salvation, entertaining, probably, at the same time, demiurgic ideas as to the creation of the world. We must not conclude from i. 18, ii. 12, that they also rejected the resurrection of Christ; into such an important point as this Paul would have entered directly and at length, as in 1 Cor. xv. But that in dualistic fashion they looked on matter as evil, may be reasonably inferred from their adoration of spirits, and from their asceticism mortifying the body, as well as from the at all events kindred phenomenon of later Gnosticism.

Attempts have been made in very different ways to ascertain more precisely the historical character of the Colossian false teachers, and on this point we make the following remarks: (1) They appear as Jewish-Christians, not as Jews (in opposition to which see ii. 19), which they were held to be by Schoettgen, Eichhorn, and others, some looking on them as Pharisees (Schoettgen; comp. Schultheiss, Engelwelt, p. 110 f.); others, as indirect opponents of Christianity through the semblance of more than earthly sanctity (Eichhorn); others, as adherents of the Alexandrine Neo-Platonism (doctrine of the Logos) (so Juncker, Kommentar, Introd. p. 43 ff.); others, as Chaldaeans or Magians (Hug); others, as syncretistic universalists, who would have allowed to Christ a subordinate position in their doctrinal structure and passed Christianity off as a stage of Judaism (Schneckenburger, last in the Stud. u. Krit. 1832, p. 840 f.; in opposition to him, Rheinwald, de pseudodoct. Coloss. Bonn, 1834). Just as little were they adherents of a heathen philosophy, whether they might be looked upon as of the Epicurean (Clemens Alexandrinus), or of the Pythagorean (Grotius), or of the Platonic and Stoic (Heumann) school, or of no definite school at all (Tertullian, Euthalius, Calixtus). (2) The right view of these false teachers, in accordance with history, necessarily carries us back to Essenism. In opposition to the opinion that they were Christian Essenes (so Chemnitz, Zacharie, Storr, Flatt, Credner, Thiersch, histor. Standp. p. 270 f., Ritschl, Ewald, Holtzmann, et al.), it is not to be urged that the Essene washings, and various other peculiarities of Essenism,
remain unnoticed in the epistle; or that the secluded and
exclusive character peculiar to this society, and the limitation
of their abode to Syria and Palestine, do not suit the case of
the Colossian heretics; or that the hypocrisy, conceit, and
persuasiveness which belonged to the latter do not harmonize
with the character of the Essenes, as it is otherwise attested.
These difficulties are got rid of by comparison with the Roman
ascetics (Rom. xiv.), who likewise were Essene Jewish-Chris-
tians, only more unprejudiced and inoffensive than these
Asiatics, whose peculiar character, which had already received
a more Gnostic development and elaboration, was of a philo-
sophic stamp, addicted to rhetorical art, full of work-piety
and hypocrisy, and therefore fraught with more danger to
Pauline Christianity, the greater the opportunity they had, just
then whilst the great apostle was himself far away and in
bonds, of raising their head. Now, if at that time the
Essene influence was not at all unfrequent among the Jews,
and thence also among Jewish-Christsans (see Ritschl, alt-
kath. Kirche, p. 232 ff., and in the Theolog. Jahrb. 1855,
p. 355), and if, beyond doubt, the theosophy of the Essenes
—kindred with the Alexandrine philosophy, although in origin
Jewish—and their asceticism (see Joseph. Bell. ii. 8; Philo,
Quod omnis probus liber, p. 876 ff.; Euseb. Praep. ev. viii. 11 ff.),
as well as their adherence to their tradition (Joseph. l.c. ii.
8. 7; comp. Credner, Beitr. I. p. 369), are very much in
accord with the characteristic marks of our heretics (comp.
generally Keim, Gesch. Jesu, I. p. 286 ff.), the latter are with
justice designated as Jewish-Christian Gnostics, or more ac-
curately, as Gnostics addicted to an Essene tendency.\(^1\) This
designation, however, is not to be taken in the sense of any
subsequently elaborated system, but must be understood as
intimating that in the doctrines of our theosophists there were
apparent the widely-spread, and especially in Essenism strongly-
asserted, elements of Gnosticism, out of which the formal
Gnostic systems were afterwards gradually and variously de-

---

\(^1\) Comp. Grau, Entwickelungsgesch. d. n. t. Schriftth. II. p. 145 ff.; Lipsius
in Schenkel's Bibel-Lexic. II. p. 498.
p. 40 ff.; Schott, Isag. p. 272; Weiss, l.c. p. 720; Grau, l.c.; Holtzmann, p. 296 ff.; Clemens in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. 1871, p. 418 ff.). Among the latter, the Cerinthian doctrine in particular is, in various points, closely allied with that combated in our epistle (comp. F. Nitzsch on Bleek, Vorles. p. 15 f.; Lipsius, d. Gnosticismus, 1860, p. 81 f.), although we are not justified in considering with Mayerhoff that this polemic was already directed against Cerinthus and his adherents, and thence arguing against the genuineness of the epistle. A similar judgment is to be formed regarding their relation to the Valentinians, who often appealed to the Epistle to the Ephesians; and Baur leaps much too rapidly to a conclusion, when he thinks (Paulus, II. p. 4 ff.) that in the Colossian false teachers are to be found the Gnostic Ebionites (who no doubt originated from Esseneism)—thereby making our epistle a product of the fermentation of the post-apostolic age, and connecting it as a spurious twin-letter with that to the Ephesians. Holtzmann forms a much more cautious judgment, when he takes his stand at a preliminary stage of Gnosticism; but even this he places in the post-apostolic age,—a position which the less admits of proof, seeing that we have no other letter from the later period of the apostle's life before the letters of the captivity and subsequent to that to the Romans, and possess for comparison no letter of Paul at all addressed to those regions where the Gnostic movements had their seat. The false teachers have, moreover, been designated as Cabbalistic (Herder, Kleuker, Osiander in the Tüb. Zeitschr. 1834, 3, p. 96 ff.); but this must likewise be restricted to the effect that the theosophic tendency generally, the special Essene-Christian shape of which Paul had to combat, may have probably been at bottom akin to the subsequently developed Cabbala, although the origin of this Jewish metaphysics is veiled in obscurity. (3) We must decidedly set aside, were it only on account of the legal strictness of the men in question, the assumption of Michaelis, that they were disciples of Apollos, to whom Heinrichs adds also disciples of John, as well as Essenes and other Judaistic teachers, and even a malevolent hominum genus ex ethnicis—of which, in itself extremely improbable, medley the
epistle itself contains no trace. (d) In contrast to all previous attempts to classify the Colossian false teachers, Hofmann prefers to abide by the position that they were Jewish Christians, "who, starting from the presupposition that the Gentile Christians, in their quality as belonging to Ethnicism, were subject to the spirits antagonistic to God which ruled therein, recommended—with a view to complete their state of salvation, which, it was alleged, in this respect needed supplement—a sanctification of the outward life, based partly on the Sinaitic law, partly on dogmas of natural philosophy." But this cannot be made good as an adequate theory by the explanation of the characteristic individual traits, since, on the contrary, that theosophico-Judaistic false teaching presents sufficient evidences of its having its historical root in Esseniism, and its further development and diversified elaboration in the later Gnosticism, provided that with unprejudiced exegesis we follow the apostle's indications in regard to the point; see especially on ii. 16–23.

In date and place of composition our epistle coincides with that to the Ephesians, and is, like the latter, to be assigned not, in conformity with the usual opinion, to the Roman, but to the Caesarean captivity of the apostle. See on Eph. Introd. § 2. In opposition to this view, de Wette, Bleek, and others attach decisive importance specially to two points: (1) That what Paul says in Col. iv. 3, 11 of his labours for the gospel harmonizes with Acts xxviii. 31, but not with his sojourn in Caesarea, Acts xxiv. 23. But iv. 11 contains no special statement at all as to the labours of the apostle in captivity, and as to iv. 3 we must observe that he there expresses the longing for future free working. The latter remark applies also in opposition to Wieseler (Chronol. des apostol. Zeitalt. p. 420) and Hofmann, who likewise regard iv. 3 f. as decisive in favour of the Roman captivity, while Hofmann finds the statement as to Mark and Jesus contained in iv. 11 incompatible with the situation in Caesarea (but see in loc.). In assuming that

1 Which, with Haurstath, Laurent, and others, Sabatier also (l'apôtre Paul, 1870, p. 198 ff.) prefers, while Weiss leaves the point undecided. Hofmann rejects our view, and Holtzmann does not find it the more probable.

COL.
the conversion of the *Gentile* Onesimus (Philem. 10) is incompatible with the statement in Acts xxiv. 23, Wieseler infers too much from the words τῶν ἱδρῶν αἱροῦ (Acts xxiv. 23), especially as the intention of a liberal custody is obvious in the arrangement of Felix. (2) That in Rome Paul might have thought of the journey to Phrygia hoped for at Phil. 22, but not in Caesarea (comp. Hofmann, p. 217), where, according to Acts xix. 21, Rom. i. 13, xv. 23 ff., Acts xxiii. 11, he had the design of going to Rome, but a return to Asia Minor would have been, after his language in Acts xx. 25, far from his thoughts. But although certainly, when he spoke the words recorded in Acts xx. 25, a return to Asia was far from his thoughts, nevertheless this idea might subsequently occur to him just as easily at Caesarea as at Rome; indeed more easily, for, if Paul had been set free at Caesarea, he could combine his intended journey to Rome with a passage through Asia. There is no doubt that when at Rome he expressed the hope (Phil. ii. 24) of again visiting the scene of his former labours; but why should he not have done the same when at Caesarea, so long, namely, as his appeal to the emperor had not taken place? See also on Phil. 22.—If our epistle was written in Caesarea, the time of its composition was the year 60 or 61, while the procuratorship was still in the hands of Felix.

As regards the contents of the epistle, after the salutation (i. 1 f.), a thanksgiving (i. 3–8), and intercessory prayer (i. 9–12), Paul passes on (ver. 12) to the blessedness of the redemption which his readers had obtained through Christ, whose dignity and work are earnestly and very sublimely set before their minds with reference to the dangers arising from heresy (i. 13–23). Next Paul testifies to, and gives the grounds for, the joy which he now felt in his sufferings as an apostle (i. 24–29). By way of preparation for his warnings against the false teachers, he next expresses his great care for his readers and all other Christians who do not personally know him, as concerns their Christian advancement (ii. 1–3), and then subjoins the warnings themselves in detail (ii. 4–23). Next follow moral admonitions (iii. 1–iv. 6); a commendatory
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mention of Tychicus and Onesimus (iv. 7–9); salutations with commendations and injunctions (iv. 10–17); and the conclusion appended by the apostle's own hand (ver. 18).

§ 3. GENUINENESS.

Even if it be allowed that the apparent allusions to our Epistle which one might find in the apostolic Fathers (Clement, Barnabas, Ignatius) are uncertain, and that even the mention of προερότηκες πάσης κράτεως in Justin Mart. c. Tryph. p. 311 (comp. p. 310, 326), and Theophil. ad Autol. ii. 31, may be independent of Col. i. 15, still the external attestation of our Epistle is so ancient, continuous, and general (Marcion, the school of Valentinus; Irenaeus, Haer. iii. 14. 1 and v. 14. 2, who first cites it by name; Canon Murat.; Clem. Al. Strom. i. p. 277, iv. p. 499, v. p. 576, vi. p. 645; Tert. Praescr. 7, de resurr. 23; Origen, c. Cels. v. 8, etc.), that no well-founded doubt can from this quarter be raised.

But modern criticism has assailed the Epistle on internal grounds; and the course of its development has been as follows. Mayerhoff (d. Brief an die Kol. mit vornehml. Berücksicht. d. Pastoralbr. kritisch geprüft, Berl. 1838) assumed the genuineness of the Epistle to the Ephesians, to the prejudice of our Epistle (de Wette inverts the procedure to the prejudice of the Ephesian Epistle); Baur, on the other hand (Paulus, II. p. 8 ff.), rejected both the cognate Epistles; comp. also Schwegler, nachapost. Zeitalt. II. p. 325 ff. According to Weisse (philos. Dogmat. I. p. 146), our Epistle, like most of the Pauline letters, is pervaded by interpolations. Hitzig also (sur Kritik paulin. Briefe, 1870, p. 22 ff.) asserts their presence, and ascribes them to the author of the (un-Pauline) Ephesian Epistle, who, after the composition of his own work, had manipulated afresh a Pauline letter to the Colossians, the genuine text of which he misunderstood. In assigning his reasons for this view, Hitzig does not go beyond the bounds of bare assertions and misunderstandings on his own part. Hoenig (in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. 1872, p. 63 ff.), after
comparing the two kindred letters, propounds the view that all those passages of the Epistle to the Colossians are to be regarded as interpolations, regarding which it can be shown that the author of the (not genuine) Epistle to the Ephesians did not know them. But Hoenig has reserved to a future time the exhibition of the detailed grounds for this bold view, and has consequently for the present withdrawn it from criticism. After thorough investigation, Holtzmann (Kritik d. Epheser- u. Kolosserbriefe, 1872) has arrived at the hypothesis of a great series of interpolations, the author of which was none other than the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians written, according to Holtzmann, somewhere about the year 100, who, with the help of this writing of his own, had worked up the short and genuinely Pauline letter to the Colossians, which he found in existence, into a new and amplified form, and thereby rescued it in a second enlarged edition from oblivion. But neither can the course of interpolation thus set forth be exegetically verified, nor can it—seeing that all the witnesses from the beginning prove only the present shape of the letter, and no trace has been left of any earlier one—be without arbitrariness rendered critically intelligible, as in fact such a procedure on the part of an interpolator, who had withal so much mastery of free movement in the sphere of Pauline thought and language that he could write the Epistle to the Ephesians, would yield a laborious and—as overlaying and obscuring the given nucleus—somewhat clumsy mosaic patchwork, which, from a psychological point of view, would be hardly conceivable.

Mayerhoff, in order to characterize the Epistle as a production of possibly the second century epitomized from the Epistle to the Ephesians with the addition of some controversial matter, lays stress on (a) differences in language and style, (b) deviations from the Pauline character both of conception and of representation, (c) the comparison with the Epistle to the Ephesians, and (d) the supposed reference of the polemics to Cerinthus. But, first, the stamp of language and the style are so entirely Pauline, that particular expressions, which we are accustomed to in Paul's writings but do not find
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here (δικαιοσύνη κ.τ.λ., σωτηρία κ.τ.λ., ἀποκάλυψις, ἵππακος, ἄρα, διά, διότι, ἔτι, et al.), or ἀπαξ λεγόμενα which occur (as ἐθελοθρησκεία, πυθανολογία, et al.), cannot furnish any counter argument, since, in fact, they are fully outweighed by similar phenomena in epistles which are indubitably genuine. There is the less ground for urging the occurrence only six times of γάρ (Text. Rec.), as even in the larger Epistle to the Ephesians it occurs only eleven times, and in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians only five times. And how little are such mechanical standards of comparison at all compatible with a mind so free in movement and rich in language as was that of Paul! In his case even the order of the words "Ελλήν καὶ Ἰουδαῖος (iii. 11) cannot seem surprising, nor can the combining of designations similar in meaning (as i. 6, 10, ii. 18, 23) appear as a strange hunting after synonyms. See, besides, Huther, Schlussbetracht. p. 420 ff.; Hofmann, p. 179 f. Secondly, un-Pauline conceptions are only imported into the Epistle by incorrect interpretations; and the peculiar developments of doctrine, which Paul gives only here, but which are in no case without their preliminary conditions and outlines in the earlier Epistles, were suggested to him by the special occasion of the letter (as, in particular, the development of the relation of Christ to the angel-world). And if the Epistle is said to lack in its dogmatic portion the logical arrangement which is found in the hortatory portion (the reverse being the case in the genuine Epistles); if Pauline freshness and vigour are said to be wanting, and poverty of thought to prevail; these are judgments which in some cases are utterly set aside by a right exegesis, and in others are of a partisan character and aesthetically incorrect. The complaint, in particular, of "poverty of thought" is characteristic of the procedure of such criticism towards its victims, no matter how precarious a subjective standard must ever be in such questions, or how various may be the judgments which are put forth as based on taste (according to Böhmer, Isag. p. 160, our Epistle is "viva, pressa, solidia, nervis plena, mascula"). Thirdly, the affinity of our Epistle with that to the Ephesians in style and contents is explained by their composition at the same time,
—as respects which, however, the priority lies with our letter,—and by the analogy of the circumstances giving occasion to write, which in either case the apostle had in view. See on Eph. Introd. § 3. Lastly, the assertion that Cerinthus is assailed is erroneous—a critical prosthysterom; see § 2.

Baur, who describes the Epistle to the Ephesians and that to the Colossians, which are held at any rate to stand or fall together, as un-Pauline, and places the former in a secondary relation to the latter, looks upon this latter as combating an Ebionitism, which would have nothing to do with a recognition of the universalism of Christianity at the cost of renouncing everything that was incompatible with the absoluteness of the Christian principle. He holds, however, that this universalism was not that based on the Pauline anthropology, but only the external universalism, which consisted in the coalition between Gentiles and Jews effected by the death of Christ, and in which, alongside of the forgiveness of sin, the Clementines placed the aim of Christ's death. Thus, according to Baur, the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians are to be placed in the post-apostolic period of a conciliation between Jewish and Gentile Christianity. The highest expression of this conciliatory destination is the Christology of the Epistles, in so far, namely, as Christ appears as the primordial principle of all being, and His whole work onward to His exaltation as the self-realization of this idea, according to which the pre-existence is the main point of the Christology. The arguments of Baur are mostly derived from the Epistle to the Ephesians; those that particularly affect our Epistle, and are supposed to attest a Gnostic stamp impressed on it (such as the idea of Christ as the central point of the whole kingdom of spirits, the notion of the πνεύμα, etc.), will be shown by the exposition to be a homogeneous development of elements of

1 The assertion is being constantly repeated, that Paul could not have copied himself. But, in fact, we have not among the apostle's letters any other two, which were written so immediately at the same time, and to churches whose wants were similar. If we had had two such, who knows but that they would have presented an analogous resemblance!

2 Planck, Küstlin, Hilgenfeld, Hœckstra (in the Theolog. Tijdschrift, 1868), as well as Schwegler, agree in substance with Baur.
doctrine already presented in the earlier Epistles. Concerning these Christological doubts, see, moreover, especially Raebiger, Christol. Paul. p. 42 ff., and generally Klöpper, de orig. epp. ad Eph. et Coloss. Gryphisw. 1853; Hofmann, p. 181 ff.; Rich. Schmidt, Paul. Christol. p. 196 ff.; Sabatier, l'apôtre Paul, p. 207 ff. It may be observed in general, that if our Epistle (and that to the Ephesians) is nothing more than a pseudo-apostolic movement of Gnosis against Ebionitism, then every other Epistle is so also, since every other writing in the N. T. may, with almost equal justice, be brought under some such category of subjective presupposition; and that it is in reality inconsistent, if the whole N. T. is not (and for the most part it has already been) made out to be a collection of later books written with some set purpose, which, by means of their pseudo-epigraphic names, have succeeded in deceiving the vigilance of centuries. The fabrication of such an epistle as that to the Colossians would be more marvellous than its originality. "Non est cujusvis hominis, Paulinum pectus effingere; tonat, fulgurat, meras flammis loquitur Paulus," Erasmus, Annot. ad iv. 16.

Ewald has modified the theory of its composition by the apostle in a peculiar way. In his view, the Epistle is indeed planned and carried out quite after the manner of the apostle; but after the contents had been settled by preliminary discussion, Paul committed the composition to Timothy (i. 1), again, however, towards the end, dictating the words more in person, and adding the final salutation (iv. 18) with his own hand. But, first, this hypothesis is already rendered doubtful

1 The exegesis of the Epistle will also dispose of what Hilgenfeld, who rejects the genuineness of the Ephesian and Colossian letters, adduces by way of establishing his assertion, that "the new and characteristic feature of the Colossian Epistle consists simply in this, that it represents Paulinism no longer merely in contradistinction to Jewish Christianity, but also in contradistinction to Gnosticism (proper);" see Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. 1870, p. 245 f. We see, he says, Paulinism in this case not merely repelling, but even in part adopting, Gnostic elements.—For Baur's Gnostic interpretation of the ωκλημα, see especially his Paulus, II. p. 12 ff., and Neutest. Theol. p. 257 ff.

2 Compare, also generally, in opposition to the hypothesis of a positive influence of Gnosis on N. T. doctrinal ideas, Heinrici, d. Valent. Gnostis u. d. heil. Schr. 1871.
by the fact that it is not made to extend uniformly to chap. iv. Secondly, it may be urged against it, that a Timothy himself, even after preliminary discussion with the apostle, could hardly have appropriated or imitated the completely Pauline stamp in such measure, as in this Epistle it recurs at every sentence and in every turn. Thirdly, the conjectured course of procedure does not appear in any other of Paul’s Epistles, and yet the present was one of the shortest and the easiest to be dictated. Fourthly, such a procedure can scarcely be reconciled with the high value and authority, well understood by the apostle, which an Epistle from him could not but possess for any Christian church, especially for one not founded by himself. Fifthly, we cannot but naturally regard the concluding salutation by his own hand (iv. 18) as simply the token of his own, and not of a merely indirect, composition (2 Thess. iii. 17). Sixthly, according to iv. 16, a similar merely indirect composition on his part would have to be attributed also to the Epistle to the Laodiceans, since the two Epistles, as they were to be read in both churches, must have been, as it were, cast in the same mould, and of essentially the same import. Lastly, the peculiar dangerous character of the spiritualistic Judaism, which had to be opposed in the Epistle, was precisely such as to claim the undivided personal action of the apostle, which was certainly, even in the enforced leisure of his imprisonment, sufficiently within his power for the purpose of his epistolary labours. The grounds on which the foregoing hypothesis is based—and in the main the assailants of the genuineness

1 Ewald appeals (presupposing, moreover, the non-genuineness of the Epistle to the Ephesians) to the longer compound words, such as ἀναπεκτολήμα, ἀναρταλίλον, ἀπαραλήρων, παρελαγίζωσε, νεόνομος, ἔφθασμα τῇ πλείουσα, to unusual modes of expression, such as ἵνα ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπος (ii. 1), I mean for the explanatory that is (i. 24 [27], iii. 10, iii. 14), in connections capable of being easily misunderstood; to the circumstances, that in the progress of the discourse and in the structure of sentences we entirely miss “the exceedingly forcible flow and the exultant ebullition, and then, again, the quick concentration and the firm collocation of the thoughts;” that the words ἢ, ὅπερ, and ἄλλα are less frequently found, and that the sentences are connected more by simple little relational words and in excessively long series, like the links of a chain, alongside of which is also frequently found the merely rhetorical accumulation of sentences left without links of connection (such as i. 14, 20, 25 f., 27, ii. 8, 11, 23,
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have already used them—are in part quite unimportant, in part framed after a very subjective standard, and far from adequate in the case of a letter-writer, who stands so high and great in many-sided wealth both of thought and diction and in its free handling as Paul, and who, according to the diversity of the given circumstances and of his own tone of feeling, was capable of, and had the mastery over, so ample and manifold variety in the presentation of his ideas and the structure of his sentences. Nor do those linguistic difficulties, which Holtzmann, p. 104 ff., has brought forward more discreetly than Mayerhoff, and to some extent in agreement with Ewald, with a view to separate the portions of the letter pertaining to the genuine Paul from those that belong to the manipulator and interpolator, suffice for his object. They could only be of weight, in the event of their exhibiting modes of expression beyond doubt un-Pauline, or of the interpolated character of the passages in question being already established on other grounds.

iii. 5); that we meet delicate but still perceptible distinctions of thought, such as the non-mention of ἀναφέρεται and ἀναμένω, and the description of the Logos by the word σήμερον itself (i. 19, ii. 9); that we find a multitude of words and figures peculiarly Pauline, but that we miss all the more the whole apostle in his most vivid idiosyncrasy throughout the main portions of the Epistle; and that many a word and figure, in fact, appears imitated from the Epistles of Paul, especially that to the Romans.

1 When we take fully into account the singularly ample storehouse of the Greek language, from which the apostle knew how to draw his materials with so much freedom and variety in all his letters, we shall not be too hastily ready to hold that such expressions, phrases, or turns, as have no parallels in the undisputed letters, at once betray another author; or, on the other hand, to reckon that such as are characteristic of, and currently used by, the apostle, are due to an assumption of the Pauline manner.
CHAPTER I.

Ver. 1. The arrangement χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Lachm. Tisch.) has preponderant testimony in its favour, but not the addition of Ἰησοῦ after χριστοῦ in ver. 2 (Lachm.). — Ver. 2. Κολοσσαῖ] K P, also C and Ν in the subscription, min. Syr. utr. Copt. Or. Nyss. Amphiloch. Theodoret, Damasc. et. al. have Κολοσσαῖ. Approved by Griesb., following Erasm. Steph. Wetst.; adopted by Matth. Lach. Tisch. 7. The Recepta is supported by B D E F G L Ν, min. Vulg. It. Clem. Chrys. Theophyl. Tert. Ambrosiast. Pelag. The matter is to be judged thus: (1) The name in itself correct is undoubtedly Κολοσσαί, which is supported by coins of the city (Eckhel, Doctr. num. III. p. 107) and confirmed by Herod. vii. 30 (see Wessel. and Valck. in loc.); Xen. Anab. i. 2. 6 (see Bornem. in loc.); Strabo, xii. 8, p. 576; Plin. N. H. v. 32. (2) But since the form Κολοσσαί has so old and considerable attestation, and is preserved in Herodotus and Xenophon as a various reading, as also in Polyagen. viii. 16, and therefore a mere copyist's error cannot be found in the case—the more especially as the copyists, even apart from the analogy which suggested itself to them of the well-known κολοσσίς, would naturally be led to the prevalent form of the name Κολοσσαί,—we must assume that, although Κολοσσαί was the more formally correct name, still the name Κολοσσαί was also (vulgarily) in use, that this was the name which Paul himself wrote, and that Κολοσσαί is an ancient correction. If the latter had originally a place in the text, there would have been no occasion to alter the generally known and correct form of the name.—After παρθένῷ ἤμων, Elz. (Lachm. in brackets) has καὶ παρθένῳ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, in opposition to B D E K L, min. vss. and Fathers. A complementary addition in accordance with the openings of other epistles, especially as no ground for intentional omission suggests itself (in opposition to Reiche, Comm. crit. p. 351 f.). — Ver. 3. καὶ παρθὲνος Lachm. and Tisch. 7:
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So B C*, vss. and Fathers, while D* F G, Chrys. have ὑπὲρ παρθ. Since, however, Paul always writes ὁ Ἰσσίος καὶ παρθή
ὑπὲρ συμβ. (Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; Eph. i. 3; also 1 Cor.
xx. 24; Eph. v. 20), and never ὁ Ἰσσίος ὑπὲρ τ. α. or ὁ Ἰσσίος παρθή
t. x., the Recepta, which has in its favour A C** D*** E K L P N,
min. Vulg. and Fathers, is with Tisch. 8 to be retained. The
καὶ was readily omitted in a mechanical way after the imme-
diately preceding ὅπως παρθήκ. Instead of περὶ, Lachm. reads
ὑπὲρ, which is also recommended by Griesb., following B D* E*
F G, min. Theophyl. Not attested by preponderating evidence,
and easily introduced in reference to ver. 9 (where ὑπὲρ stands
without variation). — Ver. 4. Instead of ὑπὲρ ἵπτερ (which is re-
commended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.), Elz.
Matth. Scholz have ὑπὲρ merely, but in opposition to A C D*
E* F G P N, min. vss. (including Vulg. It.) Fathers. If ὑπὲρ were
originally written, why should it have been exchanged for ὑπὲρ
ἵπτερ? On the other hand, ὑπὲρ ἵπτερ, as it could be dispensed
with for the sense, might easily drop out, because the word
preceding concludes with the syllable ἰν, and the word fol-
lowing (ἐλέ), like ἵπτερ, begins with ἐ. The grammatical gap
would then, following Eph. i. 15, be filled up by ὑπὲρ. — Ver. 6.
καὶ ἵπτερ] καὶ is wanting in A B C D* E* P N, min. and some vss.
and Fathers; condemned by Griesb., omitted by Lachm. and
Tisch. 8. But, not being understood, this καὶ, which has the
most important vss. and Fathers in its favour, was omitted in
the interest of simplicity as disturbing the connection. — καὶ
ἀπεκανώσων] is wanting in Elz. Matth., who is of opinion that
Chrys. introduced it from ver. 10. But it is so decisively
attested, that the omission must be looked upon as caused by
the homoeoteleuton, the more especially as a similar ending and a
similar beginning here came together (ΟΝΚΑ). — Ver 7. καὶ ἵπτερ
καὶ is justly condemned by Griesb. on decisive evidence,
and is omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. A mechanical repetition
from the preceding. — ἵπτερ] ABD* GF M*, min.: ἵπτερ; approved
by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. But since the first person both
precedes and follows (ἡμῶν ... ἡμῖν), it was put here also by care-
less copyists. — Ver. 10. After τεταγμένων, Elz. Tisch. 7 have
ἵπτερ, against decisive testimony; a supplementary addition.—
the support of the vss., which (Vulg. It. in scientia Dei) have
read the Recepta εἰς τ. ἵπτερ, attested by D*** E** K L and
most min., also Theodoret, Dam. Theophyl. Oec., or with M**
and Chrys. εἰς τ. ἵπτερον. The latter, as well as the mere ὑπὲρ
...betrays itself as an explanation of the difficult εἰς τ. ἐκχύν., which, we may add, belongs to the symmetrical structure of the whole discourse, the participial sentences of which all conclude with a destination introduced by εἰς. — Ver. 12. ἵκανώσαντι] Lachm.: καλίσαντι καὶ ἵκανώσαντι, according to B, whilst D* F G, min. Arm. Aeth. It. Didym. Ambrosiast. Vigil. have καλίσαντι merely. Looking at the so isolated attestation of καλ. κ. ἵκαν., we must assume that καλίσαντι was written on the margin by way of complement, and then was in some cases inserted with καὶ, and in others without καὶ substituted for ἵκανώσαντι. — Instead of ἵμας, Tisch. 8 has ἵμας; but the latter, too weakly attested by B, easily slipped in by means of the connection with σύμερο. — Ver. 14. After ἀναλυτρ. Elz. has διὰ ταῦτα αἰματος αὐτοῦ, against decisive testimony; from Eph. i. 7. — Ver. 16. τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ] Lachm. has erased the first τὰ and bracketed the second. In both cases the τὰ is wanting in B n*. Or.; the first τὰ only is wanting in D* E* F G P and two min. But how easily might τὰ be absorbed in the final syllable of πάντα; and this would then partially involve the omission of the second τὰ! The assumption that the final syllable of πάντα was written twice would only be warranted, if the omitting witnesses, especially in the case of the second τὰ, were stronger. — Ver. 20. The second δ’ αὐτοῦ is wanting in B D* F G L, min. Vulg. It. Sahid. Or. Cyr. Chrys. Theophyl. and Latin Fathers. Omitted by Lachm. It was passed over as superfluous, obscure, and disturbing the sense. — Ver. 21. Instead of the Rec. ἀποκαταλαγήντες, Lachm., following B, has ἀποκαταλάγηντι. D* F G, It. Goth. Ir. Ambrosiast. Sedul. have ἀποκαταλάγηντι. Since, according to this, the passive is considerably attested, and the active ἀποκαταλάβων, although most strongly attested (also by n), may well be suspected to be a syntactic emendation, we must decide, as between the two passive readings ἀποκαταλαγήντες and ἀποκαταλαγήντι, in favour of the former, because the latter is quite unsuitable. If the Rec. were original, the construction would be so entirely plain, that we could not at all see why the passive should have been introduced. — Ver. 22. After θανάτου, A P n, min. vss. Ir. have αὐτοῦ, which Lachm. has admitted in brackets. It is attested so weakly, as to seem nothing more than a familiar addition. — Ver. 23. τῇ before κειμένις, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be omitted, following A B C D* F G N, min. Chrys. — Instead of διάκονος, P n have κήρυξ κ. ἀπόστολος. A gloss; comp. 1 Tim. ii. 7. In A all the three words κήρυξ κ. ἀπόστ. κ. διάκ. are given. — Ver. 24. νῦν] D* E* F G, Vulg. It. Ambrosiast. Pel. have ἦς νῦν. Rightly; the final syllable of διάκονος in ver. 23, and the beginning of a
church-lesson, co-operated to the suppression of ἐς, which, however, is quite in keeping with the connection and the whole progress of the discourse. — After παθήμ. Elz. has ἔσεν, against decisive testimony. — ἐς ἵστοι] C D* E, min. : ἐς ἵστοι. So Lachm. in the margin. A copyist's error. — Ver. 27. The neuter ἄν τῶν πελευτέρων (Matth. Lachm. Tisch.) is attested by codd. and Fathers sufficiently to make the masculine appear as an emendation: comp. on 2 Cor. viii. 2. — ἐς ἵστοι] A B F G P, min. (quod in Vulg. it. leaves the reading uncertain): ἐς ἵστοι. So Lachm. A grammatical alteration, which, after ver. 24, was all the more likely. — Ver. 28. After διδάσκ. πάντα ἀνθρωπόν is wanting in D* E* F G, min. vss. and Fathers. Suspected by Griesb., but is to be defended. The whole καὶ διδάσκ. πάντα ἀνθρωπ. was omitted owing to the homoeoteleuton (so still in L, min. Clem.), and then the restoration of the words took place incompletely. — After χριστός Elz. has Ἰησοῦ, against decisive testimony.

Vv. 1, 2. Ἀλλὰ θελήμα Θεοῦ] see on 1 Cor. i. 1. Comp. 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 1. — καὶ Τιμόθ.] see on 2 Cor. i. 1; Phil. i. 1. Here also as subordinate joint-author of the letter, who at the same time may have been the amanuensis, but is not here jointly mentioned as such (comp. Rom. xvi. 22). See on Phil. i. 1. — ὁ ἀνδρόφος] see on 1 Cor. i. 1; referring, not to official (Chrys.: ὁ ἀνδρόφος καὶ αὐτός ἀπόστολος), but generally to Christian brotherhood. — τοῖς ἐν Κολ. ἄγ. κ.τ.λ.] to the saints who are in Colossae. To this theocratic designation, which in itself is not as yet more precisely defined (see on Rom. i. 7), is then added their distinctively Christian character: and believing brethren in Christ. Comp. on Eph. i. 1. ἄγιος is to be understood as a substantive, just as in all the commencements of epistles, where it occurs (Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor.; 2 Cor.; Eph.; Phil.); and εν Χριστῷ is closely connected with πιστ. ἄδεια, with which it blends so as to form one conception (hence it is not τοῖς εν X.), expressly designating the believing brethren as Christians, so that εν X. forms the element of demarcation, in which the readers are believing brethren, and outside of which they would not be so in the Christian sense. Comp. on 1 Cor. iv. 17; Eph. vi. 21; in which passages, however, πιστός is faithful,—a meaning which it has not here (in opposition to Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, Dalmer), because every-
where in the superscriptions of the Epistles it is only the Christian standing of the readers that is described. No doubt ἐν Χριστῷ was in itself hardly necessary; but the addresses have a certain formal stamp. If ἁγιὸς is taken as an adjective: “the holy and believing brethren” (de Wette), ἐν Χριστῷ being made to apply to the whole formula, then πιστοῖς coming after ἁγιὸς (which latter word would already have, through ἐν Χ., its definition in a Christian sense, which, according to our view, it still has not) would be simply a superfluous and clumsy addition, because ἁγιὸς would already presuppose the πιστοῖς. — The fact that Paul does not expressly describe the church to which he is writing as a church (as in 1 Cor.; 2 Cor.; Gal.; 1 and 2 Thess.) has no special motive (comp. Rom., Eph., Phil.), but is purely accidental. If it implied that he had not founded the church and stood in no kind of relation to it as such, and especially to its rulers (de Wette, by way of query), he would not have written of a Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησία (iv. 16). Indeed, the principle of addressing as churches those communities only which he had himself founded, is not one to be expected from the apostle’s disposition of mind and wisdom; and it is excluded by the inscription of the Epistle to the Ephesians (assuming its genuineness and destination for the church at Ephesus), as also by Phil. i. 1 (where the mention of the bishops and deacons would not compensate for the formal naming of the church). It is also an accidental matter that Paul says ἐν Χριστῷ merely, and not ἐν Χ. Ἰησοῦ (1 Cor.; Eph.; Phil.; 2 Thess.), although Mayerhoff makes use of this, among other things, to impugn the genuineness of the epistle; just as if such a mechanical regularity were to be ascribed to the apostle! — χάρις ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ. See on Rom. i. 7.

Ver. 3 f. Thanksgiving for the Christian condition of the readers, down to ver. 8. — εὐχαριστοῦμεν I and Timothy; plural and singular alternate in the Epistle (i. 23, 24, 28, 29 ff., iv. 3); but not without significant occasion. — καὶ πατὲρ κ.τ.λ. who is at the same time the Father, etc. See on Eph. i. 3. — πάντωτοι belongs to εὐχαρ., as in 1 Cor. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 3; Philem. 4, and not to περὶ ὑμ. προσευχ.
(Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, and many others, including Böhmer, Olshausen, Dalmer)—a connection opposed to the parallel Eph. i. 16, as well as to the context, according to which the thanksgiving is the main point here, and the prayer merely a concomitant definition; and it is not till ver. 9 that the latter is brought forward as the object of the discourse, and that as unceasing. This predicate belongs here to the thanking, and in ver. 9 to the praying, and περὶ ὑμῶν προσευχῆς
—words which are not, with Bähr, to be separated from one another (whereby προσευχῆς would unduly stand without relation)—is nothing but a more precise definition of πάντως:
“always (each time, Phil. i. 4; Rom. i. 10), when we pray for you.”—ἀκούσατες κ.τ.λ.] with reference to time; after having heard, etc. Comp. ver. 9. In that, which Paul had heard of them, lies the ground of his thanksgiving. The πλευρᾶς is faith (Rom. i. 8; 1 Thess. i. 3; 2 Thess. i. 3) not faithfulness (Ewald), as at Philem. 5, where the position of the words is different. That Paul has heard their faith praised, is self-evident from the context. Comp. Eph. i. 15; Philem. 5.
—ἐν Χ. Ἰ.] on Christ, in so far, namely, as the faith has its basis in Christ. See on Mark i. 15; Gal. iii. 26; Eph. i. 13, 15. As to the non-repetition of τὴν, see on Gal. iii. 26.—ἢ ἔχετε] Paul so writes,—not by joining on immediately (τὴν ἄγαπην εἰς πάντως κ.τ.λ.), nor yet by the mere repetition of the article, as in Eph. i. 15 (so the Recepta, see the critical remarks),—because he has it in view to enter more fully upon this point of ἄγαπη, and indeed definitely upon the reason why they cherished it.

Ver. 5. Διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα κ.τ.λ.] on account of the hope, etc., does not belong to εἰχαρ. ver. 3 (Bengel, “ex ore patet, quanta sit causa gratias agendi pro dono fidei et amoris;” comp. Bullinger, Zanchius, Calovius, Elsner, Michaelis, Zachariae, Storr, Rosenmüller, Hofmann, and others), because the ground for the apostolic thanksgiving at the beginnings of the Epistles, as also here at ver. 4, always consists in the Christian character of the readers (Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 4 ff.; Eph. i. 15; Phil. i. 5; 1 Thess. i. 3; 2 Thess. i. 3; 2 Tim. i. 5; Philem. 5),

1 For a like use of ἄν, see Stallbaum, ad Plat. Rep. p. 360 A.
and that indeed as a ground in itself, and therefore not merely on account of what one has in future to hope from it; and, moreover, because εὐχαριστεῖν with διὰ and the accusative does not occur anywhere in the N. T. It is connected with ἥν ἔχετε κ.τ.λ., and thus specifies the motive ground of the love; for love guarantees the realization of the salvation hoped for. So correctly, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Calvin, Estius, Steiger, Bleek, and others. The more faith is active through love, the richer one becomes εἰς Θεόν (Luke xii. 21), and this riches forms the contents of hope. He who does not love remains subject to death (1 John iii. 14), and his faith profits him nothing (1 Cor. xiii. 1-3). It is erroneous to refer it jointly to πίστις, so as to make the hope appear here as ground of the faith and the love; so Grotius and others, including Bähr, Olshausen, and de Wette; comp. Baumgarten-Crusius and Ewald. For ἥν ἔχετε (or the Rec. τὴν) indicates a further statement merely as regards τὴν ἁγάπην; and with this accords the close of the whole outburst, which in ver. 8 emphatically reverts to τὴν ἴμων ἁγάπην. — The ἐκπίως is here conceived objectively (comp. ἐκπ. βλέπωμένη, Rom. viii. 24): our hope as to its objective contents, that which we hope for. Comp. Job vi. 8; 2 Macc. vii. 14, and see on Rom. viii. 24 and Gal. v. 5; Zöckler, de vi ac notione voc. ἐκπίως, Giss. 1856, p. 26 ff. — τὴν ἀποκευμ. ἴμων ἐν τ. οὐρ.] What is meant is the Messiah's salvation forming the contents of the hope (1 Thess. v. 8; Rom. v. 2, viii. 18 ff.; Col. iii. 3 f.), which remains deposited, that is, preserved, laid up (Luke xix. 20), in heaven for the Christian until the Parousia, in order to be then given to him. On ἀποκ. comp. 2 Tim. iv. 8; 2 Macc. xii. 45; Kypke, II. p. 320 f.; Loesner, p. 360; Jacobs, ad Ach. Tat. p. 678. Used of death, Heb. ix. 27; of punishments, Plat. Locr.

1 In opposition to the view of Hofmann, that Paul names the reason why the news of the faith and love of the readers had become to him a cause of thanksgiving.

2 It is erroneous to say that the Parousia no longer occurs in our Epistle. It is the substratum of the ἀνασκ. ἀπεκ. i. c. s. Comp. iii. 1 ff. (in opposition to Mayerhoff, and Holtzmah, p. 208 f.).
p. 104 D, 4 Macc. viii. 10. As to the idea, comp. the conception of the treasure in heaven (Matt. vi. 20, xix. 21; 1 Tim. vi. 19), of the reward in heaven (see on Matt. v. 12), of the πολίτευμα in heaven (see on Phil. iii. 20), of the κληρονομία τετηρημένη ἐν οὐραν. (1 Pet. i. 4), and of the βραβεῖον τῆς ἀνω εἰλήσεως (Phil. iii. 14). — ἢ προσκυνάτε k.t.l.] Certainty of this hope, which is not an unwarranted subjective fancy, but is objectively conveyed to them through the word of truth previously announced. The πρὸ in προσκύνατε (Herod. viii. 79; Plat. Legg. vii. p. 797 A; Xen. Mem. ii. 4. 7; Dem. 759. 26, 955. 1; Joseph. Antt. viii. 12. 3) does not denote already formerly, whereby Paul premises se nihil allaturum novi (Calvin and many), but must be said with reference to the future, to which the hope belongs; hence the sense imported by Ewald: where-with the word of truth began among you (Mark i. 15), is the less admissible. The conception is rather, that the contents of the ἐλπίς, the heavenly salvation, is the great future blessing, the infallible pre-announcement of which they have heard. As previously announced, it is also previously heard. — τῆς ἀληθείας is the contents of the λόγος (comp. on Eph. i. 13); and by τοῦ εὐαγγ., the ἀλήθεια, that is, the absolute truth, is specifically defined as that of the gospel, that is, as that which is announced in the gospel. Both genitives are therefore to be left in their substantive form (Erasmus, Heinrichs, Baumgarten-Crusius, and many others understand τῆς ἀληθ. as adjectival: sermo verax; comp. on the contrary, on ἀλήθ. τοῦ εὐαγγ., Gal. ii. 5, 14), so that the expression advances to greater definiteness. The circumstantiality has something solemn about it (comp. 2 Cor. ix. 4); but this is arbitrarily done away, if we regard τοῦ εὐαγγ. as the genitive of apposition to τοῦ λόγου τῆς ἀληθ. (Calvin, Beza, and many others, including Flatt, Bähr, Steiger, Böhmer, Huther, Olshausen, de Wette, Hofmann); following Eph. i. 13, Paul would have written τοῦ εὐαγγελ. Ver. 6. In what he had just said, ἢ προσκυνάτε . . . εὐαγγελιζών, Paul now desires to make his readers sensible of the great and blessed fellowship in which, through the gospel, they are placed, in order that they may by this very consciousness feel themselves aroused to faithfulness towards the col.
gospel, in presence of the heretical influences; ἐπειδὴ μάλιστα οἱ πολλοὶ ἐκ τοῦ κοινωνίας ἔχειν πολλοὺς τῶν δογμάτων στηριζόμενοι, Chrysostom. Comp. Occumenius: προθυμοτέρους αὐτοὺς περὶ τὴν πληθυντίνην πολεῖ ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν πάντας κοινωνίας. — εἰς ὑμᾶς] not ἐν ὑμῖν, because the conception of the previous arrival predominates; 1 Macc. xi. 63. Often so with παρείναι in classical authors (Herod. i. 9, vi. 24, viii. 60; Polyb. xviii. 1. 1; comp. Acts xii. 20). See Bornemann and Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. i. 2. 2; Bremi, ad Aeschin. p. 320; and generally, Nägelsbach, a Ilias, p. 158 f., ed. 3. Observe, moreover, the emphasis of τοῦ παρώνος: it is there! it has not remained away; and to the presence is then added the bearing fruit.—καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τ. κόσμῳ] A popular hyperbole. Comp. Rom. i. 8; Acts xvii. 6, and see ver. 23. The expression is neither arbitrarily to be restricted, nor to be used against the genuineness of the Epistle (Hilgenfeld); nor yet to be rationalized by "as regards the idea" (Baumgarten-Crusius) and the like; although, certainly, the idea of the catholicity of Christianity is expressed in the passage (comp. Rom. x. 18; Mark xiv. 9, xvi. 15; Matt. xxiv. 14).—καὶ ἐστὶ καρποφόροι κ.τ.λ.] Instead of continuing: καὶ καρποφορομένου κ.τ.λ., Paul carries onward the discourse with the finite verb, and thus causes this element to stand out more independently and forcibly:1 "and it is fruit-bearing and growing" (see Maetzner, ad Lycurg. Leocr. p. 108; Heindorf, ad Plat. Soph. p. 222 B; Winer, p. 533 [E. T. 717]), by which is indicated the fact, that the gospel, wherever it is present, is also in course of living dynamical development, and this state of development is expressed by ἐστὶ with the participle. This general proposition based on experience: καὶ ἐστὶ καρποφόροι κ. αὐξαν., is then by καθὼς κ. ἐν

1 If καὶ is not genuine, as Bleek, Hofmann, and others consider (see the critical remarks), the passage is to be translated: as it also in the whole world is fruit-bearing, by which Paul would say that the gospel is present among the readers in the same fruit-bearing quality which it develops on all sides. But in that case the following καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν would necessarily appear as very superfluous. No doubt we might, after the preceding ἐρωτεύεται, take the λέον, with F. Nitzsch, as equivalent to ἔμπνευσι (see Stallb. ad Plat. Phaed. p. 59 B); and to this comes also the punctuation in Tisch. 5, who puts a comma after ἐστὶν. But how utterly superfluous would this λέον then be!
owing confirmed through the experience found also among the readers; so that Paul's view passes, in the first clause (τοῦ παρόντος ... κόσμῳ), from the special to the general aspect, and in the second, from the general to the special. With καρποφορ. (not occurring elsewhere in the middle) is depicted the blissful working in the inward and outward life (comp. Gal. v. 22; Eph. v. 9); and with αὐξανόμεν. the continuous diffusion, whereby the gospel is obtaining more and more adherents and local extension. Comp. Theodoret: καρποφοράν τοῦ εὐαγγ., κέκληκε τὴν ἐπαυματικὴν πολιτείαν αὔξησιν δὲ τῶν πιστευόντων τὸ πλῆθος. Huther and de Wette groundlessly refrain from deciding whether αὔξ. is intended to refer to the outward growth or to the inward (so Steiger), or to both. See Acts vi. 7, xii. 24, xix. 20. Comp. Luke xiii. 19; Matt. xiii. 32. The μάλλον στρηλθεῖσθαι, which Chrysostom finds included in αὔξ., is not denoted, but presupposed by the latter. Comp. Theophylact. The figure is taken from a tree, in which the καρποφορία does not exclude the continuance of growth (not so in the case of cereals). — ἀφ’ ἡς ἡμέρ. κ.τ.λ.] since the first beginning of your conversion which so happily took place (through true knowledge of the grace of God), that development of the gospel proceeds among you; how could ye now withdraw from it by joining yourselves to false teachers? — τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ] contents of the gospel, which they have heard; the object of ἴκνοιος. is the gospel, and τ. χάριν τ. Θεοῦ belongs to εὐσεβία; and by ἐν ἀληθείᾳ (2 Cor. vii. 14), equivalent to ἀληθῶς (John xvii. 8), the qualitative character of this knowledge is affirmed: it was a true knowledge, corresponding to the nature of the χάρις, without Judaistic and other errors. Comp. on John xvii. 19. Holtzmann hears in ἴκνοιώσατε ... ἀληθῶς "the first tones of the foreign theme," which is then in vv. 9, 10 more fully entered upon. But how conceivable and natural is it, that at the very outset the danger which threatens the right knowledge of the readers should be present to his mind!

Ver. 7 f. Καθώς] not quandoquidem (Flatt, comp. Bähr), but the as of the manner in which. So, namely, as it had just been affirmed by ἐν ἀληθείᾳ that they had known the divine grace, had they learned it (comp. Phil. iv. 9) from Ἐπαφραῖος.
Notwithstanding this appropriate connection, Holtzmann finds in this third καθὼς a trace of the interpolator.—Nothing further is known from any other passage as to Ἐπαφρᾶς the Colossian (iv. 12); according to Philem. 23, he was συναγω-μάλαντος of the apostle. That the latter circumstance is not mentioned in our Epistle is not to be attributed to any special design (Estius: that Paul was unwilling to make his readers anxious). See, on the contrary, on iv. 10. Against the identity of Epaphras with Ἐπαφροδίτως, see on Phil. ii. 25. The names even are not alike (contrary to the view of Grotius and Ewald, who look upon Ἐπαφρᾶς as an abbreviation); Ἐσταφρᾶς and the corresponding feminine name Ἐπαφρόι are found on Greek inscriptions.—συνδούλου] namely, of Christ (comp. Phil. i. 1). The word, of common occurrence, is used elsewhere by Paul in iv. 7 only.—ὅς ἐστιν κ.τ.λ.] This faithfulness towards the readers, and also, in the sequel, the praise of their love, which Epaphras expressed to the apostle, are intended to stir them up "ne a doctrina, quam ab eo didicerat, per novos magistros abduci se patiantur," Estius. The emphasis is on πιστός.—ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν] for, as their teacher, he is the servant of Christ for them, for their benefit. The interpretation, instead of you ("in prison he serves me in the gospel," Michaelis, Böhmer), would only be possible in the event of the service being designated as rendered to the apostle (διάκονος μου ἐν Χριστῷ, or something similar). Comp. Phil. 13. Even with Lachmann's reading, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (Steiger, Olshausen, Ewald), it would not be necessary to take ὑπὲρ as instead; it might equally well be taken as for in the sense of interest, as opposite of the anti-Pauline working (comp. Luke ix. 50). The present ἐστὶ (Paul does not put ἦν) has its just warrant in the fact, that the merit, which the founder of the church has acquired by its true instruction, is living and continuous, reaching in its efficacy down to the present time. This is an ethical relation, which is quite independent of the circumstance that Epaphras was himself a Colossian (in opposition to Hofmann), but also makes it unnecessary to find in ἐστὶ an indirect continuance of Epaphras' work for the Colossians (in opposition to Bleek).—ὅ καὶ δηλώσας
who also (in accordance with the interest of this faithful service) has made us to know; comp. 1 Cor. i. 11. The ἀγάπη is here understood either of the love of the Colossians to Paul (and Timothy), as, following Chrysostom, most, including Huther, Bleek, and Hofmann, explain it, or of the brotherly love already commended in ver. 4 (de Wette, Olshausen, Ellicott, and others). But both these modes of taking it are at variance with the emphatic position of ὑμῶν (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 12; 2 Cor. i. 6, vii. 7, viii. 13, et al.), which betokens the love of the readers to Epaphras as meant. There had just been expressed, to wit, by ἵνα ὑμῶν, the faithful, loving position of this servant of Christ towards the Colossians, and correlative to this is now the love which he met with from them, consequently the counter-love shown to him, of which he has informed the apostle. A delicate addition out of courtesy to the readers. — εἰς πνεύματι attaches itself closely to ἀγάπην, so as to form one idea, denoting the love as truly holy—not conditioned by anything outward, but divinely upheld—which is in the Holy Spirit as the element which prompts and animates it; for it is the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. v. 22; Rom. xv. 30), οὐ σαρκική, ἀλλὰ πνευματική (Oecumenius). Comp. χαρὰ εἰς πν., Rom. xiv. 17.

REMARK.—Since ἄρ' ἡ ὑμείρα ἡ πνεοματική, ver. 6, refers the readers back to the first commencement of their Christianity, and ἔρχομαι ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ ἑπαφρᾶ κ.τ.λ., ver. 7, cannot, except by pure arbitrariness, be separated from it as regards time and regarded as something later, it results from our passage that Epaphras is to be considered as the first preacher of the gospel at Colossae, and consequently as founder of the church. This exegetical result remains even if the Recepta καθὼς καί is retained. This καί would not, as Wiggers thinks (in the Stud. u. Krit. 1838, p. 185), place the preaching of Epaphras in contradistinction to an earlier one, and make it appear as a continuation of the latter (in this case καθὼς καί ἐπὶ ἑπαφρ. ἡμᾶς or καθὼς ἡμᾶς καθὼς καί ἐπὶ ἑπαφρ. would have been employed); but it is to be taken as also, not otherwise, placing the ἡμᾶς on a parity with the ἐν ἡμῖν. This applies also in opposition to Vaihinger, in Herzog's Encykl. iv. p. 79 f.

¹ Who, at the same time, makes the ἐν πνεύματι suggest the reference, that the ἐν ἡμίν took place in a manner personally unknown—which must have been conveyed in the context.
Ver. 9. Intercession, down to ver. 12. — διὰ τοῦτο] on account of all that has been said from ἀκούσαντες in ver. 4 onward: induced thereby, we also cease not, etc. This reference is required by ἀφ' ἡς ἡμέρας ἡκούσαμεν, which cannot correspond to the δηλώσας ἡμῖν, belonging as that does merely to an accessory thought, but must take up again (in opposition to Bleek and Hofmann) the ἀκούσαντες which was said in ver. 4. This resumption is emphatic, not tautological (Holtzmann). — καὶ ἡμεῖς] are to be taken together, and it is not allowable to join καὶ either with διὰ τοῦτο (de Wette), or even with προσευχ. (Baumgarten-Crusius). The words are to be rendered: We also (I and Timothy), like others, who make the same intercession for you, and among whom there is mentioned by name the founder of the church, who stood in closest relation to them.—προσευχ.] "Pecun mentionem generatim fecit, ver. 3; nunc exprimit, quid precetur" (Bengel). — καὶ αἴτουμενοι] adds the special (asking) to the general (praying). Comp. 1 Macc. iii. 44; Matt. xxii. 22; Mark xi. 24; Eph. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 6. As to the popular form of hyperbole, οὐ πανόμου, comp. on Eph. i. 16. On ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, so far as it is also to be taken with κ. αἴτουμα, comp. Lys. c. Alc. p. 141. — ἡσα προσευχή.] Contents of the asking in the form of its purpose. Comp. on Phil. i. 9. The emphasis lies not on προσευχή. (F. Nitzsch, Hofmann), but on the object (comp. Rom. xv. 14, i. 29, al.), which gives to the further elucidation in vv. 9, 10 its specific definition of contents. — τὴν ἐνεργ. τοῦ θελ. αἴτου] with the knowledge of His will, accusative, as in Phil. i. 11; αἴτου applies to God as the subject, to whom prayer and supplication are addressed. The context in ver. 10 shows that by the θέλημα is meant, not the counsel of redemption (Eph. i. 9; Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, and many others, including Huther and Dalmer), but, doubtless (Matt. vi. 10), that which God wills in a moral respect (so Theodoret, who makes out a contrast with the νομικαίς παρατηρήσεωσι). Comp. Rom. ii. 18, xii. 2; Eph. v. 17, vi. 6; Col. iv. 12. The distinction between γνῶσις and ἐπιγνώσις, which both here and also in ver. 10, ii. 2, iii. 10, is the knowledge which grasps and penetrates into the object, is incorrectly denied by Olshausen. See on Eph. i. 17. — ἐν πάσῃ κ.τ.λ.]
instrumental definition of manner, how, namely, this πληρωθήναι τὴν ἐπίθυμ. τ. θελ. αὐτοῦ (a knowledge which is to be the product not of mere human mental activity, but of objectively divine endowment by the Holy Spirit) must be brought about: by every kind of spiritual wisdom and insight, by the communication of these from God; comp. on Eph. i. 8. A combination with the following περιπατῆσαι (comp. iv. 5: ἐν σοφίᾳ περιπ.), such as Hofmann suggests, is inappropriate, because the two parts of the whole intercession stand to one another in the relation of the divine ethical foundation (ver. 9), and of the corresponding practical conduct of life (ver. 10 f.); hence the latter portion is most naturally and emphatically headed by the expression of this Christian practice, the περιπατῆσαι, to which are then subjoined its modal definitions in detail. Accordingly, περιπατῆσαι is not, with Hofmann, to be made dependent on τοῦ θελῆμ. αὐτοῦ and taken as its contents, but τ. θελ. τ. Θ. is to be left as an absolute idea, as in iv. 12. On πνευματικός, proceeding from the Holy Spirit, comp. Rom. i. 11; 1 Cor. ii. 13, xii. 1; Eph. i. 3, v. 19, et al. The σύνεσις is the insight, in a theoretical and (comp. on Mark xii. 33) practical respect, depending upon judgment and inference, Eph. iii. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 7. For the opposite of the pneumatic σύνεσις, see 1 Cor. i. 19. It is related to the σοφία as the special to the general, since it is peculiarly the expression of the intelligence in the domain of truth, while the σοφία concerns the collective faculties of the mind, the activities of knowledge, willing, and feeling, the tendency and working of which are harmoniously subservient to the recognised highest aim, if the wisdom is πνευματική; its opposite is the σοφία σαρκική (2 Cor. i. 12; Jas. iii. 15), being of man, and not of God, in its aim and efforts. According as φρόνησις is conceived subjectively or objectivized, the σύνεσις may be considered either as synonymous with it

1 Hence ἐν σοφίᾳ, Jas. iii. 15, 17. The predicate, although in the case of divine endowment with σοφία and σύνεσις obvious of itself (as Hofmann objects), was yet all the more opposite for expressly bringing the point into prominence, the greater the danger which threatened Colossians from non-divine, fleshly wisdom; comp. ii. 23.

2 Comp. Dem. 269. 24: σύνεσις, ἦ τα καλά καὶ αἰσχρὰ διαγράφεται.
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS.

(Eph. i. 8; Dan. ii. 21; Plat. Crat. p. 411 A), or as an attribute of it (Ecclus. i. 4: σίνεις φρονήσεως).

Ver. 10. The practical aim which that πληρωθήναι κ.τ.λ. is to accomplish; ἀεὶ τῇ πλοτείᾳ συζεύγυναι τὴν πολιτείαν, Chrysostom. The Vulgate renders correctly: ut ambuletis (in opposition to Hofmann, see on ver. 9). — ἄξιος τοῦ κυρίου] so that your behaviour may stand in morally appropriate relation to your belonging to Christ. Comp. Rom. xvi. 2; Eph. iv. 1; Phil. i. 27; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 3 John 6. The genitive (and in the N. T. such is always used with ἄξιος) does not even "perhaps" (Hofmann) belong to the following eis π. ἀρεσκ., especially as ἀρεσκεία, in the Greek writers and in Philo (see Loesner, p. 361), stands partly with, partly without, a genitival definition, and the latter is here quite obvious of itself. Such a combination would be an unnecessary artificial device. Comp. Plat. Conv. p. 180 D: ἄξιος τοῦ Θεοῦ.—eis πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν] on behalf of every kind of pleasing, that is, in order to please Him in every way. The word only occurs here in the N. T., but the apostle is not on that account to be deprived of it (Holtzmann); it is found frequently in Polybius, Philo, et al.; also Theophr. Char. 5; LXX. Prov. xxix. 30 (xxx. 30); Symmachus, Ps. lxxxi. 12. On πᾶσαν ἀρ. comp. Polybius, xxxi. 26. 5: πᾶν γένος ἀρεσκείας προσφερόμενον. Among the Greeks, ἀρεσκεία (to be accentuated thus, see Winer, p. 50 [E. T. 57]; Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 11 [E. T. 12]) bears, for the most part, the sense of seeking to please. Comp. Prov. xxix. 30: ὑπεδίον ἀρεσκείας. — ἐν παντὶ ἔγραψε κ.τ.λ.] There now follow three expositions, in order to define more precisely the nature and mode of the περιπατήσαι ἄξιος κ.τ.λ. We must, in considering these, notice the homogeneous plan of the three clauses, each of which commences with a prepositional relation of the participial idea, viz. (1) ἐν παντὶ ἔγραψε κ.τ.λ., (2) ἐν πάσῃ δινάμει, (3) μετὰ χαράς, and ends

1 Not to be attached as object of the request immediately to προσωπίζομαι, and all that intervenes to be assigned to the interpolator (Holtzmann, p. 85). Yet, according to Holtzmann, p. 123, ἐν παντὶ ἔγραψε down to τοῦ Θεοῦ is alleged to be simply an interpolated duplicate of ver. 6; in which case, however, it would not be easy to see why παραστερομένου was not written, after the precedent of ver. 6, but on the contrary προσωπίζομαι.
with a relation expressed by eis, viz. (1) eis τ. ἐπίγνωμον τ. Θεοῦ, (2) eis πᾶσα. ἔπομ. κ. μακροβομ., (3) eis τὴν μερίδα κ.τ.λ. The construction would be still more symmetrical if, in the third clause, ἐν πάσῃ χαρᾷ (Rom. xv. 32) had been written instead of μετὰ χαρᾶς—which was easily prevented by the versatility of the apostle's form of conception. — ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἄγαθῳ καρπῳφ. is to be taken together (and then again, αἰτίανομ. eis τὴν ἐπίγνωμον τ. Θεοῦ), inasmuch as ye by every good work (by your accomplishing every morally good action) bear fruit, as good trees, comp. Matt. vii. 17. But not as if the καρποφορεῖς and the αἰτίανομασ were separate things; they take place, as in ver. 6, jointly and at the same time, although, after the manner of parallelism, a special more precise definition is annexed to each. Moreover, ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἄγῳ is not to be connected with eis πᾶσαν ἀρεσκ. (Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, and others, also Steiger); otherwise we mistake and destroy the symmetrical structure of the passage. — καὶ αἰτίανομ. eis τ. ἐπίγνωμον τ. Θ. and, inasmuch as with this moral fruit-bearing at the same time ye increase in respect to the knowledge of God, that is, succeed in knowing Him more and more fully. The living, effective knowledge of God, which is meant by ἐπίγνωμον τ. Θεοῦ (ver. 6, iii. 10, ii. 2), sustains an ethically necessary action and reaction with practical morality. Just as the latter is promoted by the former, so also knowledge grows through moral practice in virtue of the power of inward experience of the divine life (the ἡτοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, Eph. iv. 18), by which God reveals Himself more and more to the inner man. The fact that here τοῦ Θεοῦ generally is said, and not τοῦ θελήματος Θεοῦ repeated, is in keeping with the progressive development set forth; there is something of a climax in it. On eis, used of the telic reference, and consequently of the regenerative direction of the growth, comp. on Eph. iv. 15; 2 Pet. i. 8. The reading τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τ. Ἐθ. would have to be taken as instrumental, with Olshausen, Steiger, Huther, de Wette, Bleek, who follow it, but would yield after ver. 9 something quite self-evident. We may add that αἰτίαν, with the dative of spiritual increase by something, is frequent in Plato and classic writers.—As to the nominatives of the participles, which
are not to be taken with πληρωθ. (Beza, Bengel, Reiche, and others), but relate to the logical subject of περιπτατ. ἄξιος, comp. on Eph. iv. 2; 2 Cor. i. 7.

Ver. 11 is co-ordinate with the foregoing ἐν παντὶ ἐργῷ ... Θεοῦ. — ἐν πάσῃ δυν. Δυναμ.] ἐν is instrumental, as in ver. 9 (Eph. vi. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 1); hence not designating that, in the acquiring of which the invigoration is supposed to consist (Hofmann), but: by means of every (moral) power (by its bestowal on God's part) becoming empowered. Δυναμίων (Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 605) does not occur in Greek authors, and is only found here and at Heb. xi. 34, Lachm. in the N. T.; in the LXX. at Eccles. x. 10; Dan. ix. 27; Ps. lxvii. 31; in Aquila; Job xxxvi. 9; Ps. lxiv. 4. Paul elsewhere uses ἐνδυναμοῦν. — κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξ. αἰτ.] according to the might of His majesty; with this divine might (see as to κράτος on Eph. i. 19), through the powerful influence of which that strengthening is to be imparted to them, it is also to be correspondent—and thereby its eminent strength and efficacy are characterized (κατα in Eph. i. 19 has another sense). Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 9; Phil. iii. 21. And τὸ κράτος τ. δόξ. αἰτ. is not His glorious power (Luther, Castalio, Beza, and others; also Flatt and Bähr), against which αἰτοῦ should have been a sufficient warning; but τὸ κράτος is the appropriate attribute of the divine majesty (of the glorious nature of God). Comp. Eph. iii. 16; Ecclus. xviii. 5. The κράτος therefore is not the glory of God (Böhmer), but the latter has the former,—and the δόξα is not to be referred to a single aspect of the divine greatness (Grotius: power; Huther: love), but to its glorious whole. Comp. on Rom. vi. 4. — εἰς πάσαν ἱππομ. κ. μακροθ.] in respect to every endurance (in affliction, persecution, temptation, and the like, comp. Rom. v. 3; 2 Cor. i. 6, vi. 4; Jas. i. 3 f.; Luke viii. 15; Rom. ii 7, et al.) and long-suffering (towards the offenders and persecutors), that is, so as to be able to exercise these virtues in every way by means of that divine strengthening. The distinction of Chrysostom: μακροθυμεῖ τις πρὸς ἑκείνους οὑς δύνατον καὶ ἀμύνασθαι ἱππομένει δὲ, οὑς οὐ δύναται ἀμύνασθαι, is arbitrary. See, on the contrary, for instance, Heb. xii. 2, 3. Others understand it variously;
but it is to be observed, that ἰσομονή expresses the more
general idea of endurance, and that μακροθυμία, the opposite
of which is ἀξοθυμία (Eur. Andr. 729; Jas. i. 19) and
ἀξοθύμωσις (Artem. iv. 69), always refers in the N. T. to the
relation of patient tolerance towards offenders. Comp. iii. 12;
Gal. v. 22; Rom. ii. 4; Eph. iv. 2; also Heb. vi. 12; Jas.
v. 10. — μετὰ χαρᾶς is joined with τὰσαν ἱσομ. κ. μακροθ.
by Theodoret, Luther, Beza, Castalio, Calvin, Grotius, Calovius,
Bengel, Heinrichs, and many others, including Olshausen,
Bähr, Steiger, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Dalmer, so that
the true, joyful patience (comp. ver. 24) is denoted. But the
symmetry of the passage (see on ver. 10), in which the two
previous participles are also preceded by a prepositional defini-
tion, points so naturally to the connection with what follows
(Syr., Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Estius,
and others, including Lachmann, Tischendorf, Böhmer, Huther,
Ewald, Ellicott, Bleek, Hofmann), that it cannot be abandoned
without arbitrariness. Even in that case, indeed, the thought
of joyful patience, which is certainly apostolic (Rom. v. 3; 1 Pet.
i. 6; Rom. xii. 12; comp. Matt. v. 12), is not lost, when the
intercession rises from patience to joyful thanksgiving. Observe
also the deliberate juxtaposition of μετὰ χαρᾶς εὐχαριστ.

Ver. 12. While ye give thanks with joyfulness, etc.—a third
accompanying definition of περιπατήσας ἄξιως κ.τ.λ. (ver. 10),
co-ordinate with the two definitions preceding, and not to be
connected with οὗ πανώμεθα κ.τ.λ. (Chrysostom, Theophylact,
Calvin: "iterum redit ad gratulationem," Calovius, Böhmer,
Baumgarten-Crusius). — τῷ πατρὶ of Jesus Christ; comp.
ver. 13, and τοῦ Κυρίου in ver. 10, not: "the Father absolutely"
(Hofmann). It is always in Paul's writings to be gathered
from the context, whose Father God is to be understood as
being (even at Eph. i. 17); never does he name God absolutely
(in abstracto) ὁ πατήρ. Comp. ver. 3, which, however, is held
by Holtzmann to be the original, suggesting a repetition by
the editor at our passage, in spite of the fact that the two
passages have different subjects. Just as little does εἰς τὴν
μερίσα κ.τ.λ. betray itself as an interpolation from Eph. i. 18
and i. 11 (Holtzmann), seeing that, on the one hand, the
expression at our passage is so wholly peculiar, and, on the other hand, the idea of ἐλπιδοφυα is so general in the N. T. Comp. especially Acts xxvi. 18. 1 — τῷ ἰκανωσαντι κ.τ.λ. Therein lies the ground of the thanksgiving, quippe qui, etc. God has made us fit (ἡμᾶς applies to the letter-writers and readers, so far as they are Christians) for a share in the Messianic salvation through the light, inasmuch as, instead of the darkness which previously prevailed over us, He has by means of the gospel brought to us the ἀλήθεια, of which light is the distinctive element and the quickening and saving principle (Eph. v. 9) of the Christian constitution both in an intellectual and ethical point of view (Acts xxvi. 18); hence Christians are children of the light (Eph. v. 8; 1 Thess. v. 5; Luke xvi. 8). Comp. Rom. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 9. In Christ the light had attained to personal manifestation (John i. 4 ff., iii. 9, viii. 12; Matt. iv. 16, et al.), as the personal revelation of the divine nature itself (1 John i. 5), and the gospel was the means of its communication (Eph. iii. 9; Heb. vi. 4; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Acts xxvi. 23, et al.) to men, who without this enlightenment were unfit for the Messianic salvation (Eph. ii. 1 ff., iv. 18, v. 11, vi. 12; 1 Thess. v. 4, et al.). The instrumental definition ἐν τῷ φωτὶ is placed at the end, in order that it may stand out with special emphasis; hence, also, the relative sentence which follows refers to this very element. An objection has been wrongly urged against our view (which is already adopted by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact; comp. Estius and others, including Flatt and Steiger), that Paul must have used πνεῦμα instead of φῶς (see Olshausen). The ἰκανοῖν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ is, indeed, nothing else than the καλεῖν εἰς τὸ φῶς (1 Pet. ii. 9) conceived in respect of its moral efficacy, and the result thereof on the part of man is the εἰναι φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ (Eph. v. 8), or the εἰναι νῦν τὸφ φωτός (1 Thess. v. 5; John xiii. 36), ὡς φωτὶρες ἐν κόσμῳ (Phil. ii. 15). But the light

1 The mode in which Acts xxvi. 18 comes into contact as regards thought and expression with Col. i. 12-14, may be sufficiently explained by the circumstance that in Acts xxvi. also Paul is the speaker. Hollmann justly advises caution with reference to the apparent echoes of the Book of Acts in general, as Luke originally bears the Pauline stamp.
is a power; for it is τὸ φῶς τῆς ἔκκλησίας (John viii. 12), has its armour (Rom. xiii. 12), produces its fruit (Eph. v. 9), effects the Christian ἐλέγχος (Eph. v. 13), endurance in the conflict of affliction (Heb. x. 32), etc. Ἐν τῷ φωτὶ is usually connected with τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων, so that this κλήρος is described as existing or to be found in light, as the kingdom of light; in which case we may think either of its glory (Beza and others, Böhmer, Huther), or of its purity and perfection (Olshausen, de Wette, and Dalmer) as referred to. But although the connecting article τοῦ might be wanting, and the κλήρος τ. ἁγ. ἐν τῷ φωτὶ might thus form a single conception, it may be urged as an objection that the heritage meant cannot be the temporal position of Christians, but only the future blessedness of the Messianic glorious kingdom; comp. ver. 13, τὴν βασιλικ. τοῦ νοῦ. Hence not ἐν τῷ φωτὶ, but possibly ἐν τῷ δόξῃ, ἐν τῷ ζωῆ, ἐν τῷ οὐρανίῳ, or the like, would be a fitting definition of κλήρος, which, however, already has in τῶν ἁγίων its definite description (comp. Eph. i. 18; Acts xx. 32, xxvi. 18). Just as little—for the same reason, and because τ. μερίδα already carries with it its own definition (share in the κλήρος)—is ἐν τῷ φωτὶ to be made dependent on τὴν μερίδα, whether ἐν be taken locally (Bengel: "Lux est regnum Dei, habentque fideles in hoc regno partem beatam") or as in Acts viii. 21 (Ewald), in which case Hofmann finds the sphere expressed (comp. also Bleek), where the saints have got their peculiar possession assigned to them, so that the being in light stands related to the future glory as that which is still in various respects conditioned stands to plentitude—as if κλήρος (comp. on Acts xxvi. 18) had not already the definite and full eschatological sense of the possession of eternal glory. This κλήρος, of which the Christians are possessors (τῶν ἁγίων), ideally before the Parousia, and thereafter really, is the theocratic designation (πνεῦμα) of the property of the Messianic kingdom (see on Gal. iii. 18; Eph. i. 11), and the μερίς (πνεῦμα) τοῦ κλήρου is the share of individuals1 in the same. Comp. Ecles. xli. 23.

1 Comp. also Bleek. Hofmann incorrectly says that τῶν κληρών serves only to designate the μερίς as destined for special possession. In that case, at least, the qualitative genitive of the abstract must have been put (τὸς κληρονομικός, as in
The Epistle of Paul to the Colossians.

Ver. 13. A more precise elucidation of the divine benefit previously expressed by τῷ ἰανώσαντι . . . φερί. This verse forms the transition, by which Paul is led on to the instructions as to Christ, which he has it in view to give down to ver. 20. — ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσ. τοῦ σκοτ.] τοῦ σκοτ. is not genitive of opposition (Hofmann), but, corresponding to the εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν that follows, genitive of the subject: out of the power, which darkness has. The latter, as the influential power of non-Christian humanity (of the κόσμος, which is ruled by the devil, Eph. ii. 2), is personified; its essence is the negation of the intellectual and ethical divine ἀληθεία, and the affirmation of the opposite. Comp. Luke xxii. 53; Matt. iv. 16; Acts xxvi. 18; Rom. xiii. 12; Eph. v. 8, vi. 12, et al. The act of the ἔφροσυναργεία has taken place by means of the conversion to Christ, which is the work of God, Rom. viii. 29 f.; Eph. ii. 4 ff. It is to be observed, that the expression ἐκ τ. ἐξουσ. τ. σκότους is chosen as the correlative of ἐν τῷ φωτὶ in ver. 12. — καὶ μετέστησεν] The matter is to be conceived locally (εἰς ἑπέρον τόσον, Plat. Legg. vi. p. 762 B), so that the deliverance from the power of darkness appears to be united with the removing away into the kingdom, etc. Comp. Plat. Rep. p. 518 A: ἐκ τε φωτὸς εἰς σκότος μετεστησαν καὶ ἐκ σκότος εἰς φῶς. — εἰς τὴν βασιλ. κ.τ.λ., that is, into the kingdom of the Messiah, Eph. v. 5; 2 Pet. i. 11; for this and nothing else is meant by ἡ βασιλεία Χριστοῦ (τοῦ Θεοῦ, τῶν ὁμοιῶν) in all passages of the N. T. Comp. iv. 11; and see on Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 20; Matt. iii. 2, vi. 10. The aorist

Ps. xvi. 5). But the concrete τοῦ καλῆς τ. ἄγ. is, as the literal sense of μείζον, portio, most naturally suggests, the genitivus partitivus (G. toius), so that the individual is conceived as μείζον of the αἰώνων of the saints, in which he for his part ενυπνεῖται.

1 This Christological outburst runs on in the form of a purely positive statement, although having already in view doctrinal dangers of the kind in Colossae. According to Holtzmann, the Christology belongs to the compiler; the whole passage, vv. 14–20, is forced and without motive, and it is only in ver. 21 that we find the direct sequel to ver. 18. The latter statement is incorrect. And why should this excursus, as a grand basis for all the exhortations and warnings that follow, be held without due motive? Holtzmann forms too harsh a judgment as to the whole passage i. 9–23, when he declares it incompatible with any strict exegetical treatment.
μετέστ. is to be explained by the matter being conceived proleptically (τὴ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν, Rom. viii. 24), as something already consummated (comp. on ἐδόξασε, Rom. viii. 30). Thus the kingdom which is nigh is, by means of their fellowship of life with their Lord (Eph. ii. 6), as certain to the redeemed as if they were already translated into it. The explanation which refers it to the Christian church (so still Heinrichs, Bähr, Huther, and most expositors) as contrasted with the κόσμος, is just as unhistorical as that which makes it the invisible inward, ethical kingdom (see especially Olshausen, following an erroneous view of Luke xvii. 21), to which also Bleek and Hofmann ultimately come. Certainly all who name Christ their Lord are under this king (Hofmann); but this is not yet his βασιλεία; that belongs to the future aiōn, Eph. v. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 9 f., xv. 24, 50; Gal. v. 21, et al.; John xviii. 36.—τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ] in essential meaning, indeed, nothing else than τοῦ νίου αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ (Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5, et al.), or τοῦ νιὸ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ αὐτοῦ (Matt. xii. 18; Mark xii. 6), but more prominently singling out the attribute (Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 141 [E. T. 162]): of the Son of His love, that is, of the Son who is the object of His love, genitive of the subject. Comp. Gen. xxxv. 18: νῦς ἀδύνατος μοι. Entirely parallel is Eph. i. 6 f.: ἐν τῷ ἡγαπητῇ, ἐν ὑμνεὶ κ.τ.λ. Augustine, de Trin. xv. 19, understood it as genitive of origin, making ἄγαπη αὐτοῦ denote the divine substantia.1 So again Olshausen, in whose view the expression is meant to correspond to the Johannine μονογενῆς. This is entirely without analogy in the N. T. mode of conception, according to which not the procreation (ver. 15), but the sending of the Son is referred to the divine love as its act; and the love is not the essence of God (in the metaphysical sense), but His essential disposition (the essence in the ethical sense), even in 1 John iv. 8, 16. Consequently it might be explained: “of the Son, whom His love has sent,” if this were suggested by the context; so far, however, from this being the case, the language refers to the exalted Christ who rules (βασιλείας).

1 Theodore of Mopsuestia finds in the expression the contrast that Christ was the Son of God ὥς φίλει, ἀλλ’ ἄγαπη τῆς νικηφόρου.
*λείαν*. The expression itself, ὁ νῦς τῆς ἁγάπης αὐτοῦ, is found in the N. T. only here, but could not be chosen more suitably or with deeper feeling to characterize the opposite of the God-hated element of σκότος, which in its nature is directly opposed to the divine love. The view, that it is meant to be intimated that the sharing in the kingdom brings with it the νικησία (Huther, de Wette), imports what is not expressed, and anticipates the sequel. Holtzmann without ground, and unfairly, asserts that in comparison with Eph. i. 6 our passage presents "stereotyped modes of connection and turns of an ecclesiastical orator," under which he includes the Hebraizing ὁ νῦς τῆς ἁγάπης αὐτ. as being thoroughly un-Pauline—as if the linguistic resources of the apostle could not even extend to an expression which is not indeed elsewhere used by him, but is in the highest degree appropriate to a specially vivid sense of the divine act of love; something sentimental in the best sense.

Ver. 14. Not a preliminary condition of the νικησία (de Wette), nor the benefit of which Christians become partakers in the kingdom of the Son of God (Huther; against which it may be urged that the βασιλεία does not denote the kingdom of the church); nor yet a mark of the deliverance from darkness having taken place (Ritschl in the Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol. 1863, p. 513), since this deliverance necessarily coincides with the translation into the kingdom; but it is the abiding (ἐγέμον, habemus, not accepimus) relation, in which that transformation into the kingdom of God has its causal basis. The ransoming (from the punishment of sin, see the explanatory τὴν ἀφεσὺν τῶν ἁμαρτ.) we have in Christ, inasmuch as He, by the shedding of His blood as the purchase-price (see on 1 Cor. vi. 20; Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5), has given Himself as a λύτρον (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45; 1 Tim. ii. 6); and this redemption, effected by His ἀναστήριον (Rom. iii. 21 ff.), remains continually in subsistence and efficacy. Hence: ἐν Ἰ, which specifies wherein the subjective ἐγέμον is objectively based, as its causa meritoria (Rom. iii. 24). Comp., moreover, on Eph. i. 7, whence διὰ τοῦ ἁμαρτον ἀντιδόθη has found its way hither as a correct gloss. But the deleting of this addition by no means implies that we should make τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν also
belong to ἀπολύτρωσι (Hofmann), as in Heb. ix. 15, especially as Paul elsewhere only uses ἀπολύτρωσι either absolutely (Rom. iii. 24; 1 Cor. i. 30; Eph. i. 7, iv. 30) or with the genitive of the subject (Rom. viii. 23; Eph. i. 14). The expression ἀφεσις τ. ἀμαρτ. is not used by him elsewhere in the epistles (comp., however, Rom. iv. 7), but at Acts xiii. 38, xxvi. 28. Holtzmann too hastily infers that the writer had read the Synoptics.

Ver. 15. As to vv. 15–20, see Schleiermacher in the Stud. u. Krit. 1832, p. 497 ff. (Werke z. Theol. II. p. 321 ff.), and, in opposition to his ethical interpretation (of Christ as the moral Reformer of the world), Holzhausen in the Tüb. Zeitschr. 1832, 4, p. 236 ff.; Osiander, ibid. 1833, 1, 2; Bähr, appendix to Komment. p. 321 ff.; Bleek on Heb. i. 2. See generally also Hofmann, Schriftenw. I. p. 153 ff., II. 1, p. 357 ff.; Beysslag in the Stud. u. Krit. 1860, p. 446 f. — After having stated, in ver. 14, what we have in Christ (whose state of exaltation he has in view, see ver. 13, τὴν Βασιλείαν), Paul now, continuing his discourse by an epexegetical relative clause, depicts what Christ is, namely, as regards His divine dignity—having in view the influences of the false teachers, who with Gnostic tendencies depreciated this dignity. The plan of the discourse is not tripartite (originator of the physical creation, ver. 15 f.; maintainer of everything created, ver. 17; relation to the new moral creation, ver. 18 ff.,—so Bähr, while others divide differently1), but bipartite, in such a way that vv. 15–17 set forth the exalted metaphysical relation of Christ to God and the world, and then ver. 18 ff., His historical relation of dignity to the church.2 This division, which in itself is logically correct (whereas ver. 17. is not suited, either as regards contents or form, to be a separate, co-ordinate part), is also externally indicated by the two confirmatory clauses οὐ ἐν ἀνθ. κ.τ.λ. in ver. 16 and ver. 19, by

1 e.g. Calovius: "Redemptoris descriptio a Deitate: ab opere creationis," and "quod caput ecclesiae sit." Comp. Schmid, Bibl. Theol. II. p. 299 f.
2 Olshausen brings the two divisions under the exegetically erroneous point of view that, in vv. 15–17, Christ is described without reference to the incarnation, and in vv. 18–20, with reference to the same.
which the two preceding affirmations in ver. 15 and ver. 18 are shown to be the proper parts of the discourse. Others (see especially Bengel, Schleiermacher, Hofmann, comp. also Gess, Pers. Chr. p. 77) have looked upon the twice-expressed ὃς ἐστιν in ver. 15 and ver. 18 as marking the beginning of the two parts. But this would not be justifiable as respects the second ὃς ἐστιν; for the main idea, which governs the whole effusion, vv. 15–20, is the glory of the dominion of the Son of God, in the description of which Paul evidently begins the second part with the words καὶ αὐτός, ver. 18, passing over from the general to the special, namely, to His government over the church to which He has attained by His resurrection. On the details, see below.—ὃς ἐστιν κ.τ.λ.] It is to be observed that Paul has in view Christ as regards His present existence, consequently as regards the presence and continuance of His state of exaltation (comp. on vv. 13, 14); hence he affirms, not what Christ was, but what He is. On this ἐστιν, comp. vv. 17, 18, and 2 Cor. iv. 4. Therefore not only the reference to Christ's temporal manifestation (Calvin, Grotius, Heinrichs, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others), but also the limitation to Christ's divine nature or the Logos (Calovius, Estius, Wolf, and many others, including Bähr, Steiger, Olshausen, Huther) is incorrect. The only correct reference is to His whole person, which, in the divine-human state of its present heavenly existence, is continually that which its divine nature—this nature considered in and by itself—was before the incarnation; so that, in virtue of the identity of His divine nature, the same predicates belong to the exalted Christ as to the Logos. See Phil. ii. 6; John xvii. 5.—εἰκὼν τοῦ Ἑστιοῦ τοῦ ἀπαντοῦ] image of God the invisible. Comp. on 2 Cor. iv. 4. As, namely, Christ in His pre-existence down to His

1 In conformity with the confirmatory function of the ἦν, according to which not the clause introduced by ἦν, but the clause which it is to confirm, contains the leading thought, to which ἦν κ.τ.λ. is logically subordinated. Hence the two parts are not to be begun with the two clauses ἦν καὶ αὐτός themselves (so Rich. Schmidt, Paulina. Christol. p. 182), in which case, moreover, ver. 15 is supposed to be quite aloof from this connection—a supposition at variance with its even verbally evident association with ver. 16.

2 Sabatier, p. 290, without reason represents the apostle as in a state of indis-
incarnation already possessed the essential divine glory, so that He was as to nature ἡσα Θεό, and as to form of appearance ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ἑπάρχῃ (see on Phil. ii. 6); so, after He had by means of the incarnation divested Himself, not indeed of His God-equal nature, but of His divine δόξα, and had humbled Himself, and had in obedience towards God died even the death of the cross, He has been exalted again by God to His original glory (Phil. ii. 9; John xvii. 5), so that the divine δόξα now exists (comp. on ii. 9) in His glorified corporeal manifestation (Phil. iii. 21); and He—the exalted Christ—in this His glory, which is that of His Father, represents and brings to view by exact image God, who is in Himself invisible. He is ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως Θεοῦ (Heb. i. 3),1 and, in this majesty, in which He is the exactly similar visible revelation of God, He will present Himself to all the world at the Parousia (Matt. xvi. 27, xxv. 31; Phil. iii. 20; 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 13; Tit. ii. 13, et al.). The predicate τοῦ ἀπόστου, placed as it is in its characteristically significant attributive position (Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. xxxvi.; Bernhardy, p. 322 f.) behind the emphatic τοῦ Θεοῦ, posits for the conception of the exact image visibility (Heb. xii. 14; 2 Cor. iii. 18; Acts xxii. 11); but the assumption that Paul had thus in view the Alexandrian doctrine of the Logos, the doctrine of the hidden and manifest God (see Usteri, Lehrbegr. p. 308; comp. Bähr, Olshausen, Steiger, Huther), the less admits of proof, because he is not speaking here of the pre-existence, but of the exalted Christ, distinct suspense in regard to his conception of this pre-existence. And Pfeiderer (in Hilgenfeld’s Zeitschr. 1871, p. 533) sees in the pre-existence a subjective product, the consequence, namely, of the fact that Christ is the ideal of the destiny of the human mind, hypostasized in a single person, to which is transferred the eternity and unchanged self-equality of the idea.

1 This is the chief point of agreement between our Epistle and the Epistle to the Hebrews; and it is explained by the Pauline basis and footing, on which the author of the latter stood. The subsequent ἔργον ἐν κ. ο. ἑ. 6, however, has nothing to do with ἔργον ἑ. 6, where the absolute word is rather to be explained in accordance with Rom. viii. 29. We make this remark in opposition to Holtzmann, according to whom “the aтор ad Ephesios as to his Christology walks in the track opened by the Epistle to the Hebrews.” Other apparent resemblances to this letter are immaterial, and similar ones can be gathered from all the Pauline letters.
including, therefore, His human nature; hence, also, the comparison with the angel Metatron of Jewish theology (comp. Hengstenberg, Christol. III. 2, p. 67) is irrelevant. The Fathers, moreover, have, in opposition to the Arians, rightly laid stress upon the fact (see Suicer, Thes. I. p. 415) that, according to the entire context, eikōn τοῦ Θεοῦ is meant in the eminent sense, namely of the adequate, and consequently consubstantial, image of God (μόνος ... καὶ ἀπαραλλάκτως εἰκῶν, Theophylact), and not as man (Gen. i. 26; comp. also 1 Cor. xi. 7; Col. iii. 10) or the creation (Rom. i. 20) is God’s image. In that case, however, the invisibility of the eikōn is not at all to be considered as presupposed (Chrysostom, Calovius, and others); this, on the contrary, pertains to the Godhead in itself (1 Tim. i. 17; Heb. xi. 27), so far as it does not present itself in its eikōn; whereas the notion of eikōn necessarily involves perceptibility (see above); “Dei asinpecti aspectabilitis imago,” Grotius. This visibility—and that not merely mental (Rom. i. 20)—had been experienced by Paul himself at his conversion, and at Christ’s Parousia will be fully experienced by all the world. Different from this is the (discursive) cognoscibility of God, which Christ has brought about by His appearance and working. John i. 18, xiv. 9. This applies against the view of Calvin, Clericus, and many others, including de Wette: “in His person, appearance, and operation ... God has made Himself as it were visible;” comp. Grotius: “Adam imago Dei fuit, sed valde tenuis; in Christo perfectissime apparuit, quam Deus esset sapiens, potens, bonus;” Baumgarten-Crusius: “the affinity to God (which is held to consist in the destination of ruling over the spirit-world) as Christ showed it upon earth.” Thus the substantiability of the exact image is more or less turned into a quasi or quodammodo, and the text is thus laid open to every kind of rationalizing caprice. We may add that Christ was already, as λόγος ἄσαρκος, necessarily the image of God, but ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, in purely divine glory; not, as after His exaltation, in divine-human δόξα; consequently, the doctrine of an eternal humanity of Christ (Beyschlag) is not to be based on eikōn τοῦ Θεοῦ. Comp. Wisd. vii. 26, and Grimm, Handb. p. 161 f. The idea, also, of the prototype of humanity, which
is held by Beyschlag here to underlie that of the image of God (comp. his Christol. p. 227), is foreign to the context. Certainly God has in eternity thought of the humanity which in the fulness of time was to be assumed by His Son (Acts xv. 18); but this is simply an ideal pre-existence (comp. Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 41 ff.), such as belongs to the entire history of salvation, very different from the real antemundane existence of the personal Logos. — πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως] After the relation of Christ to God now follows His relation to what is created, in an apologetic interest of opposition to the Gnostic false teachers; βουλεταί δείξαι, ὅτι πρὸ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως ἐστιν ὁ νῦν· πῶς ἄν; διὰ γενήσεως οὐκ οὐκ αὐτῷ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων πρότερος, καὶ οὕτως ὅτε καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκτίσεν αὐτούς, Theophylact. The false teachers denied to Christ the supreme unique rank in the order of spirits. But he is first-born of every creature, that is, born before every creature—having come to personal existence;¹ entered upon subsistent being, ere yet anything created was extant (Rom. i. 25, viii. 39; Heb. iv. 13). Analogous, but not equivalent, is Prov. viii. 22 f. It is to be observed that this predicate also belongs to the entire Christ, inasmuch as by His exaltation His entire person is raised to that state in which He, as to His divine nature, had already existed before the creation of the world, corresponding to the Johannine expression ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, which in substance, although not in form, is also Pauline; comp. Phil. ii. 6. Philo's term πρωτόγονος, used of the Logos, denotes the same relation; but it is not necessary to suppose that Paul appropriated from him this expression, which is also current among classical authors, or that the apostle was at all dependent on the Alexandrian philosophic view. The mode in which he conceived

¹ According to Hofmann (Schriftenw.), the expression is also intended to imply that the existence of all created things was brought about through Him. But this is only stated in what follows, and is not yet contained in σχισίνωσις by itself, which only posits the origin of Christ (as λόγος προφητείας) in His temporal relation to the creature; and this point is the more purely to be adhered to, seeing that Christ Himself does not belong to the category of the νεωσ. Calvin also has understood it as Hofmann does; comp. also Gess, v. d. Pers. Chr. p. 79, and Beyschlag, p. 446, according to whom Christ is at the same time to be designated as the principle of the creature, whose origin bears in itself that of the latter.
of the personal pre-existence of Christ before the world as regards (timeless) origin, is not defined by the figurative πρωτότοκος more precisely than as procession from the divine nature (Philo illustrates the relation of the origin of the Logos, by saying that the Father ἀνετεύλευ Him), whereby the premundane Christ became subsistent ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ and Ισα Θεό (Phil. ii. 6). The genitive πᾶσας κτίσεως, moreover, is not the partitive genitive (although de Wette still, with Usteri, Reuss, and Baur, holds this to be indubitable), because the anarthrous πᾶσα κτίσις does not mean the whole creation, or everything which is created (Hofmann), and consequently cannot affirm the category or collective whole¹ to which Christ belongs as its first-born individual (it means: every creature; comp. on πᾶσα οἰκοδομή, Eph. ii. 21 ²); but it is the genitive of comparison, corresponding to the superlative expression: “the first-born in comparison with every creature” (see Bernhardy, p. 139), that is, born earlier than every creature. Comp. Bähr and Bleek, Ernesti, Urspr. d. Stunde, I. p. 241; Weiss, Bibl. Theol. p. 424; Philippi, Glaubensl. II. p. 214, ed. 2. In Rev. i. 5, πρωτότοκ. τῶν νεκρῶν, the relation is different, τ. νεκρῶν pointing out the category; comp. πρωτότοκ. ἐν πολλοῖς ἁδ., Rom. viii. 29. The genitive here is to be taken quite as the comparative

¹ Comp. Stahlh. ad Plat. Rep. p. 608 C. The article would necessarily be added, as πᾶσα ἃ κτίσις, Judith xvi. 14, or ἃ πᾶσα κτίσις, 3 Mac. vi. 2, or ἃ κτίσις πᾶσα. Comp. also ἃ ἃ κτίσις, Wisd. xix. 6.

² Hofmann, Schriftenw. I. p. 156: “In relation to all that is created, Christ occupies the position which a first-born has towards the household of his father.” Essentially similar is his view in his Heil. Schr. N. T., p. 16, where ἃ κτίσις is held to mean “all creation,” and to signify “all that is created in its unity,” which is also the opinion of Rich. Schmidt, Paul. Christol. p. 211. The interpretation of Hofmann (comp. Gesa, Pers. Chr. p. 79) is incorrect, because there would thereby be necessarily affirmed a homogeneous relation of origin for Christ and all the κτίσεως. The κτίσις would stand to Christ in the relation of the μετα-παράστασις to the πρωτίστησις, of the λεγόμενα to the πρωτίστησις. Hofmann indeed (Heil. Schr. in loc.) opines that πᾶσα κτίσις is simply genitive “of the definition of relation.” But this, in fact, explains nothing, because the question remains, What relation is meant to be defined by the genitive? The πρωτίστησις πᾶσα κτίσις is not at all to be got over so easily as it is by Hofmann, namely, with a grammatically erroneous explanation of the anarthrous πᾶσα κτίσις, and with appeal to Ps. lxxxix. 28 (where, in fact, πρωτίστησις stands without genitive, and ἐν παλαιοτέρῳ the sense of the first rank).
genitive with πρῶτος; see on John i. 15, and generally, Kühner, II. 1, p. 335 f. The element of comparison is the relation of time (πρὸ τοῦ τῶν κόσμων εἰναι, John xviii. 5), and that in respect of origin. But because the latter in the case of every κτίσις is different from what it is in the case of Christ, neither πρωτόκτιστος nor πρωτόπλαστος is made use of,—terms which would indicate for Christ, who is withal Son of God, a similar mode of origin as for the creature—but the term πρωτότοκος is chosen, which, in the comparison as to time of origin, points to the peculiar nature of the origination in the case of Christ, namely, that He was not created by God, like the other beings in whom this is implied in the designation κτίσις, but born, having come forth homogeneous from the nature of God. And by this is expressed, not a relation homogeneous with the κτίσις (Holtzmann), a relation kindred to the world (Beyeschlag, Christol. p. 227), but that which is absolutely exalted above the world and unique. Theodoret justly observes: οὐ ός ἀδελφὴν ἔχων τὴν κτίσιν, ἀλλ’ ός πρὸ πάσης κτίσεως γεννηθεὶς. At variance with the words, therefore, is the Arian interpretation, that Christ is designated as the first creature; so also Usteri, p. 315, Schwegler, Baur, Reuss. With this view the sequel also conflicts, which describes Christ as the accomplisher and aim of creation; hence in His case a mode of origin higher and different from the being created must be presupposed, which is, in fact, characteristically indicated in the purposely-chosen word πρωτότοκος. The Socinian interpretation is also incorrect (Grotius, Wetstein, Nösselt, Heinrichs, and others), that κτίσις denotes the new ethical creation, along with which there is, for the most part, associated the reference of πρωτότοκος to the highest dignity (Pelagius, Melanch-

1 How much, however, the designations πρωτόκτιστος, κτίσις, κτίσισικον. &c., as applied to the origin of the Son, were in use among the Alexandrians (following Prov. viii. 22, where Wisdom says: οἵμαν ἐν τοῖς μια, comp. Ecclus. i. 4, xxiv. 8 f.), may be seen in Gieseler, Kirchengesch. i. 1, p. 327, ed. 4.

2 The Socinian doctrine argues thus: “primogenitum unum ex orum numero, quorum primogenitus est, esse necessa est;” but Christ could not be “unus e rebus conditionis creationis veterea,”—an assumption which would be Arian; He must consequently belong to the new creation, from which it follows, at the same time, that He does not possess a divine nature. See Catech. Racov. 167, p. 318, ed. Oeder.
thon, Cameron, Hammond, Zachariae, and others, including Storr and Flatt; comp. de Wette), which is assumed also by many who understand it of the physical creation. It is decisive against this interpretation, that κτίσις would necessarily require for the moral notion a more precise definition, either by a predicate (καυχή, 2 Cor. v. 17; comp. Barnabas, ep. c. xvi.: λαβόντες τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ἐπισκαντεὶς ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου, ἐγενόμεθα καυχοὶ, πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κτιζόμενοι), or at least by a context which admitted of no doubt; also, that πρωτότοκος never means the most excellent, and can only have this sense ex adjuncto (as at Ps. lxxxix. 28; Rom. viii. 29), which in this passage is not by any means the case, as the context (see ver. 16, and πρὸ πάντων in ver. 17; comp. also πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν in ver. 18) brings prominently forward the relation of time. Chrysostom justly says: οὐχ ἄξιος κ. τιμῆς, ἀλλὰ χρόνου μόνον ἐστὶ σημαντικόν, and already Theophilus, ad Autol. ii. 31, p. 172: ἐποτε δὲ ἡδέλησεν ὁ Θεὸς πασία διὰ ἐβουλεύσατο, τούτων τῶν λόγων ἐγένησε προφορικῶν, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως. This πρωτότοκον εἶναι belongs to the high dignity of Christ (comp. Rev. iii. 14: ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ), but it does not signify it. Comp. Justin, c. Try. 100: πρωτότοκον μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ κ. πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων. The ethical interpretation of the passage appears all the more mistaken, since according to it, even if πρωτότοκος is understood temporally (Baumgarten-Crusius: "κτίσις is that which is remodelled, and πρωτότοκος, He who has come first under this category, has first received this higher spiritual dignity"), Christ is made to be included under the κτίσις, which is at variance both with the context in ver. 16 f., and with the whole N. T. Christology, especially the sinlessness of Christ. If, however, in order to obviate this ground of objection, πρωτότοκος is combined as an adjective with εἰκὼν, we not only get a complicated construction, since both

1 Both errors of the Socinians, etc., are already present in Theodore of Mopsuestia, namely, that πρωτότοκος does not stand in χρόνον, but ἐκ πρωτομάτων, and signifies παρὰ τῶν τῆς κτίσεως πρωτομάτων; and that the following οὐδὲ μ. ὅ. does not denote τῷ πρωτότοκῳ, but τῶν ἐκ αὐτῷ γενομένων αὐτάκτων. Comp. also Photius, Amphil. 192.
words have their genitival definition, but πρωτότοκος (instead of πρωτότυπος) would be an inappropriate predicate for εἰκών. This applies against Schleiermacher, who, taking κτίσις as "disposition and arrangement of human things," educes the rationalizing interpretation, that Christ is in the whole compass of the spiritual world of man the first-born image, the original copy of God; that all believers ought to be formed in the image of Christ, and thence the image of God would likewise necessarily arise in them—an image of the second order. In the interest of opposition to heresy, some, following Isidore of Pelusium, Ep. iii. 31, p. 237, and Basil the Great, c. Eunom. iv. p. 104, have made the first-born even into the first-bringer-forth (πρωτοτόκος, as paroxytone, according to the classical usage, Hom. Il. xvii. 5; Plat. Theaeet. p. 161 A, 151 C; Valckenae, Schol. II. p. 389), as, with Erasmus in his Annot. (but only permissively) Erasmus Schmid and Michaelis did, although πρωτοτόκος in an active sense occurs only of the female sex, and the very πρωτότοκος ἐκ τ. νεκρ. of ver. 18 ought to have dissuaded from such an idea, to say nothing of the unfitness and want of delicacy of the figure\(^1\) as relating to Christ's agency in the creation of the world, and of the want of reference in the πρῶτον to the idea of a δεινερον—an idea which, with the usual interpretation, is implied in κτίσισεως.

—Ver. 15 f. is, moreover, strikingly opposed to that assumption of a world without beginning (Schleiermacher, Rothe).

Ver. 16. For in Him were all things created,—the logically correct confirmation of πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσισεως. For if the creation of all things took place in Christ, it is evident that He must stand before the series of created things, and be πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσισεως. — ἐν αὐτῷ is not equivalent to δι' αὐτοῦ (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Beza, Bleek, and many others), but: on Christ depended (causally) the act of creation, so that the latter was not done independently of Him—in a causal connection apart from Him—but it had in Him the ground essentially conditioning it. In Him lay, in fact, the potency of life, from which God made the work of creation proceed, inasmuch as He was the personal principle of the divine self-revelation, and therewith the accompisher of the

\(^1\) πρῶτον αὕτω κτίσισε, τῷ δὲ παντὶ κτισμένῳ τὸν κτίσει, Isidore, L.c.
divine idea of the world. A well-known classical usage to denote the dependence of a state of things, the causality of which is contained in any one. See Bernhardy, p. 210; Kühner, II. 1, p. 403 f.; from the N. T., Winer, p. 364 [E. T. 521]. Not as if the "causa principalis" of the creation lay in Christ, but the organic causality of the world's becoming created was in Him; hence the following δ' αὐτοῦ affirms not a different state of things, but the same thing under a varied form of conception and designation, by which it is brought out in greater definiteness. The primary ground of creation is ever God, Rom. xi. 36; 1 Cor. viii. 6; Heb. xi. 3. The speculative interpretation of scholastic theology, which found here the "causa exemplaris," according to which the idea omnium rerum was in Christ, is indeed followed in the main again by Bœschlag, as earlier by Kleuker, Böhmer, Bähr, Neander, Schleiermacher, Steiger, Julius Müller, Olshausen (the latter saying: "the Son of God is the intelligible world, the κόσμος νοητός, that is, things in their very idea; He bears their essence in Himself"), but is destitute of confirmation from the modes of conception and expression elsewhere in the N. T., and, as ἐκρισθη denotes the historical fact of the having been created, it would require not ἐν αὐτῷ, but ἐξ αὐτοῦ, by which the coming forth of the real from the ideal existence in Christ might be expressed. Huther finds the inward connection indicated by ἐν αὐτῷ in the idea, that the eternal essence of the universe is the divine essence itself, which in Christ became man. This idea in itself has no biblical ground; and Paul is speaking here, not of the existence and essence of the universe in Christ, but of the becoming created, which took place in Christ (ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, John i. 4), consequently of a divine act depending on Christ; comp. John i. 3: χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἐν ἀρχήν; Heb. i. 2; and Bleek in loc. Lastly, de Wette finds in ἐν besides the instrumental agency at the same time something of a telic idea (comp. also Ewald and Weiss, Bibl. Theol. p. 424 f.); but this blending together of two heterogeneous references is not justified by the δ' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν that follows. — ἐκρισθη] physical act of creation; Schleiermacher ought not to have called in question the
linguistic usage to this effect, with a view to favour the ethical interpretation of the founding of the church. See Wisd. i. 14, x. 1, xi. 18; Deut. iv. 32; comp. Gen. vi. 7; Ecclus. xxiv. 9, comp. xv. 14; Judith xiii. 18; comp. Gen. i. 1; 1 Cor. xi. 9; Eph. iii. 9; Rom. i. 25; Rev. x. 6, comp. xiv. 7. The word may have the meaning adopted by Schleiermacher: to obtain its arrangement and constitution (Herod. i. 149, 167, 168; Thuc. i. 100; Aesch. Choeph. 484; Soph. Ant. 1101; Pind. Ol. vi. 116; 3 Esdr. iv. 53), and that according to the relative nature of the notion implied in the word condere (comp. Blomf. Gloss. in Aesch. Pers. 294); but not here, where it is correlative with πάντας κτισθέντας, and where the quite general and in no way to be restricted τὰ πάντα follows. Throughout the N. T., in general κτίσω, κτίσις, κτίσμα, denote the original bringing forth, never merely the arrangement of that which exists; and even in such passages as Eph. ii. 10, 15, iv. 24, the relation is conceived, only in a popular manner, as actual creation.—Observe, moreover, the distinction of the tenses: ἐκτισθη, which denotes the act that took place; and then ἐκτιστάται, which denotes the creation which has taken place and now subsists. See Winer, p. 255 [E. T. 340]; Kühner, II. 1, p. 143 f., and ad Xen. Mem. iii. 1. 4, iii. 7. 7.—τὰ πάντα] the collective whole, namely, of what is created. This is then specified in a twofold way, as well in regard to place as in regard to nature.—τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς κ.τ.λ.] the things to be found in the heavens and those to be found on earth. This is certainly a less exact designation of all created things than that in Rev. x. 6 (τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ.; comp. Neh. ix. 6; Gen. ii. 1, et al.), but does not differ from it, as it does not exclude heaven and earth themselves, the constituent elements of which, in the popular view, are included in these two categories. Comp. 1 Chron. xxx. 11. It is incorrect, therefore, to press this expression in opposition to the explanation which refers it to the creation of the world (Wetstein: “non dicit ο οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐκτισθη sed τὰ πάντα, etc., quo habitatores significantur, qui reconciliandur,” comp. Heinrichs and others, also Catech. Raccov. 132, p. 214, ed. Oeder), and to think, with Schleiermacher, of the kingdom
of heaven; but it is arbitrary also, especially after τὰ πάντα, to make the apostle mean primarily the living (Bähr, de Wette) or rational creatures. The expression embraces everything; hence there was neither need for the mention of the lower world, nor, looking at the bipartite form of enumeration, occasion for it (it is otherwise in Phil. ii. 10; Rev. v. 3). The idea that Paul could not have adduced those under the earth as a special class of created beings, because God had not created them with the view of their being under the earth (de Wette), would imply a reflection alien to the vivid flow of the passage before us. — τὰ ὀρατὰ κ. τὰ ἀόρατα] By the latter is meant the heavenly world of spirits, the angelic commonwealth, as is evident from the more precise enumeration which follows, and not the souls of men (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others), which, on the contrary, as animating a portion of the ὀρατά, are included among the latter. Theodoret erroneously asserts that even τὰ ὀρατά applies to heavenly things (sun, moon, and stars); it applies to everything visible, as in Plat. Phaed. p. 79 A: θώμεν ὄν, εἰ βούλει, ἐφη, δύο εἰδή τῶν ὄρων τό μὲν ὀρατόν, τό δὲ ἄριστος. — The ἀόρατα are now more precisely specified disjunctively by ἅτε, sive . . . sive (put more than twice; comp. Plat. Rep. p. 612 A, 493 D; Ecclus. xli. 4). As to the four denominations of angels which follow—whose difference of rank Hofmann groundlessly denies, understanding thereby merely "spirits collectively, of whatever name they may be"—see on Eph. i. 21; Rom. viii. 38. In accordance with Eph. i. 21, where the grades of angels are mentioned in descending order, the arrangement here must be understood so, that the θρόνοι are the highest and the κυριώτητες the lowest class, the ἀρχαι and the ἐξουσίαι being two middle orders lying between these two extremes. At Eph. i.c. Paul names also four grades of the angelic hierarchy; but neither there nor here has he intended to give a complete enumeration of them, for in the former case he omits the θρόνοι, and in the latter the διανάψεις. The θρόνοι are not mentioned elsewhere in the N. T. (nor yet in Ignat. ad Trall. 5), but they occur in the Test. Levi, p. 548, in

which they are placed in the seventh heaven (εν φ άλ ημνος τός θεός προσφέρονται), also in Dionys. Areop. Hier. coel. 6 ff., and in the Rabbins (Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. p. 1097; Schoettgen, Hor. p. 808). As regards the expression, the last three denominations are to be taken as abstracts, which represent the respective concretes, and analogously the concrete noun θρόνος is used for those to be found on the thrones (for those enthroned); comp. Kühner, II. 1, p. 11; Ruhnken, ad Tim. p. 190. In this case the very natural supposition that the angels, whose designation by the term θρόνος must have been in current use, were, in the imagery which gave sensuous embodiment to religious ideas, conceived as on thrones, is not to be called in question (in opposition to Fritzsch, ad Rom. II. p. 226). They were probably conceived as enthroned round the throne of God (comp. Rev. iv. 4, xx. 4). It is to be observed, moreover, generally that Paul presupposes the various classes of angels, which he names, as well known; although we are unacquainted with the details of the case, this much is nevertheless certain, that the apostle was far removed from the dreamy fancies indulged in on this point by the later Rabbins (see Eisenmenger, entdeckt. Judenth. II. p. 374). But very soon after the apostolic age (comp. Hermas, Past. vis. iii. 4), instruction as to τοποθεσίας τῶς ἄγγελων was regarded as teaching for the more perfect. See Ignatius, ad Trall. 5. For the Christian faith there remains and suffices the testimony as to different and distinctively designated stages and categories in the angelic world, while any attempt to ascertain more than is written in Scripture passes into the fanciful domain of theosophy.—With ἐξουσίας is concluded the confirmatory sentence (ὅτι), so that a full stop is to be placed after ἐξουσίας. With τὰ πάντα begins a new sentence, in which τὰ πάντα and αὐτός correspond to one another; hence a comma only must stand after ἐκπίτασι. There is no reason for placing (with Lachmann) τὰ πάντα down to ἐκπίτασι in a parenthesis. —τὰ πάντα δὲ αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.] a solemn recapitulation, but in such a way that, instead of the act of crea-

1 Ewald well says: "Just at this point the discourse breaks forth as if with fresh force, so as once more to express as clearly as possible the whole in all conceivable temporal relations."
tion previously mentioned, there is now presented the finished and ready result (ἐκτισταῖ); the causal relation which was previously denoted by ἐν is now more precisely indicated as a relation of mediate agency (ὅπερ αἰτοῦ, comp. 1 Cor. viii. 6); then in εἰς αἰτοῦ a new element is added, and the emphasis which in ver. 16 lay on ἐκτισθη, is now laid on τὰ πάντα which stands at the head of the sentence. We cannot say with Hofmann, that by ὅπερ αἰτοῦ and εἰς αἰτοῦ the Son comes to stand in contradistinction to what has been created as Creator, after by ἐν αἰτῶ the creative act has been presented as one that had taken place only not without the Son. By the latter, ἐν αἰτῶ would become too general and indefinite a thought; while ὅπερ αἰτοῦ in fact leaves the Father as the Creator, which He is, and predicates of the Son merely the "causa medians" of the execution of the work, just as εἰς αἰτοῦ predicates the "causa finalis" of the same.—εἰς αἰτοῦ] in reference to Him, for Him, as the aim and end, "in quo Pater acquiescit," Beza. Comp. Rom. xi. 36; 1 Cor. viii. 6; Barnab. Ep. 12: ἐν αἰτῶ τὰ πάντα καὶ εἰς αἰτοῦ. The more exact purport of this relation is apparent from all that follows down to ver. 20. Everything, namely, is created, in order to be dependent on Christ and to serve His will and aim.¹ Comp. on Eph. i. 23, iv. 10; Phil. ii. 9 ff. The final cause of the world, referred in Rom. xi. 36 to God, is here affirmed of Christ, and with equal right; for He, as He was the organ of God in creation, is the commissioned ruler to whom the κυρίωτης τῶν πάντων is committed (Matt. xxviii. 18; Phil. ii. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 27; Heb. ii. 8), in order that everything created may have the ethical telic destination of serving Him.² More

¹ And, if the world was created not merely ὅπερ αἰτῶ, but also εἰς αἰτωῖ, consequently in telic reference to Him, it is certain that with the counsel of creation there was also posited, in prospect of the entry of sin, the counsel of redemption. Comp. Thomasius, Christi Pers. u. Werk. I. p. 196 ff.; Julius Müller, Dogm. Abhand. p. 121 ff.

² This εἰς αἰτωῖ is wrongly found incompatible with 1 Cor. viii. 6 (see, after Mayerhoff, Beur, and others, especially Holtzmann, p. 219), where, in fact, it is said of the ethical existence of Christians that they exist for God through Christ, inasmuch as the subject of εἰς αἰτωῖ (for God) and of ὅπερ αἰτῶ (through Christ) is not the universe, but the ἄνθρωπ. The relation of subordination between Father and Son would be only done away with at our passage, in the event of its being
special definitions of the meaning of εἰς αἰρόν are without due warrant, and in particular, the often-repeated one: to His glorification (Besa, Flatt, Böhmer, and others); it lays down Christ in general as the legitimus finis (Calvin). — The expositors, who explain the words as referring to the new moral creation, have summoned to their aid all kinds of arbitrary conjectures in detail — a remark which applies not merely to Nösselt, Heinrichs, and others, but also to Schleiermacher, who holds (comp. Baumgarten-Crusius) that τὰ ἐν τῷ ὦδ. is everything that belongs to the kingdom of heaven, and τὰ ἐπὶ τῷ ἐνσ. everything which belongs to civil order in earthly kingdoms; that τὰ ὀφαντά and τὰ ὀφαντα apply only to the latter; that the ὑπόνοι αἰ.λ. are magisterial offices, and the like.

Ver. 17. Καὶ αἰρός] which is to be separated from the preceding by a comma only (see on ver. 16), places, in contradistinction to the created objects in ver. 16 (τὰ πάντα), the subject, the creating self: “and He Himself, on His part, has an earlier existence than all things, and the collective whole subsists in Him.” Never is αἰρός in the nominative the mere unemphatic “he” of the previous subject (de Wette), either in Greek authors or in the N. T., not even in passages such as Buttmann (Neut. Gr. p. 94 [E. T. 107]) brings forward; see Fritzsche, ad Matth. p. 47; Winer, p. 141 f [E. T. 187]; Kühlner, II. 1, p. 563. — πρὸ τῶν] like πρωτότοκος, referring to time, not to rank (as the Socinians, Nösselt, Heinrichs, Schleiermacher, Baumgarten-Crusius, and

said of Christ that τὰ πάντα were created ἵνα αἰρότε. But by ἵνα αἰρότε, and by the more precise definition ἵνα αἰρότει, it is guarded; and the subordination remains unaffected by the circumstance that the ἵνα αἰρότε is laid down by God for the world as its telic aim. This ἵνα αἰρότε is the necessary preliminary condition, on God’s part, to the universal dominion which he has destined for Christ, and which the latter shall one day, at the goal of consummation, hand over to the Father (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28). Moreover, what Paul says of the σείς in Rom. viii. is essentially connected with that ἵνα αἰρότε, which does not go beyond Paul or come at all into opposition to him. The resemblance of our passage to ἱς αἰφόρος καὶ ἵνα ἰησοῦς, Rev. i. 17, xxii. 13, rests upon the Christological basis of their common faith, not upon a dependence of our epistle on the Apocalypse, which would doubtless imply a post-Pauline date (in opposition to Holtmann, p. 247).

1 Bengel correctly observes on ver. 16: “Ipse hic saepe positum magnam significant majestatem et omnem excludit creaturam.”
others hold); Paul thus *repeatedly and emphatically lays stress* on the pre-existence of Christ. Instead of ἦν, he *might* have written ήν (John i. 1); but he makes use of the former, because he has in view and sets forth the *permanence* of Christ’s existence, and does not wish to narrate about Him historically, which is done only in the auxiliary clauses with οὖς, vv. 16 and 19. On the present, comp. John viii. 58. His existence is more ancient than that of all things (ναύτῶν, not masculine, as the Vulgate and Luther translate). — ἐν αὐτῷ] as in ver. 16, referring to the *causal dependence* of the subsistence of all existing things on Christ. — συνέστηθη] denotes the subsistence of the whole, the state of lasting interdependence and order,—an idea which is not equivalent to that of creation, but presupposes it. Reiske, *Ind. Dem.* ed.: Schaeff. p. 481: “Corpus unum, integrum, perfectum, secum consentiens esse et permanere.” Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 5; Plat. *Rep.* p. 530 A: ἐνεστάναι τῷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ δημιουργῷ αὐτῶν τε καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, *Tim.* p. 61 A: γῆν... συνέστηκαν, *Legg.* vii. p. 817 B: ἡ πολιτεία συνέστηκε μίμησις τοῦ καλλιότου... βίον. Herod. vii. 225; Philo, *quis rer. div. haer.* p. 489: ὁ ἐναίμος ὁγκός, ἐξ ἐαυτοῦ διαλυτὸς δὲν καὶ νεκρὸς, συνέστηκε κ. ζωτυρεῖται προνοίᾳ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. It expresses that there is in Christ not merely the creative cause, but also the cause which brings about organic *stability and continuance* in unity (preserving and governing) for the whole of existing things. Comp. Heb. i. 3. Of attempts at explanation under the *moral* interpretation, we may note that of Schleiermacher: the *consolidating of earthly relations* and institutions; and that of Baumgarten-Crusius: “in this new world He is Lord in recognition and in sway.”

**Remark.**—The intentional prominence given to the fact of the creation of all things through Christ, and in particular of the creation of the angels in their various classes, justifies the supposition that the false teachers disparaged Christ in this respect, and that they possessed at least elements of the Gnostic-*demiurgic* doctrine which was afterwards systematically elaborated. There is no evidence, however, of their particular views, and the further forms assumed by the Gnostic elements,
as they showed themselves according to the Fathers in *Simon Magus* (Iren. *Haer.* i. 20: "Eunoiam ... generare angelos et potestates, a quibus et mundum hunc factum dixit;" comp. Epiph. *Haer.* xxi. 4), *Cerinthus*, etc., and especially among the *Valentinians*, while certainly to be recognised as fundamentally akin to the Colossian doctrinal errors (comp. Heinrici, *Valentinian Gnosis*, 1871), are not to be identified with them; nor are those elements to be made use of as a proof of the post-apostolic origin of the epistle, as still is done by Hilgenfeld (see his *Zeitschr.* 1870, p. 246 ff.), and more cautiously by Holtzmann. Of Ebionitism only *Essene* elements are to be found in Colossae, mingled with other Gnostic doctrines, which were not held by the later Ebionites. In particular, the ἡ τῶν ἑαυτῶν ἀνθρώπων, on which Paul lays so much stress, must have been doubted in Colossae, although a portion of the Ebionites expressly and emphatically taught it (ἵνα τῶν ἑαυτῶν ἀνθρώπων τῆς κτισθήσεως, Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 3). Moreover, the opinion that Paul derived the appellations of the classes of angels in ver. 16 from the language of the heretics themselves (Böhmer, comp. Olshausen) is to be rejected, because in other passages also, where there is no contrast to the Gnostic doctrine of *Aeons*, he makes use in substance of these names (Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. xv. 24; comp. Eph. i. 20 ff., iii. 10, vi. 11 ff.). They are rather to be regarded as well-known and generally-current appellations, which were derived from the terminology of later Judaism, and which heretics made use of in common with the orthodox. The anti-Gnostic element is contained, not in the technical expressions, but in the doctrinal contents of the passage; and it was strong enough to induce Marcion, who took offence at it, to omit vv. 15–17 (Tertullian, *c. Marcion*, v. 19). See, besides, Räbiger, *Christol. Paul.* p. 51 f.; Lechler, *apost. Zeit.* p. 55 f.; Klöpper, l.c.

Ver. 18. *Second* part (see on ver. 15) of the exhibition of the exaltedness of Christ. To that which Christ is as ἀνθρώπως πάσης κτίσεως (vv. 16, 17) is now added what He is as ἀνθρώπως ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, namely, the Head of the Church, and thus His πρωτεύειν has its consummation (ἐν πάσιν). The latter, namely, ἐν γάρ ταῦτα ... πρωτεύειν, embraces also a retrospect to that ἀνθρώπως πάσης κτίσεως, and includes it in ἐν πάσιν, without its being necessary, however, to attach ver. 18 to the carrying out of the relation to the world expressed
in πρωτότοκ. ἐν. κτῶν. (Hofmann, comp. Rich. Schmidt). The perspective proceeds from the dignity of the original state of our Lord to that of His state as Saviour, from His cosmic to His soteriological glory, and so at length exhibits Him to view as the ἐν πάσιν πρωτεύων. — That ver. 18, with its confirmation in ver. 19 f., has an apologetic reference to the Gnostic false teaching, must be assumed from its connection with what goes before. The passage is to be looked upon as antagonistic to the worship of angels (ii. 18), which disparaged Christ in His dignity as Head of the Church, but not (in opposition to Bähr and Huther) as antagonistic to a theological dogma, such as is found in the Cabbala, according to which the body of the Messiah (the Adam Kadmon) is the aggregate of the emanations. For the emphasis of the passage and its essential point of doctrine lie in the fact that Christ is the Head of the church, and not in the fact that He is the head of the church; it is not the doctrine of another σῶμα, but that of any other πρωτεύων, which is excluded. — καὶ αὐτός] stands again, as κ. αὐτός in ver. 17, in significant reference to τὰ πάντα: et ipse, in quo omnia consistunt, est caput, etc., so that the passage continues to divide itself as into the links of a chain. — τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας.] to be taken together; the second genitive is that of apposition (Winer, p. 494 [E. T. 666]), which gives to the word governing it concrete definiteness; comp. Müller in the Luther. Zeitschr. 1871, p. 611 ff. On the familiar Pauline mode of considering the church of believers, livingly and actively ruled by Christ as the head (Eph. iii. 10; Phil. iii. 6; Acts ix. 31), as His body, comp. 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 12 ff., 27; Eph. i. 23, iv. 12, v. 23, 30; Rom. xii. 5. — δς ἐστιν κ.τ.λ.] expository relative clause (as in ver. 15), the contents of which are related by way of confirmation to the preceding statement (Matthiae, p. 1061 f.; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 2. 64; Stallbaum, ad Phil. p. 195 f.),

1 In which is expressed the idea of the invisible church. Comp. Julius Müller, Dogmat. Abh. p. 316 ff. And this conception and representation belong quite to the apostle’s general sphere of ideas, not specially to that of the Epistle to the Ephesians, into which the interpolator is supposed by Holtzmann again to enter here, after he has manifested a comparative independence in vv. 15–18.
like our: _he, who, etc., which might be expressed, but not necessarily, by ὅτις (or ὅτις). Comp. on Eph. i. 14. If Christ had not risen, He would not be Head of the church (Acts ii. 24-36; 1 Cor. xv.; Rom. i. 4, et al.).— ἀρχή] beginning; which, however, is not to be explained either as “initium secundae et novae creationis” (Calvin), progenitor of the regenerate (Bisping), or “author of the church” (Baumgarten-Crusius), or even “ruler of the world” (Storr, Flatt); but agreeably to the context in such a way, as to make it have with the appositional πρωτότοκος its definition in ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, just as if the words ran: ἀρχή τῶν νεκρῶν, πρωτότοκος ἐκ αὐτῶν, although Paul did not express himself thus, because at once upon his using the predicate ἀρχή in and by itself the exegetical πρωτότοκος suggested itself to him. Accordingly Christ is called ἀρχή (τῶν νεκρῶν), inasmuch as Ἐκ is among all the dead the first arisen to everlasting life. It is arbitrary to discover in ἀρχή an allusion to the offering of first-fruits sanctifying the whole mass (Chrysostom, Beza, Ewald, and others); especially as the term ἄπαρχη, which is elsewhere used for the first portion of a sacrifice (Rom. xi. 16), is not here employed, although it has crept in from 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23, in a few minuscui and Fathers, as in Clement also, Cor. I. 24, Christ is termed ἄπαρχη τῆς ἀναστάσεως. To assume a reminiscence of 1 Cor. xv. (Holtzmann) is wholly unwarranted, especially as ἄπαρχη is not used. On ἀρχή, used of persons, denoting the one who begins the series, as the first in order of time, comp. Gen. xlix. 3, where ἀρχή τέκνων μου is equivalent to πρωτότοκος μου, as also Deut. xxi. 17. In what respect any one is ἄρχη of those concerned, must be yielded by the context, just as in this case it is yielded by the more precisely defining πρωτότοκος ἐκ τ. νεκρῶν; hence it has been in substance correctly explained, following the Fathers: ἀρχή, φησίν, ἐστι τῆς ἀναστάσεως, ποιεῖν πάντων ἀναστάσας,1 Theophylact.

1 The Fathers have already correctly judged that even in regard to the isolated cases of rising from the dead, which have taken place through Christ and before Him, Christ remains the first-risen. Theophylact: οἱ χάρι καὶ ἄλλα πρὸ τῶν ἀναστάσεως, ἄλλα τὰλιν ἀνάλογα: αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς τελεῖν ἄνασταις ἄνευ. Comp. on 1 Cor. xv. 20.
Only ἡς ἀναστάσεως is not to be mentally supplied, nor is it to be conjectured (de Wette) that Paul had intended to write ἄρχῃ τ. ἀναστάσεως, but, on account of the word πρωτότοκος presenting itself to him from ver. 15, did not complete what he had begun. It follows, moreover, from the use of the word πρωτότοκος, that ἄρχῃ is to be taken in the temporal sense, consequently as equivalent to primus, not in the sense of dignity (Wetstein), and not as principle (Bähr, Steiger, Huther, Dalmer, following earlier expositors). — πρωτότοκος ἐκ τ. νεκρ. is conceived in the same way as in ἀναστήματος ἐκ τ. νεκρ. (Eph. v. 14), so that it is the dead in Hades among whom the Risen One was, but from whom He goes forth (separates Himself from them, hence also ἀπὸ τ. νεκρ., Matt. xiv. 2, xxvii. 64, xxviii. 7), and returning into the body, with the latter rises from the tomb. Comp. πρωτός ἐλξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Acts xxvi. 23, also 1 Cor. xv. 22 f. This living exit from the grave is figuratively represented as birth; comp. Rev. i. 5, where the partitive genitive τῶν νεκρ. (not ἐκ τ. ν.) yields a form of conceiving the matter not materially different. Calvin takes πρωτότοκος ἐκ τ. ν. as specifying the ground for ἄρχῃ: "principium (absolutely), quia primogenitus est ex mortuis; nam in resurrectione est rerum omnium instauratio." Against this it may be urged, that ἄρχῃ has no more precise definition; Paul must have written either ἄρχῃ τῆς καθίσματος κτισμος, or at least ἡς instead of ἤς. Calvin was likewise erroneously of opinion (comp. Erasmus, Calvinius) that Christ is called Primogenitus ex mortuis, not merely because He was the first to rise, but also "quia restituit alii vitam." This idea is not conveyed either by the word or by the context, however true may be the thing itself; but a belief in the subsequent general resurrection of the dead is the presupposition of the expression πρωτότοκος (αἰνίττεται δὲ ὁ λόγος καὶ τῆς πάντων ἡμῶν ἀναστάσις, Theodoret). This expression is purposely chosen in significant reference to ver. 15, as is intimated by Paul himself in the following ἡ λα γένηται ἐν ταῖς κ.τ.λ. But it is thus all the more certain, that πρωτότοκος ἐκ τ. νεκρ. is to be taken independently, and not adjectivally together with ἄρχῃ (Heinrichs, Schleiermacher, Ewald), which
would only amount to a tautological verboseness (first-born beginning); and, on the other hand, that ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν may not be separated from πρωτότοκος in such a way as to emphasize the place, issuing forth from which Christ is what He is, namely, ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος; the former, "as the personal beginning of what commences with Him;" the latter, "in the same relation to those who belong to the world therewith coming into life as He held to the creation" (Hofmann). In this way the specific more precise definition, which is by means of ἐκ τ. νεκρῶν in significant reference to ver. 15 attached to the predicates of Christ, ἀρχή and πρωτότοκος, would be groundlessly withdrawn from them, and these predicates would be left in an indefiniteness, in which they would simply be open vessels for receiving a gratuitously imported supplement. — ἵνα γένηται κ.τ.λ.] not to be restricted to the affirmation ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν (Hofmann),¹ but to be referred to the whole sentence that Christ is ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τ. νεκρ., expressing the divine teleology of this position of Christ as the Risen One: in order that He may become, etc.; not: in order "that He may be held as" (Baumgarten-Crusius), nor yet "that He may be" (Vulgate, and so most expositors), as γενεσθαι and εἶναι are never synonymous. The ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύει is looked upon by Paul as something which is still in course of development (comp. Steiger and Huther), and is only to be completed in the future, namely, when the Risen One shall have conquered all the power of the enemy (1 Cor. xxv. 25 f.) and have erected the kingdom of the Messiah—but of this result His resurrection itself was the necessary historical basis, and hence the future universal πρωτεύει is the divinely intended aim of His being risen.—ἐν πᾶσιν] in all points, without excepting any relation, not, therefore, merely in the relation of creation (vv. 15–17). Comp. Phil. iv. 12; 1 Tim. iii. 11, iv. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 7, iv. 5; Tit. ii. 9; Heb. xiii. 4, 18. Ἐν παρθένι is more commonly used by Paul (1 Cor. i. 5; 2 Cor. iv. 8, et al.). According to Beza, παρθένος is masculine: "inter omnes, videlicet fratres, ut Rom. viii. 29." So also

¹ So that it would express the design, which Christ Himself had in His coming forth from the dead.
Kypke and Heinrichs. But this would be here, after the universal bearing of the whole connection, much too narrow an idea, which, besides, is self-evident as to the Head of the church. According to Pelagius, it denotes: "tam in visibilibus quam in invisibilibus creaturis." At variance with the text; this idea was conveyed by vv. 16, 17, but in ver. 18 another relation is introduced which does not refer to created things as such. — αὑτὸς] emphatic, as in vv. 17, 18. — πρωτεύων] having the first rank, not used elsewhere in the N. T., but see Esth. v. 11; 2 Macc. vi. 18, xiii. 15; Aquila, Zech. iv. 7; Plat. Legg. iii. p. 692 D, Dem. 1416. 25: πρωτεύων εν ἀπασι κράτισιν. Xen. Cyr. viii. 2. 15; Mem. ii. 6. 26. This precedence in rank is to be the final result of the condition which set in with the πρωτότοκον ἐλαῖ ἐκ τ. νεκρ.; but it is not contained in this πρωτότοκον ἐλαῖ itself,—an idea against which the very ἵνα γένηται is logically decisive (in opposition to de Wette’s double signification of πρωτότοκον).

Ver. 19.1 "Οτί] Confirmatory of the ἵνα γένηται κ.τ.λ., just said: "about which divinely intended γενεσθαι εν πάσιν αὐτῶν πρωτεύοντα there can be no doubt, for it has pleased, that in Him, etc." How could He, who was thus destined to be possessor of the divine fulness and reconciler of the world, have been destined otherwise than to become εν πάσιν πρωτεύον! This confirmation, therefore, does not refer to the statement that Christ is the Head of the church (Steiger, Huther, comp. Calovius), which has already its confirmation by means of ἐς ἐστιν ἀρχὴ κ.τ.λ., nor at all to ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν (Hofmann, following up his incorrect explanation of these words), as if the reason were specified why Christ should have gone to His high dignity as beginner of a new world by the path of deepest abasement—a thought which Paul would have known how to express quite differently (comp. Phil. ii. 7 ff.) than by the bare ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν.

1 Holtzmann, after having rejected vv. 14–18 entirely as an interpolation, allows to stand as original in vv. 19, 20 only the words: ἵνα εἰς ἑαυτὴν ἑαυτάλληλον πανταλληλέξιν, to which πανταλλατ. there is then attached in ver. 21, as object, καὶ ἵππας, also you, with reference to ἵππας in ver. 13. How daring and violent, and yet how paltry (rescuing merely the καὶ ἵππας), would the procedure of the author thus have been!
which is currently used everywhere of resurrection from death, and without conveying any special significance of humiliation. Nor yet does Paul move in a circle, by putting forward in ver. 19 as ground of proof that from which in ver. 15 (ὅστις εἰκὼν κ.τ.λ.) he had started (de Wette); for ver. 19 is a historical statement (observe the aorists), whereas ver. 15 expressed what Christ is, His habitual being. — ἐν αὐτῷ] although belonging to κατοικεῖ, is prefixed in emphatic transposition (Kühner, II. 2, p. 1101). — εἰδοκεῖσθαι] He was pleased, placuit ei, that, etc. As to this use of εἰδοκεῖν in the later Greek (1 Cor. i. 21; Gal. i. 15, et al.), for which, in the classical language, δοκεῖ merly was employed, see Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 370. On the accusative with infinitive, comp. 2 Macc. xiv. 35; Polyb. i. 8. 4. The subject, whose pleasure it is, is not expressed; but that it is God, is obvious from the context, which in ἥν γένηται κ.τ.λ. has just stated the divine purpose. Among Greek authors also δὸ Θεὸς is not unfrequently omitted, where it is self-evident as the subject. See Kühner, II. 1, p. 30 c. According to Ewald and Ellicott (also Weiss, Bibl. Theol. p. 428, ed. 2, and Rich. Schmidt, Paul. Christol. p. 208), τὰν τὸ πλήρωμα is the subject; and the whole fulness is a new expression for the Godhead, inasmuch as, going as it were out of itself, it fills something separate and thus becomes visible (= μὴ ἔχειν, δόξα, λόγος, πνεῦμα). Without support from N. T. usage; τὰν, too, would be unsuitable for the subject of εἰδοκεῖσθαι; and εἰς αὐτόν in ver. 29 clearly shows that Θεὸς is conceived as subject, to which εἰρηνοτοσιθείσας then refers. According to Hofmann (comp. also his Schriftheiz. II. 1, p. 357 f.), Christ is meant to be the subject of εἰδοκεῖ. Ver. 20 itself, and Eph. i. 9, ought to have precluded this error. Throughout the whole of the N. T. it is never Christ, but always the Father, who in respect to the work of redemption to be executed gives the decree, while Christ executes it as obedient to the Father; hence also Paul, “beneficium Christi commemorans, nunquam dimittit memoriam Patris,” Bengel. Comp. Reiche, Comment. crit. p. 263.— τὰν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικεῖ,] that in Him the whole fulness was to take up its abode. The more precise definition of the absolute τὰν τὸ πλήρωμα
is placed beyond doubt by the subject to be mentally supplied with εὐδόκησε, namely, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ (Eph. iii. 19; comp. τὸ πλήρ. τῆς θεότητος, Col. ii. 9). Τὸ πλήρωμα, the signification of which is not to be defined actively: id quod rem implet (in opposition to Storr, Opusc. I. p. 144 ff., Bähr, Steiger), but passively: id quo res impletur (see generally on Eph. i. 10, iii. 19, Fritzsché, ad Rom. II. p. 469), has here, as in Eph. iii. 9, the derivative general notion of copia, πλοῦτος, like the German Fülle. What is meant, namely, is the whole charismatic riches of God, His whole gracious fulness of εὐλογία πνευματικῆ (Eph. i. 3), of which Christ became permanent (κατοκῆσαι) possessor and bearer, who was thereby capable of fulfilling the divine work of reconciliation (see the following καὶ δι’ αὐτὸν ἀποκαταλλάξαι κ.τ.λ.). The case is otherwise in ii. 9, where the divine essence (τῆς θεότητος) is indicated as the contents of the πλήρωμα, and the κατοκησίων of the same in Christ is affirmed as present and with reference to His state of exaltation. It would be an utterly arbitrary course mentally to supply here the τῆς θεότητος, ii. 9, and to regard both passages as an echo of Eph. i. 23, where the notion of πλήρωμα is a very different one (in opposition to Holtzmann). Inasmuch as the charismatic πλήρωμα of God, meant in our passage, dwelt in Christ, and consequently Christ was the possessor and disposer of it, this divine fulness is not in substance different from the πλήρωμα Χριστοῦ, out of which grace passed over to men (John i. 16; Eph. iv. 13). The thought and expression in 1 Cor. xv. 28 are different from our passage, and different also from Eph. i. 23. Beza aptly observes: "cumulatissima omnium divinarum rerum copia, quam scholastici gratiam habitualem...appellant, ex qua in Christo, tanquam inexhausto fonte, omnes gratiae in nos pro cujusque membra modulo deriventur;" comp. also Bleek. Observe, at the same time, the stress lying on the πᾶν, in contrast to a merely partial imparting out of this fulness, which would have been inadequate to the object of reconciling the universe. The ontological interpretation of the "fulness of

---

1 Hence not: "la totalité de l'être qui doit être réalisée dans le monde," Sabatier, l'apôtre Paul, p. 209.
the nature of God” (Huther, Dalmer, Weiss; Oecumenius, and Theodoret: the nature of the Θεὸς λόγος; Calovius and others: of the communicatio hypostatica, that is, of the absolute immanence of God in Him, comp. Ernesti, Urspr. d. Sünde, I. p. 222; Rich. Schmidt, Paul. Christol. p. 201) does not correspond to the idea of εὐδοκησεν, for doubtless the sending of the Son, and that with the whole treasure of divine grace, into the world (John iii. 17) for behoof of its reconciliation and blessedness, was the act of the divine pleasure and resolve; but not so the divine nature in Christ, which was, on the contrary, necessary in Him,¹ although by His incarnation He emptied Himself of the divine mode of appearance (δόξα or μορφή, Phil. ii. 6 ff.). The divine nature is presupposed in what is here said of Christ. Comp. Gess, v. d. Pers. Christi, p. 85. Some (see especially Steiger, Bähr, and Reuss) have regarded τὸ πλήρωμα as derived from the Gnostic terminology of the false teachers, who might perhaps, like Valentinus, have given this name to the aggregate of the Aeons (see Baur, Gnosis, p. 157),² and in opposition to whom

¹ As in the Son of God in the metaphysical sense; hence the original being of God in Him cannot be conceived merely as ideal, which was to develope itself into reality, and the realization of which, when it at length became perfect, made Him the absolute abode of the fulness of Godhead. See Beyschlag, Christol. p. 232 f., according to whom Christ would be conceived as “man drawing down upon himself” this indwelling of God. He is conceived as the incarnate Son (comp. ver. 18 ff.), who, in accordance with the Father’s decree, has appeared as bearer of the whole fulness of salvation. For He was its dwelling not merely in principle, but in fact and reality, when He appeared, and He employed it for the work, which the Father desired to accomplish by Him (ver. 20). Comp. Gal. iv. 4; Rom. viii. 3. The indwelling of the σῶς τὸ πλήρωμα He had not, indeed, to achieve by his own effort; but He had, in obedience towards the Father, to preserve (comp. Heb. iv. 15), apply, communicate it; and so this indwelling is—not merely in the risen One, but in His very work on the cross—the presupposition of the universal reconciliation, ver. 20.

² Baur himself (Paulus, II. p. 12 ff.) likewise explains πλήρωμα from the technical language of the Gnostics, especially of the Valentinian doctrine of Aeons, but finds the Gnosticism to belong to the (post-apostolic) writer of the epistle. According to Baur (see his Neuest. Theol. p. 258), Christ is the πλήρωμα of God as He “in whom that which God is in Himself, according to the abstract idea of His nature, is filled with its definite concrete contents.” Comp. also Hilgenfeld in his Zeitschr. 1870, p. 247, according to whom our passage is intended to affirm that the Pleroma of divine nature is to be sought not in the proximate series of the Aeons of the Gnostics, but in Christ alone. Holtzmann, with
Paul maintains that in Jesus there dwells the **totality** of all divine powers of life, and not merely a single emanated spirit; but this view is all the more unwarranted, because Paul himself does not intimate any such polemical destination of the word; on the contrary, in Eph. iii. 19 also he uses πάν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ evidently without any reference of the kind. And if he had wished to state the whole fulness of the efflux of divine power in contrast to an asserted single emanation, he must have prefixed, not ἐν αὐτῷ (in Him and in none other), but πάν (the whole πλήρωμα, not merely a single constituent element of it) with the main emphasis, and have logically said: ὅτι πάν τὸ πλήρωμα εὐδοκησεν ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικήσας. Hofmann (comp. his Schriftenw. p. 29, 359), who in general has quite misunderstood ver. 19 f. (comp. above on εὐδοκησεν), takes πάν τὸ πλήρωμα as "the one-like totality of that which is," and holds that the will of Christ (to which εὐδοκ. applies) can only have been, "that that may come to dwell in Him, which otherwise would not be in Him, consequent not what is in God, but what is out of God." This idea of the immanent indwelling of the universe in Christ, repeated by Schenkel in the sense of Christ being the archetype, would be entirely alien to the N. T. view of the relation of Christ to the world, and is not indicated either at Eph. i. 10 or here in the context by τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκαν. Christ is not the place for the world, so that ultimately all come to dwell in Him, as all has been created in Him and has in Him its subsistence; but the world originated and maintained through Him, which He was to redeem, is the place for Him. If Paul had really entertained the obscure paradoxical conception attributed to him by Hofmann, he would have known how to express it simply by τὸ πάν (οὐτὰ τὰ πάντα) κατοικήσας, or by τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ παντοτός (οὐπάν πάντων) κατοικήσας. Lastly, at utter variance with both the word and the context, some have based on Eph. i.

more caution, adheres to the view that the idea of the πλήρωμα forms a first step towards the extended use which the Gnostics make of the word; whereas Hilgenfeld (Zeitschr. 1873, p. 195) finds the idea here already so firmly established, "that the πλήρωμα emerges as in a certain measure holding an independent position between God and Christ."

22 f. the interpretation of πλήρωμα as the church. So already Theoret: πλήρη την ἐκκλησίαν ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἐφεσίων ἐκάλεσεν, ὡς τῶν θελόν χαρισμάτων πεπληρωμένην. Ταύτην ἔφη εἰδοκήσαι τὸν Θεον ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ κατοικήσαι, τουτέστων αὐτῷ συνήφθαι, and recently in substance Heinrichs, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others; comp. also Schleiermacher, who, in accordance with Rom. xi. 12, 25, understands “the fulness of the Gentiles and the collective whole of Israel,” the dwelling of whom in Christ is the “definitive abiding state,” which the total reconciliation (see the sequel) must necessarily have preceded, as this reconciliation is conditioned by the fact that both parties must have become peaceful. — κατοικήσαι] The πλήρωμα is personified, so that the abiding presence, which it was to have according to the divine εἰδοκλα in Christ, appears conceived under the form of taking up its abode; in which, however, the idea of the Shechinah would only have to be presupposed, in the event of the πλήρωμα being represented as appearance (פנימיות). See on Rom. ix. 5. Comp. John i. 14. Analogous is the conception of the dwelling of Christ (see on Eph. iii. 17) or of the Spirit (see Theile on Jas. iv. 5) in believers. Comp. also 2 Pet. iii. 13. In point of time, the indwelling of the divine fulness of grace according to God’s pleasure in Christ refers to the earthly life of the Incarnate One, who was destined by God to fulfil the divine work of the ἀποκαταλλάξαται τὰ πάντα, and was to be empowered thereto by the dwelling in Him of that whole divine πλήρωμα. Without having completed the performance of this work, He could not become ἐν πάσιν προσεῖον; but of this there could be no doubt, for God has caused it to be completed through Him (οὕτι, ver. 19). Ernesti, Urspr. d. Sünde, I. p. 215 f. (comp. also Weiss, Bibli. Theol. p. 428, ed. 2), refers εἰδοκήσας κ.τ.λ. to the heavenly state of Christ, in which God, by way of reward for the completion of His work, has made Him the organ of His glory (Phil. ii. 9); he also is of opinion that ἀποκαταλλάξαται in ver. 20 does not apply to the reconciliation through His blood, but to the reunion of all created things through the exalted Lord, as a similar view is indicated in Phil. ii. 10. But this idea of the ἀποκαταλλάξαται
is just the point on which this view breaks down. For ver. 21 clearly shows that ἀποκαταλλάξαι is to be taken in the usual sense of the work of reconciliation completed through the ἡσαυρίων of Christ. Moreover, that which Christ received through His exaltation was not the divine πλήρωμα, but the divine δόξα.

Ver. 20. "Haec inhabitation est fundamentum reconciliatiónis," Bengel. Hence Paul continues: καὶ δεῖ αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα, and through Him to reconcile the whole. As to the double compound ἀποκαταλλάξαι, prorsus reconciliare, see on Eph. ii. 16. The considerations which regulate the correct understanding of the passage are: (1) that τὰ πάντα may not in any way be restricted (this has been appropriately urged by Usteri, and especially by Huther); that it consequently cannot be referred either merely to intelligent beings generally (the usual view), or to men (Cornelius a Lapide, Heinrichs, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others), especially the Gentiles (Olshausen), or to the "universam ecclesiam" (Beza), but is, according to the context (see ver. 16 ff.), simply to be

1 According to Holtzmann, p. 92, the author is assumed to have worked primarily with the elements of the fundamental passage 2 Cor. v. 18 f., which he has taken to apply to the cosmical ἀποκαταλλάξην. But, instead of apprehending this as the function of the risen Christ, he has by ἦν τὸ αἰῶνας κ.τ.λ. occasioned the coincidence of two dissimilar spheres of conception, of which, moreover, the one is introduced as form for the other. The interpolator reproduces and concentrates the thought of Eph. i. 7, 10, ii. 13-17, bringing the idea of a cosmical reconciliation (Eph. i. 10) into expression in such a way "that he, led by the sound of the terminology, takes up at the same time and includes the thought of the reconciliation of the Jews and Gentiles." In opposition to this view, the exegesis of the details in their joint bearing on the whole will avail to show that the passage with all its difficulty is no such confused medley of misunderstanding and of heterogeneous ideas, and contains nothing un-Pauline. The extension of the reconciliation to the celestial spheres, in particular, has been regarded as un-Pauline (see, especially, Holtzmann, p. 231 f.). But even in the epistles whose genuineness is undisputed it is not difficult to recognise the presuppositions, from which the sublime extension of the conception to an universality of cosmic effect in our passage might ensue. We may add, that Eph. i. 10 is not "the leading thought of the interpolation" at ver. 16 ff. (Holtzmann, p. 151); in ver. 16 ff. much more is said, and of other import.

2 As if we might say in German, ab cessibus, that is: to finish quite the reconciliation. Comp. ἐφιλέως, Plat. Legg. ix. p. 873 A.
taken as quite general: the whole of that which exists (has been created); (2) that the reconciling subject is here not Christ (Hofmann, in accordance with his incorrect reference of εἰδοκησιν in ver. 19), but God, who through Christ (δι’ αὐτοῦ) reconciled all things; (3) that consequently ἀποκαταλαλάξαι cannot be meant of the transforming of the misrelation between the world and Christ into a good relation (Hofmann), and just as little of the reconciliation of all things with one another, of the removal of mutual hostility among the constituent elements composing τὰ πάντα, but only of the universal reconciliation with the God who is hostile to sin,¹ as is clearly evident from the application to the readers in ver. 21. The only correct sense therefore is, that the entire universe has been reconciled with God through Christ. But how far? In answering this question, which cannot be disposed of by speculation beyond the range of Scripture as to the having entered into the finite and having returned again to the infinite (Usteri), nor by the idea imported into ἀποκαταλαλάξαι of gathering up into the unity of absolute final aim (Baur, neut. Theol. p. 257), the following considerations are of service: (a) The original harmony, which in the state of innocence subsisted between God and the whole creation, was annulled by sin, which first obtained mastery over a portion of the angels, and in consequence of this (2 Cor. xi. 3), by means of the transgression of Adam, over all mankind (Rom. v. 12). Comp. on Eph. i. 10. (b) Not only had sinful mankind now become alienated from God by sin and brought upon themselves His hostility (comp. ver. 21), but also the whole of the non-rational creation (Rom. viii. 19 ff.) was affected by this relation, and given up by God to ματαιωσις and δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς (see on Rom. l.c.). (c) Indeed, even the world of heavenly spirits had lost its harmony with

¹ God is the subject, whose hostility is removed by the reconciliation (comp. on Rom. v. 10); τὰ πάντα is the object, which was affected by this hostility grounded of necessity on the holiness and righteousness of God. If the hostile disposition of men towards God, which had become removed by the reconciliation, were meant (Ritschl in the Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol. 1863, p. 515), the universal τὰ πάντα would not be suitable; because the whole universe might, indeed, be affected by the hostility of God against sin, but could not itself be hostilely disposed towards Him. See, moreover, on ver. 21.
God as it originally existed, since a portion of the angels—
those that had fallen—formed the kingdom of the devil, in
antagonism to God, and became forfeited to the wrath of God
for the everlasting punishment which is prepared for the devil
and his angels. (2) But in Christ, by means of His ἡσυχία, 
through which God made peace (εἰρήνευσίας κ.τ.λ.), the
reconciliation of the whole has taken place, in virtue of the
blotting out, thereby effected, of the curse of sin. Thus not
merely has the fact effecting the reconciliation as its causa
meritoria taken place, but the realization of the universal recon-
ciliation itself is also entered upon, although it is not yet com-
pleted, but down to the time of the Parousia is only in course
of development, inasmuch, namely, as in the present αἰών the
believing portion of mankind is indeed in possession of the
reconciliation, but the unreconciled unbelievers (the tares among
the wheat) are not yet separated; inasmuch, further, as the
non-intelligent creation still remains in its state of corruption
occasioned by sin (Rom. viii.); and lastly, inasmuch as until
the Parousia even the angelic world sees the kingdom of the
devil which has issued from it still—although the demonic
powers have been already vanquished by the atoning death,
and have become the object of divine triumph (ii. 15)—not
anulled, and still in dangerous operation (Eph. vi. 12) against
the Christian church. But through the Parousia the reconcilia-
tion of the whole which has been effected in Christ will reach
its consummation, when the unbelieving portion of mankind will
be separated and consigned to Gehenna, the whole creation in
virtue of the Palingenesia (Matt. xix. 28) will be transformed
into its original perfection, and the new heaven and the
new earth will be constituted as the dwelling of δικαιοσύνη
(2 Pet. iii. 13) and of the βασίλεια of the children of God
(Rom. viii. 21); while the demoniac portion of the angelic
world will be removed from the sphere of the new world, and
cast into hell. Accordingly, in the whole creation there will
no longer be anything alienated from God and object of His
hostility, but τὰ πάντα will be in harmony and reconciled
with Him; and God Himself, to whom Christ gives back the
regency which He has hitherto exercised, will become the only
Ruler and All in All (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28). This collective reconciliation, although its consummation will not occur until the Parousia, is yet justly designated by the aorist infinitive ἀποκαταλαλάξας, because to the telic conception of God in the εὐδοκήσει it was present as one moment in conception. — The angels also are necessarily included in τὰ πάντα (comp. subsequently, τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς); and in this case—seeing that a reconciliation of the angels who had not fallen, who are holy and minister to Christ (Hahn, Theol. d. N. T. I. p. 269 ff.), considered in themselves as individuals, cannot be spoken of, and is nowhere spoken of in the N. T. — it is to be observed that the angels are to be conceived according to category, in so far, namely, as the hostile relation of God towards the fallen angels affected the angelic world viewed as a whole. The original normal relation between God and this higher order of spirits is no longer existing, so long as the kingdom of demons in antagonism to God still subsists—which has had its powers broken no doubt already by the death of Christ (ii. 14 f.; Heb. ii. 14), but will undergo at length utter separation—a result which is to be expected in the new transformation of the world at the Parousia. The idea of reconciliation is therefore, in conformity with the manner of popular discourse, and according to the variety of the several objects included in τὰ πάντα, meant partly in an immediate sense (in reference to mankind), partly in a mediate sense (in reference to the κτίσις affected by man’s sin, Rom. viii., and to the angelic world affected by its partial fall);

According to Ignatius, Ἐπιστ. 6, the angels also, ἐὰν δὲ ἀπευθεύσουσα τῷ τῷ ἄλω Χριστῷ, incur judgment. But this conception of angels needing reconciliation, and possibly even unbelieving, is doubtless merely an abstraction, just as is the idea of an angel teaching falsely (Gal. i. 8). It is true that, according to 1 Cor. vi. 3, angels also are judged; but this presupposes not believing and unbelieving angels, but various stages of moral perfection and purity in the angelic world, when confronted with the absolute ethical standard, which in Christianity must present itself even to the angels (Eph. iii. 10). Comp. on 1 Cor. vi. 3.

The idea of ἀποκαταλαλάξας is not in this view to be altered, but has as its necessary presupposition the idea of hostility, as is clear from εἰς πάντας ἐκεῖνος and from ἑξάφειος, ver. 21, compared with Eph. ii. 16! Compare Fritzsche, ad Rom. I. p. 276 ff.; Eur. Ἑρατ. 870: ἡλλαγήν τοῖς Ἐχθροῖς, Soph. Αφ. 731 (744):
the idea of ἀποκαταλλάξει, in presence of the all-embracing τὰ πάντα, is as it were of an elastic nature.1 At the same time, however, ἀποκαταλλάξει is not to be made equivalent (Melanchthon, Grotius, Cornelius a Lapide, Flatt, Bähr, Bleck, and others) to ἀποκαταφαίνεσθαι (Eph. i. 10), which is rather the sequel of the former; nor is it to be conceived as merely completing the harmony of the good angels (who are not to be thought absolutely pure, Job iv. 18, xv. 15; Mark x. 18; 1 Cor. vi. 3) with God (de Wette), and not in the strict sense therefore restoring it—an interpretation which violates the meaning of the word. Calvin, nevertheless, has already so conceived the matter, introducing, moreover, the element—foreign to the literal sense—of confirmation in righteousness: "quum creaturae sint, extra lapsus periculum non essent, nisi Christi gratia fuissent confirmati." According to Ritschl, in the Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol. 1863, p. 522 f., Paul intends to refer to the angels that had been active in the law-giving on Sinai (Deut. xxxiii. 2; Ps. lxvii. 18, LXX.), to whom he attributes "a deviation from God's plan of salvation." But this latter idea cannot be made good either by ii. 15, or by Gal. iii. 19, or by Eph. iii. 10, as, indeed, there is nothing in the context to indicate any such reference to the angels of the law in particular. The exegetical device traditionally resorted to, that what was meant with respect to the angels was their reconciliation, not with God, but with men, to whom on

1 Comp. Philippi, Glaubensl. IV. 2, p. 269 f., ed. 2.
account of sin they had been previously inimical (so Chrysostom, Pelagius, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Zanchius, Cameron, Calovius, Estius, Bengel, Michaelis, Böhmer, and others), is an entirely erroneous makeshift, incompatible with the language of the passage. — *εἰς αὐτόν* is indeed to be written with the *spiritus lenis*, as narrating the matter from the standpoint of the *author*, and because a *reflexive* emphasis would be without a motive; but it is to be referred, not to *Christ*, who, as mediate agent of the reconciliation, is at the same time its *aim* (Bähr, Huther, Olshausen, de Wette, Reiche, Hofmann, Holtzmann, and others; comp. Estius, also Grotius: "ut ipsi pareant"), but to *God*, constituting an instance of the abbreviated form of expression very usual among Greek writers (Kühner, II. 1, p. 471) and in the N.T. (Winer, p. 577 [E. T. 776]), the *constructio praegnans*: to reconcile to *Godward*, so that they are now no longer separated from God (comp. ἀπερριπτόμ., ver. 21), but are to be united with *Him in peace*. Thus *εἰς αὐτ.,* although identical in reality, is not in the mode of conception equivalent to the mere *dative* (Eph. ii. 16; Rom. v. 10; 1 Cor. vii. 11; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20), as Beza, Calvin, and many others take it. The reference to *Christ* must be rejected, because the definition of the aim would have been a special element to be added to *δι' αὐτοῦ*, which, as in ver. 16, would have been expressed by *καλ εἰς αὐτόν*, and also because the explanation which follows (*εἰρηνοτοιχίας κ. τ. λ.*) concerns and presupposes simply the *mediate agency* of Christ (δι' αὐτοῦ). — *εἰρηνοτοιχίας, down to σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ*, is a modal definition of *δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλαξαί* (not a parenthesis): *so that He concluded peace*, etc., inasmuch, namely, as the blood of Christ, as the expiatory offering, is meant to satisfy the holiness of God, and now His grace is to have free course, Rom. v. 1; Eph. vi. 15. The aorist participle is, as ver. 21 shows, to be understood as *contemporary* with ἀποκαταλλαξία (see on Eph. i. 9, and Kühner, II. 1, p. 161 f.; Müller in the Luther. Zeitschr. 1872, p. 631 f.), and not antecedent to it (Bähr), as has been incorrectly held by Ernesti in consistency with his explanation of ver. 19 (see on ver. 19), who, moreover, without any warrant from the context, in accordance
with Eph. ii. 14–16, thinks of the conclusion of the peace between Jews and Gentiles. The nominative refers to the subject; and this is, as in the whole sentence since the εὐδοκεῖσθαι, not Christ (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Luther, Storr, Heinrichs, Flatt, Steiger, Hofmann, and many others), but God. The verb ἐφημοσύνης, occurring only here in the N. T., which has elsewhere ποιεῖν εἴρημα (Eph. ii. 15; Jas. iii. 18), and also foreign to the ancient Greek, which has ἐφημοσύνολος, is nevertheless found in Hermes, ap. Stob. Ecl. ph. i. 52, and in the LXX. Prov. x. 10. — διὰ τοῦ αἵματος σταυροῦ ἀνθρώπων that is, by means of the blood to be shed on His cross, which, namely, as the sacrificial blood reconciling with God (comp. 2 Cor. v. 21), became the causa medians which procured the conclusion of peace between God and the world. Rom. iii. 25, v. 9 f.; Eph. i. 7. The reason, which historically induced Paul to designate the blood of Christ with such specific definiteness as the blood of His cross, is to be sought in the spiritualism of the false teachers, who ascribed to the angels a mediating efficacy with God. Hence comes also the designation—so intentionally material—of the reconciling sacrificial death, ver. 22, which Hofmann seeks to avoid as such, namely, as respects its definite character of a satisfaction.¹ — διὰ αἵματος not with the spiritus asper, equivalent to διὰ ζαυτοῦ, as those take it who refer ἐφημοσύνης to Christ as subject (ζαυτὸν ἐκδοῦν, Theophylact), since this reference is erroneous. But neither can διὰ αἵματος be in apposition to διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τ. στ. αἵματοῦ (Castalio, "per ejus sanguinem, h. e. per eum."), for the latter, and not the former, would be the explanatory statement. It is a resumption of the above-given διὰ αἵματος, after the intervening definition ἐφημοσύνης κ.τ.λ., in order to complete the discourse thereby interrupted.

¹ According to Hofmann, Schriften. II. I, p. 362 ff., by the blood of the cross, ver. 20, the death of Christ is meant to be presented as a judicial act of violence, and "what befell Him" as an ignominia, which He allowed to be inflicted on Him with the view of establishing a peace, which brought everything out of alienation from Him into fellowship of peace with Him. Ver. 22 does not affirm the expiation of sin, but the transition of mankind, which had once for all been effected in Christ, from the condition involved in their sin into that which came into existence with His death. Christ has, in a body like ours, and by means of the death to which we are subject, done that which we have need of in order
and that by once more emphatically bringing forward the δι'
αὐτῶν which stood at the commencement; "through Him." I
say, to reconcile, whether they be things on earth or whether
they be things in heaven. Comp. on Eph. i. 11; Rom. viii. 23.
— εἰρή τὰ ἑν τ. γ., εἰρή τὰ ἑν τ. οὐρ.] divides, without "affected
tautology" (Holtzmann), but with a certain solemnity befitting
the close of this part of the epistle, the τὰ πάντα into its two
component parts. As to the quite universal description, see
above on τὰ πάντα; comp. on ver. 16. We have, besides, to
notice: (1) that Paul here (it is otherwise in ver. 16, where
the creation was in question, comp. Gen. i. 1) names the
earthly things first, because the atonement took place on earth,
and primarily affected things earthly; (2) that the disjunctive
expression εἰρή . . . εἰρή renders impossible the view of a recon-
ciliation of the two sections one with another (Erasmus, Wet-
stein, Dalmer, and others). To the category of exegetical
aberrations belongs the interpretation of Schleiermacher, who
understands earthly and heavenly things, and includes among
the latter all the relations of divine worship and the mental
tendencies of Jews and Gentiles relative thereto: "Jews and
Gentiles were at variance as to both, as to the heavenly and
earthly things, and were now to be brought together in rela-
tion to God, after He had founded peace through the cross of
His Son." The view of Baumgarten-Crusius is also an utter
misexplanation: that the reconciliation of men (Jews and Gen-
tiles) among themselves, and with the spirit-world, is the thing
meant; and that the reconciliation with the latter consists in
the consciousness given back to men of being worthy of con-
that we may come to stand holy before Him. Not different in substance are
Hofmann's utterances in his Heil. Schr. N. T. But when we find it there stated:
"how far Christ has hereby (namely, by His having allowed Himself to be put
to death as a transgressor by men) converted the variance, which subsisted
between Him and the world created for Him, into its opposite, is not here speci-
cified in detail,"—that is an unwarranted evasion; for the strict idea of recon-
ciliation had so definite, clear, firm, and vivid (comp. ver. 14, ii. 13 f.) a place
in the consciousness of the apostle and of the church, which was a Pauline one,
that it did not need, especially in express connection with the blood of the cross,
any more precise mention in detail. Comp. Gal. iii. 13; Rom. iii. 25. Calvin well
says: "Idem pignus et pretium nostrae cum Deo pacificationis sanguis Christi,
quid in cruce fusus."
nection with the higher spirits.—Lastly, against the reference to universal restoration, to which, according to Olshausen, at least the tendency of Christ's atonement is assumed to have pointed, see on Eph. i. 10, remark 2. Comp. also Schmid in the Jahrh. f. D. Theol. 1870, p. 133.

Ver. 21. As far as ver. 23, an application to the readers of what had been said as to the reconciliation, in order to animate them, through the consciousness of this blessing, to steadfastness in the faith (ver. 23).—καὶ ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] you also, not: and you, so that it would have been separated by a mere comma from the preceding verse, and νῦν δὲ . . . θανάτου would, notwithstanding its great importance, come to be taken as parenthetical (Lachmann), or as quite breaking off the discourse, and leaving it unfinished (Ewald). It begins a new sentence, comp. Eph. ii. 1; but observe, at the same time, that Eph. ii. is much too rich in its contents to admit of these contents being here compressed into vv. 20, 21 (in opposition to Holtzmann, p. 150). As to the way in which Holtzmann gains an immediate connection with what precedes, see on ver. 19. The construction (following the reading ἀποκατατηλλάγητε, see the critical notes) has become anacoluthic, inasmuch as Paul, when he began the sentence, had in his mind the active verb (which stands in the Recepta), but he does not carry out this formation of the sentence; on the contrary, in his versatility of conception, he suddenly starts off and continues in a passive form, as if he had begun with καὶ ὑμεῖς κ.τ.λ. See Matthiae, p. 1524; Winer, p. 527 ff. [E. T. 714]; and upon the aorist, Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 171 [E. T. 197].—ἀπηλλαγὼν. κ.τ.λ.] when ye were once in the state of estrangement, characterizes their heathen condition. As to ἀπηλλαγών, see on Eph. ii. 12; from which passage ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας τ. Ἰσρ. is here as unwarrantably supplied (Heinrichs, comp. Flatt), as is from Eph. iv. 14 τῆς ξωῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ (Bähr). In conformity with the context, seeing that previously God was the subject as author of reconciliation, the being estranged from God (τοῦ Θεοῦ), the being excluded from His fellowship, is to be understood. Comp. ἔθεον ἐν τ. κόσμῳ, Eph. ii. 12. On the subject-matter, Rom. i. 21 ff. —ἐχθροῦσί] sc. τῷ Θεῷ, in a passive sense (comp. on Rom. v. 10,
xi. 28): *invitos Deo,* as is required by the idea of having become reconciled, through which God's enmity against sinful men, who were τέκνα φύσετι ὡργήσ (Eph. ii. 3), has changed into mercy towards them. This applies in opposition to the usual active interpretation, which Hofmann also justly rejects: hostile towards God, Rom. viii. 7; Jas. iv. 4 (so still Huther, de Wette, Ewald, Ritschl, Holtzmann), which is not to be combined with the passive sense (Calvin, Bleek). — τῇ διανοίᾳ and ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τ. π. belong to both the preceding elements; the former as dative of the cause: on account of their disposition of mind they were once alienated from God and hateful to Him; the latter as specification of the overt, actual sphere of life, in which they had been so (in the wicked works, in which their godless and God-hated behaviour had exhibited itself). Thus information is given, as to ἀπηλλα. and ἔχθροις, of an internal and of an external kind. The view which takes τῇ διανοίᾳ as dative of the respect (comp. Eph. iv. 18): as respects disposition (so, following older expositors, Huther, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald), would no doubt suit the erroneous active explanation of ἔχθρα, but would furnish only a superfluous definition to it, as it is self-evident that the enmity towards God resides in the disposition. Luther incorrectly renders: “through the reason;” for the συνεξεργασία is not the reason itself, but its immanent activity (see especially, Plato, Soph. p. 263 E), and that here viewed under its moral aspect; comp. on Eph. iv. 18. Beza (“mente operibus malis intenta”), Michaelis, Storr, and Bähr attach ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις κ. τ. λ. to τῇ διανοίᾳ.

1 Compare the phrase very current in the classical writers, from Homer onward, ὢν τοῖς μακραῖς, quam Dii odoerunt.

2 See Fritzschel, ad Rom. i. p. 276 f., who aptly explains καταλαμβάνεσθαι εἰς: in alicujus favorum venire, quia ante succensuerit. Comp. Philippi, Glaüben. IV. 2, p. 265 ff., ed. 2. The reconciliation of men takes place, when God, instead of being further angry at them, has become gracious towards them,—when, consequently, *He Himself is reconciled.* Comp. Luke xviii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 19. So long as His wrath is not changed, and consequently *He is not reconciled,* men remain unreconciled. 2 Macc. vii. 33: ἐ δὲ κηρύγγει ἑωρασασθαι παντὶ καταλαμβάνεται τοῖς Ιατρεῖς δοκίμοις, comp. viii. 29, i. 5, v. 20; Clem. Cor. i. 48: ἑωρασθεῖς αὕτη (God), ἰδωμ θλίψις γνώμης ἐνπαναλλαγῇ ἱμι. In Const. Apost. viii. 12. 14, it is said of Christ that He τῇ κηρύγγει καταλαμβάνῃ God, and § 17, of God: εἰς καταλαμβάνεται αὐτοῖς (with believers).
This is grammatically admissible, since we may say διανοεῖσθαι ἐν, animo versari in (Ps. lxxxiii. 8; Ecclus. vi. 37; Plato, Prot. p. 341 E), and therefore the repetition of the article was not necessary. But the badness of the disposition was so entirely self-evident from the context, that the assumed more precise definition by ἐν τοῖς ἔργα τοῦ ποιητοῦ would appear tediously circumstantial.—The articles τῇ and τοῖς denote the disposition which they have had, and the works which they have done. In the latter case the subjoined attributive furnished with the article (τοῖς ποιητοῖς) is not causal (“because they were bad,” Hofmann), but emphatically brings into prominence the quality, as at Eph. vi. 13; 1 Cor. vii. 14, and often (Winer, p. 126 [E. T. 167]).—νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατηγορήθητε as if previously ἤμειν κ.τ.λ. were used (see above): Ye also... have nevertheless now become reconciled. On δὲ after participles which supply the place of the protasis, as here, where the thought is: although ye formerly, etc., see Klotz, ad Devar. p. 374 ff.; Maetzner, ad Antiph. p. 136; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. iii. 7. 8, Anab. vi. 6. 16. On νυνὶ, with the aorist following, comp. ver. 26; Rom. vii. 6; Eph. ii. 13; Plat. Symp. p. 193 A: πρὸ τοῦ... ἐν ἡμεῖς, νυνὶ δὲ δία τὴν ἀδικίαν διωξε-θημεν ὑπὸ τ. θεοῦ. Ellendt, Lex Soph. II. p. 176; Kühner, II. 2, p. 672. It denotes the present time, which has set in with the ἀποκατηγορίαν (comp. Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 171 [E. T. 197]); and the latter has taken place objectively through the death of Christ, ver. 22, although realized subjectively in the readers only when they became believers—whereby the reconciliation became appropriated to them, and there existed now for them a decisive contrast of their νυνὶ with their πορεύτηκαν. The reconciling subject is, according to the context (vv. 19, 20), not Christ (as at Eph. ii. 16), through whom (comp. Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18) the reconciliation has taken place (see ver. 20), but, as at 2 Cor. v. 19, God (in opposition to Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Beza, Calvin, Estius, Calovius, Heinrichs, and others, including de Wette and Ewald). For the reference to Christ even the reading ἀποκατηγορίαζεν would by no means furnish a reason, far less a

1 Comp. Luthardt, vom freien Willen, p. 463.
necessity, since, on the contrary, even this active would have, according to the correct explanation of ἐκδοχος in ver. 19, to be taken as referring to God (in opposition to Hofmann).

Ver. 22. Ἔν τῷ σώματι κ.τ.λ.] that, by means of which they have been reconciled; corresponding to the δὲ αὐτοῦ and διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ of ver. 20: in the body of His flesh by means of death. Since God is the reconciling subject, we are not at liberty, with Elzevir, Scholz, and others, to read αὐτοῦ (with the spiritus asper), which would not be justified, even though Christ were the subject. We have further to note: (1) διὰ τ. θανάτου informs us whereby the being reconciled ἐν τῷ σώματι τ. σ. αὐ was brought about, namely, by the death occurring, without which the reconciliation would not have taken place in the body of Christ. (2) Looking to the concrete presentation of the matter, and because the procuring element is subsequently brought forward specially and on its own account by διὰ, the ἐν is not, with Erasmus and many others, to be taken as instrumental, but is to be left as local; not, however, in the sense that Christ accomplished the ἄποκταλλάσσων in His body, which was fashioned materially like ours (Hofmann, comp. Calvin and others, including Bleek)—which, in fact, would amount to the perfectly self-evident point, that it took place in His corporeally-human form of being.—but, doubtless, especially as διὰ τοῦ θανάτου follows, in the sense, that in the body of Christ, by means of the death therein accomplished, our reconciliation was objectively realized, which fact of salvation, therefore, inseparably associated itself with His body; comp. ἐν τῷ σαπελ μου, ver. 24, see also 1 Pet. ii. 24 and Huther in loc. The conception of substitution, however, though involved in the thing (in the θανάτιον), is not to be sought in ἐν (in opposition to Böhmer and Baumgarten-Crusius). (3) The reason for the intentional use of the material description: "in the body which consisted of His flesh" (comp. ii. 11; Ecclus. xxiii. 16), is to be sought in the apologetic interest of antagonism to the false teachers, against whom, however, the charge of Docetism, possibly on the ground of ii. 23, can the less be proved (in opposition to Beza, Balduin, Böhmer, Steiger, Huther, and Daumer), as Paul
nowhere in the epistle expressly treats of the material Incarnation, which he would hardly have omitted to do in contrast to Docetism (comp. 1 John). In fact, the apostle found sufficient occasion for writing about the reconciliation as he has done here and in ver. 20, in the faith in angels on the part of his opponents, by which they ascribed the reconciling mediation with God in part to those higher spiritual beings (who are without σῶμα τῆς σαρκός). Other writers have adopted the view, without any ground whatever in the connection, that Paul has thus written in order to distinguish the real body of Christ from the spiritual σῶμα of the church (Bengel, Michaelis, Storr, Olshausen). The other σῶμα of Christ, which contrasts with His earthly body of flesh (Rom. i. 3, viii. 3), is His glorified heavenly body, Phil. iii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 47 ff. References, however, such as Calvin, e.g., has discovered ("humile, terrenum et infirmitatibus multis obnoxium corpus"), or Grotius ("tantas res perfecti instrumento adeo tenui;" comp. also Estius and others), are forced upon the words, in which the form of expression is selected simply in opposition to spiritualistic erroneous doctrines. Just as little may we import into the simple historical statement of the means διὰ τοῦ θανάτου, with Hofmann, the ignominy of shedding His blood on the cross, since no modal definition to that effect is subjoined or indicated.—παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.] Ethical definition of the object aimed at in the ἀποκατηγορεῖτε: ye have been reconciled . . . in order to present you, etc. The presenting subject is therefore the subject of ἀποκατηγορεῖτε, so that it is to be explained: ἵνα παραστήσητε ὑμᾶς, ut sistertis vos, and therefore this continuation of the discourse is by no means awkward in its relation to the reading ἀποκατηγορεῖτε (in opposition to de Wette). We should be only justified in expecting εἰπώτις (as Huther suggests) instead of ὑμᾶς (comp. Rom. xii. 1) if (comp. Rom. vi. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 15) the connection required a reflexive emphasis. According to the reading ἀποκατηγορεῖτε the sense is ut sistertis vos, in which case, however, the subject would not be Christ (Hofmann), but, as in every case since εἰδοκήσει in ver. 19, God.—The point of time at which the παραστ. is to take place (observe the aorist) is that of the judgment, in
which they shall come forth holy, etc., before the Judge. Comp. ver. 28, and on Eph. v. 27. This reference (comp. Bähr, Olshausen, Bleek) is required by the context in ver. 23, where the παραστήσαι κ.τ.λ. is made dependent on continuance in the faith as its condition; consequently there cannot be meant the result already accomplished by the reconciliation itself, namely, the state of δικαιοσύνη entered upon through it (so usually, including Hofmann). The state of justification sets in at any rate, and unconditionally, through the reconciliation; but it may be lost again, and at the Parousia will be found subsisting only in the event of the reconciled remaining constant to the faith, by means of which they have appropriated the reconciliation, ver. 23. — ἀγλούς κ.τ.λ.] does not represent the subjects as sacrifices (Rom. xii. 1), which would not consist with the fact that Christ is the sacrifice, and also would not be in harmony with ἀνεγερα.; it rather describes without figure the moral holiness which, after the justification attained by means of faith, is wrought by the Holy Spirit (Rom. vii. 6, viii. 2, 9, et al.), and which, on the part of man, is preserved and maintained by continuance in the faith (ver. 23). The three predicates are not intended to represent the relation "erga Deum, respectu vestri, and respectu proximi" (Bengel, Bähr), since, in point of fact, ἀμώμους (blameless, Eph. i. 4, v. 27; Herod. ii. 177; Plat. Rep. p. 487 A: οὐδὲ ἄν τοῦ Ἡλία οὐδὲ τοῦ τοῦ Ἡλία μεμφηστο) no less than ἀνεγερα. (reproachless, 1 Cor. i. 8) points to an external judgment: but the moral condition is intended to be described with exhaustive emphasis positively (ἀγλούς) and negatively (ἀμώμ. and ἀνεγερα.). The idea of the moral holiness of the righteous through faith is thoroughly Pauline; comp. not only Eph. ii. 10, Tit. ii. 14, iii. 8, but also such passages as Rom. vi. 1–23, viii. 4 ff.; Gal. v. 22–25; 1 Cor. ix. 24 ff.; 2 Cor. xi. 2, et al. — κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ] refers to Christ, to His judicial appearance at the Parousia, just as by the previous αὐτοῦ after σαρκὸς Christ.

1 So also Holtzmann, p. 47, though holding in favour of the priority of Eph. i. 4, that the sense requires a reference to God, although syntactically the reference is made to Christ. But, in fact, the one is just as consistent with the sense as the other.
also was meant. The usual reference to God (so Huther, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, Bleek) is connected with
the reading ἀποκατηλλαξεν taken as so referring; comp. Jude
24; Eph. i. 4. The objection that κατενάων elsewhere
occurs only in reference to God, is without force; for that
this is the case in the few passages where the word is used, seems
to be purely accidental, since εὐνόμων is also applied to Christ
(2 Tim. ii. 14), and since in the notion itself there is nothing
opposed to this reference. The frequent use of the expres-
sion “before God” is traceable to the theocratically national
currency of this conception, which by no means excludes the
expression “before Christ.” So ἐμπροσθεν is also used of
Christ in 1 Thess. ii. 19. Comp. 2 Cor. v. 10: ἐμπροσθεν
τοῦ βηθαματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is a commentary on our κατε-
νάων αὐτοῦ; see also Matt. xxv. 32.

REMARK.—The proper reference of παραστῆσαι κ.τ.λ. to the
judgment, as also the condition appended in ver. 23, place it
beyond doubt that what is meant here (it is otherwise in Eph.
i. 4) is the holiness and blamelessness, which is entered upon
through justification by faith acti judiciai and is positively
wrought by the Holy Spirit, but which, on the other hand, is
preserved and maintained up to the judgment by the self-active
perseverance of faith in virtue of the new life of the reconciled
(Rom. vi.); so that the justitia inhaerens is therefore neither
meant alone (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Calvin,
and others), nor excluded (Theodoret, Erasmus, Beza, and
others), but is included. Comp. Calovius.

Ver. 23. Requirement, with which is associated not, indeed,
the being included in the work of reconciliation (Hofmann),
but the attainment of its blessed final aim, which would
otherwise be forfeited, namely the παραστῆσαι κ.τ.λ. above
described: so far at any rate as ye, i.e. assuming, namely, that
ye, etc. A confidence that the readers will fulfil this condition
is not conveyed by the elye in itself (see on 2 Cor. v. 3;
Gal. iii. 4; Eph. iii. 2), and is not implied here by the con-
text; but Paul sets forth the relation purely as a condition
certainly taking place, which they have to fulfil, in order to
attain the παραστῆσαι κ.τ.λ. — that “fructus in posterum lœ-
tissimus" of their reconciliation (Bengel). — τῇ πιστεί] belonging to ἐπικύρ.: abide by the faith, do not cease from it.¹ See on Rom. vi. 1. The mode of this abiding is indicated by what follows positively (τεθεμ. κ. ἐδραίως), and negatively (κ. μὴ μετακιν. κ.τ.λ.), under the figurative conception of a building, in which, and that with reference to the Parousia pointed at by παραστῆσαι κ.τ.λ., the hope of the gospel is conceived as the foundation, in so far as continuance in the faith is based on this, and is in fact not possible without it (ver. 27). "Spe amissa perseverantia concidit," Grotius. On τεθεμελ., which is not interjected (Holtzmann), comp. Eph. iii. 17; 1 Pet. v. 10; and on ἐδραίως, 1 Cor. xv. 58. The opposite of τεθεμελ. is χαρὶς θεμελίων, Luke vi. 49; but it would be a contrast to the τεθεμελ. καὶ ἐδραίως, if they were μετακινούμενοι κ.τ.λ.; concerning μὴ, see Winer, p. 443 [E. T. 596]; Baeumlein, Part. p. 295. — μετακινοῦμ.] passively, through the influence of false doctrines and other seductive forces. — ἀπὸ] away . . . from, so as to stand no longer on hope as the foundation of perseverance in the faith. Comp. Gal. i. 6. — The ἐν πῆς τοῦ εἰναγγ. (which is proclaimed through the gospel by means of its promises, comp. ver. 5, and on Eph. i. 18) is the hope of eternal life in the Messianic kingdom, which has been imparted to the believer in the gospel. Comp. vν. 4, 5, 27; Rom. v. 2, viii. 24; Tit. i. 2 f., iii. 7. — ὁ ἱκούσατε κ.τ.λ.] three definitions rendering the μὴ μετακινεῖσθαι κ.τ.λ. in its universal obligation palpably apparent to the readers; for such a μετακινεῖσθαι would, in the case of the Colossians, be inexcusable (ὁ ἱκούσατε, comp. Rom. x. 18), would set at naught the universal proclamation of the gospel (τοῦ κηρυχθ.)

¹ In our Epistle faith is by no means postponed to knowing and perceiving (comp. ii. 5, 7, 12), as Baur asserts in his Neut. Theol. p. 272. The frequent emphasis laid upon knowledge, insight, comprehension, and the like, is not to be put to the account of an intellectualism, which forms a fundamental peculiarity betokening the author and age of this Epistle (and especially of that to the Ephesians), as Holtzmann conceives, p. 216 ff.; on the contrary, it was owing to the attitude of the apostle towards the antagonistic philosophical speculations. Comp. also Grau, Entwickelungsgesch. d. N. T. II. p. 163 ff. It was owing to the necessary relations, in which the apostle, with his peculiarity of being all things to all men, found himself placed towards the interests of the time and place.
κ.τ.λ.), and would stand in contrast to the personal weight of the apostle's position as its servant (οὗ ἐγεν. κ.τ.λ.). If, with Hofmann, we join τοῦ κηρυκτέντος as an adjective to τοῦ εὐαγγελοῦ, οὗ ἐκούσατε, we withdraw from the οὗ ἐκούσατε that element of practical significance, which it must have, if it is not to be superfluous. Nor is justice done to the third point, οὗ ἐγενόμην κ.τ.λ., if the words (so Hofmann, comp. de Wette) are meant to help the apostle, by enforcing what he is thenceforth to write with the weight of his name, to come to his condition at that time. According to this, they would be merely destined as a transition. In accordance with the context, however, and without arbitrary tampering, they can only have the same aim with the two preceding attributives which are annexed to the gospel; and, with this aim, how appropriately and forcibly do they stand at the close! ¹ λογίων γὰρ μέγα ἡ τῶ Παῦλος ἰνομα, Oecumenius, comp. Chrysostom. Comp. on ἐγώ Παῦλος, with a view to urge his personal authority, 2 Cor. x. 1; Gal. v. 2; Eph. iii. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 18; Philem. 19. It is to be observed, moreover, that if Paul himself had been the teacher of the Colossians, this relation would certainly not have been passed over here in silence. — ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει (without τῇ, see the critical remarks) is to be taken as: in presence of (coram, see Ast, Lex. Plat. I. p. 701; Winer, p. 360 [E. T. 481]) every creature, before everything that is created (κτίσις, as in i. 15). There is nothing created under the heaven, in whose sphere and environment (comp. Kühner, II. 1, p. 401) the gospel had not been proclaimed. The sense of the word must be left in this entire generality, and not limited to the heathen (Bähr). It is true that the popular expression of universality may just as little be pressed here as in ver. 6. Comp. Herm. Past. sim. viii. 3; Ignatius, Rom. 2. But as in i. 15, so also here πᾶσα κτίσις is not all creation, according to which the sense is assumed to be: "on a stage embracing the whole world" (Hofmann). This Paul would properly have expressed by ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει, or ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ, or ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κ. comp. ver. 6. The expression

¹ According to Baur, indeed, such passages as the present are among those which betray the double personality of the author.
is more lofty and poetic than in ver. 6, appropriate to the
close of the section, not a fanciful reproduction betraying an
imitator and a later age (Holtzmann). Omitting even οὐ
ἐκούσατε (because it is not continued by οὐ καὶ ἐγὼ), Holtz-
mann arrives merely at the connection between ver. 23 and
ver. 25: μὴ μετακιν. ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐαγγ. οὐ ἐγεν. ἐγὼ Π. διάκ.
katὰ τὴν οἰκον. τ. θεοῦ τὴν διοδείσαν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς, just as he
then would read. Further thus: πληρόσατι τ. λόγ. τ. θεοῦ, εἰς
ἡ καὶ κοπιῶ ἀγωνιζόμ. κατὰ τ. ἐνέργ. αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργομ. ἐν
ἐμοῖ.—διάκονος] See on Eph. iii. 7. Paul has become such
through his calling, Gal. i. 15 f.; Eph. iii. 7. Observe the
aorist.

Ver. 24. A more precise description of this relation of
service, and that, in the first place, with respect to the suffer-
ings which the apostle is now enduring, ver. 24, and then
with respect to his important calling generally, vv. 25–29.
—δς (see the critical remarks) νῦν χάριν κ.τ.λ.: I who
now rejoice, etc. How touchingly, so as to win the hearts of
the readers, does this join itself with the last element of
encouragement in ver. 23!—νῦν] places in contrast with the
great element of his past, expressed by οὐ ἐγεν. κ.τ.λ., which
has imposed on the apostle so many sorrows (comp. Acts
ix. 16), the situation as it now exists with him in that
relation of service on his part to the gospel. This present
condition, however, he characterizes, in full magnanimous
appreciation of the sufferings under which he writes, as joyful-
ness over them, and as a becoming perfect in the fellowship of
tribulation with Christ, which is accomplished through them.
It is plain, therefore, that the emphatic νῦν is not transitional
(Bähr) or inferential (Lücke: "quae cum ita sint"); nor yet
is it to be defined, with Olshausen, by arbitrary importation of
the thought: now, after that I look upon the church as firmly
established (comp. Dalmer), or, with Hofmann, to be taken as
standing in contrast to the apostolic activity. — ἐν τοῖς παθήμα.
] over the sufferings; see on Phil. i. 18; Rom. v. 3. This joy
in suffering is so entirely in harmony with the Pauline spirit,

1 See upon ver. 24, Lücke, Progr. 1883; Huther in the Stud. u. Krit.
1883, p. 189 ff.
that its source is not to be sought (in opposition to Holtzmann) in 2 Cor. vii. 4, either for the present passage or for Eph. iii. 13; comp. also Phil. ii. 17. — ἵπτερ ὑμῶν] joins itself to παθήμασιν so as to form one conception, without connecting article. Comp. on vv. 1, 4; 2 Cor. vii. 7; Eph. iii. 13; Gal. iv. 14. Since ἵπτερ, according to the context, is not to be taken otherwise than as in ἵπτερ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, it can neither mean instead of (Steiger, Catholic expositors, but not Cornelius a Lapide or Estius), nor on account of (Rosenmüller, Heinrichs, Flatt; comp. Eph. iii. 1; Phil. i. 29), but simply: in commodum,1 namely, ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἐκφέρουσα δυνηθῶ, Oecumenius, and that, indeed, by that honourable attestation and glorifying of your Christian state, which is actually contained in my tribulations; for the latter show forth the faith of the readers, for the sake of which the apostle has undertaken and borne the suffering, as the holy divine thing which is worthy of such a sacrifice. Comp. Phil. i. 12 ff.; Eph. iii. 13. The reference to the example, which confirms the readers' faith (Grotius, Wolf, Bähr, and others), introduces inappropriately a reflection, the indirect and tame character of which is not at all in keeping with the emotion of the discourse.— The ὑμῶν, meaning the readers, though the relation in question concerns Pauline Christians generally, is to be explained by the tendency of affectionate sympathy to individualize (comp. Phil. i. 25, ii. 17, et al.). It is arbitrary, doubtless, to supply τῶν ἑνῶν here from Eph. iii. 1 (Flatt, Huther); but that Paul, nevertheless, has his readers in view as Gentile Christians, and as standing in a special relation to himself as apostle of the Gentiles, is shown by vv. 25–27. — καλ] not equivalent to καὶ γὰρ (Heinrichs, Bähr), but the simple and, subjoining to the subjective state of feeling the objective relation of suffering, which the apostle sees accomplishing itself in his destiny. It therefore carries on, but not from the special (ὑμῶν) "ad totam omnino ecclesiam" (Lücke), since the new point to be introduced is contained in the specific ἀνανάπλησθηκαὶ . . . Χριστοῦ, and not in ἵπτερ τ. σώματος αὐτοῦ. The connection of

1 So also Bisping, who, however, explains it of the meritoriousness of good works availling for others.
ideas is rather: “I rejoice over my sufferings, and what a holy position is theirs! through them I fulfill,” etc. Hence the notion of χαίρω is not, with Huther, to be carried over also to ἀναναπληρῶ: and I supplement with joy, etc. At the same time, however, the statement introduced by καὶ stands related to χαίρω as elucidating and giving information regarding it.—ἀναναπληρῶ] The double compound is more graphic than the simple ἀναπληρῶ, Phil. ii. 30; 1 Cor. xvi. 17 (I fill up), since ἄνει (to fill up over against) indicates what is brought in for the making complete over against the still existing ἰσορροία. The reference of the ἄνει lies therefore in the notion of what is lacking; inasmuch, namely, as the incomplete is rendered complete by the very fact, that the supplement corresponding to what is lacking is introduced in its stead. It is the reference of the corresponding adjustment, of the supplying of what is still wanting. Comp. Dem. 182. 22: ἀναναπληρῶντες πρὸς τὸν εὐπροτάτον ἀντί τού ἀπορωτάτου (where the idea is, that the poverty of the latter is compensated for by the wealth of the former); so also ἀναναπληρῶσις, Epicur. ap. Diog. L. x. 48; Dio Cass. xlv. 48: ὅσον ... ἐνδεῖ, τούτῳ ἐκ τῆς παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων συντελεῖ τὸν ἀναναπληροθῇ. Comp. ἀντεμπίπτημι, Xen. Anab. iv. 5. 28; ἀναναπλήθει, Xen. Hell. ii. 4. 12; and ἀναπληροῦν, Xen. Cyr. ii. 2. 26. The distinction of the word from the simple ἀνάπληρον does not consist in this, that the latter is said of him, who “στέρημα a se relictum ipse explet,” and ἀναναπλ. of him, who “alterius στέρημα de suo explet” (so Winer, de verbor. c. praepos. in N. T. usu, 1338, III. p. 22); nor yet in the endurance vieing with Christ, the author of the afflictions (Fritzsche, ad Rom. III. p. 275); but in the circumstance, that in ἀναναπλ. the filling up is conceived and described as defectui respondens, in ἀναπλ., on the other hand,

1 Many ideas are arbitrarily introduced by commentators, in order to bring out of the ἄνει in ἀναναπλ. a reciprocal relation. See e.g. Clericus: “Ille ego, qui olim ecclesiam Christi vexaveram, nunc vicissim in ejus utilitatem pergo multa mala perpeti.” Others (see already Oecumenius) have found in it the meaning: for requital of that which Christ suffered for us; comp. also Grimm in his Lexicon. Wetstein remarks shortly and rightly: “ἄνει ἰσορροίματος suocedit eλάμβανον,”—or rather ἀναπλῆμα.
only in general as completio. See 1 Cor. xvi. 17; Phil. ii. 30; Plat. Legg. xii. p. 957 A, Tim. p. 78 D, et al. Comp. also Tittmann, Synon. p. 230. — τὰ ἱστέρηματα] The plural indicates those elements yet wanting in the sufferings of Christ in order to completeness. Comp. 1 Thess. iii. 10; 2 Cor. ix. 12. — τῶν θλυ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ] τοῦ Χ. is the genitive of the subject. Paul describes, namely, his own sufferings, in accordance with the idea of the κοινωνεῖν τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ πάθημαί (1 Pet. iv. 13; comp. Matt. xx. 22; Heb. xiii. 13), as afflictions of Christ, in so far as the apostolic suffering in essential character was the same as Christ endured (the same cup which Christ drank, the same baptism with which Christ was baptized). Comp. on Rom. viii. 17; 2 Cor. i. 5; Phil. iii. 10. The collective mass of these afflictions is conceived in the form of a definite measure, just as the phrases ἀνα-παμπλάναι κακά, ἀναπλήσαι κακὸν ὁτὸν, and the like, are current in classic authors, according to a similar figurative conception (Hom. II. viii. 34. 354, xv. 132), Schweigh. Lex. Herod. I. p. 42. He only who has suffered all, has filled up the measure. That Paul is now, in his captivity fraught with danger to life, on the point (the present ἀναπαυσθ. indicating the being in the act, see Bernhardy, p. 370) of filling up all that still remains behind of this measure of affliction, that he is therefore engaged in the final full solution of his task of suffering, without leaving a single ἱστέρημα in it,—this he regards as something grand and glorious, and therefore utters the ἀναπαυληρῶ, which bears the emphasis at the head of this declaration, with all the sense of triumph which the approaching completion of such a work involves. “I rejoice on account of the sufferings which I endure for you, and—so highly have I to esteem this situation of affliction—I am in the course of furnishing the complete fulfilment of what in my case still remains in arrear of fellowship of affliction with Christ.” This lofty consciousness, this feeling of the grandeur of the case, very naturally involved not only the selection of the most graphic expression possible, ἀναπαυληρῶ, to be emphatically prefixed, but also the description, in the most honourable and sublime manner possible, of the
apostolic afflictions themselves as the \( \thetaλψεις \tauοῦ \ Χριστοῦ \); since in their kind and nature they are no other than those which Christ Himself has suffered. These sufferings are, indeed, sufferings for Christ’s sake (so Vatablus, Schoettgen, Zachariae, Storr, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Bohmer, and others; comp. Wetstein), but they are not so designated by the genitive; on the contrary, the designation follows the idea of ethical identity, which is conveyed in the \( ισόμοιον \epsilon\nuαι \ τοῦ \ Χριστοῦ \), as in Phil. iii. 10. Nor are they to be taken, with Lücke (comp. Fritzsche, l.c.), as: “afflictiones, quae Paulo apostolo Christo auctore et auspice Christo perferenda erant,” since there is no ground to depart from the primary and most natural designation of the suffering subject (\( \thetaλψεις \), with the genitive of the person, is always so used in the N. T., e.g. in 2 Cor. i. 4, 8, iv. 17; Eph. iii. 12; Jas. i. 27), considering how current is the idea of the \( κοιμωνία \) of the sufferings of Christ. Theodoret’s comment is substantially correct, though not exhibiting precisely the relation expressed by the genitive: \( \Χριστὸς \ τῶν \ ιπὲρ \ τῆς \ έκκλησίας \ καταδεξιότο \ θάνατον \ldots \ καί \ τὰ \ άλλα \ οὖσα \ υπὲρενιε, \ καί \ ο \ θείος \ απόστολος \ οὕσαντως \ ιπὲρ \ αὐτῆς \ ιπείστη \ τὰ \ ποικίλα \ παθήματα. \) Ewald imports more, when he says that Paul designates his sufferings from the point of view of the continuation and further accomplishment of the divine aim in the sufferings of Christ. Quite erroneous, however, because at variance with the idea that Christ has exhausted the suffering appointed to Him in the decree of God for the redemption of the world (comp. also John xi. 52, xix. 30; Luke xxii. 37, xviii. 31; Rom. iii. 25; 2 Cor. v. 21, et al.), is not only the view of Heinrichs: “\( \text{qualia et Christus passurus fuisse, si diutius vixisset}^{1} \)” (so substantially also Phot. Amplif. 143), but also that of Hofmann, who explains it to mean: the supplementary continuation of the afflictions which Christ suffered in His earthly life—a continuation which belonged to the apostle as apostle of the Gentiles, and consisted in a suffering which could not have affected Christ,

\[ 1 \] When de Wette describes our view of \( \thetaλψεις \ tau. \ x. \) as \( \text{tame}, \) and Schenkel as \( \text{tautological}, \) the incorrectness of this criticism arises from their not observing that the stress of the expression lies on \( άντικαταλείψω, \) and not on \( \tau. \ x. \) or \( \ x. \)
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because He was only sent to the lost sheep of Israel. As if Christ's suffering were not, throughout the N. T., the one perfect and completely valid suffering for all mankind, but were rather to be viewed under the aspect of two quantitative halves, one of which He bore Himself as διάκος περιτομής (Rom. xv. 8), leaving the other behind to be borne by Paul as the διάκος ἐθνῶν; so that the first, namely, that which Jesus suffered, consisted in the fact that Israel brought Him to the cross, because they would not allow Him to be their Saviour; whilst the other, as the complement of the first, consisted in this, that Paul lay in captivity with his life at stake, because Israel would not permit him to proclaim that Saviour to the Gentiles. Every explanation, which involves the idea of the suffering endured by Christ in the days of His flesh having been incomplete and needing supplement, is an anomaly which offends against the analogy of faith of the N. T. And how incompatible with the deep humility of the apostle (Eph. iii. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 9) would be the thought of being supposed to supplement that, which the highly exalted One (ver. 15 ff.) had suffered for the reconciliation of the universe (ver. 20 ff.)! Only when misinterpreted in this fashion can the utterance be regarded as one perfectly foreign to Paul (as is asserted by Holtzmann, pp. 21 f., 152, 226); even Eph. i. 22 affords no basis for such a view. As head of the Church, which is His body, and which He fills, He is in statu gloriae in virtue of His kingly office. Others, likewise, holding the genitive to be that of the subject, have discovered here the conception of the suffering of Christ in the Church, His body, so that when the members suffer, the head suffers also. So Chrysostom and Theophylact (who compare the apostle with a lieutenant, who, when the general-in-chief is removed, takes the latter's place and receives his wounds), Theodore of Mopsuestia, Augustine, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Melanchthon, Clarius, Cornelius a Lapide, Vitringa, Bengel, Michaelis, and others, including Steiger, Bähr, Olshausen, de Wette, Schenkel, Dalmer; comp. Grotius and Calovius, and even Bleek. But the idea of Christ suffering in the sufferings of His people

1 Comp. also Sabatier, l'apôtre Paul, p. 213.
(Olsbusen: "Christ is the suffering God in the world's history!") is nowhere found in the N. T., not even in Acts ix. 4, where Christ, indeed, appears as the One against whom the persecution of Christians is directed, but not as affected by it in the sense of suffering. He lives in His people (Gal. ii. 20), speaks in them (2 Cor. xiii. 3); His heart beats in them (Phil. i. 8); He is mighty in them (ver. 29), when they are weak (2 Cor. xii. 9), their hope, their life, their victory; but nowhere is it said that He suffers in them. This idea, moreover—which, consistently carried out, would involve even the conception of the dying of Christ in the martyrs—would be entirely opposed to the victoriously reigning life of the Lord in glory, with whose death all His sufferings are at an end, Acts ii. 34 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 24; Phil. ii. 9 ff.; Luke xxivv. 26; John xix. 30. Crucified Ιε άνθεχειας, He lives ικ ένυμέος Θεός, 2 Cor. xii. 4, at the right hand of God exalted above all the heavens and filling the universe (Eph. i. 22 f., iv. 10), ruling, conquering, and beyond the reach of further suffering (Heb. iii. 18 ff.). The application made by Cajetanus, Bellarmine, Salmeron, and others, of this explanation for the purpose of establishing the treasury of indulgences, which consists of the merits not merely of Christ but also of the apostles and saints, is a Jewish error (4 Macc. vi. 26, and Grimm in loc.), historically hardly worthy of being noticed, though still defended, poorly enough, by Bisping. — ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου] belongs to ἀντανακλά, as to which it specifies the more precise mode; not to τῶν θαλπ. τ. Ι. (so Storr, Flatt, Bähr, Steiger, Böhmer, Huther), with which it might be combined so as to form one idea, but it would convey a more precise description of the Christ-sufferings experienced by the apostle, for which there was no motive, and which was evident of itself. Belonging to ἀντανακλά, it contains with ἐνπέρ τῶν σάμ. ἀ. a pointed definition (σαρκί ... σώμα) of the mode and of the aim. Paul accomplishes that ἀντανακλάρομαι in his flesh, which in its

1 Steiger rightly perceived that ις τ. σαρκί μ. and ἐνπέρ τ. σ. ἀ. belong together; but he erroneously coupled both with τῶν θ. τ. Ι. ("the sufferings which Christ endures in my flesh for His body"), owing to his incorrect view of the σάμ. τ. Ι.

2 Hofmann thinks, without reason, that, according to our explanation of
natural weakness, exposed to suffering and death, receives the affliction from without and feels it psychically (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 11; Gal. iv. 14; 1 Pet. iv. 1), for the benefit of the body of Christ, which is the church (comp. ver. 18), for the confirmation, advancement, and glory of which (comp. above on ἐπὶ ὑμῶν) he endures the Christ-sufferings. Comp. Eph. iii. 13. The significant purpose of the addition of ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ κ.τ.λ. is to bring out more clearly and render palpable, in connection with the ἀναπαύσας κ.τ.λ., what lofty happiness he experiences in this very ἀναπαύσας κ.τ.λ. He is therein privileged to step in with his mortal σάρξ for the benefit of the holy and eternal body of Christ, which is the church.

Ver. 25. That He suffers thus, as is stated in ver. 24, for the good of the church, is implied in his special relation of service to the latter; hence the expository relative clause ὅς ἐγενόμην κ.τ.λ. (comp. on ver. 18): whose servant I have become in conformity with my divine appointment as preacher to the Gentiles (κατὰ τὰ οἰκονομ. κ.τ.λ.). In this way Paul now brings this his specific and distinctive calling into prominence after the general description of himself as servant of the gospel in ver. 23, and here again he gives expression to the consciousness of his individual authority by the emphasized ἐγώ. The relation of the testimony regarding himself in ver. 25 to that of ver. 23 is climactic, not that of a clumsy duplicate (Holtzmann). — κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομ. κ.τ.λ.] in accordance with the stewardship of God, which is given to me with reference to you. The οἰκονομία τ. Θεοῦ is in itself nothing else than a characteristic designation of the apostolic office, in so far as its holder is appointed as administrator of the household of God (the οἰκοδομήτης), by which, in the theocratic figurative conception, is denoted the church (comp. 1 Tim. iii. 15). Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 17, iv. 1; Tit. i. 7. Hence such an one is, in consequence of this office conferred upon him, in his relation to the church the servant of the latter (2 Cor. iv. 5), to which ἀναπαύσας κ.τ.λ., we ought to join ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μεν with τῶν θείων κ. τ.λ., as the latter would otherwise be without any reference to the person of the apostle. It has, in fact, this reference through the very statement, that the ἀναπαύσας κ.τ.λ. takes places in the flesh of the apostle.
function God has appointed him, just because he is His steward. This sacred stewardship then receives its more precise distinguishing definition, so far as it is entrusted to Paul, by the addition of εἰς ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ. It is purely arbitrary, and at variance with the context (τὴν δοθ. μοι), to depart from the proper signification, and to take it as institution, arrangement (see on Eph. i. 10, iii. 2). So Chrysostom and his successors (with much wavering), Beza, Calvin, Estius, Rosenmüller, and others. It is well said by Cornelius a Lapide: "in domo Dei, quae est ecclesia, sum oeconomus, ut dispensem... bona et dona Dei domini mei." Comp. on 1 Cor. iv. 1. — εἰς ὑμᾶς although the office concerned Gentile Christians generally; a concrete appropriation, as in ver. 24. Comp. on Phil. i. 24.

It is to be joined with τ. δοθείσαν μοι, as in Eph. iii. 2; not with πληρώσαι κ.τ.λ. (Hofmann), with the comprehensive tenor of which the individualizing "for you" is not in harmony, when it is properly explained (see below). — πληρώσαι κ.τ.λ. telic infinitive, depending on τὴν δοθείσαν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς, beside which it stands (Rom. xv. 15 f.); not on ἰς ἐγεν. διάκ. (Huther). Paul, namely, has received the office of Apostle to the Gentiles, in order through the discharge of it to bring to completion the gospel (τὸν λόγον τ. Θεοῦ, 1 Cor. xiv. 36; 2 Cor. ii. 17, iv. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 13; Acts iv. 29, 31, vi. 2, and frequently), obviously not as regards its contents, but as regards its universal destination, according to which the knowledge of salvation had not yet reached its fulness, so long as it was only communicated to the Jews and not to the Gentiles also. The latter was accomplished through Paul, who thereby made full the gospel—conceived, in respect of its proclamation in accordance with its destiny, as a measure to be filled—just because the divine stewardship for the Gentiles had been committed to him. The same conception of πληρώσας occurs in Rom. xv. 19. Comp. Erasmus, Paraphr.; also Calovius. Similarly Bengel: "ad omnes perducere; P. ubique ad summam tendit." Partly from not attending to the contextual reference to the element, contained in τ. δοθ. μοι εἰς.

1 Who rightly says: "Nimirum impletur its verbum non ratione sui ceu imperfectum, sed ratione hominum, cum ad plures sese diffundit."
of the gospel which was implied in the Gentile-apostolic ministry, and partly from not doing justice to the verbal sense of the selected expression πληρόως, or attributing an arbitrary meaning to it, commentators have taken very arbitrary views of the passage, such as, for example, Luther: to preach copiously; Olshausen, whom Dalmer follows: "to proclaim it completely as respects its whole tenor and compass;" Cornelius a Lapide: "ut complex praedicationem ev., quam coepit Christus;" Vitringa, Storr, Flatt, Bähr: πληροῦν has after ἢς the significiation of the simple docere; Huther: it means either to diffuse, or (as Steiger also takes it) to "realize," to introduce into the life, inasmuch as a doctrine not preached is empty; de Wette: to "execute," the word of God being regarded either as a mission or (comp. Heinrichs) as a decrees; Estius and others, following Theodoret: "ut omnia loca impleam verbo Dei" (quite at variance with the words here, comp. Acts v. 28); Fritzsche, ad Rom. III. p. 275: to supplement, namely, by continuing the instruction of your teacher Epaphras. Others, inconsistently with what follows, have explained the λόγος τ. Θεοῦ to mean the divine promise ("partim de Christo in genere, partim de vocatione gentium," Beza, comp. Vatablus), in accordance with which πληρ. would mean esseqüi. Chrysostom has rightly understood τ. λόγ. τ. Θεοῦ of the gospel, but takes πληρόως, to which he attaches εἰς ὑμᾶς, as meaning: to bring to full, firm faith (similarly Calvin)—a view justified neither by the word in itself nor by the context.

Ver. 26. Appositional more precise definition of the λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, and that as regards its great contents. — As to τὸ μυστήριον κ.τ.λ., the decree of redemption, hidden from eternity in God, fulfilled through Christ, and made known through the gospel, see on Eph. i. 9. It embraces the Gentiles also; and this is a special part of its nature that had been veiled (see Eph. iii. 5), which, however, is not brought into prominence till

1 In a similarly artificial fashion, emptying the purposely chosen expression of its meaning, Hofmann comes ultimately to the bare sense: "to proclaim God's word," asserting that the word is a fact, and so he who proclaims the fact fulfils it.
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ver. 27. Considering the so frequent treatment of this idea in Paul's writings, and its natural correlation with that of the γενέων, an acquaintance with the Gospel of Matthew (xiii. 11) is not to be inferred here (Holtzmann).—ἀπό τῶν αἰῶνων κ. ἀπό τῶν γενεάων] This twofold description, as also the repetition of ἀπό, has solemn emphasis: from the ages and from the generations. The article indicates the ages that had existed (since the beginning), and the generations that have lived. As to ἀπό τῶν αἰῶνων, comp. on Eph. iii. 9. Paul could not write πρὸ τῶν αἰῶν, because while the divine decree was formed prior to all time (1 Cor. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 9), its concealment is not conceivable before the beginning of the times and generations of mankind, to whom it remained unknown. Expressions such as Rom. xvi. 25, χρόνους αἰῶνλιν,9 and Tit. i. 2 (see Huther in loc.), do not conflict with this view. ἀπό τ. γενεάων does not occur elsewhere in the N. T.; but comp. Acts xv. 21. The two ideas are not to be regarded as synonymous (in opposition to Huther and others), but are to be kept separate (times—men).—νυνὶ δὲ ἐφανερώθη] A transition to the finite tense, occasioned by the importance of the contrast. Comp. on i. 6. Respecting νυνι, see on ver. 21. The φανέρωσις has taken place differently according to the different subjects; partly by ἀποκάλυψις (Eph. iii. 5; 1 Cor. ii. 10), as in the case of Paul himself (Gal. i. 12, 15; Eph. iii. 3); partly by preaching (iv. 4; Tit. i. 3; Rom. xvi. 26); partly by both. The historical realization (de Wette; comp. 2 Tim. i. 10) was the antecedent of the φανέρωσις, but is not here this latter itself, which, on the contrary, is indicated by τοις ἀνθρώποις αἰῶνοι as a special act of clearly manifesting communica-

1 Just as little ground is there for tracing ἴσως τὰ ἱστομένα ν.τ.ν., in ii. 22, to Matt. xv. 9; ὅ ὑπάρχει, in ii. 19, to Matt. vii. 3, 4; ἡμέραν, in ii. 3, to Matt. xiii. 22; and in other instances. The author, who manifests so much lively copiousness of language, was certainly not thus confined and dependent in thought and expression.

9 According to Holtzmann, indeed, p. 309 ff., the close of the Epistle to the Romans is to be held as proceeding from the post-apostolic auctor ad Ephesios,—a position which is attempted to be proved by the tones (quite Pauline, however) which Rom. xvi. 15–27 has in common with Col. i. 26 f.; Eph. iii. 20, iii. 9, 10, v. 21; and in support of it an erroneous interpretation of ἴσως τὰ ἱστομένα, in Rom. xvi. 26, is invoked.
tion. — τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῖς] i.e. not: to the apostles and prophets of the N. T. (Flatt, Bähr, Böhmer, Steiger, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, following Estius and older expositors, and even Theodoret, who, however, includes other Christians also),—a view which is quite unjustifiably imported from Eph. iii. 5, whence also the reading ἀποστόλως (instead of ἁγίοις) in F G has arisen. It refers to the Christians generally. The mystery was indeed announced to all (ver. 23), but was made manifest only to the believers, who as such are the εὐλογοι ἁγίοι belonging to God, Rom. i. 7, viii. 30, ix. 23 f. Huther wrongly desires to leave τοῖς ἁγίοις indefinite, because the μυστήριον, so far as it embraced the Gentiles also, had not come to be known to many Jewish-Christians. But, apart from the fact that the Judaists did not misapprehend the destination of redemption for the Gentiles in itself and generally, but only the direct character of that destination (without a transition through Judaism, Acts xv. 1, et al.), the ἐφανερωθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ is in fact a summary assertion, which is to be construed a potiori, and does not cease to be true on account of exceptional cases, in which the result was not actually realized.

Ver. 27. Not exposition of the ἐφανεροτοίς ἁγ. αὐτοῦ, since the γνωρίσας has for its object not the μυστήριον itself, but the glory of the latter among the Gentiles. In reality, ὅς subjoins an overarc movement of the discourse, so that to the general τῷ μυστήριῳ ἐφανερωθη τοῖς ἁγ. αὑτοῦ a particular element is added: "The mystery was made manifest to His saints,—to them, to whom (quamque quibus) God withal desired especially to make known that, which is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles." Along with the general ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ God had this special definite direction of His will. From this the reason is plain why Paul has written, not simply ὅς ἐγνώρισεν ὁ Θεός, but ὅς ἠθέλεσεν ὁ Θεός γνωρίσαι. The meaning that is usually discovered in

1 Holtzmann also, p. 49, would have the apostles thought of "first of all." The resemblances to Eph. iii. 3, 5 do not postulate the similarity of the conception throughout. This would assume a mechanical process of thought, which could not be proved.
free grace, and the like (so Chrysostom, Theodoret, Calvin, Beza, and many others, including Bähr, Böhmer, de Wette; Huther is, with reason, doubtful), is therefore not the aim of the word, which is also not intended to express the joyfulness of the announcement (Hofmann), but simply and solely the idea: "He had a mind." — γνωρίζειν to make known, like ἐφανερώθη, from which it differs in meaning not essentially, but only to this extent, that by ἐφανερ. the thing formerly hidden is designated as openly displayed (Rom. i. 19, iii. 21, xvi. 26; Eph. v. 13, et al.), and by γνωρίζειν that which was formerly unknown as brought to knowledge. Comp. Rom. xvi. 26, ix. 22; Eph. i. 9, iii. 3, 5, 10, vi. 19; Luke ii. 15, et al. The latter is not related to ἐφανερ. either as a something more (Bähr: the making fully acquainted with the nature); or as its result (de Wette); or as entering more into detail (Baumgarten-Crusius); or as making aware, namely by experience (Hofmann). — τί τὸ πλούτος τῆς δόξης κ.τ.λ. what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, i.e. what rich fulness of the glory contained in this mystery exists among the Gentiles,—since, indeed, this riches consists in the fact (δε ἐστι), that Christ is among you, in whom ye have the hope of glory. In order to a proper interpretation, let it be observed: (1) τί occupies with emphasis the place of the indirect ὅ, τί (see Poppo, ad Xen. Cyrop. i. 2. 10; Kühner, ad Mem. i. 1. 1; Winer, p. 158 f. [E. T. 210]), and denotes "quae sint divitiae" as regards degree: how great and unspeakable the riches, etc. Comp. on Eph. i. 18, iii. 18. The text yields this definition of the sense from the very connection with the quantitative idea τὸ πλούτος. (2) All the substantives are to be left in their full solemn force, without being resolved into adjectives (Erasmus, Luther, and many others: the glorious riches; Beza: "divitiae gloriosi hujus mysterii"). Chrysostom aptly remarks: σεμνῶς εἶπε καὶ ὅγκον ἐπέθηκεν ἀπὸ πολλῆς διαθέσεως, ἐπιτάσεως τῆς ἐπιτάσεως. Comp. Calvin: "magniloquus est in extollenda evangelii dignitate." (3) As τῆς δόξης is governed by τὸ πλούτος, so also is τοῦ μυστηρίου governed by τῆς δόξης, and ἐν τοῖς ἑθοῖ belongs to the ἐστι which is to be supplied, comp.
Eph. i. 18. (4) According to the context, the δόξα cannot be anything else (see immediately below, ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης) than the Messianic glory, the glory of the kingdom (Rom. viii. 18, 21; 2 Cor. iv. 17, et al.), the glorious blessing of the ηλπηρονυμία (comp. ver. 12), which before the Parousia (Rom. viii. 30; Col. iii. 3 f.) is the ideal (ἐλπίς), but after it is the realized, possession of believers. Hence it is neither to be taken in the sense of the glorious effects generally, which the gospel produces among the Gentiles (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and many others, including Huther, comp. Dalmer), nor in that specially of their conversion from death to life (Hofmann), whereby its glory is unfolded. Just as little, however, is the δόξα of God meant, in particular His wisdom and grace, which manifest themselves objectively in the making known of the mystery, and realize themselves subjectively by moral glorification and by the hope of eternal glory (de Wette), or the splendor internus of true Christians, or the bliss of the latter combined with their moral dignity (Böhmer).

(5) The genitive of the subject, τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου, defines the δόξα as that contained in the μυστηρίων, previously unknown, but now become manifest with the mystery that has been made known, as the blessed contents of the latter. Comp. ver. 23: ἐλπὶς τοῦ εὐαγγέλου. To take the δόξα as attribute of the mystery, is forbidden by what immediately follows, according to which the idea can be none other than the familiar one of that glory, which is the proposed aim of the saving revelation and calling, the object of faith and hope (in opposition to Hofmann and many others); iii. 4. Comp. on Rom. v. 2. — ἐν τοῖς ἑνυστοῖς] φαίνεται δὲ ἐν ἑτέρως, πολλῷ δὲ πλέον ἐν τούτωι ἡ πολλή τοῦ μυστηρίου δόξα, Chrysostom. "Qui tot saeculis demersi fuerant in morte, ut viderentur penitus desperati," Calvin.—δὲ ἐστι Χριστὸς ἐν υἱῷν] “Christus in gentibus, summum illis temporibus paradoxon,” Bengel. According to a familiar attraction (Winer, p. 157 [E. T. 207]), this δὲ applies to the previous subject τοῦ πλούτου τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστ. τ., and introduces that, in which this riches consists. Namely: Christ among you,—in this it consists, and by this information is given at the same time how great it is (τι ἐστιν).
Formerly they were χωρὶς Χριστοῦ (Eph. ii. 12); now Christ, who by His Spirit reigns in the hearts of believers (Rom. viii. 10; Eph. iii. 17; Gal. ii. 20; 2 Cor. iii. 17, et al.), is present and active among them. The proper reference of the relative to τὸ πλοῦτος κ.τ.λ., and also the correct connection of ἐν ὑμῖν with Χριστὸς (not with ἡ ἐλπὶς, as Storr and Flatt think), are already given by Theodoret and Oecumenius (comp. also Theophylact), Valla, Luther, Calovius, and others, including Böhmer and Bleek, whereas Hofmann, instead of closely connecting Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, makes this ἐν ὑμῖν depend on ἑστι, whereby the thoughtful and striking presentation of the fact “Christ among the Gentiles” is without reason put in the background, and ἐν ὑμῖν becomes superfluous. Following the Vulgate and Chrysostom, διὰ is frequently referred to τοῦ μυστηρ. τοῦτον: “this mystery consists in Christ’s being among you, the Gentiles,” Huther, comp. Ewald. The context, however, is fatal to this view; partly in general, because it is not the mystery itself, but the riches of its glory, that forms the main idea in the foregoing; and partly, in particular, because the way has been significantly prepared for διὰ ἑστι through τί, while ἐν ὑμῖν corresponds to the ἐν τοῖς ἐθνοῖς referring to the πλοῦτος, and the following ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς δόξης glances back to the πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης. — Χριστὸς] Christ Himself, see above. Neither ἡ τοῦ Χ. γνώσεως (Theophylact) is meant, nor the doctrine, either of Christ (Grotius, Rosenmüller, and others), or about Christ (Flatt). On the individualizing ὑμῖν, although the relation concerns the Gentiles generally, comp. ὑμᾶς in ver. 25. “Accommodat ipsis Colossensibus, ut efficacius in se agnoscant,” Calvin. — ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς δόξης] characteristic apposition (comp. iii. 4) to Χριστὸς, giving information how the Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν forms the great riches of the glory, etc. among the Gentiles, since Christ is the hope of the Messianic δόξα, in Him is given the possession in hope of the future glory. The emphasis is on ἡ ἐλπὶς, in which the probative element lies. Compare on the subject-

1 Hence also to be rendered not in vobis (Luther, Böhmer, Olshausen), but inter vos. The older writers combated the rendering in vobis from opposition to the Fanatics.
matter, Rom. viii. 24: τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν, and the contrast ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες in Eph. ii. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 13; and on the concrete expression, 1 Tim. i. 1; Ignat. Eph. 21; Magnes. 11; Ecclus. xxxi. 14; Thuc. iii. 57. 4; Aesch. Ch. 236. 776.

Ver. 28. Christ was not proclaimed by all in the definite character just expressed, namely, as "Christ among the Gentiles, the hope of glory;" other teachers preached Him in a Judaistic form, as Saviour of the Jews, amidst legal demands and with theosophic speculation. Hence the emphasis with which not the simply expository οὐ (Erasmus and others), but the ἡμεῖς, which is otherwise superfluous, is brought forward;¹ by which Paul has meant himself along with Timothy and other like-minded preachers to the Gentiles (we, on our part). This emphasizing of ἡμεῖς, however, requires the οὐ to be referred to Christ regarded in the Gentile-Messianic character, precisely as the ἡμεῖς make Him known (comp. Phil. i. 17 f.), thereby distinguishing themselves from others; not to Christ generally (Hofmann), in which case the emphasizing of ἡμεῖς is held to obtain its explanation only from the subsequent clause of purpose, ἵνα παραστ. κ.τ.λ.—The specification of the mode of announcement νουθετοῦντες and διδάσκοντες, admonishing and teaching, corresponds to the two main elements of the evangelical preaching μετανοεῖτε and πιστεύετε (Acts xx. 21, xxvi. 18; Rom. iii. 3 ff.; Mark i. 15). Respecting the idea of νουθετῶν, see on Eph. vi. 4. It occurs also joined with διδάσκω in Plato, Legg. viii. p. 845 B, Prot. p. 323 D, Apol. p. 26 A; Dem. 130. 2.—ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ belongs to νουθετ. and διδάσκω: by means of every wisdom (comp. iii. 16) which we bring to bear thereon. It is the πῶς of the process of warning and teaching, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 10, in which no sort of wisdom remains unemployed. The fact that Paul, in

¹ Without due reason, Holtzmann, p. 153, finds the use of the plural disturbing, and the whole verse tautological as coming after ver. 25. It is difficult, however, to mistake the full and solemn style of the passage, to which also the thrice repeated σώφρων ἠλπίσαμεν belongs.

² In iii. 16 the two words stand in the inverse order, because there it is not the μεσαιων preceding the σώφρων which is the aim of the νουθετῶν, but mutual improvement on the part of believers.
1 Cor. i. 17, comp. ii. 1, 4, repudiates the σοφία λόγου in his method of teaching, is not—taking into consideration the sense in which σοφία there occurs—at variance, but rather in keeping, with the present assertion, which applies, not to the wisdom of the world, but to Christian wisdom in its manifold forms. — The thrice repeated πάντα ἀνθρώπων (in opposition to the Judaizing tendency of the false teachers) “maximam habet δεινότητα ac vim,” Bengel. The proud feeling of the apostle of the world expresses itself.¹ — ἵνα παραστήσ. κ.τ.λ.] The purpose of the ἰν ἡμέις καταγγέλλομεν down to σοφία. This purpose is not in general, that man may so appear (Bleek), or come to stand so (Hofmann), but it refers, as in ver. 22, and without mixing up the conception of sacrifice (in opposition to Bähr and Baumgarten-Crusius), to the judgment (comp. on 2 Cor. iv. 14), at which it is the highest aim and glory (1 Thess. ii. 19 f.) of the apostolic teachers to make every man come forward τέλειον ἐν Χ. Ἐν Χριστῷ contains the distinguishing specialty of the τελείωσις, as Christian, which is not based on anything outside of Christ, or on any other element than just on Him. It is perfection in respect of the whole Christian nature; not merely of knowledge (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others, including Böhmer), but also of life. Moreover, this ἐν Χ. is so essential to the matter, and so current with the apostle, that there is no ground for finding in it an opposition to a doctrine of the law and of angels (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others). Theophylact, however (comp. Chrysostom), rightly observes regarding the entire clause of purpose: τι λέγεις; πάντα ἀνθρώπων; ναὶ, φησίν, τούτο σπουδάζομεν εἰ δὲ μὴ γένηται, οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς.

Ver. 29. On the point of now urging upon the readers their obligation to fidelity in the faith (ii. 4), and that from the platform of the personal relation in which he stood towards them as one unknown to them by face (ii. 1), Paul

¹ Which Hofmann groundlessly calls in question, finding in πάντα ἀνθρώπων the idea: “every one singly and severally.” This is gratuitously introduced, and would have been significantly expressed by Paul through ἰν εἰσέρχεται (Acts xx. 31), or through the addition of ἐκκ νεκ, or otherwise; comp. also 1 Thess. ii. 11. Calvin hits the thought properly: “ut sine exceptione totus mundus ex me discat.”
now turns from the form of expression embracing others in common with himself, into which he had glided at ver. 28 in harmony with its contents, back to the individual form (the first person singular), and asserts, first of all, in connection with ver. 28, that for the purpose of the παραστήσας κ.τ.λ. (εἰς δ', comp. 1 Tim. iv. 10) he also gives himself even toil (κοπιῶν, comp. Rom. xvi. 6, 12; 1 Cor. iv. 12), striving, etc. — καὶ also, subjoins the κοπιῶν to the καταγγέλλειν κ.τ.λ., in which he subjects himself also to the former; it is therefore augmentative, in harmony with the climactic progress of the discourse; not a mere equalization of the aim and the striving (de Wette). Neither this καὶ, nor even the transition to the singular of the verb,—especially since the latter is not emphasized by the addition of an ἐγώ,—can justify the interpretation of Hofmann, according to which εἰς δ' is, contrary to its position, to be attached to ἀγωνιζόμενος, and κοπιῶν is to mean: “I become weary and faint” (comp. John iv. 6; Rev. ii. 3, and Düsterdieck in loc.). Paul, who has often impressed upon others the μὴ ἐκκακεῖν, and for himself is certain of being more than conqueror in all things (Rom. viii. 37; 2 Cor. iv. 8, et al.), can hardly have borne testimony about himself in this sense, with which, moreover, the ἀγωνιζόμενος in the strength of Christ is not consistent. In his case, as much as in that of any one, the οὐκ ἐκπλασσας of Rev. ii. 3 holds good. — ἀγωνιζόμενος Compare 1 Tim. iv. 10. Here, however, according to the context, ii. 1 ff., the inward striving (comp. Luke xiii. 24) against difficulties and hostile forces, the striving of solicitude, of watching, of mental and emotional exertion, of prayer, etc., is meant; as respects which Paul, like every regenerate person (Gal. v. 17), could not be raised above the resistance of the σάρξ to the πνεῦμα ruling in him. Comp. Chrysostom: καὶ οὐχ ἀπλῶς σπουδάζω, φησιν, οὐδὲ ὁς ἔτυχεν, ἀλλὰ κοπιῶν ἀγωνιζόμενος μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς σπουδῆς, μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἀγρυπνίας. It is not: “tot me periculis ac malis objicere” (Erasmus, comp. Grotius, Estius, Heinrichs, Bähr, and others), which outward struggling, according to Flatt, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others, should be understood along with that inward striving; ii. 1 only points to the latter; comp. iv. 12. — σαρᾶ
τὴν ἐνέργειαν κ.τ.λ.] for Paul does not contend, amid the labours of his office, according to the measure of his own strength, but according to the effectual working of Christ (ἀνροῦ is not to be referred to God, as is done by Chrysostom, Grotius, Flatt, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others), which worketh in him. Comp. Phil. iv. 13. How must this consciousness, at once so humble and confident of victory, have operated upon the readers to stir them up and strengthen them for stedfastness in the faith! — τὴν ἐνεργουὴν.] is middle; see on 2 Cor. i. 6; Gal. v. 6; Eph. iii. 20. The modal definition to it, ἐν δυνάμει, mightily (comp. on Rom. i. 4), is placed at the end significantly, as in 2 Thess. i. 11; it is groundlessly regarded by Holtzmann as probably due to the interpolator.
CHAPTER II.

VER. 1. ἔγραφα Lachm. and Tisch. 8 read ἔγραψα, following ABCDE* F K min. But how easily may ἔγραψα have been suggested to the copyists by i. 24 and iv. 12!—The form ἔγραψα (Lachm. and Tisch. 7) or ἔγραψε (Tisch. 8) is more than sufficiently attested by ABCDE* K*, etc., to induce its reception in opposition to the usage elsewhere. Respecting this Alexandrian form see Winer, p. 73 [E. T. 90]; and on ἔγραψα, Fritzsche, ad Aristoph. Th. 32. —Ver. 2. Instead of συμβιβασθήσας, Elzevir has συμβιβασθήσθαι, in opposition to decisive testimony; an emendation.—πάντα πλοῦτον] A C min. have πάντα τὸ πλοῦτος (so Lachm. Tisch. 7), and are also joined by B K* Clem. with πάντα πλοῦτος (so Tisch. 8). Here also (comp. i. 27) the neuter is the original; in thinking of the more common ὁ πλοῦτος the PANTO became PANTA, in accordance with which πλοῦτον also came to be written. The reading of Tisch. 8 is a restoration of the neuter form after the article had been lost.—Instead of the simple τοῦ Θεοῦ (so Griesb. Scholz, Tisch. 7, Rinck; among modern expositors, Bähr, Olshausen, de Wette, Ewald), Elzevir has τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ παρθένου καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, while Lachm. reads τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ, and Tisch. 8 τοῦ Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ. Among the numerous various readings, τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ (also adopted by Steiger, Huther, Bleek, Hofmann) is certainly strongly enough attested by B. Hilar. (but without vss.), while the simple τοῦ Θεοῦ has only 37, 67*, 71, 80*, 116, Arm. ed. Venet. in its favour. A C K*, 4, Sahid. Vulg. ms. have τοῦ Θεοῦ παρθένου (τοῦ X., which Böhmer and Reiche prefer, whilst K* Syr. p. have τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ παρθένου τοῦ Χ., and others still, such as Syr. Copt. Chrys. read τοῦ Θ. παρθένου καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and consequently come nearest to the Recepta; but a few authorities, after the mention of God, insert ἐν Χριστῷ, as Clem. Ambrosiaster: τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Χ. Regarding these variations we must judge thus: (1) the far too weak attestation of the bare τοῦ Θεοῦ is decisive against it; (2) the reading of Lachm.: τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ, is to be regarded as the original, from which have arisen as glosses the amplifications τοῦ Θεοῦ παρθένου τοῦ Χ., 1 and τοῦ Θεοῦ παρθένου τοῦ Χ., 1

1 If this reading, relatively so strongly attested, were the original one, it would not be easy to see why it should have been glossed or altered. The
as well as the Recepta; (3) the reading τοῦ Ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ arose out of a gloss (ἐν Χριστῷ) written on the margin at ἐν φ’, in accordance with i. 27, which supplanted the original Χριστῷ; (4) the ἐν Χριστῷ thus introduced was again subsequently eliminated, without, however, the original Χριστῷ being reinserted, and thus arose the reading of Griesb. τοῦ Ὑμῶν, which therefore—and with this accords its late and weak attestation—appears to be merely a half completed critical restoration. — Ver. 4. [ὁ] is wanting in B Ν*, Tisch. 8; but it was readily omitted by the copyists before the syllable ΛΕ. — μητίς] Lachm. and Tisch. read μητῖς, which, following preponderant codd. (A B C D E F Π Ν), is to be preferred. — Ver. 7. ἐν ἰηρίᾳ περ. Lachm. and Tisch. have only ἰηρίᾳ, following B D* min. Vulg. It. Archel. Ambrosiast. Theophyl. Properly; the ἰηρίᾳ was mechanically introduced from the adjoining text. — ἐν αὐτῷ] though suspected by Griesb., and rejected by Tisch. 8 (it is wanting in A C Ν*, min. Copt. Tol. Archel.), is to be defended. Its omission was easily occasioned by the fact that προσωπ, was found to be already accompanied by a more precise definition expressed by ἐν. The ἐν αὐτῷ read by D* Ν**, 1, Pel. vss., though only a mechanical repetition of the preceding ἐν αὐτῷ, testifies indirectly to the fact that originally ἐν αὐτῷ was in the text. — Ver. 10. ἐς ἴστην] Lachm. reads ἐς ἴστην, following B D E F G Germ. Hilar. A mistaken correction, occasioned by the reference of the preceding ἐν αὐτῷ to τῇ σχήματι. — Ver. 11. After σώματος Elz. has τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν; an exegetical addition, in opposition to decisive testimony. Comp. Rom. vi. 6. — Ver. 13. The second ἤματς is indeed wanting in Elz., but receives so sufficient attestation through A C K L Ν*, min. vss. and Fathers, that its omission must be explained on the ground of its seeming superfluous. B min. Ambr. have ἤματς, which is conformed to the following ἤμα. Instead of this ἤμα, Elz. has ᾲμα, in opposition to decisive testimony. — Ver. 17. ἐς] Lachm. reads ἐς, following B F G lt. Goth. Epiph. Ambrosiast. Aug. To be preferred, inasmuch as the plural was naturally suggested to the copyists by the plurality of the things previously mentioned. — Ver. 18. ἐς μὴ ἵσωμεν] μὴ is wanting in A B D* Ν*, 17, 28, 67**, Copt. Clar. Germ. codd. in Aug., Or. ed. Tert. ? Lucif. Ambrosiast., while F G have ἰσω. The negation is with justice condemned by Griesb., Steiger, Olshausen, Huther, Ewald; deleted by Tisch. 8 (bracketed by Lachm.), although defended specially by Reiche, whom Hof-
mann also follows. An addition owing to misapprehension. See the exegetical remarks.—Ver. 20. s/ Elz. reads si ὅν, in opposition to decisive testimony. An addition for the sake of connecting, after the analogy of ver. 16 and iii. 1.

Expressing in a heart-winning way his earnest concern for the salvation of the souls of his readers, Paul introduces (vv. 1–3) what he has to urge upon them in the way of warning against the seduction of false teachers (vv. 4, 5), of exhortation to faithfulness (vv. 6, 7), and then, again, of warning (ver. 8). He then supports what he has urged by subjoining the relative soteriological instructions and remindings (vv. 9–15), from which he finally draws further special warnings as respects the dangers threatening them on the part of the false teachers (vv. 16–23).

Ver. 1. Γεύπ] The apostle now confirms in concreto the εἰς δ' κ. κοπ. ἀγωνιζόμενος κ.τ.λ., which has just been affirmed of himself in general: in proof of that assertion I would have you to know, etc. Hofmann holds erroneously, in consequence of his mistaken explanation of κοπίω in i. 29, that Paul desires to explain why he has said that he is becoming weary over the exertion, etc.—Instead of the more frequent οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγωνεῖν (see on Rom. xi. 25, i. 13), Paul uses the θέλω ὑμ. εἰδέναι, also in 1 Cor. xi. 3; comp. Phil. i. 12.—ηλίκον] what a great, vehement conflict. Paul nowhere else uses this word, which is classical, but does not occur either in the LXX. or in the Apocrypha; in the N. T. it is only found again at Jas. iii. 5. That by the conflict is meant the internal pressure of solicitude and apprehension, etc. (comp. i. 29, also Rom. xv. 30), is plain—when we remember the imprisoned condition of the apostle, who now could not contend outwardly with the false teachers themselves—from ver. 2. It is at the same time self-evident that the wrestling of prayer was an eminent way of conducting this spiritual conflict, without its being necessary to regard iv. 12 as a criterion for determining the sense in our passage.—καὶ τῶν ἐν Λαοδίκ.] The neighbouring Laodicéans (Rev. iii. 14 ff.) were without doubt exposed to like heretical dangers; hence also the injunction as to the mutual communication of the Epistles, iv. 16.—καὶ δύοι κ.τ.λ.] The sense is:
and generally (καλ, see Frizsche, ad Matth. p. 786. 870) for all to whom I am personally unknown. It adds the entire category, to which the ἰησεῖς and those ἐν Λαόδικεσ, both regarded as churches, were reckoned to belong. Comp. Acts iv. 6. It is plain from our passage that Paul had not been in Colossae and Laodicea. It is true that Wiggers, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1838, p. 176, would have ὅσοι κ.τ.λ. understood as referring to a portion of the Colossians and Laodiceans, in which case καλ would mean even; but the text itself is decisively opposed to this view by the following αἱρῶν, ver. 2, which, if the ὅσοι κ.τ.λ. to which it refers be not the class in which the readers and Laodiceans were included, would be altogether unsuitable; as, indeed, the bare even does not suffice to give special prominence to a particular portion (we should expect μᾶλτα or the like), and the comprehensive ὅσοι withal does not seem accounted for. Erroneous also is the view (held already by Theodoret in the Hypothes. and in the Commentary, though Credner, Einl. § 154, erroneously denies this) of Baronius, Lardner, and David Schultz (in the Stud. u. Krit. 1829, p. 535 ff.), that the ὅσοι κ.τ.λ. were other than the ἰησεῖς and ὅσοι ἐν Λαόδικ.; Paul having been personally known to both the latter. The subsequent αἱρῶν is fatal to this theory likewise; and how singularly without reason would it have been, if Paul had designated as the objects of his anxiety, along with two churches of the district which are supposed to have known him personally, all not knowing him personally, without distinction of locality! With how many of the latter were there no such dangers at all existing, as the Colossians and Laodiceans were exposed to! To this falls to be added the fact, that in the entire Epistle there is not a single hint of the apostle having been present in Colossae. See, on the contrary, on i. 8 and on i. 23. Comp. Wieseler, Chronol. des apost. Zeitalt. p. 440. According to Hilgenfeld, in his Zeitschr. 1870, p. 245 f., the intimation that Paul was personally unknown to the Colossians betrays the composition of the Epistle at a later time, when the recollection of his labours there had been already superseded and had vanished from the memory of the churches. As if such a forgetfulness were
even conceivable, in presence of the high esteem in which the apostle was held!—That Paul should have been so concerned about the Colossians and Laodiceans, as those who did not know him personally, is natural enough, seeing that they were not in a position to oppose the living impression of the apostle's personal ministry, and his direct authority, to the heretical seductions. Comp. ver. 5. — ἐν σαρκί] not belonging to ἐκφάκασι— in which case it would be a contrast to seeing ἐν πνεύματι (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Baumgarten-Crusius)—joins itself, so as to form one idea, with τὸ πρόσωπον μου (Winer, p. 128 [E. T. 169]). See ver. 5. The addition, which might in itself be dispensed with (comp. Gal. i. 22; 1 Thess. ii. 17), serves the purpose of concrete representation, without its being necessary to import into it a contrast to the "spiritual physiognomy" (Olshausen), or to the having made acquaintance in a spiritual fashion (Hofmann), in connection with which Estius even discovers a certain ταπείνωσις through a higher estimation of the latter; although generally the idea of a spiritual mode of intercourse, independent of bodily absence, very naturally occasioned the concrete description: my bodily face. There is all the less ground for assigning ἐν σαρκί, as an anticipation of ver. 5, to the hand of the manipulator, and that in such a way as to betray an author who knows the apostle to be already snatched away from the flesh and present in heaven (Holtzmann).

Ver. 2. The end aimed at (ἵνα) in this conflict: in order that their hearts may be comforted, viz. practically by the fact, that they are united in love, etc. Accordingly, συμβεβασθ. κ.τ.λ. contains the mode of that comforting, which ensues, when through loving union the evil of heretical division, whether threatening or already rampant, is removed. Most thoughtfully and lovingly Paul designates the concern of his solicitude as παράκλησις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν, not impeaching them on account of the heretical seductions, but making those temptations to be felt as a misfortune, in the presence of which one requires comfort (Vulgate: "ut consolentur"). Chrysostom remarks aptly (comp. Theophylact): ἡδύ λοιπὸν σπεύδει καὶ ἠδίκει ἐμβαλέω εἰς τὸ δόγμα, οὕτε κατηγορῶν οὕτε ἀπαλλάττων
The explanation which makes παρακαλ. mean, like γυμν (LXX. Deut. iii. 28; Job iv. 3), to strengthen, confirm (so Huther, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius), is quite opposed to the Pauline usage, according to which it means to exhort (so Luther here), to give consolation (so Hofmann; comp. Bleek), to entreat, to encourage, to comfort; the latter in particular, when, as here, it is joined with καρδία. Comp. iv. 8; Eph. vi. 22; 2 Thess. ii. 17 (also Ecclus. xxx. 23). — συμβιβασθέντες referred to the logical subject of the foregoing, i.e. to the persons, of whom αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν was said. See on Eph. iv. 2. It means here not instructi (Vulgate; comp. 1 Cor. ii. 16, and the LXX.), nor yet introduced,1 which linguistic usage does not permit, but brought together, united, compacti (ver. 19; Eph. iv. 16; Thuc. ii. 29. 5; Herod. i. 74; and see Wetstein and Valckenaer, Schol. i. p. 453 f.). In connection therewith, δν ἀγάπη, which denotes Christian brotherly love, is the moral element, in which the union is to subsist; to which is then added the telic reference of συμβιβασθ. by καὶ εἰς κ.τ.λ.: united in love and for behoof of the full richness, etc., i.e. in order, by that union, to attain the possession of this full richness, which could not be attained, but only hindered, by division and variance. καὶ εἰς is not to be joined with παρακαλ. (Storr, Flatt), since the καὶ rather adds to the ἐν-relation of the συμβιβ. its εἰς-relation, and is therefore merely the simple and, not etiam (Bengel, Hofmann); but not to be explained either as et quidem (Bähr, Böhmer); or by an ἐκδοσι to be supplied (Olshausen permits a choice between the two). — τῆς πληροφ. τῆς σωτηρίας. The full certainty of Christian insight is the lofty blessing, the whole riches of

1 So Hofmann, who couples it in this sense with εἰς εἰς εἰς εἰς, taking εἰς εἰς adverbially, and explaining the οἷς, which stands in the way, in the sense of "even," to the effect that this introduction into all riches of the understanding has as its presupposition another introduction, viz. that into the faith. This is a sophisticatedly forced mode of disposing of the οἷς, suggested by nothing in the context, especially since faith by no means, either of itself or in vv. 5-7, falls to be considered as a preliminary stage, as if the πληροφορία κ.τ.λ., like a new stadium, had to be entered upon through a second introduction; on the contrary, this πληροφορία is the full rich development of faith in the inner life. We may add that συμβιβάζει to introduce is nothing but a lexicographical fiction invented by Hofmann. Chrysostom already says rightly: ἧν ἀνακαλεῖ.
which, *i.e.* its blissful possession as a whole, they are to attain, so that in no element of the σύνεσις and in no mode thereof does there remain any lack of completely undoubting conviction;¹ comp. 1 Thess. i. 5; Heb. vi. 11, x. 22; Rom. iv. 21, xiv. 5. On the conception of πληροφορείν, see Bleek on Ἰησ. II. 2, p. 233 f. As to σύνεσις, intelligence, both theoretical and practical, comp. on i. 9; that here also what is specifically Christian is meant κατ' ἐξοχήν, is plain from the context. See the sequel. The cumulative fulness of the description πᾶν τὸ πλήρες. τ. συνέσις is naturally and earnestly called forth by the consideration of the dangers which threatened the πληροφεία τ. συνέσις through the attempts of false teachers (ver. 4). Οἶδα, ὅτι πιστεύετε, ἀλλὰ πληροφορεῖτε ύμεις βούλομαι σὺ ν εἰς τὸν πλοῦτον μόνον, ἀλλ' εἰς πάντα τὸν πλοῦτον, ἵνα καὶ ἐν πάσῃ καὶ ἐπιστατικῶς πνεύματι πληροφορεῖτε ἵν' εἴη, Chrysostom. — εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κτλ. parallel to the preceding εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλοῦτος κτλ., and destined to bring in with emphasis the great object of the σύνεσις (the divine counsel of redemption, τὸ μυστήριον, see on i. 26); so that what was previously set forth at length by εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλοῦτος τ. πληροφ. τ. συνέσις is now succinctly summed up for the sake of annexing the object by εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν. Thus the distinction between ἐπίγνωσις and γνώσις (ver. 3) is brought out clearly.² Comp. on i. 9. But τοῦ μυστήριον. τ. Θ. is not to be attached also to τῆς συνίστασις (Hofmann), so that the τῆς ἐπίγνωσις would occupy an interrupting position. — τοῦ Θεοῦ] Genitive of the subject; it is God, whose decree the μυστήριον is. The reading to be approved, τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ (see the critical remarks), means: of the God of Christ, i.e. to whom Christ belongs in a special way, as to His Father, Sender, Head, etc.; see on Eph. i. 17; comp.

¹ Neither Greek authors, nor the LXX., nor the Apocrypha have πληροφεία. In Ptol. Tetr. p. 4, 9, πληροφεία is found.
² According to Holtzmann, p. 303, in the frequent mention of γνώσις and ἐπίγνωσις, of σοφία and σύνεσις, of γνώρισις and φανεραία, of μυστήριον ἀκρωτηριασμ. and φανεραία τοῦ μυστήρ., we may detect already the terminology of the Grecian mysteries. As if these ideas and expressions were not sufficiently Pauline, and their intentional application were not sufficiently intelligible in the light of theosophic aberrations. Comp. also on i. 23; and Weiss, Bibl. Theol. p. 420, ed. 2.
John xx. 17; Matt. xxvii. 46. The separation of Χριστοῦ, however, from τ. Θεοῦ, and the taking it as apposition to τοῦ μυστήριου τοῦ Θεοῦ, so that Christ Himself appears as the personal secret of God, "because He is personally the truth contained in God and revealed from God" (Hofmann, comp. Holtzmann, p. 215), must be rejected, because Paul would thus have expressed himself in a way as much exposed to misapprehension as possible. He would either have inserted an ὅ ἐστι after τοῦ Θεοῦ (i. 24; 1 Cor. iii. 11), or have omitted τοῦ Θεοῦ, which would have made τοῦ μυστήριου Χριστοῦ, as in Eph. iii. 4, the mystery contained personally in Christ. But as the apostle has actually written, the reader could only understand the mystery of the God of Christ. If Christ is God's (see on 1 Cor. iii. 23; comp. Luke ii. 26, ix. 20; Acts iv. 26), then God is also the God of Christ. After Θεοῦ, therefore, no comma is to be inserted. Finally, the view of Hilary (" Deus Christus sacramentum est"), that ὁ Θεὸς is Christ Himself (so Steiger and Bisping, also Philippi, Glaubensl. IV. 1, p. 460, ed. 2), is wholly without Pauline analogy, and is not to be supported by such passages as Rom. ix. 5; Tit. ii. 13; Eph. v. 5; in fact, even the lofty predicates employed in i. 15 ff., ii. 9, draw the line of distinction between God and Christ. Moreover, the expression itself is not harsher (de Wette), or even more inconceivable (Olschhausen), more unsuitable and obscure (Reiche), than the phrase ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμ. Ἰησοῦ Χ. in Eph. i. 17; since in connection with the notion "the God of Christ," the designation of the latter as our Lord is unessential. The addition Χριστοῦ finds its motive in the connection, because it was just in Christ that God formed the decree of redemption (the μυστήριου), and has carried it out (Eph. iii. 10 f., et al.). Whosoever has known God as the God of Christ, has the divine μυστήριον therewith unveiled to him.

Ver. 3. Ἐν ἐνῷ is to be referred to τοῦ μυστήριου—a remark which applies also in the case of every other reading of the foregoing words—not to Christ, as is commonly done

1 Older dogmatic expositors (see especially Calovius) discover here the omniscience of Christ.
with the Recepta, and by Böhmer, Dalmer, and Hofmann even with our reading. The correct reference is given, in connection with the Recepta, by Grotius (against whom Calovius contends), Hammond, Bengel, and Michaelis; and in connection with our reading, by Huther, Schenkel, and Bleek; its correctness appears from the correlation in which ἀπόκρυφοι stands to τοῦ μυστηρ. The destination of this relative clause is to bring out the high value of the ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ μυστηρίου (since in Him, etc.), and that in contrast to the pretended wisdom and knowledge of the false teachers; hence also the emphatic πάντες οἱ θεοὶ. κ.τ.λ.—The σοφία and γνώσις are here conceived objectively, and the genitives indicate wherein the treasures consist. The distinction between the two words is not, indeed, to be abandoned (Calvin: “duplicatio ad augendum valet;” comp. Huther and others), but yet is not to be defined more precisely than that γνώσις is more special, knowledge, and σοφία more general, the whole Christian wisdom, by which we with the collective activity of the mind grasp divine relations and those of human morality, and apply them to right practice. Comp. on i. 9.—On θεσαυροῖς, comp. Plato, Phil. p. 15 E: ὁς τινὰ σοφίας εὐρήκως θεσαυρὸν, Xen. Mem. iv. 2. 9, i. 6. 14; Wisd. viii. 14; Ecles. i. 23; Bar. iii. 15.—ἀπόκρυφοι] is not the predicate to εἰσὶ (so most writers, with Chrysostom and Luther), as if it were ἀποκρυμμένοι εἰσιν instead of εἰσίν ἀπόκρυφοι; for, as it stands, the unsuitable sense would be conveyed: “in whom all treasures . . . are hidden treasures.” But neither is it a description of the qualitative how of their being in Him, in so far, namely, as they do not lie open for ordinary perception (Hofmann); for this adverbial use of the adjective (see Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. i. 4. 12, ii. 2. 17; Krüger, § 57. 5) would be without due motive here, seeing that the apostle is concerned, not about the mode of the ἐν φίλοις, but about the characterizing of the treasures themselves, whereupon the how in question was obvious of itself. We must therefore take

1 In connection with which Bühr, Baumgarten-Crusius, and Bleek convert the notion of being hidden into that of being deposited for preservation (ἀνοικτία, i. 5).
ἀπόκρυφοι simply as an attributive adjective to θησαυρός, placed at the end with emphasis: in whom the collective hidden treasures... are contained. Comp. LXX. Isa. xliv. 3; 1 Macc. i. 23; Matt. xiii. 44. The treasures, which are to be found in the mystery, are not such as lie open to the light, but, in harmony with the conception of the secret, hidden (comp. Matt. l.c.), because unattainable by the power of natural discernment in itself, but coming to be found by those who attain εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου, whereby they penetrate into the domain of these secret riches and discover and appropriate them. The objection to this view of ἀπόκρυπτος as the adjective to θησαυρός, viz. that there must then have been written οἱ ἀπόκρυπτος (Bähr, Bleek, Hofmann), is erroneous; the article might have been (1 Macc. i. 23), but did not need to be, inserted. With the article it would mean: quippe qui abscondisti sunt; without the article it is simply: "thesauri absconditi" (Vulgate), i.e. ἀπόκρυφοι δότες, not οἱ δότες ἀπόκρυφοι.

Ver. 4. After this affecting introduction, testifying to his zealous striving for the Christian development of his readers, and thereby claiming their faithful adherence to his gospel, the warning now follows, for the sake of which Paul has prefixed vv. 1–3 (τοῦτο). That τοῦτο does not refer merely to ver. 3 (so Oecumenius, Theophylact, Calvin, Zanchius, Estius, and others, including Bähr and Böhmer; Huther is undecided) is in itself probable, since vv. 1–3 form a connected sentence admirably preparatory in its entire purport for what follows, and is confirmed by ver. 5, which glances back to ver. 1. Hence: This contained in vv. 1–3, which ye ought to know, I say with the design that, etc.—ινα μηδεις (see the critical remarks); comp. Mark v. 43; Tit. iii. 12; Rev. iii. 11, et al.—παραλογίζεσθε.] In N. T., only found elsewhere in Jas. i. 22 (see Theile in loc.); frequent in the later Greek writers since Demosthenes (822. 25, 1037. 15). It indicates, by a term borrowed from false reckoning, the deception and overreaching that take place through false reasoning. What particular sophistries the false teachers, whose agitations at all events tended (see ver. 8 f.) to the disadvantage of the Pauline gospel, were guilty of, does not appear. It
is certain, however, that they were not those suggested by Böhmer (nothing good can come out of Nazareth; one who was crucified cannot have possessed divine wisdom), since the false teachers were not non-Christians. Hardly did these beguiling sophistries affect the person of the apostle, as if he were not concerning himself about the confirming and training of churches not planted by himself, as Hofmann thinks. In that case we should have in vv. 1–3 only a self-testimony to the contrary, which, as assertion against assertion, would neither have been skilful nor delicate; nor do we in what follows find any defence in opposition to personal calumniations. This applies also in opposition to Holtzmann, p. 177. The γάρ in ver. 5 by no means requires this interpretation. — ἐν πιθανολογίᾳ] by means of persuading speech; Luther’s “with rational discourses” misapprehends the meaning. It occurs in this place only in the N. T.; but see Plato, Theaet. p. 162 E; comp. Dem. 928. 14: λόγος θαυμασίως πιθανός, also πιθανολογεῖ, Diog. L. x. 87; Diod. Sic. i. 39; and πιθανός λέγειν, Lucian, Amor. 7. Hence the art of persuasion: ἡ πιθανολογικῇ, Arr. Epict. i. 8. 7.

Ver. 5. A special reason, having reference to his bodily absence, by which his readers are encouraged not to allow themselves to be deceived. — τῷ σαρκί] with respect to the flesh, i.e. bodily. Comp. 1 Cor. v. 3. — ἀλλὰ] at, yet am I on the other hand, beginning the apodosis; see on Rom. vi. 5 and 1 Cor. iv. 15. — τῷ πνεύματι] with respect to the spirit, i.e. mentally; my spirit, translating itself in thought into your midst, is along with you. Erroneously Grotius: “Deus Paulo revelat, quae Colossis fieren,” so that πνεύμα would be meant of the Holy Spirit. According to Wiggers, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1838, p. 181, and Vaihinger, in Herzog’s Encyklop. IV. p. 79, ἄρειμι takes for granted the apostle’s having been there previously. A quite groundless assumption; the verb expresses (ἀπό) the being away from, but does not indicate whether a person had been previously present or not, which can only be gathered from the connection or other circumstances of the case. In this case the context directly indicates, by ver. 1, that a bodily παρείμαι had not occurred. It
is otherwise in 1 Cor. v. 3; 2 Cor. x. 1, 11, xiii. 2, 10; Phil. i. 27. From the similar expression in 1 Cor. v. 3. Theodoret nevertheless infers that Paul ὃς θεασάμενος αὐτοῦς ἐγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν. — ὑμῖν ὑμῶν] in your society, among you. Comp. Luke viii. 38, xxii. 56; Phil. i. 23; 1 Thess. iv. 17; 2 Pet. i. 18, et al. — χαίρων κ. βλέπων] There is here no illogical prefixing of the χαίρων in the lively feeling of joy (Huther, comp. de Wette); χαίρων rather expresses joy at the fact that he is with them spiritually, and καὶ βλέπων ὑμ. τὴν τάξιν κ.τ.λ. then adds what at this joyful being with the Colossians he sees in them, so that the description thus advances with κ. βλέπω.: in spirit I am along with you, rejoicing in this mental presence, and therewith seeing, etc. Comp. also Hofmann, who, however, imports into βλέπων the pregnant meaning not conveyed by the simple verb; it is as plainly present to my soul, as if I saw it with my eyes. This would be κ. ὃς βλέπων, or κ. ὃς ἐν ὑφαλωμοίς βλ. Renderings blending the ideas, such as gaudeo videns (Grotius, Wolf, Bähr, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek, and others), or beholding with joy (Bengel, Heinrichs, Flatt), are at variance with the words as they stand. Some erroneously cite Josephus, Bell. iii. 10. 2, where χαίρω καὶ βλέπων (not βλέπω) means: I rejoice, when I even see it. Winer, p. 438 [E. T. 589], and Fritzsche, ad Rom. II. p. 425, supply with χαίρων the words: concerning you. But the supplying of ἐφ’ ὑμῶν is not justified by the context, which naturally suggests joy at the being together with the readers, for χαίρω stands alongside of this as an accompanying relation without any other definition of object. And according to this view there is no ground at all for an explicative rendering of καὶ, which Winer still admits (so also Böhmer and Olahausen). — The testimony, moreover, which is given to the readers by βλέπων κ.τ.λ. is not inconsistent with the anxious conflict in ver. 1; but, on the contrary, makes the latter, in a psychological point of view, all the more conceivable, when the dangers which threatened a state of things still even now so good are considered. — ὑμῶν τ. τάξιν] The prefixed pronoun owes this position to the favourable expectation which the Colossians, more than many others, have
awakened in the apostle. The τάξις is order, orderly condition. Its antithesis is ἀτάξια, Plato, Tim. p. 30 A. For the idea see Plato, Gorg. p. 504 A: τάξεως ... καὶ κόσμου πτυχώσα οἰκία, Polyb. i. 4. 6: ἡ σύμπασα σχέσις κ. τάξις τῆς οἰκουμένης, iii. 36. 6: ἡ ... διάλυσις κ. τάξις. It is often used of the organized condition of the state, Dem. 200. 4, Plat. Crit. p. 109 D; elsewhere also (see Sturz, Lex. Xen. IV. p. 245) of the army, sometimes to designate a section of it (a company of two λοχα), and sometimes to express its regular arrangement in rank and file (Thuc. iii. 87. 2, iv. 72. 2, 126. 4, viii. 69. 1). Hofmann takes both τάξις and στερέωμα in a military sense. But the two words have not in and of themselves the military sense; they would receive it from the context, which is not the case here. Moreover, the meaning fortress, military bulwark, is expressed not by στερέωμα generally, but by ἔρυμα or ἔχθρωμα, 2 Cor. x. 4. Hence, if we would avoid arbitrariness, we can only abide by the view that here τάξις means the orderly state of the Christian church, which has hitherto not been disturbed by sectarian divisions or forsaken by the readers. Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 40. To this outward condition Paul then subjoins the inner one, by which the former is conditioned: and the solid hold of your faith in Christ. στερέωμα, firmamentum, that which has been made firm (Arist. partit. an. ii. 9; Theophr. H. pl. v. 7. 3), a late word, often found in LXX., Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, and Apocrypha (see Schleusner, Thes. V. p. 102 f.), represents the steadfastness and immoveableness of faith in such a way, that the latter appears as protected by a strong work (with solid foundation, masonry, etc.) from injury (Ezek. xiii. 5; Ps. xviii. 2; 3 Esdr. viii. 81). On the subject-matter, comp. Acts xvi. 5: ἐστερεοῦμαι τῇ πίστει, 1 Pet. v. 9: ἀντίλητητε στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει. The abstract firmness, however (Huther, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek, and older expositors), which would be στερεότης, is never designated by the word. Chrysostom explains rightly: οἵτι πολλὰ συμαγαγόν συγκολλήσεις πυκνῶς καὶ ἀδιαστάστως, τότε στερέωμα γίνεται. The genitive τῆς πίστεως, finally, is not to be taken in such a way as to make

1 Whom Holtmann, p. 177, has too rashly followed.
faith the ὑποτάξεως (Hofmann), which protects the readers, as if it were τὸ ὑπὸν ὑποτάξεως; but as the genitive of the subject, in such a way that their faith has the ὑποτάξεως securing it, which Paul spiritually sees.—To call in question the unducedness here attested (Baumgarten-Crusius, who leaves it a question whether the sense is not merely: "if it is so"), or to refer it to only a part of the church (Flatt), is a quite arbitrary result of unduly pressing the general utterance of commendation.

Ver. 6 f. From the warning given in ver. 4 and having its ground assigned in ver. 5, follows (ἦν) the positive obligation to make Christ, as He had been communicated to them through the instruction which they had received, the element in which (ἐν αὐτῷ) their conduct of the inner and outer life moves (περίπατεôte), whereupon the more precise modal definitions are subjoined by ἔρχεται εἰς τ.λ., ἢ ὅς according as. Observe that in the protasis παρέλαβεν and in the apodosis περίπατεôte (not ἐν αὐτῷ, as Hofmann thinks) have the emphasis, in which case the addition of an ὣς was not necessary. Their walk in Christ is to be in harmony with the instruction, by means of which they have through Epaphras received Christ. — παρέλαβεν] have received (i. 7; Eph. iv. 20), comp. Gal. i. 9, 12; 1 Thess. ii. 13, iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 23. Christ was communicated to them as the element of life. The rendering: have accepted (Luther, Bähr, Bohmer, Huther, Hofmann), is not contrary to Pauline usage (de Wette; but see on Phil. iv. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 1); but it is opposed to the context, in which after ver. 4 (see especially ver. 7: καθὼς ἐδιδάχθη, and ver. 8: κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν διδομένων, the contrast between true and false Christian instruction as regulative of the walk, and not the contrast between entrance into the fellowship of Christ and the walk therewith given (Hofmann), predominates. — τῶν Χ. 'Ι. τῶν κύριων] A solemnly complete

1 To this conception ἦν αὐτῷ refers subsequently. Chrysostom and his followers take this ἦν so, that Christ is regarded as the way. But this Johannine conception nowhere occurs in Paul's writings; nor does it accord with παρέλαβεν, with which, however, the extremely common Pauline idea of the ἦν τῶν διδακτικῶν ἑδραίος is in harmony.

2 Eph. iii. 17 f., by comparing which Holtzmans discovers in our passage the
designation, a summary of the whole confession (1 Cor. xii. 3; Phil. ii. 11), in which τὸν κύριον, conformably with its position and the entire connection, is to be taken in the sense: as the Lord, consequently attributively, not as a mere apposition (de Wette, Bleek, Ellicott, and others), in which Hofmann includes also Ἰησοῦν, a view which is not warranted by Eph. iii. 1. — Ver. 7. ἔρριξομεν κ. ἐποικοδ. ἐν αὑτῷ] introduces the ethical habitus in the case of the required περιπτατεῖν ἐν Χ. But the vivid conception, in the urgency of properly exhausting the important point, combines very dissimilar elements; for the two figures, of a plant and of a building, are inconsistent as such both with περιπτατεῖστε and with one another. Comp. Eph. iii. 17 f. By beginning a new sentence with ἔρριξομενον κ.τ.λ., and thus construing it in connection with ver. 8 (Schenkel, Hofmann), we should gain nothing in symmetry, and should only lose without sufficient reason in simplicity of construction; while we should leave the ἐν αὑτῷ περιπτατεῖτε in ver. 6 in a disproportionately bald and isolated position. This conjunction, moreover, of heterogeneous figures might quite as legitimately have been made by the apostle himself as by an interpolator, whose hand Holtzmann thinks that he here discovers. — Observe further the difference in time of the two participles, whereby the steadfastness of the ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι (figuratively represented by ἔρριξομ.) is denoted as a subsistent state, which must be present in the case of the περιπτατεῖν ἐν αὑτῷ, while the further development of the Christian condition (figuratively represented by ἐποικοδ.) is set forth as a continuing process of training; comp. Acts xx. 32. — ἐποικοδ.] becoming built up, in which ἔτη exhibits the building rising on the foundation. Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 10, 12; Eph. ii. 20; Xen. Anab. iii. 4. 11; Plat. Legg. v. p. 736 E. The building up may in itself be also regarded as an act accomplished (through conversion), as in Eph. ii. 20: ἐποικοδομηθέντες, which, however, as modal definition of περιπτατ., would not have suited here. The progress and finishing of the building (de Wette, following Acts xx. 32, where, however, the simple form ἔκται. hand of the interpolator, is both as regards contents and form too diverse for that purpose.
should be read) are conveyed by the present, not by ἐποικοεῖν in itself (comp. Eph. ii. 22). Nor does the latter represent the readers as stones, which are built up on the top of those already laid (Hofmann); on the contrary, they are in their aggregate as a church (comp. on Eph. i.c.) represented as an οἰκοδομή in the course of being built (i.e. of a more and more full development of their Christian common life), in regard to which the ἐν in ἐποικοεῖν presupposes the foundation laid by Epaphras, namely, Christ (1 Cor. iii. 11); and the building materials, including the stones, are not the persons, but the doctrines, by means of which the builders accomplish their work (see on 1 Cor. iii. 12).—ἐν αἰρῇ] belongs to both participles, so that Christ is to be conceived doubtless as the soil for the roots striking downwards (Eph. iii. 17), and as the foundation (1 Cor. iii. 11) for the building extending upwards; but the expression is determined by the conception of the thing signified, namely, the ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι, as in ἐν αἰρῇ περιπατ. and not by the figures; hence Paul has not written ἐν αἰρών (1 Cor. iii. 12), or ἐν' αἰρῇ (Eph. ii. 20), which would have been in harmony with the latter participle, but he exhibits Christ as the Person, in whom that which is meant by the being rooted and becoming built up has its specific being and nature, and consequently the condition of endurance and growth. Comp. on Eph. ii. 21.—καὶ βεβαιωμ. τῇ πιστῇ.]

And to this being rooted and becoming built up there is to be added the being established by the faith, as the development of quality in the case, in order that no loose rooting may take place, nor any slack building be formed. The dative τῇ πιστεί (see the critical remarks) is to be taken as instrumental, not: with respect to (in opposition to de Wette), since the following modal definition περισσ. ἐν αἰρῇ specifies, not how they are to be established in respect of the faith, but how they are to be established by it, by the fact, namely, that they are rich in faith; poverty in faith would not be sufficient to bring about that establishment. In like manner we should have to

1 Hofmann inappropriately, since in the case of ἐποικοεῖν at any rate we have to think of the foundation, takes ἐν αἰρῇ in the sense that Christ surrounds the building.
take the reading ἐν τ. πίστει, which Hofmann defends. He, however, joins this ἐν τ. πίστει not with βεβαιώμενοι, but with the following περισσεύοντες,—a connection which is excluded by the genuineness of ἐν αὐτῇ, but which is, even apart from this, to be rejected, because Paul would, in order to be fairly intelligible, have inserted the ἐν αὐτῷ only after βεβαιώμενοι, to which it would also refer.—καθὼς ἀδιάφορον] namely, to become stablished by the faith. For this they have received (from Epaphras, i. 7) the instructions which are to guide them.—περισσεύοντες κ.τ.λ.] is subordinate to the βεβαιώμενοι, and that as specifying the measure of the faith, which must be found in them in order that they may be stablished through faith; while at the same time the requisite vital expression, consecrated to God, of the piety of the believing heart is brought out by ἐν εἰκαρ.: while ye are abundantly in the same amidst thanksgiving, i.e. while ye are truly rich in faith, and at the same time giving thanks to God for this blessing of fulness of faith. The emphasis is upon περισσοῦ, in which lies the more precisely defining element; περισσεύον ἐν is nothing else than the usual abundare aliqua re, to have abundance of something (Rom. xvi. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 7; Phil. i. 9, et al.), and ἐν εἰκαρ. indicates an accompanying circumstance in the case, the ethical consecration of grateful piety, with which the richness in faith must be combined; comp. iii. 17, i. 12. It is well explained, in substance, by Theophylact: περισσοῦ τι ἐνδείκνυσθαι ἐν τῇ πίστει, εἰκαριστεύων τῷ θεῷ, ὃτι ἡξίωσεν ἡμᾶς τοιαύταις χάρισιν, καὶ μὴ ἐαυτῶν τὴν προκοπὴν ἐπιφράσσασαν. Rightly also by Oecumenius, who takes ἐν εἰκαρ. as equivalent to σὺν εἰκαρ. Comp. Castalio, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Bähr, Steiger, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Dalmer, Hofmann, and others. Others, however, regard ἐν εἰκαρ. as belonging to περισσοῦ. Such is the view not only of the majority who reject ἐν αὐτῇ on critical grounds (as Ewald), but also of Luther, Michaelis, Storr, Flatt, Huther (that the Colossians in their faith towards God . . . are to show themselves abundantly grateful). De Wette favours this rendering on the ground that the clause is not attached by καλ, which, however, is quite in keep-
ing with the circumstance that περισσ. κ.τ.λ. is subordinate to the βεβαιωμ. κ.τ.λ. In opposition to the combination περισσ. ἐν εὐχαρ. there may be urged, first, the arrangement of the words in itself; secondly, the fact that ἐν αὐτῷ would be superfluous; and thirdly, that all the other elements of the verse refer to the nature of faith, and hence the latter, in harmony with the context, is to be regarded also in the last participial clause as the object of the discourse, whereas ἐν εὐχαρ. is to be treated as a relation associated with the faith.

Ver. 8. Be upon your guard, lest there shall be some one carrying you away as a prey. In that case, how grievously would what I have just been impressing upon your hearts, in vv. 6, 7, be rendered fruitless! — The future έσται after μὴ (comp. Heb. iii. 12) has arisen from the apprehension that the case may yet actually occur. See Stallbaum, ad Plat. Rep. p. 451 A; Hartung, Partikell. II. p. 139 f.; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 104. Comp. also on Gal. iv. 11. — As to the participle with the article, comp. on Gal. i. 7: τινές εἰσιν οἱ παράσοντες. — Respecting συλαγωγεῖν, belonging to the later Greek, see Eustath. ad II. v. p. 393, 52. Very inaccurately rendered by the Vulgate: decipiât. In Aristaen. ii. 22, joined with οἰκον, it means to ῥᾶ; and is so taken here by Hilary, Chrysostom, Theodoret (ἀποσυλλαῖ τήν πίστιν), Theophylact (τὸν νοῦν), Luther, Wolf, and many others, including Baumgarten-Crusius. But the stronger sense of the word praedam abigere (Heliod. x. 35; Nicet. Ann. 5, p. 96 D) is in keeping with the verb of the previous exhortation, περιπατεῖτε, as well as with the purposely chosen peculiar expression in itself, which is more significant than the classical συλάν or συλείσεν, and serves vividly to illustrate the idea of the seduction, through which one falls under extraneous power, as respects its disgracefulness. — διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας κ. κενῆς ἀπάντησι through philosophy and empty deceit. It is to be observed that neither the preposition nor the article is repeated before κενῆς (see Kühner, II. 1, pp. 476, 528; Buttmann, Neu. Gr. p. 86 [E. T. 100]), because with καὶ κεν. ἀπάντησι: there is added no further element different from τῆς φιλοσοφ. (in col.
opposition to Hofmann), but only that which the philosophy in its essence is; it is empty deception, that is, having no real contents; the πιθανολογία (ver. 4), with which it is presented, is a κενεαγορά (Plat. Rep. p. 607 B), and κενολογία (Plut. Mor. p. 1069 C). On the idea of κενός (1 Cor. xv. 14; Eph. v. 6), comp. Dem. 821. 11.: κενώτατον πάντων λόγων λέγομεν, and on ἀπάτη, Plat. Soph. p. 260 C: οὕτως δὲ γε φεύγουσιν ἡτοι ἄπατη . . ., καὶ μὴν ἀπάτης ὁμοις εἰδώλων τε καὶ εἰκόνων ἡ δὲ καὶ φαντασίας πάντα ἀνάξημα μεστὰ εἶναι. The philosophy, however, against which Paul utters his warning, is not philosophy generally and in itself—a view at variance with the addition κ. κενῆς ἀπάτ. closely pertaining to it, however much the wisdom of the world in its degeneracy (comp. Herm. gottesd. Alterth. § 12; and Culturgesch. d. Griech. u. Rom. I. p. 236 ff., II. p. 132), as experience was conversant with its phenomena in that age,⁴ may have manifested itself to the apostle as foolishness when compared with the wisdom of the gospel (1 Cor. i. 18 ff., ii. 6). Rather, he has in view (comp. ver. 18) the characteristic speculation, well known to his readers, which engaged attention in Colossae and the surrounding district,⁵ and consisted of a Gnostic theosophy mixed up with Judaism (Essenism). This is, on account of its nature directed to the supersensuous and its ontological character, correctly designated by the term philosophy in general, apart from its relation to the truth, which is signalized by the κ. κενῆς ἀπάτης appended.⁶ (Plat. Def. p. 414 C: τῆς τῶν

---

1 Comp. Luther's frequent denunciations of philosophy, under which he had present to his mind its degeneracy in the Aristotelian scholasticism.

2 Comp. also Calovius. The latter rightly remarks how ἀριστοκρίνεις and ἀναλύοντες men would proceed, who should regard philosophical and theological truth as opposites; and points out that if Greek philosophy do not teach the doctrine of eternal life and its attainment, it is not a καὶ ἀνάπηρα, but an imperfecto. Fathers of the Church also, as e.g. Clemens Al. (comp. Spieß, Logos spermat. p. 341), aptly distinguish philosophy itself from the phenomena of its abuse. The latter are philosophy also, but not in accordance with the truth of the conception.

3 These words κ. κενῆς, characterizing the philosophy meant, are therefore all the less to be regarded, with Holtzmann, as a tautological insertion; and it is mere arbitrariness to claim the words κατὰ τ. παράλ. τῶν ἀναφ. for the Synoptical Gospels (Matt. xv. 2 f.) as if παράλογα (comp. especially Gal. i. 14) were not sufficiently current in the apostle's writings.
CHAP. II. 8.

Possibly it was also put forward by the false teachers themselves expressly under this designation (comp. the Sophists as the φάσκοντες φιλοσοφεῖν, Xen. Mem. i. 2, 19; and οἴδομεν πάντι εἰδέναι, in i. 4, 1). The latter is the more probable, since Paul uses the word only in this passage. Comp. Bengel: "quod adversarii jactabant esse philosophiam et sapientiam (ver. 23), id Paulus inanem fraudem esse dicit." The nature of this philosophy is consequently to be regarded as Judaistic-Oriental; we are under no necessity to infer from the word φιλοσοφία a reference to Greek wisdom, as Grotius did, suggesting the Pythagorean (Clemens Alexandrinus thought of the Epicureans, and Tertullian of such philosophers as Paul had to do with at Athens). The idea that the "sacrarum literarum earumque recte interpretandarum scientia" (Tittmann, de vestigis Gnost. in N. T. frustra quaesitas, p. 86 ff.) is meant, is opposed, not to the word in itself, but to the marks of heretical doctrine in our Epistle, and to the usage of the apostle, who never so designates the O. T. teaching and exposition, however frequently he speaks of it; although Philo gives it this name (see Loesner, Obs. p. 364), and Josephus (see Krebs, p. 236) applies it to the systems of Jewish sects, and indeed the Fathers themselves apply it to the Christian doctrine (Suicer, Thes. s.v.); see Grimm on 2 Macc. i. 1, p. 298 f.—κατὰ τ. παράδ. τ. ἀνθρ.] might be—and this is the common view—closely joined with ἀπάτης (Winer, p. 128 f. [E. T. 169]). But the οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν would not suit this connection, since ἀπάτη is already in itself a definite and proper idea, in association with which a κατὰ Χριστόν would be inconceivable; whereas the figuration συλαγωγεῖν still admits also the negative modal statement (οὐ κατὰ Χ.) for greater definiteness. Accordingly κατὰ τ. παράδ. κ.τ.λ. (comp. Steiger, Ellicott) is to be taken as definition of mode to συλαγωγεῖν. Paul, namely, having previously announced whereby the συλαγωγεῖν takes place, now adds for the still more precise description of that procedure, in order the more

1 The speculations of Essenism are also designated as philosophy in Philo. Comp. Keim, Gesch. Jesu, I. p. 292.
effectively to warn his readers against it, that in accordance with which it takes place, i.e. what is the objective regulative standard by which they permit themselves to be guided. He does this positively (κατὰ τὴν . . . κόσμου) and negatively (κ. οὔ κατὰ Χριστοῦ). The genitive τῶν ἀνθρ. is to be explained: ἦν παρέλαβε παρὰ τῶν ἀνθρ. (comp. 2 Thess. iii. 6), and τῶν denotes the category, the tradition humana as such, opposed to the divine revelation. Comp. Mark vii. 8. What is meant, doubtless, is the ritual Jewish tradition outside of the Mosaic law (comp. on Matt. xv. 2), the latter being excluded by τῶν ἀνθρ.; but Paul designates the thing quite generally, according to the genus to which it belongs, as human.—κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου] Parallel of the foregoing: according to the elements of the world, i.e. according to the religious rudiments, with which non-Christian humanity occupies itself. The expression in itself embraces the ritual observances of both of Judaism and heathenism, which, in comparison with the perfect religion of Christianity, are only "puerilia rudimenta" (Calvin), as it were the A B C of religion, so that Paul therefore in this case also, where he warns his readers against Judaistic enticing, characterizes the matter according to its category. As to the designation itself and its various interpretations, see on Gal. iv. 3. Among the latest expositors, Bleek agrees with our view, while Hofmann explains: “because it (the philosophy which is described as deceit) permits the material things, of which the created world consists, to form its standard.” See in opposition to this on Gal. i. c. Both expressions, τὴν παράδ. τ. ἀνθρ. and τὰ στοιχ. τ. κόσμου, have it as their aim to render apparent the worthlessness and unsuitableness for the Christian standpoint (comp. Gal. iv. 9). Hence, also, the contrast which, though obvious of itself, is nevertheless emphatic: καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστοῦ. The activity of that συλαγώγειν has not Christ for its objective standard; He, in accordance with His divine dignity exalted above everything (see ver. 9), was to be the

¹ Calvin well says: “Quid vocat elementa mundi? Non dubium quin cremonias; nam continuo post exempli loco speciem unam adducit, circumcisionem scilicet.”
sole regulative for all activity in Christian teaching, so that the standard guiding their work should be found in the relation of dependence upon Him; but instead of this the procedure of the συλλαγωγών allows human tradition, and those non-Christian rudiments which the Christian is supposed to have long since left behind, to serve as his rule of conduct! How unworthy it is, therefore, to follow such seduction!

Ver. 9. Since indeed in Him dwells, etc. This is not "a peg upon which the interpolator hangs his own thoughts" (Holtzmann). On the contrary, Paul assigns a reason for the ό κατὰ Χριστόν just said, with a view more effectually to deter them from the false teachers. The force of the reason assigned lies in the fact that, if the case stand so with Christ, as is stated in vv. 9 ff., by every other regulative principle of doctrine that which is indicated in the words κατὰ Χριστόν is excluded and negated. Others make the reason assigned refer to the warning: βλέπετε κ.τ.λ., so that ώσ adduces the reason why they ought to permit this warning to be addressed to them (Hofmann, comp. Huther and Bleek); but, in opposition to this view, it may be urged that the έν αὐτῷ placed emphatically first (in Him and in no other) points back to the immediately preceding ό κατὰ Χριστόν (comp. Chrysostom and Calvin); there is therefore nothing to show that the reference of ώσ ought to be carried further back (to βλέπετε). In Christ the whole fulness of Godhead—what a contrast to the human παράδοσις and the στοιχεῖα of the world! — κατοικεῖ] The present, for it is the exalted Christ, in the state of His heavenly δόξα, that is in view. Comp. i. 15. In Him the entire πλήρωμα has its κατοικητήριον (Eph. ii. 22), so that He is the personal bearer of it, the personal seat of its essential presence. — τὰν τὸ πλήρωμα (comp. on i. 19) is here more precisely defined by the "vocabulary abstractum signifiantissimum" (Bengel) τῆς θεότητος, which specifies what dwells in Christ in its entire fulness, i.e. not, it may be, partially, but in its complete entirety. On the genitive, comp. Rom. xi. 25, xv. 29. It is not the genitive auctoris (Nösselt: "universa comprehensio eorum, quae Deus per Christum vellet in homines transferre"); the very abstract θεότητ. should have been a
sufficient warning against this view, as well as against the interpretation: "id quod inest θεόνη" (Bähr). ἡ θεόνη, the Godhead (Lucian, Icarom. 9; Plut. Mor. p. 415 O), the abstract from ὁ Θεός, is to be distinguished from ἡ θεόνη, the abstract from θεός (Rom. i. 20; Wisd. xviii. 19; Lucian, de calumn. 17). The former is Deitas, the being God, i.e. the divine essence, Godhead; the latter is divinitas, i.e. the divine quality, godlikeness. See on Rom. i. 20. Accordingly, the essence of God, undivided and in its whole fulness, dwells in Christ in His exalted state, so that He is the essential and adequate image of God (i. 15), which He could not be if He were not possessor of the divine essence. The distinction between what is here said about Christ and what is said about Him in i. 19 is, that the πνεύμα is here meant metaphysically, of the divina essentia, but in the former passage charismatically, of the divina gratia, and that κατουκεῖν is conceived here as in present permanence, but in the former passage historically (namely, of Christ's historical, earthly appearance). See on i. 19. The erroneous attempts that have been made to explain away the literal meaning thus definitely and deliberately expressed by Paul, are similar to those in i. 19. One of these, in particular, is the mis-explanation referring it to the church as the God-filled organ of divine self-revelation (Heinrichs, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel) which has its dwelling-place in Christ. 1 Already Theodoret (comp. τισί in Chrysostom), indeed, quotes the explanation that Christ signifies the church in which the πνεύμα dwells, but on account of σωματικῶς hesitates to agree to it, and rather accedes to the common view, thereby deviating from his interpretation of i. 19. Theophylact is substantially right (comp. Chrysostom and Oecumenius): ei τι ἑστιν ὁ Θεός λόγος, ἐν αὐτῷ οἰκεῖ, so that the fulness of the Godhead in the ontological, and not in

1 Thus, indeed, the fulness of the Godhead has been removed from Christ, but there has only been gained instead of it the unbiblical idea that the church dwells in Christ. The church has its support in Christ as the corner-stone (Eph. ii. 20, 21), but it does not dwell in Him. On the contrary, Christ dwells in the church, which is His body, and the πνεύμα filled by Him (see on Eph. i. 28), namely, in virtue of the Spirit dwelling in the church (see on Eph. ii. 22), which is the Spirit of Christ (Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iv. 6; Phil. i. 19).
the simply mystical or morally religious sense (de Wette) is meant. — But how does it dwell in Christ? σωματικός, in bodily fashion, i.e. in such a way that through this indwelling in Christ it is in a bodily form of appearance, clothed with a body. Comp. also Hofmann in loc., and Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 29; Weiss, Bibl. Theol. p. 428, ed. 2. It is not in Christ (ἀσωμάτως), as before the Incarnation it was in the λόγος (Θεός ἐν ὑμῖν Θεός, John i. 1), but (comp. also Gess, Pers. Chr. p. 260 ff.) it is in His glorified body (Phil. iii. 21), so that the ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ and ἵσα Θεό ἐιναι, which already existed in the λόγος ἄσαρξ (Phil. ii. 6), now in Christ’s estate of exaltation—which succeeded the state of humiliation, whereby the μορφή Θεοῦ was affected—have a bodily frame, are in bodily personality.¹

Of course the θεότης does not thereby itself come into the ranks of the σωματικά οὐσίαι (Plat. Locr. p. 96 A), but is in the exalted Christ after a real fashion σωματικά εἴδει (Luke iii. 22), and therefore Christ Himself is the visible divinely-human image of the invisible God (i. 15). In this glory, as Possessor of the Godhead dwelling in Him bodily, He will also appear in the Parousia—an appearance, therefore, which will manifest itself visibly (1 John iii. 2) as the actual ἐνεργεία τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ (Tit. ii. 13). The reference of the whole statement, however, to the exalted Christ is placed beyond question by the use of the present κατωκεῖ, which asserts the presently existing relation, without requiring a νῦν along with it (in opposition to Huther). The renderings: essentialiter, οὐσιωδός (Cyril, Theophylact, Calvin, Beza, and others, including Usteri, Steiger, Olshausen, Huther, Bisping), in which case some thought of a contrast to the divine ἐνεργεία in the prophets (see Theophylact), and: realiter (Augustine, Erasmus, Vatablus, Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Schoettgen, Wolf, Nösselt, Bleek, and others), in which was found the opposite of τυπικός (ver. 17), are linguistically inappropriate; for σωματικός never means anything else than corporeus. Comp. on the

¹ It is now only worth remarking historically, but is almost incredible, how the Socinians have twisted our verse. Its sense in their view is: “quod in doctrina ipius tota Dei voluntas integra et reapse est patenta,” Catech. Bacon. 194, p. 398, ed. Oeder. Calovius gives a refutation in detail.
adverb, Plut. Mor. p. 424 D. The less justifiable is the hypothesis of Rich. Schmidt (Paul. Christol. p. 191), that in the term σωμάτικώς the contrast of ver. 17 was already present to the apostle's mind. Those who adopt the erroneous explanation of πλήρωμα as referring to the church, assign to σωματικώς the meaning: "so that the church stands related to Him as His body" (Baumgarten-Crusius and Schenkel), which issues in the absurdity that the body of Christ is held to dwell in Christ, whereas conversely Christ could not but dwell in His body. It is true that the church is related to Christ as His body, not, however, in so far as it dwells in Him and, according to the context, this must have been the case here, if the explanation in question be adopted), but either in so far as He dwells in it, or in so far as He is its Head, which latter thought is quite foreign to the connection of the passage; for even in ver. 10 Christ is not called the Head of the church. It is, moreover, to be observed, that the adverb is placed emphatically at the end. The special reason, however, on account of which the κατοικεῖν κ.τ.λ. is thus prominently set forth as bodily, cannot, indeed, be directly shown to have been supplied by the circumstances of the Colossians, but is nevertheless to be recognised in an apologetic interest of opposition to the false teachers, who by their doctrines concerning the angels (comp. ver. 10: ἀρχής κ. ἐξουσ.) must have broken up, in a spiritualistic sense, the πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος.

Ver. 10. Καὶ ἔστε ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρ.] still depending on ἐπειδή: and (since) ye are filled in Him, i.e. and since the πληροτής which ye possess rests on Him, the bodily Bearer of the divine πλήρωμα. The two are correlative: from the πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος, which dwells in the exalted Christ, flows the πεπληρωμένον εἶναι of the Christian, which has its basis, therefore, in no other than in Christ, and in nothing else than just in fellowship with Him. Filled with what? was self-evident to the consciousness of the reader. It is the dynamic, charismatic πληρώσει, which Christians, in virtue of their union of life with the Lord, whose Spirit and ζωή are in them, have received, and continuously possess, out of the metaphysical πληρώμα dwelling in Christ, out of the πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος.
The emphasis is not upon ἐστέ, but, as shown by the subsequent relative definitions, upon ἐν αὐτῷ. If the πεπληρωμένον εἶναι depends on Ἰημ, on nothing and on no one but Ἰημ, then everything else which men may teach you, and with which they may wish to seize you and conduct you in leading strings, is οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν. With due attention to this emphasis of ἐν αὐτῷ, we should neither have expected ὑμεῖς (in opposition to de Wette; comp. Estius and others: "et vos") nor have explained ἐστε in an imperative sense (in opposition to Grotius, Bos, Heumann); which latter view is to be rejected, because the entire connection is not paraenetic, and generally because, whilst a πληροῦσθε (Eph. v. 18) or γίνεσθε πεπληρ. may, ἔστε πεπληρ. cannot, logically be enjoined.¹ There is, moreover (comp. also Hofmann), nothing to be supplied with πεπληρ. (usually: τὴς θεότητος, see Theophylact and Huther; de Wette, Bleek: τοῦ πληρῶμ. τ. θεότ.)

since the specifically ontological sense of the purposely-chosen θεότης would not even be consistent with the supposed equalization of the Christians with Christ (οὐδὲν ἐλάττου ἔχετε αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ πεπληρομένοι καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔστε τῆς θεότητος, Theophylact), and this equalization does not exist at all, because Paul has not written καὶ ὑμεῖς. In what their being filled consisted, was known to the readers from their own experience, without further explanation; their thoughts, however, were to dwell upon the fact that, since their being full depended on ὁσιότης, those labours of the false teachers were of quite another character than κατὰ Χριστόν. — ὡς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ κ.τ.λ.] This, as also ver. 11, now supplies confirmatory information regarding the fact that they have their being filled not otherwise than just in ὁσιότης; namely, neither through ἄρχαί κ. ἐξουσία, since Christ is the head of every ἄρχη and ἐξουσία; nor yet through circumcision, since they have received in Christ the real ethical circumcision. — πάσης ἄρχ. κ. ἐξουσία.] is not more precisely defined as in Eph. iii. 10; hence, in

¹ Calovius has well said: "Beneficium Christi, non nostrum officium;" comp. Wolf. In complete opposition to the context, Grotius brings out the sense: "illo contenti estote," which he supports by the remark: "quia quod plenum est, nihil aliud desiderat."
virtue of the munus regium of the Lord quite generally: every principality and power, but with the tacit apologetic reference: consequently also of the angelic powers (i. 16) belonging to these categories and bearing these names, to whose mediation, to be attained through ὑποκείμα, the false teachers direct you,—a reference which Hofmann, understanding the expressions in the sense of spiritual beings ruling arbitrarily and in opposition to God especially over the Gentile world (notwithstanding the fact that Christ is their Head!), groundlessly denies; see ver. 18. If Christ be the Head of every ἀρχή and ἐξουσία, i.e. their governing sovereign, the Christian cannot have anything to expect from any angelic powers subordinate to Christ,—a result involved in the union in which He stands to the Higher, to Christ Himself.—With the reading ἐστιν (see the critical remarks), which is also preferred by Ewald,¹ Lachmann has placed καὶ ἐστε εὖ αὑτῷ πεπληρω, in a parenthesis. But, while this important thought would neither have motive nor be appropriate as a mere parenthesis, it would also be improper that the neuter subject τὸ πλήρωμα τ. θεότ. should be designated as ἡ κεφαλή κ.τ.λ., which applies rather to the personal possessor of the πλήρωμα, to Christ.

Ver. 11. Respecting the connection and its reference to the false teachers, so far as they "legem evangelio miscibant" (Calvin), see on ver. 10. — ἐν δὲ like ἐν αὑτῷ in ver. 10: on whom it also causally depends that ye, etc. This applies to the point of time of their entrance into the union with Christ, as is clear from the historical περετμ., which took place on them through their conversion (comp. ver. 12).—καὶ also circumcised were ye. The καὶ is the simple also, which, however, does not introduce an element included under πεπληρωμ. ἐστε (Hofmann), but to the previous relative statement (ὅς ἐστιν κ.τ.λ.) appends another; comp. ver. 12. Hofmann's objection, that the foregoing relative statement has indeed reference to the readers, but is made without reference to them, is an empty subtlety, which is connected with the

¹ Inasmuch as he takes τίνι directly as scilicet, utpote, and regards this usage as a linguistic peculiarity of this Epistle. But this rendering is not required either in i. 24 or in iii. 17; and respecting i. 27, see the critical remarks.
erroneous rendering of πάσης ἀρχής κ. ἐξουσ. — περιτομῇ ἀχειροπ.] is not supplementary and parenthetical (Hofmann), as if Paul had written περιτομῇ δὲ ἀχειροπ., but appends immediately to περιετμήθη. its characteristic, whereby it is distinguished from what is elsewhere meant by circumcision; hence the thought is: "in your union with Christ there has also taken place a circumcision upon you (Gentiles), which is not (like the Jewish circumcision) the work of hands;" comp. Eph. ii. 11. On the word ἀχειροπ. itself (which is similar to ἀχειροπορητός, Poll. ii. 154), in analogous antithetical reference, comp. Mark xiv. 58; 2 Cor. v. 1; and on the idea of the inner ethical circumcision, of which the bodily is the type, comp. Deut. x. 16, xxx. 6; Ezek. xlv. 7; Acts vii. 51. See Michaelis in loc., and the expositors on Rom. ii. 29; Schoettgen, Hor. I. p. 815. — ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει κ.τ.λ. This characteristic περιετμήθητε περιετμ. ἀχειρ. took place by means of the putting off of the body of the flesh, which was accomplished in your case (observe the passive connection), i.e. in that the body, whose essence and nature are flesh, was taken off and put away from you by God.¹ With reference to ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει κ.τ.λ., which is to be coupled not merely with περιετμήθητε (Hofmann), but with the entire specifically defined conception of circumcision περιετμ. περιετ. ἀχειροπ., it is to be noticed: (1) that the genitive τῆς σάρκος is the genitivus materiae, as in i. 22; (2) that the σάρκι here is not indifferent, but means the flesh as the seat of sin, and of its lusts and strivings (Rom. vii. 23, 25, viii. 3, 13; Gal. v. 16; Eph. ii. 3; Col. iii. 5, et al.); so that Paul (3) might have conveyed the idea of τὸ σῶμα τῆς σαρκ. also by τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας (Rom. vi. 6), but the description by τῆς σαρκός was suggested to him by the thought of the circumcision (Rom. ii. 28; Eph. ii. 11). (4) The significant and weighty expression ἀπεκδύσει (the substantive used only here, the verb also in ver. 15, iii. 9; Josephus, Antt. vi. 14. 2) is selected in contrast to the operation of the legal circumcision, which only

¹ Compare Hofmann, Schriftdew. II. 2, p. 171. The same writer, however, now objects that ἀρισθεία cannot have passive significance. But this it is not alleged to have: God is the ἀρισθοῦν, i.e. He who, as author of regeneration, puts off from man the body of flesh.
wounded the σώμα τοῦ σαρκός and removed a portion of one member of it; whereas the spiritual circumcision, divinely performed, consisted in a complete parting and doing away with this body, in so far as God, by means of this ethical circumcision, has taken off and removed the sinful body from man (the two acts are expressed by the double compound), like a garment which is drawn off and laid aside. Ethically circumcised, i.e. translated by conversion from the estate of sin into that of the Christian life of faith and righteousness (see ver. 12), consequently born again as καινὴ κτίσις,1 as a καινὸς ἀνθρωπος created after God (Eph. iv. 24), man has no longer any σῶμα τῆς σαρκός at all, because the body which he has is rid of the sinful σάρξ as such, as regards its sinful quality; he is no longer ἐν τῇ σαρκί as previously, when ἐνηργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν (Rom. vii. 5; comp. ver. 23); he is no longer σάρκων, τετραμένοι ὑπὸ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν (Rom. vii. 14), but is dead for sin (Rom. vi. 11); he has crucified the σάρξ (Gal. v. 24), and no longer walks κατὰ σάρκα, but ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος (Rom. vii. 6); by the law of the Holy Spirit he is freed from the law of sin and death (Rom. viii. 2), ἐν πνεύματι (Rom. viii. 9), dead with Christ (Gal. ii. 19; 2 Cor. v. 14; Col. iii. 3), and risen, so that his members are ὅπλα δικαίωσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ (Rom. vi. 13). This Christian transformation is represented in its ideal aspect, which disregards the empirical imperfection, according to which the σάρξ is still doubtless even in the regenerate at variance with the πνεύμα (Gal. v. 17). Our dogmatists well describe regeneration as perfecta a parte Dei, but as imperfecta a parte hominum recipiendum. To take σῶμα in the sense of massa or aggregate (Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, and others, including Steiger and Bähr2), is opposed as well to

---

1 The epoch of this transformation is baptism (see Weiss, Bibl. Theol. p. 439, col. 2; comp. Holtzmann, p. 178), by which, however, the baptism of Christian children is by no means assumed as the antitype of circumcision (Steiger, Philippus). Comp. on 1 Cor. vii. 14; Acts xvi. 15.

2 Comp. also Philippus, Glaubensl. V. 2, p. 225, who declares my explanation to be forced, without proof, and contrary to the Scripture; and Reiche, Comm. crit. p. 274, who understands σῶμα of the “toto quasi vitiositas (v. vitiis) corporis,” so that the putting away of all immorality is denoted. Similarly Dalmer.
the context, in which the discourse turns upon circumcision and (ver. 12) upon burial and resurrection, as also to the linguistic usage of the N. T. In classic authors it expresses the notion in question in the physical sense, e.g. Plat. Tim. p. 32 C: τὸ τοῦ κόσμου σῶμα (comp. p. 31 B, Hipp. maj. p. 301 B), and in later writers may also denote generally a whole consisting of parts (comp. Cicero, ad Att. ii. 1. 4). In opposition to the erroneous assumption that σῶμα must have a figurative meaning here, as Julius Müller, v. d. Sünd., I. p. 459 f., still in the 5th ed., thinks, see on Rom. vi. 6; comp. also Hofmann, Schriftbew. I. p. 560 f. — ἐν τῷ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χ. by means of the circumcision of Christ, parallel to the previous ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδόσει κ.τ.λ., naming specifically (as different from that of the Old Testament) the circumcision described previously according to its nature. The genitive τοῦ Χριστοῦ is to be rendered: the circumcision, which is produced through Christ. The context requires this by the further explanation of the thing itself in ver. 12. Comp. above, ἐν φα. But Christ is not conceived of as Himself the circumciser, in so far, namely, as by baptism (Theophylact, Beza, and others), or by His Spirit (Bleek), He accomplishes the cleansing and sanctification of man (see on ver. 12); but as the One through whom, in virtue of the effective living union that takes place in conversion between man and Himself, this divine περιτομή, in its character specifically different from the Israelite circumcision, is practically brought about and rendered a reality, and in so far it is based on Christ as its αὐτος (Theodoret). It is not, however, baptism itself (Hofmann, following older expositors) that is meant by the circumcision of Christ, although the predicate ἀνεμον. would not be in opposition to this view, but the spiritual transformation, that consecration of a holy state of life, which takes place in baptism; see ver. 12: ἐν τῷ βαπτίζεσθαι. According to Schneckenburger, in the Theol. Jahrb. 1848, p. 286 ff., the ἀπεκδοσις τ. σώμ. τ. σαρκ. is meant of the death of Christ, and also the περιτομή τοῦ Χ. is meant to denote this death, so that

1 Müller also holds that Paul here conceives the old sinful nature as a body which, in regeneration, the Christian puts off; and that σάξ is to be understood only of the earthly-human life.
the latter is an explanation by way of application of the former, in opposition to the heretical recommendation of a bodily or mystical περιεμφή.

It may be decisively urged against this view, that after τῆς σαρκὸς there is no αὐτοῦ, (comp. i. 22), which was absolutely necessary, if the reader was to think of another subject than that of περιεμφήθητε; further, that τῇ ἀκροβυσσίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν, in ver. 13, stands in significant retrospective reference to the ἀπέκδωσις τ. σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς; and that συνταφέντες κ.τ.λ. in ver. 12 is synchronous with περιεμφήθητε κ.τ.λ., and represents substantially the same thing. Moreover, the description of the death of Christ as His circumcision would be all the more inappropriate, since, in the case of Christ, the actual circumcision was not absent. According to Holtzmann, the entire clause: ἐν τ. ἀπεκδ. τοῦ σῶμα τ. σαρκ., ἐν τ. περιε, τ. Χ., should be deleted as an addition of the interpolator, because the expression σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς has occurred at i. 22 in quite another—namely, an indifferent, genuinely Pauline—reference. This reason is incorrect, because in i. 22 it is not τῆς σαρκὸς, but τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, and this αὐτοῦ makes the great essential difference between the expression in that passage and that employed in our present one.

Ver. 12 supplies further information as to how the περιεμφήθητε, so far as it has taken place by means of the circumcision of Christ, has been accomplished. — συνταφέντες κ.τ.λ.] synchronous with περιεμφ. (comp. on i. 20, ἐπηνοοῦσας): in that ye became buried with Him in baptism. The immersion in baptism, in accordance with its similarity to burial, is—seeing that baptism translates into the fellowship of the death of Christ (see on Rom. vi. 3)—a burial along with Christ, Rom. vi. 4. Through that fellowship of death man dies as to his sinful nature, so that the σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς (ver. 11) ceases to live, and by means of the fellowship of burial is put off (ver. 11). The subject who effects the joint burial is God, as in the whole context. In the burial of Christ this joint burial of all that confess Him as respects their sinful body was objectively completed; but it takes place, as respects each individually and in subjective appropriation, by their baptism,
prior to which the realization of that fellowship of burial was, on the part of individuals, still wanting.—ἐν δὲ καὶ συνηγήρθε] A new benefit, which has accrued to the readers ἐν Χριστῷ, and which in their case must bring still more clearly to living consciousness their ἐν Χριστῷ πεπληρωμένον εἶναι; so that ἐν δὲ here is parallel to the ἐν δὲ in ver. 11, and refers to Christ, as does also αὐτῶν subsequently. It is rightly taken thus, following Chrysostom and his successors, by Luther and most others, including Flatt, Bähr, Huther, Ewald. Others have referred it to ἐν τῷ βαπτίζεται. (Beza, Calixtus, Estius, Michaelis, Heinrichs, and others, including Steiger, Böhmer, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hofmann, Dalmer, Bleek); but, in opposition to this may be urged, first, the very symmetry of the discourse (ὅτι . . . ἐν δὲ καὶ . . . ἐν δὲ καὶ); secondly, and specially, the fact that, if ἐν δὲ refers to baptism, ἐν could not be the proper preposition, since ἐν τῷ βαπτίζεται, in accordance with the meaning of the word and the figure of burial, refers to the dipping into (not overflowing, as Hofmann thinks), whilst the spiritual awakening to new life, in which sense these expositors take συνηγήρθε, would have taken place through the emerging again, so that we should expect ἐκ ὅς, or, at all events, the non-local δι’ ὅς; and, thirdly, the fact that just as συνηγήσεις has its own more precise definition by ἐν τῷ βαπτίζεται, so also has συνηγήρθε. through διὰ τῆς πίστεως κ.τ.λ., and therefore the text affords no occasion for taking up again for συνηγήρθε, the more precise definition of the previous point, viz. ἐν τῷ βαπτίζεται. No, the first benefit received in Christ which Paul specifies, viz. the moral circumcision, accomplished by God through the joint burial in baptismal immersion, has been fully handled in ver. 11 down to βαπτισματί in ver. 12, and there now follows a second blessing received by the readers in Christ (ἐν δὲ καὶ): they have been raised up also with Christ, which has taken place through faith, etc. The previous joint burial was the necessary moral preliminary condition of this joint awakening, since through it the σῶμα τῆς σαρκός was put off. This συνηγήρθε, is to be understood in the sense of the fellowship of the bodily resurrection of Christ, into which fellowship man enters by faith in
such a way that, in virtue of his union of life and destiny with Christ brought about by means of faith, he knows his own resurrection as having taken place in that of Christ—a benefit of joint resurrection, which is, indeed, prior to the Parousia, an ideal possession, but through the Parousia becomes real (whether its realization be attained by resurrection proper in the case of the dead, or by the change that shall take place in those who are still alive). Usually συναγερθῆ is taken in the ethical sense, as referring to the spiritual awakening, viz. from moral death, so that Paul, after the negative aspect of the regeneration (ver. 11; βαπτίσματι, ver. 12), now describes its positive character; comp. also Huther, Ewald, Bleek, Hofmann. But in opposition to this view is the fact that the fresh commencement ἐν ὕ καλ, corresponding with the similar commencement of ver. 11, and referring to Christ, makes us expect the mention of a new benefit, and not merely that of another aspect of the previous one, otherwise there would have been no necessity for repeating the ἐν ὕ καλ; as also, that the inference of participation in the proper resurrection of Christ from death lies at the basis of the following τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν. Comp. on Eph. ii. 1, and ii. 5, 6. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Oecumenius have already correctly explained it of the proper resurrection (καὶ γὰρ ἐγείρεσθαι τῇ δυνάμει, εἰ καὶ μὴ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ), but Theophylact makes it include the ethical awakening also: holding that it is to be explained κατὰ δόυο πρόπους, of the actual resurrection in spe, and at the same time ὅτι πνευματικῶς τὴν νεκρωσίν τῶν ἔργων τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἀπερρήσαμεν. — διὰ τῆς πίστεως κ. τ. λ.] The τῆς πίστεως is described by Holtzmann, p. 70, as syntactically clumsy and offensive; he regards it as an interpolation borrowed from Eph. i. 19 f. Groundlessly; Paul is describing the subjective medium, without which the joint awakening, though objectively and historically accomplished in the resurrection of Christ, would not be appropriated individually, the λατρεῖν for this appropriation being wanting. The unbeliever has not the blessing of having risen with Christ, because he stands apart from the fellowship of life with Christ, just as also he has not the reconciliation, although the
reconciliation of all has been accomplished objectively through Christ's death. The genitive τῆς ἐνεπετάσ τ. Θ. is the object of faith; so Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus, Castalio, Beza, Calvin, Zeger, Grotius, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, and others, including Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, Bleek, and Hofmann, in the 2d ed. of the Schrifftbew. II. 2, p. 174 f. But others, such as Luther ("through the faith which God works"), Bengel, Flatt, Bähr, Steiger, de Wette, Böhmer, Huther, et al., take τῆς ἐνεπ. τ. Θ. as genitivus causae, for which, however, Eph. i. 19 is not to be adduced (see in loc.), and in opposition to which it is decisive that in all passages, where the genitive with πιστής is not the believing subject, it denotes the object (Mark xi. 22; Acts iii. 16; Rom. iii. 22; Gal. ii. 16, 20, iii. 22; Eph. iii. 12; Phil. i. 27, iii. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 13; Jas. ii. 1; Rev. ii. 13, xiv. 12), and that the description of God as the Being who has raised up Christ from the dead stands most naturally and directly in significant reference to the divine activity which procures, not the faith, but the ὑπενεπετάσθαι, and which is therefore set forth in a very appropriate manner as the special object of faith (comp. iv. 17, 24, vi. 8, x. 9; 2 Cor. iv. 13, 14; Eph. i. 19 f.; 1 Pet. i. 21). At the basis, namely, of the τοῦ ἐνεπετάστει αὐτ. ἐκ νεκρ. lies the certainty in the believer's consciousness: since God has raised up Christ, His activity, which has produced this principale and majus, will have included therein the consequens and minus, my resurrection with Him. To the believer the two stand in such essential connection, that in the operation of God which raised up Christ he beholds, by virtue of his fellowship of life with Christ, the assurance of his own resurrection having taken place along with that act; in the former he has the pledge, the ἐνεχειρον (Theodoret) of the latter. Hofmann now again (as in the first ed. of the Schrifftbeweis) explains τῆς ἐνεπ. τ. Θ. as in opposition to τῆς πιστής, in such a way that Paul, "as if correcting himself," makes the former take the place of the latter, in order to guard against the danger of his readers conceiving to

1 The efficacy of the divine power shown in the resurrection of Christ is the guarantee of the certainty of salvation.
themselves faith as a conduct on man’s part making possible the participation in the resurrection of Christ by God, while in reality it is nothing else than the product of the ἐνέργεια of God. A quite gratuitously invented self-correction, without precedent, and undiscoverable by the reader; although the thought, if it had entered the mind of Paul, might have been indicated with the utmost simplicity and ease (possibly by διὰ τῆς πίστεως, μᾶλλον δὲ διὰ τῆς ἐνέργ. τ. Θ.).

Ver. 13. Since that συνεργήσων was the awaking to eternal life, Paul now goes on to give special prominence to this great blessing, the making alive, and that in reference to the Gentile-Christian position of the readers; and to this he annexes, in ver. 14 f., an anti-Judaistic triumphant statement reminding them of the cancelling of their debt-bond with the law.—To attach καὶ ὑμᾶς... σαρκὸς ὑμῶν still to ver. 12, and to make it depend on ἐγείραντος (Steiger), is rendered impossible by the right explanation of τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνέργειας τ. Θ. in ver. 12, to say nothing of the abrupt position in which συνεζωσών. would thus appear. Καὶ ὑμᾶς goes along with συνεζωσών, so that ὑμᾶς is then repeated (see Fritzscbe, Quaest. Luc. p. 14; Bornemann in the Sächs. Stud. 1846, p. 66; Kühner, II. 1, p. 568; Winer, p. 139 [E. T. 184]), the repetition being here occasioned by the emphasis of the συνεζωσών: “You also, when ye were dead... He made you alive together with Him.” The καὶ therefore is not the copula and, but, in harmony with the ὑμᾶς placed in the front emphatically: also, as in Eph. ii. 1. It has its reference in this, that the readers had been Gentiles liable to eternal death, but the συνεζωσών. had been extended, as to all believers, so also to them. The

---

1 This applies also in opposition to Hofmann, who takes ver. 13 likewise as a continuation of the description of God given in τῶν ἁγίων. autōn ἐν ὑμ., and therein makes the apostle guilty of a clumsy change of construction, viz. that he intended to make εὐρετήριον follow, but, because this word would have been “inconvenient” after μετ’ ὑμῶν κ. c., exchanged it for an independent sentence. But εὐρετήριον would have been inserted without any inconvenience whatever: on the contrary, it would only have expressed the alleged idea conformably to the construction clearly and definitely. The comparison of L. 26 is unsuitable. Holtzmann follows substantially the view of Hofmann, but regards the change of structure as the result of dictation. There is no change of structure in the passage at all.
correctness of this reference is shown by the context as well through τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκ. ὑμῖν., as through the pronoun of the first person which is introduced after χαροῦμεν. Extremely arbitrary is the view of Olshausen, who thinks that in ver. 11 f. the readers are addressed as representatives of the collective community, but by καὶ ὑμᾶς in ver. 13 personally; while Baumgarten-Crusius, in complete antagonism to the position of the words, joins καὶ, not to ὑμᾶς, but to the verb: “also He has called you to the new life that abideth.”—To arrive at a proper understanding of what follows we must observe: (1) That συνεξωποιήσεως is not to be taken, any more than συνηγέρθησε previously, in an ethical sense, as referring to regeneration (so usually since Oecumenius, as e.g. Grotius: “sicut Christo novam contulit vitam ex morte corporis, ita et nobis novam ex morte animorum;” comp. also Bleek and Hofmann), but in its proper sense, and that (comp. Kaeuffer, de ζωής αἰων. not. p. 94 f.) as referring to the everlasting life to which God¹ raised up Christ, and which He has thereby also provided for believers in virtue of their fellowship with Christ (as an ideal possession now, but to be realized at the Parousia). See also Eph. ii. 5. The reconciliation (which de Wette understands) is not the ζωοποιήσεως itself, as is plain from the compound συνεξωμον., but its precursor and medium. The συζωοποιεῖν stands in the same relation to the συνεξεύρεσις as the nature of the act to its process; but the reason why συνηγέρθη here stands before the συζωοποιεῖν (it is different in Eph. ii. 5) is, that the συνηγέρθης was correlative with the συναφέντος in ver. 12, hence that word is used first, while in Eph. lc. the being dead preceded, with which the συζωοποιεῖν primarily corresponds. (2) Like συνεξωμον., so also νεκρως is not to be taken in an ethical sense (so usually both here

¹ God is the subject of συνζωοποιεῖται, not Christ (Ewald and the older expositors); for God has raised up Christ, and God is, according to the present context (it is different in iii. 13), the forgiver of sins, and has brought about the remission of sins through the λαυρᾶμα of Christ (ver. 14). Hence also it is not to be written τῷ ὑμῖν (with the aspirate). Just as God was obviously the acting subject in συμπεριθέτο, in συναφείται, and in συγκροί., so also He is introduced in the same character emphatically in ver. 12, and remains so till the close of ver. 15.
and in Eph. ii. 1, as e.g. Calvin, who thinks that the alienatio a Deo is meant), but, with Chrysostom and Theodoret, in its proper sense; the readers have been—this is the conception—prior to their conversion to Christ a prey of death. This is by no means to be understood, however, in the sense of physical death (for that comes from Adam’s sin, see on Rom. v. 12), but in that of eternal death, to which they were liable through their sins, so that they could not have become parts-takers of the eternal ζωή (comp. on Rom. vii. 9 f.). See also on Eph. ii. 1. What is meant, therefore, is not a death which would have only become their eternal death in the absence of the quickening (Hofmann), but the eternal death itself, in which they already lay, and out of which they would not have come without that deliverance, nay, which on the contrary—and here we have a prolepsis of the thought—would only have completed itself in the future αἰών.1 (3) This being dead occurred in the state (ἐν) of their sins (τῶν indicates the sins which they had committed) and of the uncircumcision of their flesh, i.e. when as respects their sinful materially-psyical nature they were still uncircumcised, and had not yet put off by conversion their Gentile fleshly constitution.2 The ἄκροβυτια in itself they even now had as Gentile Christians, but according to ver. 11 it was no longer ἄκροβ. τῆς σαρκός in their case, but was now indifferent (iii. 11; 1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. v. 6, vi. 15), since they had been provided with the ethical circumcision of Christ and emptied of the σώμα τῆς σαρκός. The ethical reference of the expression does not lie, therefore, in ἄκροβυτια itself, but in the characteristic τῆς σαρκός ὑμῶν (genitive of the subject); in this uncircumcision they were as Gentiles prior to their conversion, but were so no longer as Christians. Consequently ἄκροβ. is not to be taken figuratively (Deut. x. 16; Ezek. xlv. 7; Jer. iv. 4) as a designation of vitiositas (so Theodoret, Beza,

1 Quite correlative is the conception of the ζωή as eternal life, which the righteous man already has, although he has still in prospect the glorious perfection of it in the future αἰών.

2 The is not repeated before τῆς ἄκροβ. because the two elements coupled by καί are conceived together so as to form the single idea of unconversion; Kühner, II. 1, p. 476. This applies also in opposition to Holtzmann, p. 156.
Grotius, Bähr, Bleek, and most expositors), but in its proper sense, in which the readers as ἀκρόβυστοι could not but have understood it, and therein withal not as a symbol of uncleanness (Huther), or of the alienatio a Deo (Calvin, comp. Hofmann), or the like; on the contrary, the entire ethical stress lies on τῆς σαρκ. ὑμῶν. The idea of original sin (Flacius and other dogmatic expositors, comp. Bengel: “exquisita appellatio peccati origin.”) is likewise involved, and that according to its N. T. meaning (Rom. vii. 14 ff.), not in ἀκρόβυστον, but doubtless in τῆς σαρκ. ὑμῶν. Nevertheless this τῆς σαρκ. ὑμῶν belongs only to τῇ ἀκρόβυστῃ, and not to τοῖς παραπτώμασι as well (Hofmann); comp. Eph. ii. 11. Otherwise we should have, quite unnecessarily, two references heterogeneous in sense for the genitive; besides, the notion of παράπτωμα presupposes not the σάρξ, but the Εγώ in its relation to the divine law as the subject; hence also the expression παραπτ. τῆς σαρκ. (or ἀμαρτία τ. σ.) does not occur, while we find ἐργα τῆς σαρκός in Gal. v. 19. Holtzmann, p. 71, ascribes the words καὶ τῇ ἀκρόβσ. τ. σαρκός ὑμ. to the interpolator’s love for synomys and tautological expressions, and wishes to condemn them also in consequence of what in ver. 11 belongs to the latter (p. 155). But they are not at all tautological; and see on ver. 11. — καρποδέμνος κ.τ.λ. after having granted to us, i.e. forgiven, etc. This blotting out of our whole debt of sin was necessarily prior to the σωτηρία. ὑμᾶς σῶν αὐτώς. By the fact, namely, that He remitted to us all the sins which we had committed (πάντα τὰ παραπτ.), the causa efficiens of the being (eternally) dead was done away. Comp. Chrysostom: τὰ παραπτώματα, ἀ τὴν νεκρότητα ἐπόλει. This καρποδέμνος κ.τ.λ. is the appropriation of the reconciliation on the part of God, which believers experienced when they believed and were baptized; the objective expiatory act through the death of Christ had preceded, and is described in ver. 14. — ὑμῶν] applies to believers generally.  

¹ Not specially to Jewish Christians (Hofmann, who discovers here the same idea that is expressed in Heb. ix. 15, and makes a new period begin with καρποδέμνος), since Paul does not express a contrast with the Gentile-Christians, but very often passes from the second person, which refers to the readers, to the
mon with others, is prepared for by καὶ ὑμᾶς, but could not have been introduced, if χαρισμῶν κ.τ.λ. had been conceived as synchronous with συνεξοιτ., in which case Paul must logically have used ὑμῖν (not ἡμῖν), as the reading is in B κ** Vulg. Hilary. On χαριζομένων, comp. 2 Cor. ii. 10, xii. 13; Eph. iv. 32. On the subject-matter: 2 Cor. v. 19 ff.

Ver. 14. The participle, which is by no means parallel and synchronous with χαρισμῶν in ver. 13, or one and the same with it (Hofmann), is to be resolved as: after that He had blotted out, etc. For it is the historical divine reconciling act of the death of Christ that is meant, with which χαρισμῶν κ.τ.λ. cannot coincide, since that work of reconciliation had first to be accomplished before the χαριζομένων κ.τ.λ. could take place through its appropriation to believers.—εξαλείψεων] is to be left quite in its proper signification, as in Acts iii. 19, Rev. iii. 5, vii. 17, xxi. 4, and frequently in LXX. and Apocrypha; since the discourse has reference to something written, the invalidating of which is represented in the sensuous form of blotting out, even more forcibly than by διαγράφειν (to score out; see Ruhnken, ad Tim. p. 81). Comp. Plat. Rep. p. 386 C, p. 501 B: ἐξαλείψων...πάλαι ἐγγράφων, Ep. 7, p. 342 C: τὸ ἑγγράφομεν τε καὶ ἐξαλείψων, Dem. 468. 1 in reference to a law: εἰ χρῆ τοῦτον ἐξαλείψαι, Xen. Hell. ii. 3. 51; Lucian, Imag. 26; Eur. Iph. A. 1486. Comp. Valckenaer, ad Act. iii. 19.—τὸ καθ ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον] the handwriting existing against us. What is thus characterized is not the burden of debt lying upon man, which is, as it were, his debt-schedule (Bleek), but the Mosaic law. A χειρόγραφον, namely, is an obligatory document of debt (Tob. v. 3, ix. 5; Polyb. xxx. 8. 4; Dion. Hal. v. 8; and the passages in Wetstein; also the passages quoted from the Rabbins in Schoettgen), for which the older Greek writers use συγγραφή.

first, in which he, in accordance with the sense and connection, continues the discourse from the standpoint of the common Christian consciousness. Comp. i. 12; Gal. iv. 5, 6; Eph. ii. 1, 4, et al.; Winer, p. 539 [E. T. 725]. Nor does the idea of the figurative χειρόγραφον, which Hofmann urges, by any means require such a limitation—which there is nothing to indicate—of the ἡμῖν embracing himself and others.
or γραμματείων, Dem. 882. 7, 956. 2; see also Hermann, Privatalterth. § 49, 12. And the law is the χειρόγραφον confronting us, in so far as men are bound to fulfill it perfectly, in order to avoid the threatened penal curse; and consequently because no one renders this fulfilment, it, like a bill of debt, proves them debtors (the creditor is God). We are not to carry the figure further, in which case we should come to the halting point in the comparison, that the man who is bound has not himself written the χειρόγραφον. ¹ Hofmann maintains that this element also, namely, man’s having written it with his own hand, is retained in the conception of the figurative χειρόγραφον. But the apostle himself precludes this view by his having written, not: τὸ ήμῶν χειρόγρ. (which would mean: the document of debt drawn by us), but: τὸ καθ’ ήμῶν χειρόγρ.; which purposely chosen expression does not affirm that we have ourselves written the document, but it does affirm that it authenticates us as arrested for debt, and is consequently against us. The words τοῖς δόγμασιν appended (see below) also preclude the conception of the debt-record being written by man's own hand. Moreover, the law is to be understood as an integral whole, and the various limitations of it, either to the ceremonial law (Calvin, Beza, Schoettgen, and others), or to the moral law (Calovius), are altogether in opposition to the connection (see above, πάντα τὰ παραπτ.), and un-Pauline. The explanation referring it to the conscience (Luther, Zwingli, Melanchthon, and

¹ The relation of obligation and indebtedness in which man stands to the law (comp. Gal. iii. 10) is quite sufficient to justify the conception of the latter as the χειρόγραφον, without seeking this specially in the promise of the people, Ex. xxiv. 3 (Chrysostom, Occumenius, Theophylact, and others; also Hofmann); which the reader could not guess without some more precise indication. Indeed, that promise of the people in Ex. xxiv. 3 has by no means the mark of being self-written, but contains only the self-obligation, and would not, therefore, any more than the amen in Deut. xxvii. (which Castalio suggests), suffice for the idea of the χειρόγραφον, if the latter had to contain the debtor’s own handwriting. In accordance with the apostle’s words (τὸ καθ’ ήμῶν χειρόγρ., see above), and with the type of his doctrine regarding the impossibility of legal righteousness, his readers could think only of the γράμμα of the law itself as that which proves man a debtor; comp. Rom. ii. 27, 29, vii. 6; 2 Cor. iii. 6. Wieseler, on Gal. p. 255 (appealing to Luke xvi. 5 ff.), Bleek, and Holtzmann, p. 64, also erroneously press the point that the χειρόγρ. must necessarily be written or signed by the debtor himself.
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS.

others) is also at variance both with the word and with the context. The conscience is the medium for the knowledge of the law as the handwriting which testifies against us; without the activity of the conscience, this relation, in which the law stands to us, would remain unknown. Exception has been taken to its being explained of the Mosaic law on account of the use of ἡμῶν, seeing that this law existed only for the Jews. But without due ground; for it is in fact also the schedule of debt against the Gentiles, in so far, namely, as the latter have the knowledge of the δικαίωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ (Rom. i. 32), have in fact τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν (Rom. ii. 15), and, consequently, fall likewise under the condemning sentence of the law, though not directly (Rom. iii. 19, ii. 12), but indirectly, because they, having incurred through their own fault a darkening of their minds (Rom. i. 20–23), transgress the "κοινὸν ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων νόμον" (Dem. 639. 22). The earnest and graphic description of the abrogation of the condemning law in ver. 14 is dictated by an apologetic motive, in opposition to the Judaism of the false teachers; hence it is the more inappropriate to understand with Cornelius a Lapide and others the covenant of God with Adam in Gen. ii. 16, as was already proposed by Chrysostom, Occumenius, Theophylact (comp. Iren. Haer. v. 17. 3, and Tertullian).—τοῖς δόγμασιν] Respecting δόγμα, command, especially of legal decrees, see on Eph. ii. 15; Wetstein on Luke ii. 1; the dative is closely connected with χειρόγραφον, and is instrumental: what is written with the commands (therein given), so that the δόγμα, which form the constituent elements of the law, are regarded as that wherewith it is written. Thus the tenor of the contents of what is written is indicated by the dative of the instrument (ablative modi), just as the external constituent elements of writing, e.g. γράμμασι in Gal. vi. 11, and τίτοις in Plat. Ep. 7, p. 343 A, are expressed by the

1 Luther's gloss: "Nothing is so hard against us as our own conscience, whereby we are convinced as by our own handwriting, when the law reveals to us our sin." Melanchthon: "sententia in mente et corde tanquam scripta lege et agnitione lapsus," in connection with which he regards the conscience as "sylogismus practicus ex lege ductus."
same dative. Observe the verbal nature of χειρόγραφον, and that the dative is joined to it, as to τὸ γεγραμμένον (comp. Plat. l.c.: τὰ γεγραμμένα τύποις). This direct combination of a verbal substantive with a dative of the instrument is such an unquestionable and current phenomenon in classical Greek (see Matthiae, II. p. 890; Heindorf, ad Plat. Cratyl. p. 131; and especially Kühner, II. 1, p. 374), that the connection in question cannot in the least degree appear as harsh (Winer, Buttmann), or even as unnatural (Hofmann); nor should it have been regarded as something "welded on" by the interpolator (Holtzmann, p. 74), who had desired thereby to give to χειρόγρ. its reference to the law. The explanation given by many writers (Calvin, Beza, Vitringa, Wolf, Michaelis, Heinrichs, and others, comp. Luther), which hits nearly the true sense: the χειρόγραφον, consisting in the δόγμασι, is to be corrected grammatically in accordance with what we have said above. It is in complete variance with the arrangement of the words to join τοῖς δόγμ. to τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν by supplying an ὅν (Calovius). Bähr, Huther, and Dalmer (comp. de Wette) regard it as a more precise definition of the entire τὸ καθ' ἡμ. χειρόγρ., so that Paul explains what he means by the χειρόγρ., and, at the same time, how it comes to be a debt-document testifying against us. So also Winer, p. 206 [E. T. 275]. This, however, would have been expressed by τὸ τοῖς δόγμασι καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγρ., or in some other way corresponding grammatically with the sense assumed. Ewald joins τοῖς δόγμ. as appropriating dative (see Bernhardy, p. 88 f.) to χειρόγρ.: our bond of obligation to the statutes. But if χειρόγρ. were our bond of obligation (subjectively), the expression τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρ. would be inappropriate, and Paul would have said merely τὸ ἡμῶν χειρ. τ. δόγμ. It is incorrect as to sense, though not linguistically erroneous, to connect τοῖς δόγμ. with ἐξαιλείψας, in which case it is explained to mean (as by Harless on Eph. ii. 15) that the

1 So also Wieseler in Rosenmüller's Rep. II. p. 135 ff.: τὸ χειρόγρ. τὸ τοῖς δόγμ. καθ' ἡμῶν ἢτοι.

2 Comp. Wieseler on Gal. p. 258: "with reference to the statutes." He takes Paul's meaning to be, "our testimony with our own hand, that we have transgressed the statutes of the law of Moses."
abrogation of the law had taken place either as regards its statutes (Steiger); or by the evangelical doctrines of faith (the Greek expositors, Estius, Grotius, Hammond, Bengel, and others); or nova praeepta stabiliendo (Fritzsche, Diss. in 2 Cor. II. p. 168 f.). In opposition to these views, see Eph. ii. 15. Erasmus, Storr, Flatt, Olshausen, Schenkel, Bleek, and Hofmann have attached it to the following relative clause, in opposition to the simple order of the words, without any certain precedent in the N. T. (with regard to Acts i. 2, Rom. xvi. 27, see on those passages), and thereby giving an emphasis to the τὸν δόμῃ, which is not warranted (for the law as such contains, in fact, nothing else than δόματα). — ὁ ἡσυχασμός ἡμῶν] an emphatic repetition—bringing into more marked prominence the hostile relation—of the thought already expressed by καθ' ἡμῶν, with the view of countering the legalistic efforts of the false teachers. Bengel's distinction, that there is here expressed ἵππα πρόκειται, and by καθ' ἡμῶν, status belli, is arbitrary and artificial. It means simply which was against us, not: secretly against us, as Beza and others, including Böhmer, interpret the word, which Paul uses only in this place, but which is generally employed in Greek writers, in the Apocrypha and LXX., and in the N. T. again in Heb. x. 27. The relative attaches itself to the entire τὸ καθ' ἡμ. κεφαλή. τοῖς δόμην. — καὶ αὐτὸ ἡρκεῖν κ.τ.λ.] Observe not only the emphatic change of structure (see on i. 6) which passes from the participle, not from the relative (Hofmann), over to the further act connected with the former in the finite tense, but also (comp. on i. 16) the perfect (Thuc. viii. 100; Dem. 786. 4): and itself (the bill of debt) he has taken out of the way, whereby the abrogation now stands completed. A graphically illustrative representation: the bill of debt was blotted out, and it has itself been carried away and is no longer in its place; ἡρκεῖν αὐτὸ ἐκ τοῦ µέσου µὴ ἀφείς ἐκεῖν ὄψεαι, Oecumenius. αἰτῶ denotes the handwriting itself, materialiter,

1 So also Thomasius, Chr. Pers. u. Werk. III. 1, p. 110. He considers as the χειρόγραφον not the Mosaic law itself, but the bill of debt which the broken law has drawn up against us. The very parallel in Eph. ii. 15 is decisive against this view.
in contrast to the just mentioned blotting out of its contents. For He has nailed it, etc.; see the sequel. Hofmann imports the idea: it in this (hostile) quality; as if, namely, it ran καὶ τούτῳ δὲ (Xen. Anab. vi. 5. 13; Philem. 9). — The ἐκ τοῦ μέσου is our: "out of the way," said of obstructions which are removed. Comp. Plat. Eryx. p. 401 E; Xen. Anab. i. 5. 14; de praefect. 3. 10, and the passages in Kypke, II. p. 323. The opposite: ἐν μέσῳ εἶναι, to be in the way, Dem. 682. 1; Aesch. Suppl. 735; Dorv. ad Charit. vii. 3, p. 601. Thus the law stood in the way of reconciliation to God, of the χαρίζεσθαι κ.τ.λ. in ver. 13. — προσηλώσας κ.τ.λ.] προσηλώσαν only found here in the N. T.; see, however, Plat. Phaed. p. 83 D (with πρός); Lucian, Prom. 2, Dial. D. I. (τοῦ Καινάκων προσηλωμένος); Galen. IV. p. 45, 9: τῳ σταυρῳ, 3 Macc. iv. 9. Since the law which condemned man lost its punitive force through the death of Christ on the cross, inasmuch as Christ through this death suffered the curse of the law for men (Gal. iii. 13), and became the end of the law (Rom. x. 4), at the same time that Christ was nailed as ἡμαστηρίου to the cross, the law was nailed to it also, and thus it ceased to be ἐν μέσῳ. Observe, moreover, the logical relation of the aorist participle to the perfect ἤρκεν. The latter is the state of the matter, which has emerged and exists after God has nailed, etc. The κ. αὐτῷ ἤρκεν ἐκ μέσου takes place since that nailing. In the strong expression προσηλώσας, purposely chosen and placed foremost, there is involved an antinomistic triumph, which makes the disarming of the law very palpably apparent. Chrysostom has aptly observed on the whole passage: οὐδαμοῦ οὗτως μεγαλοφώνως ἐφθέγξατο. Ὁρᾷς σπουδὴν τοῦ ἄφανσθηναι τὸ χειρόγραφον δοκῇ ἐπολύσατο; οἶνον πάντες ἤμεν ἀνθραί κ. κόλασιν αὐτῶς κολασθεὶς ἔλυε καὶ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν καὶ τὴν κόλασιν. Nevertheless, προσηλώσας neither figuratively depicts the tearing in pieces of the χειρόγρ. (Chrysostom, Occumenius, Theophylact), nor is there any allusion to an alleged custom of publicly placarding antiquated laws (Grotius). According to Hofmann (comp. also his Schriftbew. II. 1, p. 370 f.), a public placarding with a view to observance is meant; the requirement of Israelitish legal
obligation has become changed into the requirement of faith in the Crucified One which may be read on the cross, and this transformation is also the pardon of transgressions of the law. This is a fanciful pushing further of the apostolic figure, the point of which is merely the blotting out and taking away of the law, as the debt-document hostile to us, by the death of the cross. The entire representation which is presented in this sensuous concrete form, and which is not to be expanded into the fanciful figure of transformation which we have just referred to, is intended, in fact, to illustrate merely the forgiveness of sins introduced by ἐλεημοσύνης κ.τ.λ. in ver. 13, and nothing more. Comp. 1 Pet. ii. 24. It is to be observed, at the same time, that the ἔλεησεν and the άλλον ἐκ τ. μέσον do not represent two acts substantially different, but the same thing, the perfect accomplishment of which is explained by way of climax with particularising vividness.

Ver. 15. In this doing away of the law was involved the victory and triumph of God over the devilish powers, since the strength of the latter, antagonistic to God, is in sin, and the strength of sin is in the law (1 Cor. xv. 56); with the law, therefore, the power of the devil stands or falls. — If ἀπέκδυσο, ran parallel, as the majority suppose, with προσηλώσας, there must have been a καλ inserted before ἔδειξαμα, as in ver. 14 before the finite verb, because otherwise no connection would be established. Hence a full stop (Beza) must be placed before ἀπέκδυσο, or at least a colon (Elzevir, Bleek); and without any connecting particle the significant verb heads all the more forcibly the description of this final result expressed with triumphant fulness: Having stripped the lordships and powers, he has made a show of them boldly, holding triumph over them in the same. Observe the symmetrical emphatic prefixing of ἀπέκδυσο, ἔδειξαμα, and θραμβό. The subject is

1 Holtzmann, p. 156 f., rejects this verse because it interrupts the transition of thought to ver. 10 (which is not the case); because ἔδειξαμεν is un-Pauline (but in what sense is it un-Pauline? it is in any sense a very rare word); because θραμβό is used here otherwise than in 2 Cor. ii. 14 (this is incorrect); but, especially, because ver. 15 can only be explained by the circle of ideas of Eph. iii. 10 and Col. i. 10; Eph. iv. 8, i. 15 f. (passages which touch our present one either not at all, or at the most very indirectly).
still always God, not Christ, as Baur and Ewald hold, following Augustine, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Erasmus, Grotius, Calovius, and many others; hence the reading ἀπεκδύω σάρκα in F G (which omit τ. ἁρχ. κ. τ. ἐξουσ.). Syr. Goth. Hil. Aug. was an erroneous gloss; and at the close, not αὐτῷ (Syr. Vulg. It. Theodoret, Luther, Melanchthon, Elzevir, Griesbach, and Scholz), instead of which G has ἔαυτῷ, but ἀυτῷ should be written; see Wolf in loc. The figurative ἀπεκδύοντα, which illustrates the deprivation of power that has taken place through the divine work of reconciliation, represents the ἁρχᾶς καὶ ἐξουσ. as having been clothed in armour (comp. Rom. xiii. 12; Eph. vi. 11; 1 Thess. v. 8), which God as their conqueror stripped off and took from them; Vulg.: expoliants. Comp. on ἔκδονεν and ἀποδονεν, used from Homer's time in the sense of spoliare, Dem. 763. 28, 1259. 11; Hesiod, Scut. 447; Xen. Anab. v. 8. 23; 2 Macc. viii. 27; and on the subject-matter, Matt. xii. 19; Luke xi. 22. Moreover, we might expect, in accordance with the common usage of the middle, instead of ἀπεκδυσάμενος, which is elsewhere used intransitively (comp. iii. 9), the active ἀπεκδύονας (comp. Matt. xxvii. 28, 31; Luke x. 30); yet even in Plat. Rep. p. 612 A, the (right) reading ἀπεκδύναμεθα is taken in the sense of nudavimus; and Xenophon uses the perfect ἀποδέδυκεν, which is likewise intransitive elsewhere (see Kühner, I. p. 803), actively, see Anab. l.c.: πολλοὶ ἔδη ἀποδέδυκεν, multos veste spoliavit; comp. Dio Cass. xlv. 47. Further, the middle, as indicating the victorious self-interest of the action (sibi expoliavit), is here selected even with nicety, and by no means conveys (as Hofmann, in order to refute this explanation, erroneously lays to its charge) the idea: in order to appropriate to Himself this armour; see on the contrary generally, Krüger, § 52. 10. 1; Kühner, II. 1, p. 93 f. The disarming in itself, and not the possession of the enemy's weapons, is the interest of the victor. Lastly, the whole connection does not admit of any intransitive interpretation, such as Hofmann, in his Schriftbew. I. p. 350 f.

1 Through this erroneous definition of the subject it was possible to discover in our passage the descent into hell (Anselm and others).
(and substantially also in his *Heil. Schr. in loc.*), has attempted, making the sense: God has laid aside from Himself the powers ruling in the Gentile world—which were round about Him like a veil concealing Him from the Gentiles—by manifesting Himself in unveiled clearness. Something such as this, which is held to amount to the meaning that God has put an end to the ignorance of the Gentile world and revealed Himself to it, Paul must necessarily have said; no reader could unravel it from so strange a mode of veiling the conception, the more especially seeing that there is no mention at all of the victorious word of Christ converting the Gentiles, as Hofmann thinks, but on the contrary of what God has effected in reference to the ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουρίαι by the fact of reconciliation accomplished on the cross; He has by it rendered powerless the powers which previously held sway among mankind; comp. John xii. 30 f., xvi. 11.—That these ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουρίαι are two categories of evil angels (comp. Eph. vi. 12), corresponding to two classes of good angels similarly named (comp. ver. 10), is taught by the context, which has nothing to do with mediating beings intervening between God and the world (Sabatier), or even with human rulers. Ritschl, in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1863, p. 522, understands the angels of the law-giving (comp. on i. 20), of whom God has divested Himself (middle), i.e. from whose environment He has withdrawn Himself. Even apart from the singular expression ἄσωκοντάμ. in this sense, this explanation is inappropriate, because the ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουρίαι appear here as hostile to God, as beings over whom He has triumphed; secondly, because the angels who ministered at the law-giving (see on Gal. iii. 19) have no share in the contents of the law, which, as the νόμος Θεοῦ, is holy, righteous, good, and spiritual (Rom. vii.), and hence no deviation from God's plan of salvation can be attributed to the angels of the law; and, finally, because the expression τὰς ἀρχὰς κ. τὰς

1 In which sense also Grotius explained it, though he takes ἀσωκόνταμ. rightly as *exarmatos*. See, in opposition to him,Calovius. Hofmann's explanation is also followed by Holtzmann, p. 222; it is an unfortunate attempt at rationalizing.
ēkouías is so comprehensive that, in the absence of any more precise indication in the text, it cannot be specially limited to the powers that were active in the law-giving, but must denote the collective angelic powers—hostile, however, and therefore devilish. Them God has disarmed, put to shame, and triumphed over, through the abrogation of men's legal debt-bond that took place by means of the atoning death. The emphatic and triumphant prominence given to this statement was, doubtless, specially occasioned by those speculations regarding the power of demons, with which the false teachers were encroaching on the work of Christ. — δεινομάθεις, preserved only here and in Matt. i. 19 (comp. however, παραδεινομάθεις, especially frequent in Polybius; see Schweighäuser, Lex. p. 429), denotes, in virtue of its connection with the conception of triumph, the making a show (Augustine, ep. 59: "exemplavit;" Hilary, de trin. 9: "ostentui esse fecit") for the purpose of humiliation and disgrace (comp. Chrysostom), not in order to exhibit the weakness of the conquered (Theodoret, Böhmer), but simply their accomplished subjugation; comp. Nah. iii. 6: θέσωμαι σε εἰς παράδειγμα.—ἐν παράσεως] is usually rendered publicly, before the eyes of all, consequently as equivalent to φανερός in John vii. 10 (the opposite: ἐν κρυπτῷ, John vii. 4.; Matt. vi. 4.; Rom. ii. 28); but this the word does not mean (see on John vii. 4); moreover, the verb already implies this idea;¹ and the usage of Paul elsewhere warrants only the rendering: boldly, freely and frankly. Comp. Eph. vi. 19; Phil. i. 20. Hilary: "cum fiducia;" Vulgate: "confidenter palam." The objection that this sense is not appropriate to the action of God (Hofmann), overlooks the fact that God is here represented just as a human triumpher, who freely and boldly, with remorseless disposal of the spoils acquired by victory, subjects

¹ Hence Hofmann joins it with ἑρμήσιος, in which, however, the idea of publicity is obviously already contained. Hofmann, indeed, assumes a reference of contrast to the invisible triumphs, which God has ever been celebrating over those powers. But thus the idea of ἑρμήσιος is extended to an unwarranted amplitude of metaphorical meaning, while, nevertheless, the entire anthropoplastic imagery of the passage requires the strict conception of the public ἑρμήσιος. Moreover, the pretended contrast is altogether foreign to the context.
the conquered to ignominious exhibition. 1 — θραμβεύσεις αὐτ. ἐν αὐτῷ] synchronous with ἔδειγμ.: while He triumphed over them. Respecting θραμβεύσεις τινα, to triumph over some one, see on 2 Cor. ii. 14. Comp. the passive θραμβεύσεθαι, to be led in triumph, Plut. Coriol. 35. αὐτοῦ refers κατὰ σίνεσιν to the devils individually, who are conceived as masculine (as δαίμονες, κοσμοκράτορες, Eph. vi. 12), see generally Winer, p. 138 [E. T. 183]; and ἐν αὐτῷ is referred either to the cross (hence, also, the readings ἐν τῷ ἔνδοξῳ or σταυρῷ) or to Christ. The former reference is maintained by the majority of the Fathers (Theophylact: ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοὺς δαίμονας ἠπτημένους δεῖξας), Beza, Calvin, Grotius, and many others, including Böhmer, Steiger, Olshausen, Ewald, Weiss, Bibl. Theol. p. 432, ed. 2; and the latter, by Erasmus, Luther, Melanchthon, Wolf, Estius, Bengel, and many others, including Flatt, Bähr, Huther, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bisping, Bleek, Hofmann, Rich. Schmidt. The reference to Christ is erroneous, because Christ is not mentioned at all in ver. 14, and God pervades as subject the entire discourse from ver. 11 onwards. We must hold, therefore, by the reference to τῷ σταυρῷ, so that ἐν αὐτῷ once more places the cross significantly before our eyes, just as it stood emphatically at the close of the previous sentence. At the cross God celebrated His triumph, inasmuch as through the death of Christ on the cross obliterating and removing out of the way the debt-bill of the law He completed the work of redemption, by which the devil and his powers were deprived of their strength, which rested on the law and its debt-bond. The ascension is not to be here included.

Ver. 16. Οὐ] since ye, according to vv. 11–15, are raised to a far higher platform than that of such a legal system. — κρυφτῷ ἐν βρώσει] No one is to form a judgment (whether ye are acting allowable or unallowably, rightly or wrongly) con-

1 It is an inconsiderate fancy of Hofmann to say, by way of controverting our explanation: Who would be surprised, that the triumppher should make a show of the conquered, "without previously asking their permission"? As if such a thought, no doubt very silly for the victor, were necessarily the contrast to the stark daring action, with which a general, crowned with victory, is in a position to exhibit his captives without any scruple, without sparing or hesitation! He has the ἰκανὸν for the ἰκανομακρύνει, and uses it in ἰκανοήσει.
cerning you in the point of eating (ἐν, comp. Rom. ii. 1, xiv. 22; 1 Pet. ii. 12). There is hereby asserted at the same time their independence of such judgments, to which they have not to yield (comp. Eph. v. 6). With Paul, βρῶσις is always actio edendi, and is thus distinct from βρῶμα, cibus (Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Cor. viii. 4; 2 Cor. ix. 10; also Heb. xii. 16), although it is also current in the sense of βρῶμα with John (iv. 32, vi. 27, 55), and with profane authors (Hom. ii. xix. 210, Od. i. 191, x. 176, et al.; Plat. Legg. vi. p. 783 C; Hesiod, Scut. 396). This we remark in opposition to Fritzche, ad Rom. III. p. 200. The case is the same with πόσις (Rom. xiv. 17) and πόμα (1 Cor. x. 4; Heb. ix. 10).—ἐν πόσιν] Since the Mosaic law contained prohibitions of meats (Lev. vii. 10 ff.), but not also general prohibitions of drinks, it is to be assumed that the false teachers in their ascetic strictness (ver. 23) had extended the prohibition of the use of wine as given for the Nazarites (Num. vi. 3), and for the period of priestly service (Lev. x. 9), to the Christians as such (as ὄργυν). Comp. also Rom. xiv. 17, 21. De Wette arbitrarily asserts that it was added doubtless in consideration of this, as well as of the Pharisaic rules as to drinks, Matt. xxiii. 24, and of the prohibition of wine offered to idols (οὖν does not point to such things), but still mainly on account of the similarity of sound (Rom. xiv. 17; Heb. ix. 10, and Bleek in loc.).—ἐν μέρει ἔσορτὶς κ.τ.λ.] ἐν μέρει, with the genitive, designates the category, as very frequently also in classical authors (Plat. Theaet. p. 155 E, Rep. p. 424 D; Dem. 638. 5, 668. 24); comp. on 2 Cor. iii. 10, and see Wytenbach, ad Plut. I. p. 65. The three elements: festival, new moon, and Sabbath, are placed side by side as a further classis rerum; in the point (ἐν) of this category also no judgment is to be passed upon the readers (if, namely, they do not join in observing such days). The elements are arranged, according as the days occur, either at longer unequal intervals in the year (ἔσορτὶς), or monthly (νομον), or weekly (σαββατ.). But they are three, co-ordinated; there would be only one thing with three connected elements, if καὶ were used instead of ἥ in the two latter places where it occurs. The three are given in inverted order in 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; 2 Chron. ii. 4,
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xxxi. 3. On the subject-matter, comp. Gal. iv. 10. Respecting the Jewish celebration of the new moon, see Keil, Archäol. I. § 78; Ewald, Alterth. p. 470 f.; and on σάββατα as equivalent to σάββατον, comp. Matt. xii. 1, xxviii. 1; Luke iv. 16, et al. ἐν μέρει has been erroneously understood by others in the sense of a partial celebration (Chrysostom: ἐξευτελίζει λέγουν ἣ ἐν μέρει ἐορτάζον ou γὰρ δὴ πάντα κατεῖχον τὰ πρῶτα, Theodoret: they could not have kept all the feasts, on account of the long journey to Jerusalem; comp. Dalmer), or: vicibus festorum (Melanchthon, Zanchius), or, that the participation in the festival, the taking part in it is expressed (Otto, dekalog. Unters. p. 9 ff.), or that it denotes the segregatio, "nam qui dierum faciunt discriminem, quasi unum ab alio dividunt" (Calvin). Many, moreover inaccurately, hold that ἐν μέρει means merely: in respect to (Beza, Wolf, and most expositors, including Bähr, Huther, and de Wette); in 2 Cor. iii. 10, ix. 3, it also denotes the category. Comp. Aelian. V. H. viii. 3: κρίνουσε δικαστὸν ἐν τῷ μέρει φόνου.

Ver. 17.1 An epexegetical relative sentence, assigning the ground for what has just been said.—ὅ, which (see the critical remarks), is not to be arbitrarily referred merely to the observance of feasts and days (Flatt and Hofmann), but to the things of the law mentioned in ver. 16 generally, all of which it embraces.—σκιά not an outline (σκιαγραφία, σκιαγράφημα), as in the case of painters, who "non exprimunt primo ductu imaginem vivis coloribus et elukoukès, sed rudes et obscursas lines primum ex carbone ducunt," Calvin (so also Clericus, Huther, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others), which σκιά does not mean even in Heb. viii. 5, x. 1, and which is forbidden by the contrast of τῷ σῶμα, since it would rather be the perfect picture that would be put in opposition to the outline.

1 Holtzmann, without assigning his reasons, regards the entire verse as an "extract from the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Heb. ix. 6, 9 f., 25, x. 1, 11, viii. 5); he thinks that the whole polemic of vv. 16–23 was intended to introduce the more developed features of later heresy into the picture of the apostolic age. But the difficulty of ver. 18 (which Holtzmann considers utterly unintelligible) and ver. 22 f., as well as the alleged un-Paoline character of some expressions in ver. 19, does not furnish a sufficient basis for such an opinion. Comp. on vv. 18, 19, 22, 23.
It means nothing else than shadow. Paul is illustrating, namely, the relation of the legal ordinances, such as are adduced in ver. 16, to that which is future, i.e. to those relations of the Messianic kingdom, which are to be manifested in the αἰῶν μελλόν (neither ἄγαθὸν from Heb. x. 1, nor anything else, is to be supplied with τῶν μελλόντων), and in doing so he follows the figurative conception, that the μελλοντα, which therefore, locally considered, are in front, have cast their shadow behind, which shadow is the Mosaic ritual constitution—a conception which admirably accords with the typical character of the latter (Heb. viii. 5, x. 1), of which the constitution of the Messianic kingdom is the antitype. It is to be noted further: (1) The emphasis of confirmation lies not on τῶν μελλόντων (Beza), but on σκιά, in contrast to τὸ σῶμα. If, namely, the things in question are only the shadow of the Messianic, and do not belong to the reality thereof, they are—in accordance with this relatively non-essential, because merely typical nature of theirs—not of such a kind that salvation may be made dependent on their observance or non-observance, and adjudged or withheld accordingly. (2) The passage is not to be explained as if ἦν stood in the place of εἰσὶ, so that τὰ μελλοντα would denote the Christian relations already then existing, the κανή διαθήκη, the Christian plan of salvation, the Christian life, etc. (so usually since Chrysostom); but, on the contrary, that which is spoken of is shadow, not, indeed, as divinely appointed in the law (Hofmann)—for of this aspect of the elements in question the text contains nothing—but in so far as Paul sees it in its actual condition still at that time present. The μελλοντα have not yet been manifested at all, and belong altogether (not merely as regards their completion, as de Wette thinks, comp. also Hofmann) to the αἰῶν μελλόν, which will begin with the coming again of Christ to set up His kingdom—a coming, however, which was expected as very near at hand. The μελλοντα could only be viewed as having already set in either in whole or in part, if ἦν and not εἰσὶ were used previously, and thereby the notion of futurity were to be taken relatively, in reference to a state of things then already past (comp. Gal.
iii. 23; 1 Tim. i. 16), or if ἐστὶ were meant to be said from the standpoint of the divine arrangement of those things (Hofmann), or if this present tense expressed the logical present merely by way of enabling the mind to picture them (Rom. v. 14), which, however, is inadmissible here, since the elements indicated by σκιά still continued at this time, long after Christ’s earthly appearance, and were present really, and not merely in legal precepts or in theory. (3) The characteristic quality, in which the things concerned are meant to be presented by the figurative σκιά, is determined solely by the contrast of τὸ σῶμα, namely, as unsubstantiality in a Messianic aspect: shadow of the future, standing in relation to it, therefore doubtless as typically presignificant, but destitute and void of its reality. The reference to transitoriness (Spencer, de legit. rit. p. 214 f., Baumgarten-Crusius, and others) is purely imported.—τὸ δὲ σῶμα] scil. τῶν μελλόντων, but the body of the future. Inasmuch as the legal state of things in ver. 16 stands to the future Messianic state in no other relation than that of the shadow to the living body itself, which casts the shadow, Paul thus, remaining faithful to his figure, designates as the body of the future that which is real and essential in it, which, according to the context, can be nothing else than just the μέλλοντα themselves, their concrete reality as contrasted with the shadowy form which preceded them. Accordingly, he might have conveyed the idea of the verse, but without its figurative garb, in this way: δὲ ἐστὶ τύπος τῶν μελλόντων, αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ μέλλοντα Χριστοῦ.—Χριστοῦ] scil. ἐστὶ, belongs to Christ. The μέλλοντα, namely, viewed under the figurative aspect of the σῶμα which casts the shadow referred to, must stand in the same relation to Christ, as the body stands in to the Head (ver. 19); as the body now adumbrating itself, they must belong to Christ the Head of the body, in so far, namely, as He is Lord and ruler of all the relations of the future Messianic constitution, i.e. of the Mes-

1 The explanation of Hilgenfeld, 1873, p. 199: “the mere σῶμα Χριστοῦ, a purely somatic Christianity,” is at variance with the antithetical correlation of σκιά and σῶμα, as well as with the apostle’s cherished conception of the σῶμα of Christ, which is continued immediately in ver. 19.
sianic kingdom, of the βασιλεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ (i. 13; Eph. v. 5). Whosoever, therefore, holds to the shadow of the future, to the things of the law (as the false teachers do and require), and does not strive after the μέλλοντα themselves, after the body which has cast that shadow, does not hold to Christ, to whom as Head the σῶμα (τῆς σκιάς) belongs as His own. This view, which is far removed from "distorting" the thought (as Hofmann objects), is required by the natural and obvious correlation of the conception of the body and its head, as also by ver. 19. There is much inaccuracy and irrelevancy in the views of expositors, because they have not taken τὰ μέλλοντα in the sense, or not purely in the sense, of the relations of the αἰῶν μέλλων, but in that of the then existing Christian relations, which in fact still belonged to the αἰῶν o délcos, and because, in connection therewith, they do not take up with clearness and precision the contextually necessary relation of the genitive Χριστοῦ as denoting Him, whose the σῶμα is, but resolve it into what they please, as e.g. Grotius (so also Bleek): "ad Christum pertinent, ab eo solo petenda est;" Huther: "the substance itself, to which those shadowy figures point, has appeared in Christ;" Ewald: "so far as there is anything really solid, essential, and eternal in the O. T., it belongs to Christ and to His Spirit;" Hofmann: "the body of the future is there, where Christ is, present and given with Him" (consequently as if ἐν Χριστῷ were used).—On τὸ σῶμα in contrast to σκιά, comp. Josephus, Bell. ii. 2. 5: σκίαν αὐτοῦ γένος βασιλείας, ἦς ἤρπασεν ἑαυτῷ τὸ σῶμα. Philo, de conf. l. p. 434: τὰ μὲν ῥητὰ τῶν χρησμῶν σκιάς τινας ὡσανεὶ σωμάτων εἶναι τὰς δ' ἐμφανομέναι δυνάμεις τὰ ὑφεστῶτα ἀληθελὰ τρόμωμα. Lucian, Hermot. 29. Observe, however, that σῶμα invariably retains its strict literal sense of body, as a sensuous expression for the substantially real, in contrast to the unsubstantial shadow of it.

Ver. 18.¹ Warning against a further danger, with which they were threatened on the part of these false teachers.—μηδὲν] not different from μήτις in ver. 16, as if the latter emphasized the verb and the former the subject (Hofmann).

This would be correct, if in ver. 16 it were μη διὰ κρινέω τις ὑμᾶς. Comp. on μήτις, ver. 8, and on μηδεῖς, ver. 4. Moreover, the words cannot be regarded (with Holtzmann) as a duplicate proceeding from the interpolar, especially as they contain a new warning, and in such a peculiar form (καταβραβεύω]. Let no one deprive you of the prize. καταβραβεύω, which is not a Cicilian word (Jerome; see, on the contrary, Eustath. ad Il. i. 93. 33: καταβραβεύει αυτόν, διε φαοίν οί παλαιοί), is only now preserved among ancient Greek authors in Dem. c. Mid. 542, ult.: ἐπιστάμεθα Στράτωνα ἵπτο Μινίδου καταβραβευθήτα καὶ παρὰ πάντα τὰ δίκαια ἀτιμωθήτα, where it expresses the taking away of victory in a judicial suit, and the procuring of a sentence of condemnation, and that in the form of the conception: to bring it about to the injury of some one, that not he, but another, shall receive the prize from the βραβεῦς. Midias had bribed the judges. The κατά intimates that the prize was due to the person concerned, although it has been in a hostile spirit (not merely unrighteously, which would be παραβραβεύειν; 1 Plut. Mor. p. 535 C; Polyb. xxiv. 1. 12) withdrawn from him and adjudged to another. The right view substantially, though not recognising the distinction from παραβραβεύω, is taken by Chrysostom (παραβραβευθῆναι γὰρ ἔστω, ὅταν παρὰ ἐτέρων μὲν ἡ νίκη, παρὰ ἐτέρων δὲ τὸ βραβεῖον) and Theophylact, also Suidas: τὸ ἄλλον ἀγωνιζομένου ἄλλον στεφανοῦσθαι λέγει ὁ ἀπόστολος καταβραβεύεσθαι. Comp. also Zonaras, ad Concil. Laod. can. 35, p. 351: τὸ μὴ τὸν νικήσαντα ἄξιον τοῦ βραβείου, ἄλλον ἐτέρῳ διδόναι αὐτῷ ἀδικομένου τοῦ νικήσαντος. The conception is: (1) To the readers as true believers belongs the Messianic prize of victory,—this is the assumption upon which the expression is based; (2) The false teachers desire to deprive them of the prize of victory and to give it to others, namely, to themselves and their adherents, and that through their service of angels, etc.; (3) Just as little, however, as in

1 With which Theodoret confounds it (ἐδίκειν βραβεῖαν); he makes it the unrighteous awarding of the prize of victory: ἵπτετο δὲ καὶ οἱ τὰς ἐπαραβάσεις τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τιμημονίας ἐπὶ τῶν μετοχῶν αυτῶν ἵπτετο τὰ ἐλαττω ἀναγήμονα, εἰκάζω ἓνα μαθήμα ὡς ἀκριβῶς παραβραβεύεσθαι.
the case of the καταβασθέειν in ver. 16, ought the readers to give heed to, or let themselves be led astray by, this hostile proceeding of the καταβασθέειν, which is based upon subjective vanity and is (ver. 19) separation from Christ and His body,—this is implied in the imperatives. Consequently, the view of Jerome, ad Aglas. p. 10, is not in substance erroneous, although only approximately corresponding to the expression: "Nemo adversus vos praemium accipiat;" Erasmus is substantially correct: "praemium, quod sectari coepestis, vobis intervertat;" comp. Calvin, Estius, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, and others; while the Vulgate (seducat), Luther ("to displace the goal"), and others content themselves with a much less accurate statement of the sense, and Bengal imports into the passage the sense of usurped false leading and instruction, as Beza similarly took it. The βασθείον, to which καταβρ. refers, is not Christian liberty (Grotius, who explains it prae- mium exigere), nor yet: "the honour and price of the true worship of God" (de Wette), but, in accordance with the standing apostolic conception (comp. Phil. iii. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 24): the bliss of the Messianic kingdom, the incorruptible στέφανος (1 Cor. ix. 25), the στεφ. τῆς δικαιοσύνης (2 Tim. iv. 8), τῆς δόξης (1 Pet. v. 4), τῆς ζωῆς (Jas. i. 12); comp. 2 Tim. ii. 5.

With reference to the βασθείον, Elsner, Michaelis, Storr, Flatt, Steiger, and others, including Bähr, Böhmer, Reiche, Huther, and Bleak, following Photius in Oecumenius (μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς κατακρίνεται), have taken καταβασθεῖσα in the sense of to condemn, parallel to the κρίνεται in ver. 16, or to refuse salvation to (Hofmann). This rendering is not, indeed, to be rejected on linguistic grounds, since Hesychius and Suidas both quote the signification κατακρίνειν in the case of καταβασθείειν; but it cannot be justified by proofs adduced, and it is decidedly in opposition to the context through the following θέλον κ.τ.λ., which presupposes not a judgment of the opponents, but an

1 "Nemo adversum vos rectoris partes sibi ultrum sumat." He starts from the common use of βασθείον in the sense of regere ac moderari (see Dorvill. ad Charit. p. 404). Comp. on iii. 15. But neither the passage of Dem. i.e., nor the testimony of the Greek Fathers, of Suidas, Eustathius, and Zonaras, nor the analogy of ἑπικρίθησθαι, would justify the adoption of this sense in the case of the compound καταβρασθθεῖσα.
action, something practical, which, through their perverse religious attitude, they would fain accomplish. — θέλειν. sc. καταβαβελεῖν ὑμᾶς: while he desires to do this, would willingly accomplish it (comp. Disen, ad Find. Ol. ii. 97) by humility, etc. So rightly Theodoret (τούτῳ τολμῶν συνεβούλευον ἐκείνοι γίνεσθαι ταπεινοφροσύνη δήθεν κεχρημένοι), Theophylact (θέλουσιν ὑμᾶς καταβαβελεῖν διὰ ταπεινοφρ.), Photius in Oecumenius, Calvin, Casaubon, and others, including Huther and Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 322 [E. T. 376]. The "languidum et frigidum," which Reiche urges against this view, applies at the most only in the event of καταβαβελεῖν being explained as to condemn; and the accusation of incorrectness of sense (Hofmann) is only based upon an erroneous explanation of the subsequent εἰν ταπεινοφρ. κ.τ.λ. The interpretation adopted by others: taking delight in humility, etc. (Augustine, Castalio, Vatablus, Estius, Michaelis, Loesner, and others, including Storr, Flatt, Bähr, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek, Hofmann, and Hilgenfeld), is based upon the extremely unnecessary assumption of an un-Greek imitation of ζητεῖν, such as occurs, indeed, in the LXX. (1 Sam. xviii. 22; 2 Sam. xv. 26; 1 Kings x. 9; 2 Chron. ix. 8; Ps. cxlvii. 10), but not in the N. T.; for in Matt. xxvii. 43, θέλειν is used with the accusative, comp. on Rom. vii. 21. Moreover, in the O. T. passages the object of the delight is almost invariably (the only exception being Ps. cxlvii. 10) a person. Even in the Apocrypha that abnormal mode of expression does not occur. Others, again, hold that it is to be joined in an adverbial sense to καταβαβελεῖν. It would then (see Erasmus, Annot.) have to be rendered cupidōr or studiose (Plat. Theaet. p. 143 D; and see Reisig, Conject. p. 143 f.), or unconstrained, voluntarily, equivalent to εὐθελοῦσι, εὐθελοῦσιν, εὐθελοῦσι (Plat. Symp. p. 183 A, very frequent in Homer, Soph. Phil. 1327, Aesch. Choeph. 19. 790, and the passages from Xenophon quoted by Sturz, Lex. II. p. 21), which sense, here certainly quite unsuitable, has been transformed at variance with linguistic usage into the idea: "hoc minus sibi a nullo tributum exercens" (Beza), or: unwarrantably (Böhmer, comp. Steiger), or of his own choice (Luther, who, like Ewald, couples it with ἐμπαθεῖν), or:
arbitrarily (Ewald), or: capriciously (Reiche), etc.; consequently giving it the sense of ἐκὼν, αὐτοθέλης, αὐτοκέλευστος, or αὐτογνώμων. Even Tittmann, Synon. p. 131, comes at length to such an ultro, erroneously quoting Herod. ix. 14, where θέλων must be taken as in Plat. Theaet. l.c. — ἐν ταπεινοφρ. κ. θησκ. τῶν ἄγγελ.] ἐν is not propter, which is supposed to have the meaning: because ταπεινοφρ. κ.τ.λ. is necessary to salvation (Reiche); nor does it denote the condition in which the καταβαθεῖων takes place (Steiger, Huther); but, in keeping with the θέλων, it is the means by which the purpose is to be attained: by virtue of humility and worshipping of angels. Thereby he wishes to effect that the βαθεῖον shall be withdrawn from you (and given to himself and his followers). τ. ἄγγελων is the genitive of the object (comp. Wisd. xiv. 27; Herodian, iv. 8. 17; Clem. Cor. I. 45; see also Grimm on 4 Macc. v. 6, and the passages from Josephus in Krebs, p. 339), and belongs only to θησκ., not to ταπεινοφρ. That the latter, however, is not humility in the proper sense, but is, viewed from the perverse personal standpoint of the false teachers, a humility in their sense only, is plain from the context (see below, εἰκὴ φυσιών. κ.τ.λ.), although irony (Steiger, Huther) is not to be found in the word. Paul, namely, designates the thing as that, for which the false teachers held it themselves and desired it to be held by others, and this, indeed, as respects the disposition lying at the root of it, which they sought to exhibit (ἐν ταπεινοφρ.), and as respects the abnormal religious phenomenon manifested among them (κ. θησκ. τ. ἄγγελων); and then proceeds to give a deterrent exposure of both of these together according to their true character in a theoretical (ἀ. . . ἐμβατ.) and in a moral (εἰκὴ φυσ. . . . τὴν κεφαλὴν) respect. How far the false teachers bore themselves as ταπεινόφρονες, is correctly defined by Theodoret: λέγωντες, ὡς ἀδάντος ὅ τῶν διὸν Θεός, ἀνέφικτος τε καὶ ἀκατάληπτος, καὶ προσήκει διὰ τῶν ἄγγελων τὴν θείαν εἰμένειαν πραγματεύσεως, so that they thus regarded man as too insignificant in the presence of the divine majesty to be able to do without.

1 Compare Augustine, Conf. x. 42: "Quem invenirem, qui me reconciliaret tibi? Abeundum mihi fuit ad angelos? Multi conantes ad te redire, neque per
the mediation of angels, which they sought to secure through ἑρμηνεύειν (comp. 4 Macc. iv. 11), thereby placing the merit of Christ (Rom. v. 2) in the background. It is differently explained by Chrysostom and Theophylact (comp. also Photius in Oecumenius): the false teachers had declared the majesty of the Only-Begotten to be too exalted for lowly humanity to have access through Him to the Father, and hence the need of the mediation of angels for that purpose. In opposition to this view it may be urged, that the very prominence so frequently and intentionally given to the majesty of Christ in our Epistle, and especially as above the angels, rather goes to show that they had depreciated the dignity of Christ. Reiche and Ewald (comp. Hofmann’s interpretation below) find the ταπεινωφροσύνη in the ἄφεσις σώματος of ver. 23, where, however, the two aberrations are adduced separately from one another, see on ver. 23. Proofs of the existence of the worship of angels in the post-apostolic church are found in Justin, Ap. I. 6, p. 56, Athenagoras, and others; among the Gnostic heretics (Simonians, Cainites): Epiph. Haer. xx. 2; Tertullian, praechr. 33; Iren. Haer. i. 31. 2; and with respect to the worshipping of angels in the Colossian region Theodoret testifies: ἔμεινε δὲ τούτῳ τὸ πᾶσον ἐν τῇ Φρυγίᾳ καὶ Πισίδια μέχρι πολλῶν οὗ δὴ χάριν καὶ συνέλθοσα σύνοδος ἐν Δαοδικείᾳ τῆς Φρυγίας (A.D. 364, can. 35) νόμῳ κεκάλυκε τὸ τοῖς ἄγγελοις προσεύχεται, καὶ μέχρι δὲ τοῦ νῦν εὐκτήριον τοῦ ἀγίου Μιχαήλ παρ’ ἐκεῖνον καὶ τῶν ἁμάρτων ἐκείνων ἐτίν ἰδεῖν. The Catholic expedients for evading the prohibition of angel-worship in our passage (as also in the Concil. Laod., Mansi, I. p. 568) may be seen especially in Cornelius a Lapide, who understands not all angel-worship, but only that which places the angels above Christ (comp. also Bisping), and who refers the Laodician prohibition pointing to a “κεκρυμμένη εἰδωλολατρεία” (“ὅτι οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανὸς ἐγκαταλείπεται τὴν ἐκκλη-

se ipsos valentes, sicut audio, tentaverunt haece et inciderant in desiderium curiosarum visionum, et digni habitui sunt illusionibus.” The (false) ταπεινωφροσύνη was the subjective source of their going astray to angel-worship.

σίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀπέναι καὶ ἄγγέλους ὄνομάζειν" κ.τ.λ.), in accordance with the second Nicene Council, only to the cultus latræa, not dulia, consequently to actual adoration, not τμητικῶν προσκύνησις. In opposition to the words as they stand (for ὑβησκελα with the genitive of the subject would necessarily be the cultus, which the angels present to God, 4 Macc. v. 6, 12.; Joseph. Antt. xii. 5. 4; comp. Acts xxvi. 5), and also in opposition to the context (see ver. 19), several have taken τῶν ἄγγέλων as the genitive of the subject, and have explained it of a religious condition, which desired to be like that of the angels, e.g. Luther: "spirituality of the angels," comp. Melanchthon, Schoettgen ("habitus aliiquis angelicus"), Wolf, Dalmer. Nevertheless, Hofmann, attempting a more subtle definition of the sense, has again taken τῶν ἄγγέλων as genitive of the subject, and joined with it not only ὑβησκελα, but also ταπεινοφροσύνη. The ταπεινοφροσύνη of the angels, namely, consists in their willingly keeping within the bounds assigned to them as spirits, and not coveting that which man in this respect has beyond them, namely, what belongs to the corporeal world. And the ὑβησκελα of the angels is a self-devotion to God, in which, between them and Him, no other barrier exists than that between the Creator and His creatures. That ταπεινοφροσύνη and this ὑβησκελα man makes into virtue on his part, when he, although but partially, renounces that which belongs to Him in distinction from the angels (ταπεινοφρ.), and, as one who has divested himself as much as possible of his corporeality, presents himself adoringly to God in such measure as he refrains from what was conferred upon him for bodily enjoyment. I do not comprehend how, on the one hand, the apostle could wrap up the combinations of ideas imputed to him in words so enigmatical, nor, on the other, how the readers could, without the guidance of Hofmann, extract them out of these words. The entire exposition is a labyrinth of imported subjective fancies. Paul might at least have written ἐν ἐγκρατείᾳ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνομάτι (οὐ καθ’ ὄνομα, οὐ καθ’ ὄνοματα) τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ ὑβησκελα τῶν ἄγγέλων! Even this would still have been far enough from clear, but it would at
least have contained the point and a hint as to its interpretation. See, besides, in opposition to Hofmann, Rich. Schmidt, *Paul. Christol.* p. 193 f. — ἀ ἐόρατεν ἐμβατείνων] Subordinate to the θελεν κ.τ.λ. as a warning modal definition to it: entering upon what he has beheld, i.e. instead of concerning himself with what has been objectively given (ver. 19), entering the subjective domain of visions with his mental activity, —by which is indicated the mystico-theosophic occupation of the mind with God and the angels,¹ so that ἐόρατεν (comp. Tert. c. *Marc.* v. 19) denotes not a seeing with the eyes, but a mental beholding,² which belonged to the domain of the φανταζόμαι, in part, doubtless, also to that of visionary ecstasy (comp. Acts ii. 17; Rev. ix. 17; δραμα in Acts ix. 10, 12, x. 3; 2 Chron. ix. 29, et al.; Luke i. 22). This reference must have been intelligible to the readers from the assertions put forth by the false teachers,³ but the failure to observe it induced copyists, at a very early date, to add a negative (sometimes μὴ and sometimes οὐ) before ἐόρατεν. Ἐμβατείνω (only used here in the N. T.; but see Wetstein, also Reisig, *ad Oed. Col. praef.* p. xxxix.), with accusative of the place conceived as object (Kühner, II. 1, p. 257), also with the genitive, with the dative, and with εἷς, means to step upon, as e.g. νῆσον, Aesch. *Pers.* 441; τῶλων, Eur. *El.* 595; γῆν, Josh. xix. 49; also with reference to a mental domain, which is

¹ This fanciful habit could not but be fostered and promoted by the Jewish view, according to which the appearances of angels were regarded as φαντάσματα (Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* I. 1, p. 153, ed. 4).

² Ewald regards ἐόρατεν as more precisely defined by is παραπόθ. κ. τ. λ., as if it ran ἐστί παραπόθ. κ. τ. λ. ἐόρατεν: "while he enters arbitrarily upon that, which he has seen in humility and angel-worship (consequently has not actually himself experienced and known), and desires to teach it as something true." But such a hyperbaton, in the case of the relative, besides obscuring the sense, is without precedent in the N. T. Comp. on ver. 14. Besides, the thought itself is far from clear; and respecting εἷς, see above.

³ For the sphere of vision of the ἐόρατεν lay not outside of the subjects, but in the hollow mirror of their own fancy. This applies also in opposition to Hilgenfeld, who now (1873, p. 198 f.) properly rejects the μὴ, but takes ἐστί ἑαυτὸς. Incorrectly: "abiding by the senses." Opposed to this is the very use of the perfect ἐστί, and the significant expression ἐμβατείνω. The apostle does not mean the ἐφανερώθη, but the ἐφανερώθη (i. 16), into which they ascend by visions which they profess to have had.
trodden by investigation and other mental activity, as Philo, de plant. Noé, p. 225 C, et al.; see Loesner, p. 369 f.; 2 Macc. ii. 30; comp. also Nemes. de nat. hom. p. 64, ed. Matth.: ἐφραίων ἐμβατεῖν τῇ θεωρήτικῇ, but not Xen. Conv. iv. 27, where, with Zeunius, ἐμαστεύειες ought to be read. Phavorinus: ἐμβατεῖσαι τὸ ἐνδον ἑξερευνῆσαι ἢ σκοπῆσαι. It is frequently used in the sense of seizing possession (Dem. 894. 7; Eur. Heralc. 876; Schleusner, Thes. II. 332; Bloomfield, Gloss. in Aesch. Pers. p. 146 f.). So Budaeus and Calvin (se ingerens), both with the reading μή, also Huther (establishing himself firmly in the creations of fancy); still the context does not suggest this, and, when used in this sense, ἐμβατ. is usually coupled with εἴς (Dem. 894. 7, 1085. 24, 1086. 19; Isa. ix. 3, et al.; 1 Macc. xii. 25). In the reading of the Recepta, ἐ μή ἑώρακεν, the sense amounts either to: entering into the unseen transcendental sphere, wherein the assumption would be implied that the domain of sense was the only field legitimately open, which would be unsuitable (2 Cor. v. 7, xiii. 12); or to: entering into things, which (although he dreams that he has seen them, yet) he has not seen—a concealed antithetical reference, which Paul, in order to be intelligible, must have indicated. The thought, in the absence of the negative, is not weak (de Wette), but true, in characteristic keeping with the perverseness of theosophic fancies (in opposition to Hofmann’s objection), and representing the actual state of the case, which Paul could not but know. According to Hofmann, the ἐ μή ἑώρακεν which he reads is to be taken, not with ἐμβατεῖν, but with what goes before: of which, nevertheless, he has seen nothing (and, consequently, cannot imitate it). This is disposed of, apart even from the incorrect inference involved in it,² by the preposterousness of Hofmann’s exposition of the ταπεινοφροσύνη κ. ἡρασκελα τῶν ἄγγ., with which the connection, hit upon by

---

¹ Comp. Chrysostom: they have not seen the angels, and yet bear themselves as if they had seen them.

² For even the unseen, which may in any other way have been brought to our knowledge, we may and under certain circumstances should imitate (comp. e.g. Eph. v. 1). And even the angels and their actions have been included among the objects of the divine revelation as to the history of salvation and its accomplishment.
him, of εἰκὴ with ἐμβαθεῖνων ("an investigation, which results in nothing"), also falls to the ground.—εἰκὴ φυσιοῦμ. κ.τ.λ., and then καὶ ὦ κρατῶν κ.τ.λ., are both subordinate to the & ἐφάρκεν ἐμβαθεῖνων, and contain two modal definitions of it fraught with the utmost danger.—εἰκὴ φυσιοῦμ.] for the entering upon what was seen did not rest upon a real divine revelation, but upon a conceited, fanciful self-exaggeration. Τὸ δὲ γε φυσιοῦμενος τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἐναντίον οὐκ ἔστι τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἐσκῆπτοντο, τοῦ δὲ τύφον τὸ πάθος ἀκριβῶς περιεκεντό, Theodoret. On εἰκὴ, temere, i.e. without ground, comp. Matt. v. 22 ; Rom. xiii. 4 ; Plat. Menex. p. 234 C ; Xen. Cyrop. ii. 2 .22. It places the vanity, that is, the objective groundlessness of the pride, in contradistinction to their presumptuous fancies, emphatically in the foreground. Even if ἐμβαθεῖν is not taken absolutely with Hofmann, we may not join it with εἰκὴ (in opposition to Steiger, de Wette, Reiche ; Böhmer is doubtful), since it is not the uselessness (in this sense εἰκὴ would require to be taken, 1 Cor. xv. 2 ; Gal. iii. 4, iv. 11) of the ἐμβαθεῖν & ἐφάρ. (or & μὴ ἐφάρ.), but this ἐμβαθεῖν in and of itself, that forms the characteristic perversity in the conduct of those people—a perversity which is set forth by εἰκὴ φυσιοῦμ. κ.τ.λ., and in ver. 19 as immoral and anticchristian.—ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦ τῆς σαρκ. αὐτοῦ] becoming puffed up by (as operative principle) the reason of his flesh. This is the morally determined intellectual faculty in its character and activity as not divinely regulated, in which unennobled condition (see on Eph. iv. 23) it is the servant, not of the divine πνεῦμα, whose organ it is designed to be, but of the materio-physical human nature, of the σάρξ as the seat of the sin-power, and is governed by its lusts instead of the divine truth. Comp. Rom. i. 21, 28, iv. 1, vi. 19, vii. 14, xii. 2 ; Eph. iv. 17 f.; see also Kluge in the Jahrb. f. D. Theol. 1871, p. 329 ff. The νοῦ does not belong to the essence of the σάρξ (in opposition to Holsten); but, be it observed, the matter is so represented that the σάρξ of the false teacher, in accordance with its dominant superiority, appears personified (comp. Rom. viii. 6), as if the νοῦ, influenced by it, and therewith serviceable to it, were its own. In virtue of this non-free and, in its activity, sinfully-directed reason,
the man, who is guided by it, is ἀνόητος (Gal. iii. 1, 3; Tit. iii. 3), loses his moral judgment (Rom. xii. 2), falls into ἐπιθυμομασίας ἀνόητος (1 Tim. vi. 9), and withstands Christian truth and purity as κατεφθαρμένος τὸν νοῦν (2 Tim. iii. 8; 2 Cor. xi. 3), and ἐκκοσμουμένος τῇ διανοιᾷ (Eph. iv. 18).—The puffing up of the persons in question consisted in this, that with all their professed and apparent humility they, as is commonly the case with mystic tendencies, fancied that they could not be content with the simple knowledge and obedience of the gospel, but were capable of attaining a special higher wisdom and sanctity. It is well said by Theophylact: τῶς γὰρ οὐ σαρκικοῦ νοὸς κ. παχέος τὸ ἀθετήσαι τὰ ἐντὸ Χριστοῦ λεγέντα, John iii. 16, 17, 19, x. 26 f., καὶ μυρία δοσι! Ver. 19. Καὶ] annexing to εἰκῇ φυσιομένος κ.τ.λ. a further, and that a negative, modal form of the & ἐώρακεν ἐμβαθείων. This ἐμβαθείων into what is seen takes place, namely, in such a way, that one is puffed up by fleshly reason, and does not hold the Head, etc. So much is it at variance with the nature and success, as respects unity, of the church! — οὐ κρατῶν κ.τ.λ.,] not holding fast (but letting it go, comp. Song of Sol. iii. 4: ἐκράτησα αἰτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκα αἰτῶν) the Head, inasmuch, namely, as they seek angelic mediation. Bengel aptly observes: "Qui non unice Christum tenet, plane non tenet." — ἐξ οὐ κ.τ.λ.,] represents the whole objectionableness of this οὐ κρατῶν τ. κεφ., and the absolute necessity of the opposite. This οὖ is not to be referred to the verbal idea (Bengel's suggestion: "ex quo sc. tenendo caput"), but applies objectively (comp. Eph. iv. 15 f.) to that which was designated by τὴν κεφαλ. In this view it may be masculine, according to the construction κατὰ σύνεσιν (Kühner, Π. 1, p. 49), as it is usually taken, but it may also—and this is preferable, because here the personality is not, as in Eph. iv. 15 f., specially marked—be neuter, so that it takes up the Head, not

1 The conduct of those men is the negation of this holy relation, a separation from the organism of the body of Christ as an unity. The compressed characterizing of this articulated organism is therefore as suitable here as in Eph. iv. 16, and by no means an opus supererogationis on the part of the author (Holtzmann).
personally (though it is Christ), but in accordance with the neuter idea: from which. See Matthiae, p. 988; Kühner, II. 1, p. 55. Comp. Maetzner, ad Antiph. p. 201. The τ. κεφαλ. might also be taken attributively: not holding fast as the Head Him, from whom, etc. (Ewald), which would be, however, less simple and less forcibly descriptive. ἐξ denotes the causal issuing forth of the subsequently expressed relation, comp. Eph. iv. 16. — πᾶν τὸ σῶμα] consequently no member is excepted, so that no member can expect from any other quarter what is destined for, and conveyed to, the whole body from the head. The conception of the church as the body of Christ, the Head, is not in our Epistle and the Ephesian letter different from that of the other Epistles (in opposition to Holtzmann, p. 239 ff.). Comp. on 1 Cor. xii. 12 f., vi. 15; Rom. xii. 4 f.; also 1 Cor. xi. 3. Any pressing contrary to the author's design of the thought of a σῶμα, which strictly taken is a trunk, is in this particular case excluded by the graphic delineation of the constantly living and active connection of the members with the Head. Every comparison, indeed, when pressed, becomes halting. — διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν κ. συνδεσμῶν ἔπιχορ. κ. συμβιβασ.] The participial relation to the following verb is this: from the Head the whole body is furnished and bound together and grows in this way, so that ἔξ ὦ therefore is to be referred neither to the participles only, nor to the verb only, but to both; and διὰ τ. ἀφ. κ. συνδεσμ. specifies by what means the ἔπιχορ. κ. συμβιβασ., proceeding from the Head, is brought about, viz. through the (bodily) nerve-impulses (not joints, as it is usually explained; see on Eph. iv. 16), which are conveyed from the Head to the body, and through the bands, which, proceeding from the Head, place the whole in organic connection. Observe that ἔπιχορ. refers to διὰ τ. ἀφῶν, and συμβιβασ. to κ. συνδεσμ. Theophylact (comp. Theodoret) has aptly illustrated the former by the action of the nerves which is diffused from the head through the entire body, so that ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐστι πᾶσα αἰσθήσις κ. πᾶσα κίνησις. As, therefore, the body receives its efficiency from the head through the contact of impulses effected by means of the network of nerves, so would the church,
separated from Christ—from whom the feelings and impulses in a spiritual sense, the motions and activities of the higher ζωή, are conveyed to it—be without the supply in question. Comp. the idea of the figure of the vine. Further: as, starting from the head, the whole body, by means of the bands which bind member to member, is bound together into one organic whole; so also is the entire church, starting from Christ, by means of the bands of Christian communion (σωφροσύνα), which give to the union of individuals the coherence of articulate unity. Faith is the inner ground of the ἄφαλ, not the latter themselves (in opposition to Bengel); so also is love the inner ground of the συνδεσμοί of the mystical body, not these latter themselves (in opposition to Tertullian, Zanchius, Estius, Bengel, and others); and the operative principle on the part of Christ the Head is the Holy Spirit (Eph. iv. 4; 1 Cor. xii. 3 f.; 7, et al.). Theodoret erroneously (comp. Ewald) explains the συνδεσμοί as the ἀπόστολοι κ. προφήται κ. διδάσκαλοι, and Böhmer takes the ἄφαλ and συνδεσμ. as the believers. The latter, as also the teachers, are in fact the members; and share in experiencing what is here asserted of the entire body.—ἐπιχορηγοῦμ.] receiving supply, being furnished. Comp. on the passive expression, which is not un-Pauline (Holtzmann), but in harmony with the general passive usage (Kühner, II. 1, p. 109), Polyb. iv. 77. 2: πολλαὶ ἀφορμαὶ ἐκ φύσεως κεκορηγημέναι, iii. 75. 3, et al.; Diod. Sic. i. 73; Ecclus. xlv. 6; 3 Macc. vi. 40. The compound, not expressing "in addition besides" (Bleek), denotes that the χορηγία is coming to, is being conveyed towards. Comp. 2 Cor. ix. 10; Gal. iii. 5; Dion. Hal. x. 54. But it is not said with what the body is provided, as χορηγεῖ (comp. also ἐπιχορ., Ecclus. xxv. 22) is often used absolutely (see e.g. the passages from Polybius in Schweighäuser, Lex. p. 663), and admits of its more precise definition being supplied from the context, which, however, here points not to nourishment (Grotius, de Wette), but to that which is accomplished through the feelings (ἄφων), namely, the vital activity, of which the body would be destitute in the absence of the different impulses. Comp. Chrysostom: ό εἶναι καὶ το καλῶς εἶναι, Theophylact: πᾶσα αἰσθητικ κ.
πάσα κύριος, and in the application: ἅμβελει τῷ ἐγερεῖν αὐτοῖς τὸν πνεύματι, — τὴν αὐτοὶς τοῦ θεοῦ] denoted by the article as the divine growth absolutely; τοῦ θεοῦ is the genitive auctoris: which God confers (1 Cor. iii. 6, 7), with which ἐκ ὅς is not at variance (as Bähr thinks), since God is ranked above Christ (1 Cor. xii. 3), and is the supreme operating principle in the church (1 Cor. xii. 6; Eph. iv. 6). At once weak, and suggested by nothing in the text, is the view: “incrementum, quod Deus probat” (Calvin, Bähr¹). What is meant is the gradual growth of Christians collectively toward Christian perfection. The circumstance that αὐτοῖς as an intransitive only occurs again in Eph. ii. 21, comp. iv. 15, and αὐτοὶς only in Eph. iv. 16, cannot prove it to be an un-Pauline mode of expression (Holtzmann). Respecting the connection of the verb with the more precisely defined cognate noun, see Winer, p. 210 [E. T. 281]; Lobeck, Paralip. p. 507 f.; Kühner, II. 2, p. 262 f.

Ver. 20 f. After these warnings, vv. 16–19, which were intended to secure his readers against the seduction threatening them, the apostle now returns for the same purpose once more to the two main foundations of the Christian life, to the fellowship with Christ in death (ver. 20), and fellowship with Him also in resurrection (iii. 1). His aim is to show, in connection with the former, the groundlessness and perversity of the heretical prohibitions of meats (vv. 20–23), and to attach to the latter—to the fellowship of resurrection—the essence of Christian morality in whole and in detail, and therefore the paraenetic portion of the Epistle (iii. 1–iv. 6), the tenor of which thereby receives the character of the holiest moral necessity. — ei ἀπεθάνοντες κ. τ. λ. the legal abstinence required by the false teachers (see below) stands in contradiction with the fact, that the readers at their conversion had entered into the fellowship of the death of Christ, and thereby had become loosed from the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (see on ver. 8), i.e. from the ritual religious elements of non-Christian humanity, among which the legal prohibition of meats and the traditional regulations founded thereon are included. How far the man who

¹ Comp. Chrysostom and Oecumenius, who explain τοῦ θεοῦ by σωρὰ θεόν.
has died with Christ has passed out of connection with these elementary things, is taught by ver. 14, according to which, through the death of Christ, the law as to its debt-obligation has been abolished. Consequently, in the case of those who have died with Christ, the law, and everything belonging to the same category with it, have no further claim to urge, since Christ has allowed the curse of the law to be accomplished on Himself, and this has also taken place in believers in virtue of their fellowship of death with Him, whereby the binding relation of debt which had hitherto subsisted for them has ceased. Comp. Gal. ii. 19, iv. 3, 9; Rom. vii. 4, et al. — ἀποθανέων, with ἀπό, meaning to die away from something, moriendo liberari a (Porphyr. de abstín. ab esu anim. i. 41), is only met with here in the N. T.; elsewhere it is used with the dative, as in Gal. ii. 19, Rom. vi. 2, whereby the same thing is otherwise conceived in point of form. It is, moreover, to be observed, that Christ Himself also is by death released from the στοιχεία, since He was made under the law, and, although sinless, was destined to take upon Himself the curse of it; hence it was only by His death in obedience to the Father (Phil. ii. 8; Rom. v. 19), that He became released from this relation. Comp. on Gal. iv. 4. Huther erroneously denies that such an ἀποθανεῖν can be predicated of Christ, and therefore assumes (comp. Schenkel and Dalmer) the brachylogy: "if, by your dying with Christ, ye are dead from the στοιχεία τοῦ κόσμου."—τι δἄντες κ.τ.λ.] why are ye, as though ye were still alive in the world, commanded: Touch not, etc. Such commands are adapted to those who are not, like you, dead, etc. As ἀποθανόντες σὺν Χ. ἀπό τ. στοιχ. τ. κόσμ., ye are no longer alive in the domain of the non-Christian κόσμος, but are removed from that sphere of life (belonging to the heavenly πολίτευμα, Phil. iii. 20). The word δογματίζοντες, only found here in the N. T., but frequently in the LXX. and Apocrypha, and in the Fathers and decrees of Councils (see Suicer, Thes. I. p. 935), means nothing more than to decree (Diod. Sic. iv. 83; Diog. L. iii. 51; Anth. Pal. ix. 576. 4; Arrian. Epict. iii. 7; Esth. iii. 9; 3 Esdr. vi. 34; 2 Macc. x. 8, xv. 36; 3 Macc. iv. 11), and δογματίζοντες is
passive: why are ye prescribed to, why do men make decrees for you (vobis) ? so that it is not a reproach (the censure conveyed by the expression affects rather the false teachers), but a warning to those readers (comp. vv. 16, 18) who were not yet led away (i. 4, ii. 5), and who ought not to yield any compliance to so absurd a demand. That the readers are the passive subject, is quite according to rule, since the active has the dative along with it, δογματικων τωι (2 Macc. x. 8); comp. also Hofmann and Beza. The usual rendering takes δογματικων as middle, and that either as: why do ye allow commands to be laid down for you (Huther), rules to be imposed upon you (de Wette), yourselves to be entangled with rules (Luther) ? and such like;¹ or even: why do ye make rules for yourselves (Ewald)? comp. Vulgate: decernitis. This, however, would involve a censure of the readers, and ὃς ξωντες ἐν κόσμῳ would express the unsuitableness of their conduct with their Christian standing—a reproach, which would be altogether out of harmony with the other contents of the Epistle. On the contrary, ὃς ξωντες ἐν κ. indicates the erroneous aspect in which the Christian standing of the readers was regarded by the false teachers, who took up such an attitude towards them, as if they were not yet dead from the world, which nevertheless (comp. ver. 11 f.) they are through their fellowship with Christ (iii. 3; Gal. ii. 19 f.; 2 Cor. v. 14 f.). The ὃς ξωντες ἐν κόσμῳ, moreover, is entirely misunderstood by Bähr: “as if one could at all attain to life and salvation through externals.” Comp. on the contrary, the thought of the εἶναι ἐν τῇ σαρκί in Rom. vii. 5 and Gal. vi. 14. Observe, further, that this ζην ἐν κόσμῳ is not one and the same thing with εἶναι ἐν τῷ τῷ στοιχείῳ τοῦ κόσμου (Hofmann, by way of establishing his explanation of στοιχεία in the sense of the material things of the world); but the ζην ἐν κ. is the more general, to which the special εἶναι ἐν τῷ τῷ στοιχείῳ τ. κ. is subordinate. If the former is the case, the latter also takes place by way of consequence.—μὴ ἅψτας κ.τ.λ.] a vivid concrete representation of the δογματα concerned, in a “compendiaria mimesis” (Flacius). The triple

¹ Comp. Chrysostom: τῶι τῶι στοιχείων ἐνιαυτῆς; similarly Theodoret, Beza; and recently, Bähr, Böhmer, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek, and others.
description brings out the urgency of the eager demand for abstinence, and the relation of the three prohibitions is such, that μηδὲ both times means nor even; in the second instance, however, in the sense of ne guidem, so that the last point stands to the two former together in the relation of a climax: thou shalt not lay hold of, nor even taste, nor once touch! What was meant as object of this enjoined ἀπέχεσθαι (1 Tim. iv. 3) the reader was aware, and its omission only renders the description more vivid and terse. Steiger’s view, that the object was suppressed by the false teachers themselves from fear and hypocrisy, is quite groundless. From the words themselves, however (γεύσῃ), and from the subsequent context (see ver. 23), it is plain that the prohibitions concerned certain meats and drinks (comp. ver. 16); and it is entirely arbitrary to mix up other things, as even de Wette does, making them refer also to sexual intercourse (θυγγάνειν γυναικός, Eur. Hipp. 1044, et al.; see Monck, ad Eur. Hipp. 14; Valckenaer, ad Phoen. 903), while others distinguish between ἄψη and θήγη in respect of their objects, e.g. Estius: the former refers to unclean objects, such as the garments of a menstruous woman, the latter to the buying and selling of unclean meats; Erasmus, Zanchius: the former concerns dead bodies, the latter sacred vessels and the like; Grotius: the former refers to meats, the latter to the “vitandas feminas,” to which Flatt and Dalmer, following older writers, make ἄψη refer (1 Cor. vii. 1). Others give other expositions still; Böhmer arbitrarily makes θήγη refer to the oil, which the Essenes and other theosophists regarded as a labes. That Paul in ἄψη and θήγη had no definite object at all in view, is not even probable (in opposition to Huther), because γεύσῃ stands between them, and ver. 23 points to abstinence from meats, and not at the same time to anything else.—Following the more forcible ἄψη, lay hold of, the more subtle θήγη, touch, is in admirable keeping with the climax: the object was to be even ἀθικτον (Soph. O. C. 39). Comp. on the difference between the two words, Xen. Cyrop. i. 3. 5: ἦν μὲν τοῦ ἄρτου ἄψη, εἰς οὐδὲν τὴν χειρὰ ἀποφώμανον (σὲ ὀφώ), ἦν δὲ τούτων (these dainty dishes) τῶν θήγης, εὐθὺς ἀποκαθαρὶ τὴν χειρὰ εἰς τὰ χειρό-
μεταρα, also v. 1. 16. In an inverted climax, Eur. Bacch. 617: σοτ ἔθησαν σοθ' ἠπαθ' ἡμῶν. See also Ex. xix. 12, where the LXX. delicately and aptly render ἔθησαν, to touch the outer border of the mountain, by the free translation θίγειν τι αὶτοῦ, but then express the general ἔθησα by the stronger ὅ ἀφανεν τοῖς ἄρους. Hofmann erroneously holds that ἀποθαμα expresses rather the motion of the subject grasping at something, θυγάνω rather his arriving at the object. In opposition to this fiction stands the testimony of all the passages in the Gospels (Matt. viii. 3, ix. 20; John xx. 17, and many others), in which ἀπεκεκλεῖ signifies the actual laying hold of, and, in Paul’s writings, of 1 Cor. vii. 1, 2 Cor. vi. 17, as also the quite common Grecian usage in the sense of contractare (attingere et inhaerere), and similarly the signification of the active to fasten to, to make to stick (Lobeck, ad Soph. Α. 698; Duncan, Lex. Hom. ed. Rost, p. 150). The mere stretching out the hand towards something, in order to seize it, is never ἀπεκεκλεῖ. Hofmann, moreover, in order to establish a climax of the three points, arbitrarily makes the subtle gloss upon γεύσῃ, that this might even happen more unintentionally, and upon θύγαν, that this might happen involuntarily.—Respecting the aorist θίγειν (a present θίγειν instead of θυγάνω can nowhere be accepted as certain), see Schaefer, ad Greg. Cor. p. 990, Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 804; Kühner, I. p. 833.

Ver. 22. We are not to put in a parenthesis μὴ ἀφη…ἀποκρησις (Erasmus Schmid, Heinrichs, and others), but merely ἂ ἐστιν…ἀποκρ., (Griesbach, Lachmann, Scholz, Ewald); for the construction proceeds uninterruptedly to θύγαν, is then only broken by the judgment ἂ ἐστι π. εἰς φθ. τ. ἀποκρ., and thereafter runs on with κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλμ. κ.τ.λ. — ἂ ἐστι…ἀποκρ., is an inserted judgment of the apostle anent that which the false teachers interdicted by μὴ ἀφη κ.τ.λ.: which all are destined to destruction through the use,—from which it is to be rendered

1 For it is only an incidental observation in opposition to the above ἰκτιστα; the main ground of opposition to the latter lies in οἱ ἐκεῖνοι, εἰς Χ.

2 lac. εἰς φθονόρ, it serves for destruction, i.e. it serves for the purpose of being destroyed. See generally Winer, p. 178 [E. T. 228]; Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 191 [E. T. 150f.]. Comp. Wisd. iv. 18; Ecclus. xxxiv. 10; Judith v. 21, 24, viii. 22.
palpably apparent, how _preposterous_ it is to make such things a condition of eternal bliss by urging abstinence from them. We have here a similar line of argument to that in Matt. xv. 17. Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 13. Hence _phorā _is meant to denote the perishing which takes place through the natural dissolution (digestion) of the meats and drinks; and with this conception quite accords the purposely-chosen compound τῆς ἀποχής, which, like _abusus_, indicates the _using up_, the _consuming_ (Plut. Mor. p. 267 E; Davis, _ad_ Cic. _N. D._ iv. 60).

So it is unanimously explained by Chrysostom, Theodoret (εἰς κόπρον γὰρ ἀπάντα μεταβάλλειται), Oecumenius (ὑπὸρα γάρ, φησιν, ἵπποκεντα ἐν τῷ ἀφεδρῶ), Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Wolf, Grotius, Michaelis, and many others, including Bähr, Steiger, Olshausen, Ewald, Bleek, Hofmann. But, according to others, who likewise regard ἀ... _ἀποχρ_. as a parenthetical judgment, the ἀ is to be referred to the prohibitions, _ἀποχρ_ to the _use_, _i.e._ the following of them, and _phorā_ (comp. Gal. vi. 8) to the destruction of the persons who follow them: _all which δόγματα by their use tend to (eternal) destruction_. So Ambrosiaster, Augustine, Cornelius a Lapide, Calixtus, Heumann, Junker. Errorneously; because _ἀποχρ_ never means merely _use_, and even the simple _χρή_, in the sense of _τής_ _χρή_, would be an unsuitable designation; in fact, the entire addition, "by the use," would be utterly superfluous. On account of _ἀποχρ_, the expedient must also be rejected, on linguistic grounds, that ἀ... _ἀποχρ_ are still _words of the false teachers_, which Paul repeats with irony: "_omnia haec (vetita) usu suo perniciem afferunt_," Heinrichs, comp. Schenkel. By others, who, like Tischendorf, have deleted the marks of parenthesis, the whole down to _ἀθρωπῶν_ is taken together: all this, which the false teachers forbid, tends through the using to ("moral," de Wette) destruction, " _si sc. ex doctorum Judaicorum praecptis et doctrinis hac de re judicium feratur_," Kypke; so also

---

1 Similarly Dalmer, who, however, _takes τῆς _ _ἀποχής_ in the sense of _abusus_, joining it immediately to ἄνεμος _et ἀνέμος._ But while _ἀνέμω_ (Dem. 215. 8; Herod., v. 1. 13) is found in the sense of _abusus_ _ἀνέμω_ _παρακείμενος, _ _ἀνέμω_ is not, though it was so taken by Erasmus Schmid, Schoettgen, Zachariae, as also by Grimm in his _Lexicon_.

---
Vatablus, Storr, Flatt, Böhmer, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius (Huther is undecided between this explanation and ours). But in opposition to this it may be urged, that the compound ἀποκρήσει would be entirely without a motive, since not the consumption, but the use at all would be soul-destroying according to the maxims of those people. Our view alone supplies a motive for the use of ἀποκρήσει, and that through the point of its connection with εἰς φθορά, in which case, however, the object affected by ἀποχρ. and εἰς φθορ. must be the same (the things forbidden). De Wette's objections are irrelevant, since the thought of the parenthesis ἀ... ἀποχρ. is expressed not strangely, but with Pauline ingenuity, the words κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλμ. κ.τ.λ. annexed to δογματίζεσθαι are by no means superfluous (see below), nor does this annexation require us to begin the parenthesis with μὴ ἄψη and thereby to include heterogeneous elements together; for μὴ ἄψη κ.τ.λ. still belongs closely to δογματ., of which it is the contents, and κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλμα κ.τ.λ. is then annexed, after the brief incidentally inserted remark, to δογματ. and its contents (μὴ ἄψη κ.τ.λ.). — κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα κ.τ.λ.] The article before ἐντάλμα, and extending also to διδασκαλ., is generic. The μὴ ἄψη κ.τ.λ. was decreed by the false teachers conformably to the commandments and doctrines of men, not in consequence of what God had commanded and taught. This element, annexed to δογματίζεσθαι, is by no means superfluous (in opposition to de Wette), since, in fact, δόγμα in itself is a command generally, and may be one based upon divine authority; it rather serves to bring out with perfect clearness the conflicting relation, in which that δογματίζεσθαι stands to the ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ κ.τ.λ. For what the false teachers decreed was not the prohibitions of meats contained in the law of Moses as such, and these alone (although they too would have been incompatible with the ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χ. κ.τ.λ.), but such as consisted in the human (Essene) definitions, expansions, and amplifications of the former (κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ver. 8). It was in this, and not in the mere setting up again of the Mosaic law abolished through Christ (Chrysostom and many others), that the δογματίζεσθαι was regulated by human standard, without the divine authority and warrant.
Moreover, διδασκ. is not synonymous with ἐντάλμα, but has a wider sense (in Matt. xv. 9 and Mark vi. 7, the narrower idea comes after as a more precise definition), so that the two together specify the preceptive and generally (καὶ) the doctrinal standard. Comp. Isa. xxix. 13.

Ver. 23. And of what nature and quality is that, which I have just termed τὰ ἐντάλματα κ. διδασκαλ. τῶν ἀνθρ. ? — ἀντίω] quippe quae, i.e. ita comparata, ut (Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. ii. 1, 30). The conception was different in & of ver. 22, where the thing in question was regarded purely objectively, as mere object. — ἐστι] belongs to ἔχοντα, without, however, being with this equivalent to ἔχει; it introduces what the ἀντίω are as regards their quality. If it belonged to οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ των (Bähr), or to πρὸς πλησμ. τ. σ. (Bengel), or to ἐν ἔθελονθηκαίᾳ κ.τ.λ. (that which moves and has its being in ἔθελον. κ.τ.λ.), as Hofmann thinks, taking λόγον μ. ἔχοντα σοφ. parenthetically—why should it not have been actually placed beside that to which it would belong? Apart from this, Hofmann's connection of it with ἐν ἔθελον. could alone deserve consideration, since from ἐν ἔθελον. onwards all that follows is consecutive. But even this connection must be abandoned, because the sphere of subsistence indicated by ἐν ἔθελον. κ.τ.λ. would be too wide for such special prohibitions, ver. 21, as are conveyed by ἀντίω, and because we have no right to put aside from the connection, as a mere incienium, the important thought (comp. ver. 8) expressed by λόγ. τ. ἔχ. σοφιας, which comes in with ἐστί so emphatically at the very head of the judgment, and appropriately, as regards meaning, attaches to itself all that follows. — λόγον ἔχεω, explained by many since Jerome approximately in the sense of speciem or praetextum habere (see Kypke, de Wette, Dalmer, and others; also Köster in the Stud. u. Krit. 1854, p. 318), may, according as we adopt for λόγος the signification ratio or sermo, mean either: to have ground (so in the passages from Demosth., Dionys. Hal., and Lesbonax in Kypke; from Plat. in Ast, Lex. II. p. 257; from Polyb. in Schweighäuser, Lex. p. 370), in

1 So Hilgenfeld, in his Zeitschr. 1870, p. 250, holding that what is rejected in the legal sense in ver. 22 is here "permitted as voluntary asceticism." See,
which case the ground may certainly be only an apparent one, a pretext (comp. Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 36); further, to have an insight into something (often thus in Plato, e.g. Rep. p. 475 C), to have regard to (Herod. i. 62; Plat. Tim. p. 87 C); or: to have a reputation, so that one is in any relation the subject of discourse, of legend, of mention, of rumour, etc.; see e.g. Plat. Epin. p. 987 B: 'Ενοσφόρος... Ἀφροδίτης εἶναι σχεδόν ἔχει λόγον (dicitur), Herod. v. 56: λόγον ἔχει τὴν Πυθαγορίαν ἀναπείσεις, comp. ix. 78; Xen. Oec. 11. 4 (the same thing conceived under another form: λόγος ἔχει τινα, Herod. vii. 5, and frequently). The latter signification is here to be adhered to, because the subsequent οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι, when correctly rendered, accords with it as bearing on the matter in hand, and is in sense appropriately correlative. Hence: that which has a repute of wisdom, popularly passes for wisdom. Comp. οὐκ ἔχει (Rev. iii. 1) and οὐκ ἔχεσθαι (1 Cor. v. 11). — μὲν without a subsequent δὲ; there was before the apostle's mind the contrast: repute, truly, but not the reality, οὐ δύναμιν, οὐκ ἐλεήθειαν, Chrysostom. He omitted to express this, however, led aside by the progress of his discourse, so that instead of bringing in the antithesis of λόγον by δὲ, he makes οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι follow without δὲ, and in contrast not to the λόγον, but to the ἐν ἐθελοβρ. κ.τ.λ.,—from which we are to gather in substance, what in starting with λόγον μὲν it was intended to express. See Erasmus, Annot., and generally Winer, p. 534 f. [E. T. 719]; Buttmann, Neut. Gr. p. 313 [E. T. 365]; Klotz, ad Devar. p. 656; Maetzner, ad Antiph. p. 153; Baeumlein, Partik. p. 163 f. The linguistic phenomenon of this μὲν without an adversative word following is so common, that there is no ground for requiring before οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τ. an ἀλλά (Hofmann), which might have been used (Baeumlein, p. 170), but not necessarily. Holtzmann also takes too much offence at the absence of a formal contrast, and finds in πρὸς πλησιμ. τ. σαρκός an ill-inserted remnant of the original.—ἐν ἐθελοβρήσει] instrumental, specifying by what means it is brought about, on the part of those who lay down the com-
however, on the sequel, from which the impossibility of this interpretation is self-evident.
mandments and doctrines referred to, that the latter have a repute of wisdom: through self-chosen worship, i.e. through a cultus, which is not divinely commanded, but is the work of their own self-determination. What was meant by this, the reader was aware; and ver. 18 places it beyond doubt that the worship of angels formed an essential and chief part of it, though it need not, from the general character of the expression in our passage, have been meant exclusively; other forms of capricious cultus may have been included with it. The substantive ἔθελοθρ. does not occur elsewhere except in ecclesiastical writers; but the verb ἔθελοθρησκεύω is explained by Suidas: ἰδιῷ θελήματι σέβεσθαι τὸ δοκοῦν, and Epiph. Haer. i. 16 explains the name Pharisees: διὰ τὸ ἀφαρμομένου εἶναι αὐτοῦς ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων διὰ τὴν ἔθελοπερισσοθρησκείαν παρ' αὑτοῖς νεομοσμένην. Comp. ἔθελοθρησκεία (Plat. Symp. p. 184 C, Rep. p. 562 D), ἔθελοκάθαρσις, ἔθελοκινδύνος, ἔθελόπορος, ἔθελοπρόξενος (Thuc. iii. 70, 2, where the scholiast explains: ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ γενόμενος καὶ μὴ κελευσθείς κ.τ.λ.), and various others. Hofmann erroneously takes away from the word in itself the bad sense, and explains (after the analogy of ἔθελοπονία and ἔθελουργία): worship, which one interests himself in. This view is prohibited by the evident retrospective reference of this word and the following one to ver. 18, where, according to the right interpretation, the θρησκεία was certainly something bad. The unfavourable meaning, according to Hofmann's present explanation (he gave a different but also erroneous view in his Schriftbew. II, p. 72; see, in opposition to it, my third edition), is only got by the addition of σώματος, which belongs to all the three points, so that ἔθελοθρησκεία σώματος must be understood as a worship gladly and earnestly rendered, but which is rendered only with bodily demeanour. But σώματος does not suit either with ἔθελοθρ. or ταπεινοφρ., but only with ἀφειδία. For it is plain from

1 According to Hofmann, namely, ταπεινοφροσύνη σώματος is a disposition of self-humiliation, which, however, only weakens the body by abstinences. But it would rather have the absurd sense: humility of the body: for ταπεινοφροσύνη neither means humiliation nor self-humiliation, but humility, meekness, ver. 18, iii. 12; Phil. ii. 3.
THE EPISODE OF PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS.

ἀφείδια σώματος that σώματος is the genitive of the object, from which it follows that θρησκεία σώματος would yield the opposite sense: a θρησκεία rendered to the body (comp. θρησκ. τῶν ἄγγελων in ver. 18), which would come ultimately to the idea of the λατρεύων τῇ ήδονῇ (Lucian, Nigr. 15), comp. Plut. Mor. p. 107 C: λατρεία τοῦ σώματος, and on the matter conceived as θρησκεία, Phil. iii. 19. — ταπεινοφροσ.] from the point of view of the false teachers (comp. ver. 18), what they thus designated; although in fact it consisted in this, that, as in all false humility, they with spiritual conceit (comp. ver. 18, and subsequently πρὸς πλησιμον. τ. σαρκός) took pleasure in unduly undervaluing themselves—an ethical self-contempt, which involved in relation to God the ἔθελοθρησκεία, and towards the body an unsparingness through mistaken abstinence and mortifying asceticism, inconsistent with Christian liberty. On ἀφείδια, comp. Plat. Defin. p. 412 D; Plut. Mor. p. 762 D; further, ἀφείδειν βίον, Thuc. ii. 43. 3; ψυχής, Soph. El. 968; σώματος, Lys. ii. 25, Diod. Sic. xiii. 60. — οὐκ ἐν τῷ τινὶ not through anything whatever that is an honour, not through anything honourable, by which that repute would appear founded in truth and just. The expression is purposely chosen, in order to make the λόγος σοφίας appear as repute without honour, i.e. without any morally estimable substratum on the part of the persons concerned. The following πρὸς πλησιμονὴν τῆς σαρκός is also purposely chosen; in it πλησιμον. significantly glances back to ἀφείδια, and τῆς σαρκός to σώματος, and there is produced a thoughtful contrast, a striking ethical oxymoron: for the sake of fully satisfying the flesh. Those commandments and doctrines have a repute of wisdom, etc., in order to afford thereby full satisfaction to the material-physical human nature. Thus, while the repute of wisdom is procured among other things by mortifying the body, the flesh is satisfied; the fleshly sinful lust of these men gets fully satisfying nourishment conveyed to it, when they see that their doctrines and commandments pass for wise. What lust of the flesh it is which Paul has in view, is placed beyond doubt by the case itself and also by ver. 18, namely, that of religious conceit and pride, which through the λόγον σοφίας ἔχειν feels itself flattered
and gratified in the fancy of peculiar perfection. This interpretation, which we have given of οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι, πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκὸς, is held in substance, following Hilary ("sagina carnalis sensus traditio humana est"), by Bengel, Storr, Flatt, Böhmer, Steiger, Bähr, Huther, Dalmer, Bleek, and others. Most, however, refer ἐν τιμῇ τινι to the honour to be shown to the body (or the σάρξ, see Luther), and πρὸς πλησμ. τ. σαρκ. to bodily satisfaction, so that the sense results: not in some esteeming of the body to the satisfying of bodily wants; \(^1\) "sentit apost., sapientiam illam aut praecpta talia esse, per quae corpore debitus honor, pertinens ad expletionem, i.e. justam refectionem carnis, subtrahatur," Estius. So, in substance, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Pelagius, Erasmus, Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, Musculus, Clarus, Zeger, Erasmus Schmid, Zanchius, Vatablus, Calovius, Cornelius a Lapide, Wolf, Michaelis, Nösselt, Rosenmüller, and others, including de Wette and Baumgarten-Crusius. It is fatal to this view:—(1) that ἐν τιμῇ τινι, as is shown by the repetition of ἐν, is the contrast not merely to ἐν ἀφείδια σῶματος, but to the entire connected ἐν ἐθελοθησκεία ... σῶματος, and hence the reference to the honour to be shown to the body does not seem justified by the context; \(^2\) (2) further, that for the designation of the mere satisfaction at this particular place, where Paul could only have had a πρόνοια τῆς σαρκὸς in view, as in Rom. xiii. 14, the term πλησμονὴ would be very inappropriate, especially in contradiction to the mortifications of the false teachers, since it denotes filling up, satisfying fully, even in Ex. xvi. 3 (see generally the passages from the LXX. and Apocrypha quoted by Schleusner, Thes. IV. p. 375 f.); comp. Plat. Legg. viii. p. 837: Xen. Mem. iii. 11. 14, rep. Lac. 2. 5, Cypgr. iv. 2. 40, Ages. 5. 1; Lucian. Nigr. 33, Ep. Saturn. 28; Polyb. ii. 19. 4; (3) finally, that the interchange of σῶματος and σαρκὸς, in

\(^1\) "God will have the body honoured, i.e. it is to have its food, clothing, etc., for its necessities, and not to be destroyed with intolerable fasting, labour, or impossible chastity, as the doctrine of men would do," Luther's gloss.

\(^2\) This applies also in opposition to Olahausen, who in the case of ἐν τιμῇ τινι follows the explanation of respect for the body, but with regard to πρὸς πλησμ. τ. σαρκ. follows our view.
the event of the latter not being meant in an ethical character, would seem to be without a motive, while, according to our view, σαρκός stands in as ingenious correlation with σώματος, as πλησμονή with ἀϕειδία. These arguments apply also in opposition to Ewald's view; "what seems very wise, but is in no value whatever, is rather quite useless for the satisfaction of the flesh, which yet also demands its rights, if man would not wantonly disorganize his earthly life or even destroy it" (2 Cor. x. 3). Hofmann finally takes πλησμονή τ. σαρκός rightly, but explains οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι in such a way as to make τινι masculine, and to attach it as appropriating dative to τιμῇ: "not so that honour accrues to any one." This is to be rejected, because Paul, instead of simply and clearly writing τιμῇ των, would only have expressed himself in a way singularly liable to be misunderstood by τωλ, which every reader was led to join as a feminine with τιμῇ ("in honore aliquo," Vulgate). Nor is it to be easily seen what subjects, beyond the teacher of the false wisdom himself, we should have to conceive to ourselves under τωλ taken as masculine.
CHAPTER III.

VER. 4. Instead of ἐρώτ., which Griesb. approves, and Lachm. puts in the margin, but Tisch. 8 in the text, ἐρώτ. is read by Elz. Scholz, and Tisch. 7, in opposition to CD* E* FP G* min. Arm. Slav. ed. Vulg. It. and many Fathers (not Origen). A is defective here. Considering this weighty evidence in favour of ἐρώτ., and seeing that the following καὶ ἐρώτ. suggested the change of person to the copyists, as indeed the beginning of a lesson with ver. 4 could not but have favoured the insertion of the general ἐρώτ., we have stronger grounds for regarding ἐρώτ. as original than as a repetition from ver. 3. —Ver. 5. ἐρώτ.] is wanting, indeed, in BC* K* min. Clem. Or. (five times) Eus., but has all the vss. in its favour; hence the evidence against it is not sufficient to warrant its rejection, with Tisch. 8, as an inserted supplement. —δ’ ἁ] C* D* E FG Clar. Germ. read δ’ ἂ or δ’ ἅ. Rightly; the Receptra, though strongly attested, is an alteration to correspond with the plurality of the preceding objects under comparison of Eph. v. 6. —ἐκ τοῦ τοῦτο ὑπὸ τ. ἀρνισίας] is wanting in BD* (?) Sahid. Aeth. Clem. Cypr. Ambrosiat., bracketed by Lachm. and omitted by Tisch. The evidence against it is too weak to justify its rejection, especially in the face of the agreement of the passage otherwise with Eph. v. 6, and of the incompleteness of the thought which would remain, in case those words were omitted; Reiche properly defends them. —Ver. 7. Instead of νοῦς Elz. and Scholz have αὐτοῦ, in opposition to decisive Codd., although defended by Reiche. —Ver. 11. Before εἰσδ. Lachm. inserts καὶ; considerably attested, it is true (not by BC*), but nevertheless an addition which crept in easily in consequence of the first two clauses of the verse; nearly all the same authorities (not A) have it also before εἰσδ. —Ver. 12. Instead of νεκροῦς Elz. has νεκροῦν, in opposition to decisive testimony. —Ver. 13. ἢ Χριστός] Lachm. reads ἢ χριστός, following AB D* FG 213, Vulg. It. Aug. (once) Pel. Rightly; the Receptra is an interpretation, instead of which ἢ Θεός (Ν) and Deus in Christo (Arm. Aug. once) are also found. —Ver. 14. ἅ] ABC FGP Vulg. It. Clem. Chrys. read ὅ, which
is approved by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. \( \text{εἰς (καὶ)} \) and the \textit{Recepta \ ητίς (καὶ)} are emendations.—Ver. 15. Instead of \( \tauὸν \chiριστὸν \) Elz. has \( \tauὸν \Thetaοῦ, \) in opposition to decisive evidence, from Phil. iv. 7.—Ver. 16. The \( \text{καὶ} \) before \( \nuμὼν \) and \( \phiίλας \) should in both cases be omitted (Scholz omits only the first), in accordance with preponderating evidence. Borrowed from Eph. v. 19.—in \( \chiάρ. \) Lachm. and Tisch.: in \( \tauῆ \chiάρ., \) which, on the authority of \( \text{BD\*E\*FG\*καί} \) Clem. Chrys. Theodoret, is to be preferred. The article was passed over as superfluous.

—Following far preponderant testimony (also \( \text{καὶ} \)), we must read subsequently with Lachm. and Tisch. 8: \( \text{καὶ \καρδίας \υμ. τῷ \Θεῷ, not: in τῆ \καρδία \υμ. τῷ \χριστῷ (Elz. Reiche), or: in τῆ \καρδία \υμ. τ. \Θεῷ (Tisch. 7).} \) Comp. Eph. v. 19.—Ver. 17. \( \chiριστὸν \text{\'Ισραήλ} \) Lachm.: \( \text{\'Ισραήλ χριστὸν, which is to be adopted on the authority of \text{ACD\*FG min. vss. and Fathers; καὶ has χριστὸν \text{\'Ισραήλ.}} \) καὶ is to be omitted, with Lachm. and Tisch., following \( \text{ABC καί} \) min. vss. and Fathers; from Eph. v. 20.—Ver. 18. After \( \text{τοῦ} \) Elz. reads \( \text{ιδίοις, in opposition to decisive evidence; from Eph. v. 22.—Ver. 19. After \text{γυναῖκας} \) Lachm. has \( \text{υμῶν, which, with considerable evidence in its favour, is the more especially to be adopted, as in Eph. v. 25 \text{ιστι} \text{νως is found. The omission easily occurred, because \text{τοῦ} \text{άνθρώπως} \text{previously was also without genitival definition.} \) —Ver. 20. Instead of \( \text{in χριστῷ} \) Elz. has \( \tauῷ \chiριστῷ, which is to be regarded on decisive evidence as an omission of the apparently superfluous \text{in.} \) —Ver. 21. \text{εἰς (καὶ)} Lachm. and Scholz, as also Griesb., recommend: \( \text{παρ-} \text{οργίς, following, it is true, \text{ACD\*E\*FG\*KL\* (παροργίς(καί) min. Vulg. It. Theodoret, ms. Theoph. ; but it comes from Eph. vi. 4.—Ver. 22. Elz. and Tisch. \text{χριστὸς \text{ὅφθαλμοδούλευε}} \text{ις, which Reiche approves. But \text{ὅφθαλμοδούλευε} (recommended by Griesb. and adopted by Lachm. and Scholz) is the reading in \text{ABD E F G min. Damascus. Theoph. ; and Chrysostom also by \text{καὶ \text{ὅφθαλμο-} 


douλευε} testifies in favour of the singular. The singular is to be preferred as preponderantly attested, and because the final syllable \( \text{AI (q)} \) might very easily bring about the conversion into the plural. If the singular had come in from Eph. vi. 6, Chrysostom's reading, \( \text{καὶ \text{ὁθώ, would be more frequent.} \) —Instead of \( \chiριστὸν \) Elz. has \( \Thetaοῦ, contrary to decisive witnesses.—Ver. 23. \text{καὶ πᾶν} \text{ο, τι \text{καὶ} \text{ν}} \text{The reading \text{δ Ἰδι, which Griesb. approves, and Lachm. Scholz and Tisch. have adopted, is decisively attested; the \text{Recepta is from ver. 17.—Ver. 24. \text{τῷ} \text{γάρ} \text{γάρ has so decisive witnesses against it (also \( \text{καί} \)), that, with Lachm. and Tisch. (Griesb. also condemns it), it is to be deleted as a current connective addition. —Ver. 25. \text{ο ἔδι} \text{ο γάρ is}
decisively attested (also by Ἐ); it is approved by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. The antithetical ἀναίρετος crept in from misunderstanding. — κομίσται. The form κομίσται (Lachm.) is found in B D εκ K L μιν. Fathers. To these may be added F G, which have κομίζῃσται. The Recepta must give way to the more strongly attested κομίσται. Comp. on Eph. vi. 8.

Contents.—The generally hortatory second portion of the Epistle, preceded in ii. 6 merely by a special exhortation against the danger of heresy, does not begin with ii. 6 (Hofmann), but only now, and seeks to promote in the readers the essential moral direction of the Christian life (vv. 1–4); after which they are encouraged to lay aside and abandon everything which is contrary to that direction (vv. 5–11), and to adopt and follow all that is good and edifying in a Christian sense (vv. 12–17). Then follow exhortations in reference to the various relations of the household (ver. 18–iv. 1).

Ver. 1 f. Ἐγγίζεται does not make the relation problematical any more than in ii. 20, but sets it forth as an undoubted fact (ii. 12), from which the subsequent duty results, in syllogistic form, as is frequently the case in Paul’s writings (see Fritzsche, ad Rom. I. p. 325), and also in the classics (Hartung, Partikel. I. p. 259 f.; Kühner and Herbst, ad Xen. Mem. i. 5. 1). The being risen with Christ, namely, is not meant in the sense of the regenerate moral life (see on ii. 12), but as the relation of real participation in the resurrection of Christ, which involves as its ethical correlate the obligation τὰ ἀνεῳ ἔντονερ. To be risen with Christ, and not τὰ ἀνεῳ ἔντονερ, would be a contradiction.—οὖν therefore, points back to ver. 20, and with logical propriety, since fellowship in the resurrection of Christ is the necessary consequence of fellow-

1 It is therefore with all the less reason that Hitzig, p. 23 ff., would have vv. 1, 2 regarded as “a portion of the reviser’s work,” at the same time denying the integrity of the text in ii. 22, 23, declaring ii. 19 to be an interpolation, and very arbitrarily remodelling ii. 17, 18. He thinks that the interpolation of iii. 1 f. betrays times subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem, when earthly grounds of hope had vanished, but not extending beyond the period of Trajan,—which is assumed to result from iv. 17. Combinations such as these are
ship in *His death,*—a fact which Paul had in view also in ver. 21, in writing ὑς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ. The ὑν is not intended to be *resumptive,* namely, of what was said in ii. 12 (Hofmann); otherwise what comes after that verse down to the present one must have had the nature of a parenthesis, or a digression. — τὰ ἄνω] the opposite to τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ: that *which is in heaven* (comp. John viii. 23; Gal. iv. 26; Phil. iii. 14), by which is indicated the *Messianic salvation* which, with its future blessings (ii. 17), is preserved in heaven to be manifested and communicated at the Parousia (vv. 3, 4). Comp. Matt. vi. 33, and the conceptions of the treasure in heaven (Matt. vi. 20), of the heavenly βραβεία (ii. 18; Phil. iii. 14), πολίτευμα (Phil. iii. 20), Jerusalem (Gal. iv. 26). It is substantially the same as δόξαν κ. τιμὴν κ. ἀφθαρσίαν ἐνθέω in Rom. ii. 7. As a philosophical analogy, comp. especially the ἄνω ὅδε, in the beautiful close of Plato’s *Republic,* and the farewell of Socrates in the *Phaedo.* A *liturgical colouring,* which such expressions as τὰ ἄνω (also τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς κ.τ.λ. in i. 16, 20) are alleged to have (Holtzmann), is arbitrarily assumed as a criterion of a later age.—οὐ ὁ Χ. ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ.] furnishing a motive encouraging them to perfect the fellowship. “Par est enim illuc tendere studia curasque membrorum, ubi jam versatur caput,” Erasmus. The event of the bodily ascension (but not a definite form of the process) is here, as in every case where the exalted Christ is the subject of discourse, *presupposed.* Comp. especially Phil. iii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 48. Notwithstanding the local ὅ, Hofmann thinks that Paul has conceived the supramundane existence of Christ *not at all locally.* Comp., however, on Eph. i. 20 and Mark xvi. 19; and see the frequent and significant ὅπου ἐγὼ ἦταν and ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ from the lips of Jesus in John. —Ver. 2. τὰ ἄνω] repeated with emphasis, and then still further strengthened by the negative contrast. The *φρονεῖτε* is *more* beyond the reach of criticism. According to Holtzmann, vv. 2, 3 presuppose the destruction of all hopes connected with the continuance of the theocracy, and directly allude to Heb. xii. 22; even the “sitting at the right hand” (as in Eph. i. 20) is withal, notwithstanding Rom. viii. 34, assumed. Of the entire chapter, Holtzmann only leaves vv. 3, 12, 13, 17 to stand as original.
comprehensive than ἐγκαταιτέ, expressing not only the striving (comp. Rom. ii. 7), but the whole practical bent of thought and disposition (comp. Beck, bibl. Seelel. p. 62), the moral meditari, Phil. ii. 5. — τὰ ἐν τῇ τ. γῆς] e.g. money and estate, honours, comforts, etc. Comp. Phil. iii. 19: οἱ τὰ ἐπίγευα ἐφονούντες, also 1 John ii. 15, et al. Neither the contrast nor the subsequent text warrants us in finding here a further reference to the requirements of the false teachers. So Theophylact: τὰ περὶ βραχάτων εἰ ἡμέρων; Calvin: "adhiber sequitur suam dispositionem de ceremonyis, quae similis tricis facit, quæ nos humi repere cogant;" comp. Beza, Michaelis, and others. The hortatory portion of the Epistle proceeds no longer at all in the form of statements opposed to the false teachers, but in that of general moral exhortations.—We have to observe, further, that the earthly is not of itself placed under the point of view of the sinful, which would be quite un-Pauline (1 Cor. vii. 23), but is so as the contents of the striving which is opposed to the τὰ ἐνῳ φορεῖν. Comp. the idea in Matt. vi. 21.

Ver. 3. Assigning a reason for the requirement of ver. 2. — For ye are dead; how then could your mind be directed towards earthly things! and your life does not belong to the realm of the visible world, but it is hidden with Christ in God: how should you not then τὰ ἐνῳ φορεῖν! It is a guide to a correct and certain interpretation of the passage, that this statement of a reason must affirm the same thing as was already contained, only without special development, in εἰ σωματικῷ τ. X. of ver. 1. This special exposition Paul now gives. Whosoever is risen, namely, has died and lives, and these are the two points to which ver. 3 refers. — ἀνεθάνατε] namely, by your having entered into the fellowship of the death of Christ. This being dead has dissolved in the consciousness of the Christian the ties that hitherto bound him to earthly things. He finds himself still in the realm of the earthly, but he no longer lives therein, ii. 21. Comp. Phil. iii. 20; Gal. ii. 20. — ἤ ζωὴ ὑποῦ] must necessarily be the life, which has followed the being dead; consequently the eternal life, comp. ver. 4, which set in through the resurrection (of
which Christians, in fact, have become partakers with Christ, ver. 1)—a life which the believer has, prior to the Parousia, as a possession that has not yet been manifested but is still in secret (οὕτω ἐφανεράθη, 1 John iii. 2), a treasure in heaven, possessed in hope and still unrevealed, destined to appear in glorious manifestation only at the Parousia. — σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ]
For Christ Himself, apart from fellowship with whose life the ζωὴ of His believers cannot have its being and essence, is hidden till the Parousia; and only then sets in His φανέρωσις (ver. 4), ἀποκάλυψις (1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 7, 13, iv. 13), ἐπιφάνεια (1 Thess. ii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 14), with which also the ἀποκάλυψις τῶν νεών τ. Θεοῦ (Rom. viii. 19) will take place, ver. 4. Comp. 2 Tim. ii. 10 f.; 1 John iii. 2. — ἐν τῷ Θεῷ] in God, in so far, namely, as Christ, who, according to John (i. 18), is εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦ πατρὸς, remains hidden in God till the Parousia, as σώματος of God (ver. 1), living united with God in His glory hitherto unseen, in order thereafter to proceed from God and to manifest Himself with the full divine glory. But, as with Christ, so also with our life, which is hidden σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ, and therefore can only issue forth at His second coming from God, and be received by us in real glorious communication and manifestation through our συνδεσθήσει (Rom. viii. 17, comp. v. 2, 10). If the coherence of the relation expressed by ἐκρυπτᾶται was asserted by σὺν τῷ Χ., so also is its inference by ἐν τῷ Θεῷ. The essential part of our explanation, viz. that ἡ ζωὴ ἡ μ. is eternal life, is held also by Chrysostom, Theodoret (ἐκείνου γὰρ ἀναστάτους πάντες ἡγέρθημεν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ὅραμεν τῶν πραγμάτων τὴν ἐκβασιν), Oecumenius (τῶν γὰρ ἄλλως Χριστιανῶν ζωὴ ἐστιν μένουσα, ἡ μὲν τοῦ πάροσα εἰκόνα μᾶλλον θανάτου ἡ ζωῆς ἐκείνη), Theophylact (Paul wished to show αὐτοῦς καθημένους ἄνω καὶ ἄλλην ζωὴν την, τὴν ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, τὴν μὴ φανομένην), Calvin, Beza, Erasmus Schmid, Grotius, and others, including Baumgarten-Crusius. The accurate contextual connection of this view with what precedes, and with ver. 4 (see above), excludes the explanation adopted by many, of ζωὴ in the ethical, spiritual sense. So Erasmus, Vatablus, Calovius, Bengel, Flatt (“the inner, new, blissful life of true Christians”), Bähr,
Böhmer, Steiger, Olshausen, and others, including Huther, Bleek, and de Wette, who apprehends this life as being hidden in two respects: namely, as regards the disposition and striving, it is, because directed to the heavenly, internal and ideal, whereas the life of worldly men in the common sense is real or manifest; as regards the imputation or recompense, it lacks outward happiness, but enjoys internal peace, and is therefore in this respect also hidden or ideal, whereas the worldly life, in unison with the outer world, leads to external peace or to happiness, and is so far, therefore, real or manifest also; the σων τῷ X. denotes not merely the spiritual fellowship, but is "at the same time to a certain extent" to be understood in a local sense (comp. ver. 1), and ἐν τῷ Ἐσῶ denotes the sphere of the Christian life, or "its relation to the system of the universe, that it belongs to the invisible world, where God Himself lives." Of all this there is nothing in the words; the historical sense of which neither requires nor bears such a spiritualistic idealisation with more senses than one, but, on the contrary, excludes it as caprice. The ἡ ζωή ύπον does not refer to the ethical life of Christians at all, neither alone nor along with eternal life (Cornelius a Lapide, Estius; comp. Bleek and Ewald). On the contrary, it is aptly said by Kaeuffer, de ζωῆς aev. n. p. 93: "vitam enim piam et honestam, quam homo Christianus in hac terra vivere possit ac debeat, P. dicere non poterat nunc cum Christo in Deo (in coelis puta, in quibus Christus nunc est) reconditam esse, atque olim in splendidio Jesu reeditu de coelo revelatum iri; haec non nisi vitae coelestis convenient." Hofmann's distinction is less clear and definite: the ζωή is meant as the blessing, in which Christians have an advantage over the world, by their

1 "The life of believers is said to be hidden, inasmuch as it is internal, and what is external does not harmonize with it;" and in τῷ Ἐσῶ God is conceived as the element, "into whose essence believers, like Christ Himself, are assumed and enwrapped."

2 In whose view the Christian leads a life in God, and this is a hidden life, because the world knows nothing about it (comp. Erasmus: "juxta judicium mundi"); in fact, to the Christian himself its full glory is not manifest (comp. Bengel); and by τῷ τῷ X. it is shown that the Christian leads such a life not of himself, but only in his fellowship with Christ. Dalmer gives an obscure and heterogeneous explanation.
having participated in the death and resurrection of Christ,—
a life, which is indeed life in the full sense of the word, but
which does not appear before the world as what it is, so long
as Christ is hidden from the world and in God. Notwith-
standing, Hofmann properly rejects the explanations referring
it to the holy life of the Christian, and to the holy and blissful
life together. — Observe, further, the difference in the tenses,
the aorist ἀνεθάνετε denoting the accomplished act of dying at
conversion, by which they entered into the fellowship of the
death of Christ; and the perfect κέρπ., the continuous subsisting
relation in reference to the present up to the (near) Parousia.

Ver. 4. And what a blissful future is connected with the
ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέρπ. κ.τ.λ. ! This bright, favourable side of the
previous thought is the continuation of the proof of ver. 2
begun in ver. 3, detaching them thoroughly from earthly
pursuits and elevating them to the courage of victory; vividly
introduced without connecting particle (καλ): "repentina luce
percellit," Bengel, which Hofmann fails to perceive, when he
objects to the absence of ἐκ. The relation is not antitheti-
cal at all. — φανερώθη[] shall have become manifest, have come
forth from His present concealment, namely, by His Parousia.
See on ver. 3. — ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν[] your life. Christ Himself is
thus designated (comp. ἡ Ἡλίκ in i. 27), because He is the
personal author, possessor, and bearer of the eternal life of
His believers (comp. John xiv. 6, xi. 25), and this, according
to the context, inasmuch as they have entered into the fellow-
ship of His resurrection: they are alive1 with Him (σὺν τ. Χ.,
ver. 3); His life is their life. The definite object of this
apposition, moreover, is argumentative, for the following τῶτε
κ.τ.λ. — καὶ ὑμεῖς[] as Christ, so also ye with Him. The two
subjects have the emphasis. — φανερώθη. ἐν δόξῃ] Comp. συν-
δοξασθόμεν in Rom. viii. 17. It means nothing else than the
glory of the Messianic kingdom, in which believers (also glorified
bodily, 1 Cor. xv. 43; 2 Cor. v. 1 ff.; Phil. iii. 21) shall be
manifested visibly. The offence which Holtzmann takes at
the use of φανεροῦσαι (instead of ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι, Rom. viii.

1 Comp. Ignatius, Eph. 3, where Christ is designated τοῦ ἀνεθανόντος ὑμῶν ζηστι,
also Magnes. 1, Smyrn. 4.
17 ff.) and ζωή, presupposes a too limited range for Paul's manipulation of language. Our passage has nothing to do with 2 Cor. iv. 10 ff. Nor does it even "almost look" (Holtzmann) as if the author were conceiving the readers as already dead at the Parousia. The φανερωθήκατε ἐν δόξῃ takes place in the case of those still alive through their being changed, as the reader was aware.

Ver. 5. ὶν draws the inference from vv. 3, 4, in order now to lead to that which must be done with a view to the carrying out of the μὴ τὰ ἐπὶ τ. γῆς. The inference itself is: "Since, according to vv. 3, 4, ye are dead, but have your life hidden with Christ in God and are destined to be glorified with Christ, it would be in contradiction of all this, according to which ye belong no longer to the earth but to the heavenly state of life, to permit your earthly members still to live; no, ye are to put them to death, to make them die" (Rom. iv. 19; Heb. xi. 12; Plut. Mor. p. 954 D) — νεκρῶσατε prefixed with emphasis as the point of the inference; the term is selected in significant reference to ἀπεθάνετε and ἡ ζωή ῥμῶν, vv. 3, 4. — τὰ μὲν ἡμῶν] means nothing else, and is not to be explained otherwise than: your members (hand, foot, eye, etc.). That these were not to be put to death in the physical sense, but in an ethical respect (comp. ii. 11)—seeing, namely, that they, as the seat and organs of sinful lusts (Rom. vii. 23), which they still are even in the case of the regenerate (Gal. v. 17, 24), are to lose their vigour of life and activity through the Christian moral will governed by the Holy Spirit, and in so far to experience ethical deadening (comp. Rom. vii. 5, 23, viii. 13, and the analogous representation by Jesus as to plucking out the eye, etc., Matt. v. 29 f., xviii. 8 f.; comp. also xix. 12)—was self-evident to the reader, as it was, moreover, placed beyond doubt by the following appositions πορνεύων κ.τ.λ. Hence there was neither ground nor warrant in the context to assume already here (see ver. 9) the conception of the old man, whose desires are regarded as members (Beza, Flacius,

1 In the section vv. 5–17, in which Hönig, in relation to Eph. iv. 1–5, 20, finds the stamp of originality, Holtzmann discovers the concentrating labour of the interpolator, whose second (and better) effort is the passage in Colossians.
Calvin, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Calovius, and others, including Böhmer, Olshhausen, and Bleek), although the required putting to death presupposes that the old man is still partially alive. Nor is *sin itself*, according to its totality, to be thought of as *body* and its individual parts as *members* (Hilary, Grotius, Bengel, Bähr, and others; comp. also Julius Müller, *v. d. Sünde*, I. p. 461, ed. 5, and Flatt),—a conception which does not obtain even in ii. 11 and Rom. vi. 6, and which is inadmissible here on account of *ὑμῶν*. The view of Steiger, finally, is erroneous (comp. Baumgarten-Crusius), that the entire *human existence* is conceived as *σῶμα*. We may add that the *νέκρωσις* of the members, etc., is not inconsistent with the death (*ἀπεθάνετε*, ver. 3) already accomplished through conversion to Christ, but is *required* by the latter as the necessary, ever new act of the corresponding morality, with which faith lives and works. And in view of the ideal character of this obligation the command *νεκρώσατε* κ. τ. λ.—this requirement, which is ever repeating itself, of the *ethical mortification*—is never superfluous. — *τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* which are upon the earth, corresponds to the *τὰ ἐπὶ τ. γ. in ver. 2*; in contrast, not to the glorified human nature of Christ (Hofmann, *Schriften*, I. p. 560), but to the *life hidden with Christ in God*. In this antithetical addition is involved an element which *justifies* the requirement *νεκρώσατε τ. μ. ύμ.,* not expressing the *activity* of the *μέλη* for what is *sinful* (de Wette, comp. Flatt and others, in connection with which Grotius would even supply *τὰ φρονοῦντα* from ver. 2), which the simple words do not affirm, but: that the *μέλη*, as existing upon earth, have nothing in common with the life which exists in heaven, that their life is of another kind and must not be spared to the prejudice of that heavenly *κωφί*! Comp. also Hofmann's present view. The context does not even yield a *contrast of heavenly members* (Huther), i.e. of a life of activity for what is heavenly pervading the members, or of the members of the new man (Julius Müller), since the *κωφί* is not to be understood in the sense of the *spiritual*,

1 Chrysostom illustrates the relation by comparing the converted person to a cleansed and brightened statue, which, however, needs to be afterwards cleansed afresh from new accretions of rust and dirt.
ethical life. — πορνειαν κ.τ.λ.] Since Paul would not have the members slain as such absolutely and unreservedly, but only as regards their ethical side, namely, the sinful nature which dwells and works in them (Rom. vii. 23), he now subjoins detailed instances of this sinful nature, and that with a bold but not readily misunderstood directness of expression appositionally, so that they appear as the forms of immorality cleaving to the members, with respect to which the very members are to be put to death. In these forms of immorality, which constitute no such heterogeneous apposition to τὰ μελη ὁμ. as Holtzmann thinks, the life of the μελή, which is to be put to death, is represented by its parts. Paul might have said: λήγω δὲ πορνειαν; but by annexing it directly, he gave to his expression the form of a distributive apposition (see Kühner, II. 1, p. 247), more terse and more compact after the σχῆμα καθ' ὄλον καὶ μέρος. It is neither a sudden leap of thought nor a metonymy. — ἀκαθαρσ. in reference to lustful uncleaness; comp. on Rom. i. 24; Gal. v. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Eph. iv. 19, v. 3. Paul gives, namely, from πορν. to κακῆν, four forms of the first Gentile fundamental vice, unchastity, beginning with the special (πορνειαν), and becoming more and more general as he proceeds. Hence follows: πάθος, passion (the ἄττασθαι ἐν τῇ τῆς ἠδονής, Plat. Prot. p. 352 A; Dem. 805. 14; Arist. Eth. ii. 4), heat; Rom. i. 26; 1 Thess. iv. 5; and Lünemann in loc. Comp. also Plat. Phaed. p. 265 B: τὸ ἐρωτικὸν πάθος, Phaedr. p. 252 C. And finally: ἐπιθυμ. κακῆν (Plat. Legg. ix. p. 854 A), evil desire, referring to unchaste longing. Comp. Matt. v. 28; Breitenbach, ad Xen. Hier. 6. 2. Unnatural unchastity (Rom. i. 26 f.; 1 Cor. vi. 9) is included in ἀκαθ., παθ., and ἐπιθ. κακ., but is not expressly denoted (Erasmus, Calovius, Heinrichs, Flatt, Böhmer) by πάθος (comp. pathici, Catullus, xvi. 2; παθικενεσθαι, Nicarch. in Anth. xi. 73), a meaning which neither admits of linguistic proof, nor is, considering the general character of the adjoining terms (ἀκαθαρσ. ἐπιθ. κακ.), in keeping with the context. ἐπιθ. κακ. is to be distinguished from πάθος as the more general conception; the πάθος is always also ἐπιθυμία and relatively ἐπιθ. κακῆ, but not the converse, since a ἡγείσθαι or κρατεῖν τῆς
éπιθυμίας may also take place. — κ. τὴν πλεονεξίαν] After the vice of uncleanness comes now the second chief vice of the Gentiles (comp. on Eph. iv. 19): covetousness. Hence the connection here by means of καί, which is not even, but (in opposition to Hofmann) the simple and, and the article, which introduces the new category with the description of its disgraceful character,1 associating this descriptive character as a special stigma with the vice of πλεονεξία. In opposition to the erroneous interpretations: insatiable lust (Estius, Michaelis), or: the gains of prostitution (Storr, Flatt, Bähr), see on Eph. l.c., and Huther. The πλεονεξία is not separated by the article from the appositional definitions of the μέλη, and co-ordinated with τὰ μέλη, so that the latter would only be “the members which minister to unchaste lust” (Huther); for τὰ μέλη ὑμ. can only denote the members generally, the collective members; and ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν (Rom. vii. 5, 23) understood generically, and not as referring to particular individual members, sin is operating with all its lusts, as, in accordance with this ethical mode of viewing the matter, the collective members form the σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς of ii. 11. Bengel remarks aptly that the article indicates totum genus vitii a genere commemoratarum modo specierum diversum. — ἦτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρ.] quippe quae est, etc., further supports the νεκρῶσατε specially in reference to this vice, which, as the idolatry of money and possessions, is κατ’ ἐξοχὴν of a heathen nature. It has been well said by Theodoret: ἐπειδὴ τὸ μαμανᾶ κύριον ὁ σωτὴρ προσηγόρευε, διδάσκον, ὡς ὁ τῷ πάθει τῆς πλεονεξίας δουλεύων ὡς Θεὸν τὸν πλούτον τιμᾶ. In 1 Cor. v. 11, the εἰδωλολατρ. is to be taken differently (in opposition to Holtzmann). Moreover, see on Eph. v. 5. Observe, further,

1 Looking to the so closely marked twofold division of the vices adduced, it is inconsistent with the text to take, with Hofmann, the three elements, ἀναθεμ., ὑάτε, and ἰστερ. ἀμα., in such a general sense as to make ἀναθεματικαί mean every “action which mars the creaturely honour (!) of man,” ὑάτε, the passion which enslaves through excitement of the blood, and ἰστερ. ἀμα., all evil desire, which is, as such, a morbid excitement of the blood. The excitement of the blood, thus sanguinely enough invented without any hint whatever from the text, is then held to convert the second and third elements into cases in which one sins against his own body,—a characteristic point, which Paul has not in view at all in connection with the apposition to τὰ μέλη ν. τ., as is plain from the appended ἀ. τ. πλεονεξία belonging to the same opposition.
that the addition of the πλεονεξία to unchastity (comp. 1 Cor. v. 11) can afford no ground for supposing that the author of the Ephesians borrowed this combination from 1 Thess. ii. 3, and that it was taken into our present Epistle from that to the Ephesians (Holtzmann). Comp. also 1 Cor. vi. 9 f.

Ver. 6. This relative affirmative stands in a confirmatory reference to the νεκρῶσατε κ.τ.λ. above, the omission of which would draw down upon the readers, instead of the φανερο-θήναι ἐν δόξῃ of ver. 4, a fate such as is here described. — δα' ἐστι (see the critical remarks) has the significant stress of the relative clause: on account of this immorality mentioned in ver. 5. The Recepta δα' ἐστι is to be taken just in the same way, and not to be referred to the μέλη (Bähr), since it is not the latter themselves, but their life activities specified by πορέλων κ.τ.λ., which call forth the wrath of God. — ἐρχεται] namely, at the judgment. Comp. Eph. v. 6; 1 Thess. i. 10: ἡ ὁργὴ ἡ ἐρχομένη; Matt. iii. 7: ἡ μεταλλουσα ὁργή. Hence: ἡμέρα ὁργῆς in Rom. ii. 5; Rev. vi. 17. Chrysostom well says: Paul warns διὰ τῶν μεταλλοντων ἐξ ὧν ἀπηλλαγμένους κακῶν. See also on Eph. v. 6. The frequent reference to the manifestation of the divine wrath (comp. Rom. i. 18 ff.) in the course of this temporal life (Huther and many others) overlooks the correlation with ver. 4, and the apostle's conception of the nearness of the Parousia. Hence, also, the combination of the two references (Theophylact and others, also Flatt) is to be rejected.—Respecting the νοῶν τῆς ἀπειθ. (the Jews and Gentiles, who reject the gospel and thereby disobey God), comp. on Eph. v. 6, and as to this mode of expression generally, Steiger on 1 Pet. i. 14.

Ver. 7. Transition to the following exhortation; and how touching through the effect of the contrast! — ἐν ὅλοις is, with the reading δα' ἐστι in ver. 6, necessarily to be referred to the νοῶν τῆς ἀπειθ.: among whom ye also walked once, by which is meant, not external association (which in fact was not cancelled by conversion, 1 Cor. v. 10), but the fellowship of moral conduct. But, even with the reading δα' ἐστι in ver. 6, ἐν ὅλοις is to be taken (comp. Eph. ii. 2 f.) as inter quos (Vatablus, Rosenmüller, de Wette, Schenkel, Bleek), and not to be referred, as it commonly is (Chrysostom, however, seems to understand it
as masculine) to the vices named in ver. 5, because the relative most naturally attaches itself to what immediately precedes, in order to continue the discourse, and because, if ἐν οἷς refer to the sins, then ἐξήκτε ἐν τοῖς once more asserts substantially the same thing, so that the discourse gains nothing in thoughtfulness through the two verbs, as in Gal. v. 25, but is unduly amplified. The distinctions which in this case have been attempted between περίπατεῖν and ζην still make the one or the other appear as self-evident. See e.g. Calvin: vivere and ambulare are distinguished from each other like potentia (comp. Grotius: "moveri") and actus, the former preceding and the latter following; Beza (and Estius): vivere denotes naturae habitum, ambulare, ἐνέργειαν ἰσόμα; Bähr (comp. Olshausen and Reiche): the former refers more to the disposition, the latter to the outward conduct; Hofmann: the state of life (ἐξήκτε), with which the conduct in detail (περίπατον) harmonized. — ὅτε ἐξήκτε ἐν τοῖς εξήκτε stands emphatically and pregnant first: when ye lived in these, i.e. when ye were alive therein, inasmuch as the ἀπεθάνατος of ver. 3 had not yet set in in your case, the requirement of the νεκροῦν in ver. 5 was still strange to you, and these disgraceful things formed the element and sphere of activity of your life. On ζην, to be alive, in contrast to the being dead, comp. Rom. vii. 9; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; also Col. ii. 20; ἐν τοῖς is neuter, grouping together demonstratively, and setting forth contemptuously, the states of vice spoken of. According to Flatt, Böhmer, and Huther, it is masculine: "then, when ye belonged to the children of disobedience," so that ζην ἐν κόσμῳ (ii. 20) and ἀναστρέφειν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ (2 Cor. i. 11) would have to be compared. In opposition to this view it may be urged that ὅτε ἐξήκτε ἐν τοῖς, in this sense, would be a very meaningless and superfluous more precise designation of the πορεί, whereas, according to the view above adopted, it is thoughtful and characteristic. — On the change from the

1 With the Recepta ἀνοίκτις any other reference than that, which ἀνοίκτις has, is excluded; hence the origin of ἀνοίκτις.

2 Hence not to be attributed, with Holtzmann, to the tautological style of the author, in remembrance of 1 Cor. vi. 11.
merely historical aorist to the descriptive imperfect, lending a lively colour to the representation, and claiming the closer attention of the reader who had passed more rapidly over the ἀπεσταλμένος, comp. Kühner, II. 1, p. 133, and Reisig, ad Soph. O. C. p. 254 f.

Ver. 8. Нω τοῦ ἐμ"] In contrast to the past, which has just been described: but now, when ye are no longer alive in those things. — καὶ ὑμεῖς] does not refer to the fact that the Ephesians also are thus exhorted (Eph. iv. 22, 25, 31), as Holtzmann here contrives to suggest; but as καὶ ὑμ. in ver. 7 reminded the readers of the immoral pre-Christian society, which they also had formerly resembled, so this καὶ ὑμεῖς reminds them of the moral Christian society, which they also ought to resemble now. — τὰ πάντα] the whole of these, i.e. the things indicated by et τοὺς without any exception; ye shall retain nothing of them, “ne quid veneni resideat” (Grotius). To this τὰ πάντα the apostle then annexes directly and in rapid asyndetic continuation yet other sins, which are likewise to be left off. Bleek erroneously takes ὅργην κ.τ.λ. as in opposition to τὰ πάντα; for the latter can only be retrospective (comp. Hofmann), and cannot, consistently with the text, be taken as meaning, “everything that belongs to the old man.” — άπαθεν] like garments (see on Eph. iv. 22); a lively change of figures; the conception of members is laid aside. — θυμοῦ] distinguished from ὅργην as the ebullition, the effervescing of the latter (Eustath. ad Il. i. p. 7. 17). See on Rom. ii. 8; comp. Eph. iv. 31; Rev. xvi. 19; Ecclus. xlviii. 10; 1 Macc. ii. 49; Hom. Il. ix. 629; Plat. Phil. p. 47 E: τοῖς θυμοῖς κ. ταῖς ὅργαις. — κακίαν] wickedness, malicious nature. Comp. on Rom. i. 29; Eph. iv. 31. — βλασφημαν] slander, not against God, but against others, as oral outbreak of the evil dispositions mentioned. Comp. Eph. 1c.; 1 Cor. iv. 13; Rom. iii. 8; Tit. iii. 2; frequently in classic writers; in Dem. 312. 19 joined with σκοφαντία. — ἄδικολογημαν] only used here in the N. T.: shameful discourse, which, in accordance with the category of all the sins here named, is not to be understood of unchaste discourse, as, following the Fathers (see Suicer, Thes. I. p. 136), it has commonly been taken (Hof-
mann: “obscene” discourse); comp. Epictet. Enchir. 33. 16; Xen. de Lac. rep. 5. 6; aιοχρολογούμενος in Plat. Rep. p. 395 E; Pollux, iv. 105; and the passages in Wetstein; also aιοχροσετέω in Athen. xiii. p. 571 A; and respecting the aιοχρολογία ἐφʼ ἱερῷ, see Lobeck, Aghaorh. p. 689. Rather: railing speech (Polyb. viii. 13. 8, xxxi. 10. 4), forming one genus with βλασφημάν, but a wider idea. Comp. aιοχρολογοῦμενον, Hom. II. iii. 38, xxiv. 238. All the elements in ver. 8 specify the malevolent and hostile disposition; and the two last, especially the oral manifestation thereof; hence the addition of ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμ., which, without arbitrariness, cannot but be referred to both words (so also Bleek), not to aιοχρολογοῦμενον alone, and is, with Grotius, to be conceived as depending on the still operative idea of ἀπόθεος, so that it may not be characterized as a “secondary malformation” (Holtzmann). The readers are to lay aside, generally, ὅργη, θυμόν, κακλαν; and to lay aside from their mouth βλασφημίαν, aιοχρολογίαν. We are not to suppose any special purpose in connection with the addition; it serves merely for the concrete representation; but, if we should regard it as the more precise definition of aιοχρολογοῦμενον (Hofmann), or should even, as is often done, by supplying an ἐκτοπορευόμενον, join it with aιοχρολογίαν, or with βλασφήμη καὶ aιοχρολογία, it would be utterly void of meaning. The special idea of that which defiles (Chrysostom), or of the opposite of Christian praise to God (Hofmann), does not form the basis of the ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμ.; on the contrary, it is the conception in general of what is unsuited and foreign (comp. on νῦν ἐὰ) to Christian fellowship and intercourse, which serves as the presupposition for the entire exhortation. Comp. Eph. iv. 29.

Ver. 9. Μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλ. i.e. lie not one to another, so that εἰς expresses the direction of the ψεύδεσθαι (comp. ψ. κατά τινος in the sense of the hostile direction, Plat. Euthyd. p. 284 A, al.; Jas. iii. 14), like ὑπό in Xen. Anab. i. 3. 5; Plat. Legg. xi. p. 917 A; Lev. vi. 2. It is different in Susann. 55. 59. It connects itself with what precedes, and hence it is to be separated only by a comma from ver. 8 (with Lachmann and Tischendorf); the following ἀπεικονίζων-
μενοι κ.τ.λ. adds a determining motive for the whole ἀπέθεσθε . . . ἀλλήλους: since ye have put off the old man . . . and put on the new, etc., with which the retaining of wrath, etc., and the further lying (observe the present ἕτεκ) would not be consistent; on the contrary, this transformation which, in principle, has taken place in and with the conversion to Christ, must manifest itself practically by the laying aside of those vices. Accordingly, the aorist participles are not synchronous with the foregoing (exuentes, etc., so Vulgate, Luther, Calovius, and others, including Flatt, Olshausen, Huther, de Wette, Ewald, and Bleek), but precedes it; they are not included in the exhortation, for which reason 1 Pet. v. 6 f. is inappropriately appealed to, but assign a ground for it. This is clear, even in a linguistic point of view, from the fact that ἕτεκεσθε is the present; and also, as regards the sense, from the circumstance that if the words be regarded as part of the exhortation itself, as a definition of the mode of what is required, the exuentes only, and not the induentes, would correspond with the requirement to lay aside and to abstain from lying. Besides, ver. 11 is inappropriate as a constituent part of an exhortation, but suits well as an argumentative enlargement. Finally, the assumed figurative exhortation only comes in expressly at ver. 12, and that by way of inference (οὖν) from what had been said previously from ἀπεκδυσάμ. onwards in the same figure, though not yet in paroletic form. Without any sufficient reason, and out of harmony with the simple paroletic form of the entire context, Hofmann begins with ἀπεκδυσάμ. a new period, whose protasis ends in ver. 11, and whose apodosis begins with οὖν in ver. 12 (comp. on Rom. ii. 17 ff.); by this we gain only a more clumsy complication of the discourse, especially as the supposed apodosis has again participial definitions. The entire practical part of the Epistle proceeds in plain sentences, not dialectically joined together. Comp., moreover, on ver. 12. — Respecting the double compound ἀπεκδυσ., comp. on ii. 11. — The terminus ante quem for παλαιός is the adoption of Christianity, so that, by the whole expression ὁ παλαιός ἄνθρωπος generically the collective pre-Christian condition in a moral
respect\(^1\) is presented as personified.\(^2\) Comp. on Rom. vi. 6; Eph. iv. 22. — σῶν τὰς πράξεων αὐτοῦ] not generally: with his doing (Hofmann), but in the bad sense: along with his evil practices, with his bad tricks. Comp. on Luke xxiii. 51 and Rom. viii. 13.

Ver. 10. The positive aspect of the transformation (regeneration) wrought by God through conversion to Christ; and since ye have put on, etc. — τὸν νέον] The collective new Christian-ethical condition, conceived as personified and set forth objectively, so that it appears as becoming individually appropriated by the putting on. It might, with equal propriety, be designated from the point of view of time as the homo recens in contrast to the decayed and worn-out nature of the pre-Christian moral condition (comp. the νέον φύραμα in 1 Cor. v. 7), as from the point of view of the new, altogether different, and previously non-existent quality as the homo novus. It is the former here,\(^3\) the latter in Eph. iv. 23 (comp. also ii. 15), where καυσίς ἀνθρ. is used. See regarding the difference between the two words, Tittmann, Synon. p. 59 ff. The specification of quality is then further added by τὸν ἀνακαυνοῦμα κ.τ.λ. The notion of not growing old (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Erasmus) is not implied in νέον. — τὸν ἀνακαυ

---

\(^{1}\) Original sin is not denoted by the expression and the conception to which it is subservient (in opposition to Calvin; “veteris hominis nomine intelligi pravitatem nobis ingentam;” comp. Calovius: “concupiscientiam pravam congenitam”); it is, however, according to the biblical view (Rom. vii. 14 ff.), its presupposition and the regulative agent in the moral character of the old man.

\(^{2}\) With the entrance of Christianity into the life of humanity, the old has passed away, and all things have become new (2 Cor. v. 17). But the old man was individually put off by the several subjects through their own historical conversion to Christ. The χριστιανὸς individual of Gal. iii. 27 is not in substance different from the having put on the new man.

\(^{3}\) In the ethical sense Christians are, as it were, the νεόλατα (Blomfield, Glossa. Pers. 674) of humanity.
of the old man. Comp. Rom. xii. 2. Hence the present participle, which is neither to be taken as imperfect (B.-Crusius), nor as renewing itself (Bleek); and ἀνα does not refer to the relation of re-establishment, namely, of the justitia originalis (since τοῦ κτισμοῦ does not directly mean the first creation), but only to the old constitution, the transformation and new-moulding (renewal) of which forms the process of development of the νέος ἀνθρώπως. Comp. Winer, de verb. c. praepos. composita. p. 10 f. The καυτοτης of the νέος ἀνθρ. is relative. In Greek authors ἀνακαυτός is not found, but ἀνακαυτίζω is (Isocr. Aret. 3, App. 2, p. 13; Plut. Marcell. 6), Heb. vi. 6; also in the LXX. — εἰς ἑπίγνωσιν] is to be taken along with the following κατ’ εἰκ. τ. κτισ. αὐτῶν, and with this expresses the end aimed at by the ἀνακαυτόθεος. Through the latter there is to be produced a knowledge, which accords with the image of God. Comp. Beza. God, as respects His absolute knowledge, i.e. a knowledge absolutely adequate to its objects, is the model, with which the relative knowledge of the regenerate to be attained in the course of their being renewed, i.e. their increasing penetration into divine truth, is to be accordant. And the more it is so—the more fully it has developed itself in accordance with the divine ideal—the more is it also the determining power and the living practical agent of the whole conduct, so that all those vices enumerated in ver. 8 are excluded by it, and even become morally impossible. Hofmann rightly takes κατ’ εἰκ. τοῦ κτισ. αὐτῶν as the more precise description of ἑπίγνωσιν, though defining the sense to this effect, that the new man “everywhere looks to, and estimates everything by the consideration, whether he finds the stamp of this image.” But, in that case, an object (πάντων) would

1 “Renovatus autem dicitur novus ille homo, quia novus quondam fuit in prima creatione,” Calovius. Comp. Steiger, Huther, de Wette, Philipp, Dogm. II. p. 375 ff., ed. 2, and many others. Thus we should have for the νέος ἀνθρώπως, not the conception of a nova creatura (nasè νεώς, 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15), but that of a redintegrae creature. But it is to a new life that the believer is regenerated, raised up, etc. by God. This new creation is not the redintegratio of the first, though it is its antitype, as Christ Himself, so far as in Him the new creation is founded and begun (now, see Rom. v. 15, 17-19, vi. 1 ff.), is the antitype of Adam (Rom. v. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 45). Consequently this passage is only indirectly probative for the doctrine of the image of God as innate.
necessarily stand with ἐπιγνωσία, and the idea of ἀνακαλέως or δοκιμάζων would be substituted for that of ἐπιγνωσίας. The κατ' εἰκόνα κ.τ.λ. is usually connected with ἀνακαλώνυμ, and εἰς ἐπιγνωσίας. taken by itself, in connection with which Steiger, Huther, de Wette, and Bleek (comp. also Ewald) arbitrarily adopt the view, that the prominent mention of the knowledge was occasioned by a polemic opposition to the false teachers and their tendencies to false gnosis. But how abrupt, isolated, and indefinite would the εἰς ἐπιγνωσίας thus stand! No; the subsequent κατ’ εἰκόνα κ.τ.λ. just serves as a more precise characteristic definition for the—in theory and practice so extremely important—point of Christian knowledge. The expression of this definition in this particular way comes very naturally to Paul, because he is speaking of the homo recens creatus, in connection with which, after the analogy of the creation of Adam, the idea of the image of God naturally floated before his mind, —the image which that first-created man had, and which the recens creatus is to attain and present by way of copy in that towards which he is being developed, in the ἐπιγνωσίας. This development is only completed in the αἰών μετά, 1 Cor. xiii. 12; for its aim before the Parousia, see Eph. iv. 13 f. —τοῦ κτισµος αὐτοῦ] A description of God, harmonizing with the conception of the νέος ἄνθρωπος, who is God’s creature. Comp. on Eph. iv. 24. It is erroneous, with Chrysostom, Theophylact, Ewald, and others, to understand Christ as referred to; for creating is invariably represented in Scripture as the work of God (even in i. 16), and especially here where a parallel is instituted with the creation of Adam after God’s image. Comp. Eph. ii. 10, iv. 24. Olshausen, indeed, understands τοῦ κτισµος αὐτοῦ to mean God, but would have the image of God, in accordance with i. 15, taken of Christ, who is the archetype of man. There is no ground for this view in the context, which, on the contrary, reminds us simply of Gen. i. 27; comp. κατὰ Θεοῦ, in Eph. iv. 24, a simpler expression, which has found here a significant more precise definition out of the riches of the apostle’s store of ideas (not a fanciful

¹ So also Julius Müller, v. d. Sünde, II. p. 496, ed. 5; see, on the other hand, Ernesti, Uebr. der Sünde, II. p. 133 ff.
variation, as Holtzmann thinks) in vivid reproduction. — αὐτῷ] must refer to the νέος ἀνθρώπος, whom God has created by regeneration, not to τ. ἀνθρώπον alone ("which is the substance, on which the old and new qualities appear as accidents," de Wette), as the orthodox explanation is forced to assume contrary to the text; see e.g. Calovius: "Per imaginem ejus, qui creavit ipsum, imago Dei, quae in prima creatione nobis concessa vel concrecta est, intelligitur, ad quam nos renovamur, quaeque in nobis reparatur per Spiritum sanctum, quae ratione intellectus consistebat in cognitione Dei, ut ratione voluntatis in justitia et sanctitate, Eph. iv. 24. Per verbum itaque τοῦ κτίσαντος non nova creatio, sed vetus illa et primaeva intelligitur, quia in Adamo conditi omnes sumus ad imaginem Dei in cognitione Dei." Rather, the divine creation of the new man had that primaevam creationem for its sacred-historical type, and is the work of salvation antitypically corresponding with it, which the Creator has done in Christ; hence also Paul has not written κτίσαντος (as Philippi, i.e. p. 376, thinks might have been expected), but κτίσαντος, comp. iv. 24, ii. 10; 2 Cor. v. 17; also Jas. i. 18.

Ver. 11. Where all the separating diversities have ceased, by whose phenomena of malevolence and passion mentioned in ver. 8 were occasioned and nourished. Comp. Gal. iii. 28, of which passage Baur indeed sees here only an extended and climactic imitation. — ἐνῷ where there is not, etc.; namely there, where the old man has been put off, and the νέος κ.τ.λ. put on, ver. 10. It represents the existing relation according to local conception, like the Latin ubi, i.e. qua in re, or in quorum statu, like the local iva; comp. Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. iii. 5. 1; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 331 f. The relation is one objectively real, historically occurring (comp. Gal. iii. 28; Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 13), present in renewed humanity. Consequently ἐνῳ is not to be referred to the ἐπιγνωσις, and to be interpreted within which, i.e. in the Christian consciousness (Schenkel); but just as little is the relative clause to be joined immediately with εἰς ἐπιγνωσις καὶ εἰκών κ.τ.λ. so that it affirms that there, where this image is found, all contrasts, etc., have vanished; so Hofmann in connection with
his erroneous explanation of εἰς ἐπιγραφὰς κατ’ εἰκόνα κ.τ.λ., see on ver. 10. — Respecting ἐν, equivalent to ἑνετι, see on Gal. iii. 28. — "Ελλην κ. Ιουδ.] national diversity, without taking "Ελλην, however, with Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others, in the sense of proselyte. — περιτ. κ. ἀκροβ.] theocratic diversity. — βάρβαρος κ.τ.λ.] In the increasing vividness of conception the arrangement by pairs is dropped, and the nouns are placed beside each other asyndetically. Paul does not couple with βάρβαρος, as he does again in the case of δούλος, its opposite, which was already adduced ("Ελλην, comp. on Rom. i. 14), but proceeds by way of a climax: Σκύθης. Bengel (comp. Grotius) well says: "Scythæ . . . barbaris barbariores;" they were included, however, among the barbarians (in opposition to Bengel, who thinks that the latter term indicates the Numidians). For instances in which the Scythians are termed βαρβαρώτατοι (comp. also 2 Macc. iv. 47; 3 Macc. vii. 5), see Wetstein. We may infer, moreover, from the passage, that among the Christians there were even some Scythians, possibly immigrants into Greek and Roman countries. — ἀλλὰ τὰ πάντα . . . Χριστός] the dividing circumstances named, which, previous to the putting on of the νέος ἄνθρωπος, were so influential and regulative of social interests and conduct, have now—a fact, which was beyond doubt not recognised by the Jewish prejudice of the false teachers—since the Christian renovation (comp. 2 Cor. v. 17) ceased to exist in the fellowship established by the latter (ideal expression of the thought: their morally separating influence is abolished); whereas Christ is the sum total of all desires and strivings, and that in all individuals, without distinction of nations, etc.; He "solus proram et puppim, ut aiunt, principium et finem tenet" (Calvin). All are one in Christ,
Gal. iii. 28, v. 15; Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Eph. ii. 14. Comp. on this use of the τὰ πάντα in the sense of persons, who pass for everything, 1 Cor. xv. 28; Herod. iii. 157, vii. 156; Thuc. viii. 95. 1; Dem. 660. 7; Hermann, ad Viger. p. 727.

— Χρυστοῦ] the subject put at the end with great emphasis. He, in all His believers (ἐν πάσι) the all-determining principle of the new life and activity, is also the constituent of the new sublime unity, in which those old distinctions and contrasts have become meaningless and as it were no longer exist. The Hellene is no longer other than the Jew, etc., but in all it is only Christ, who gives the same specific character to their being and life.

Ver. 12. Ὁδι] for these virtues are in keeping with the νέος ἀνθρώπως, according to what has been said in ver. 11; it would be a contradiction to have put on the new man, and not to have put on these virtues. The new moral condition, into which ye have entered by your conversion, passing thereby into the fellowship of equality and unity in Christ described in ver. 11, binds you to this by the necessity of moral consistency. The ὅδι therefore serves for the introduction of the direct summons by way of inference from its foregoing premises, just like the ὅδι in ver. 5, but not for the introduction of the apodosis (Hofmann; see on ver. 9), as if it were resumptive. — ενδύσασθε] for, although the putting on of the νέος ἀνθρ. has taken place as a fact historically through the conversion to Christ, nevertheless it has also, in accordance with the ethical nature of the νέος ἀνθρ. (comp. τὸν ἀνακαθυμβικὸν κ.τ.λ. in ver. 10), its continued acts, which are to take place, namely, by appropriation of the virtues which the new man as such must have. — ὁς ἐκλεκτὸς κ.τ.λ.] as it becomes such; ἐκλ. τ. Θεοῦ is the subject, and ἄγ. κ. ἀγαπ. its predicates. The consciousness of this distinguished bliss, of being the elect of God—chosen by God from profane humanity for eternal Messianic salvation (Eph. i. 4; Rom. viii. 33; Tit. i. 2, al.), who as such1 are holy (through the ἁγιασμὸς πνεύματος, 2 Thess. ii. 13), and beloved of God (Rom. v. 5; Eph. i. 6), —

1 For the act of the divine ἵλαται, which in itself is before time, has come into temporal realization and manifestation through the calling (comp. ver. 15).
how could it fail to touch the consciences of the readers, and incite them to the very virtues, corresponding to so high a position,—virtues of that fellowship described in ver. 11, which are required from them as renewed men! Observe, moreover, that the ἐκλεγθῇ τ. Θεὸς is the presupposition of what is said by ἀπεκδυσάμενοι κ.τ.λ. in vv. 10, 11, and that therefore ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς κ.τ.λ. is not inserted without significant connection with what goes before. It is likewise admissible to take the words ἄγιοι κ. ἡγατ. substantively, either as co-ordinate with the ἐκλεκτὸς τ. Θ. and explanatory of this idea ("as the elect of God, holy and beloved," Luther, Calvin, Grotius, and the majority, including Bähr, Böhmer, Huther, de Wette, Hofmann), or so that ἐκλεκτὸς τ. Θεὸς stands in adjectival relation to them (Bleek: "elect holy and beloved ones of God"); but it is more in keeping with the purposely chosen order of the words to concentrate the whole stress on ἐκλεκτὸς Θεὸς. Bengel, connecting as we do, aptly observes: "Ordo verborum quos eximia respondet ordinem rerum: electio aeterna praecedit sanctificationem in tempore; sanctificati sentiunt amorem et deinceps imitantur." Theophylact (comp. also Steiger) took ἄγιοι as the chief word, which is more precisely defined by ἐκλ. τ. Θεὸς and ἡγατ. (ἐγένοντο μὲν γὰρ ἰδιαὶ, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐκλεκτὸς οὐδὲ ἡγατημένοι οὐμείς δὲ ταύτα πάντα). Neither supported by the position of the words nor by the context, which does not suggest any contrast.—οἰκείῳ οἰκτιρμοῦ] οἰκτ. is the genitive of quality, and the expression is quite similar to that in Luke i. 78, ἀπόθαγμα δέλων; see in loc. Hence οἰκείῳ is not to be taken here in the abstract sense (love, so usually), but in its proper sense: viscera, as the seat of sympathy; consequently: a heart, the moving feeling of which is sympathy. Comp. Ewald and Hofmann. The two are separated in Phil. ii. 1. As to the conception of οἰκτιρμ., comp. on Rom. ix. 15 — χρηστότητα] kindness, the opposite is ἀποτομία, Rom. xi. 22. Comp. Eph. iv. 32. See generally, Tittmann, Synon. p. 140 ff.—ταπεινοφορ., humbleness, which is meant here, however, according Comp. generally, Weiss in the Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol. 1857, p. 78 ff., and Bibl. Theol. § 88, ed. 2.
to the entire context, not towards God (Böhmer), but (see ver. 11) in relation to others, as the opposite of haughtiness (ὑψηλοφρονεῖς); Eph. iv. 2; Phil. ii. 3. — On προσωπ., gentleness (opposite: Eph. iv. 31, and ἀγρίωτης, Plat. Conv. p. 197 D), and μακροθ., long-suffering, bearing with immoral opposition (comp. Eph. iv. 2, and on Gal. v. 22), ver. 13 throws fuller light.

Ver. 13. Neither the second part of the verse, καθὸς ... ὑμεῖς, nor ἀνεχόμενοι ... μομφὴν, is to be parenthesized; for the whole is an uninterrupted continuation of the construction. — ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλὰ.] modal definition of the ἐνδύσασθαι of the last two virtues, informing us how the required appropriation of them is to manifest itself in active conduct: so that ye, etc. This conduct is conceived as developing itself in and with the completion of the required ἐνδύσασθαι; hence ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλὰ is not to be regarded as only "loosely appended" (Hofmann) to μακροθ.; — καὶ χαρίζομενοι κ.τ.λ.] for the endurance (comp. Eph. iv. 2) is to advance to positive forgiveness, and not to remain a mere passive attitude. Observe here the alternation of ἀλλήλων (one the other) and ἕαυτος (yourselves each other); the latter is used, because to the χαρίζοσθαι of the Christians, which they are to show to themselves mutually, there is proposed as pattern the χαρίζοσθαι which they have experienced from above, from Christ. Comp. Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. ii. 6. 20. — μομφὴν] blame, reproach, only here in the N. T., not found at all in the Apocrypha and LXX., but very common in the classics, especially the poets, also with ἔχειν, to find fault with something, Eur. Phoen. 780, Alc. 1012, Or. 1069; Soph. Aj. 179, and Schneidewin in loc.; Pind. Isthm. iv. 61. — καθὸς καὶ κ.τ.λ.] The duty of the χαρίζοσθαι ἑαυτ. is so essentially Christian and important, that Paul goes on further to hold up before the readers the great motive and incitement for its fulfilment, namely, the forgiveness which they themselves have experienced, which Christ (ὁ κύριος, see the critical remarks) has bestowed upon them. Comp. Eph. iv. 32, where, however, the principal subject of the χαρίζοσθαι is indicated, namely, God (comp. ii. 13), who has pardoned in Christ. To the expression in our passage—and a consideration of the
circumstances of the Colossian church naturally prompted the emphasizing of the merit of Christ—corresponds the frequent ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, Rom. xvi. 20, 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 23; 2 Cor. viii. 9, xii. 9, xiii. 13; Gal. i. 6, vi. 18; Phil. iv. 23. There is no trace here of "an advanced Christology" (Holtzmann). The divine pardon obtained for us by Christ in His work of atonement (Rom. v. 6 f., 15), and continuously procured through His intercession (Rom. viii. 34), is in so far His (in the sense that Ἑ is the pardoning subject) as He is the procurer, bearer, and accomplisher of the divine grace (Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 19 f.), and God's love is His love (Rom. viii. 35, 39; Eph. iii. 19; Rom. v. 7 f.). The pardon received from Christ, however, binds us by moral necessity (Matt. xviii. 33; and generally, Rom. viii. 9) to forgive also upon our side;—anything beyond this, namely, what is contained in Matt. vi. 12, as de Wette thinks, is not conveyed in the words, but results as a consequence.—καί ἡμεῖς] sc. χαρίζομενοι. The context suggests this, and not the imperative; hence the orderly connection is not broken, and the whole verse contains accompanying participial definitions, after which, in ver. 14, the discourse continues uninterrupted.—Respecting the double καί of the comparison, see on Rom. i. 13.—It is to be observed, moreover, that καθὼς refers only to the pardon itself, and does not concern the service by which Christ has procured the pardon, the death, namely, which the Christian ought to be ready to undergo for the brethren, John xiii. 34, as Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others think, but which would be here an irrelevant importation.

Ver. 14. In addition to all this, however, put on love, by which Christian perfection is knit. In making τ. ἀγάπην dependent on ἐνθάδε, Paul abides by his figure: becoming added (Kühner, II. 1, p. 433) to all those virtues (regarded as garments), love is to be put on like an upper garment embracing all, because love brings it about, that the moral perfection is established in its organic unity as an integral whole. Thus love is the bond of Christian perfection, its συνιδέτικον δραμανόν; without love, all the individual virtues, which belong in themselves to that perfection, would not unite.
together into that necessary harmonious entirety, in which perfection consists. Not as if the latter were already existent without love (as Schenkel objects to this view), but love is the σύνδεσμος constituting its perfection; apart from love there is no τελειότης, which has its condition sine qua non only in the inclusion of its other factors in love; how love accomplishes this, no one has better shown than Paul himself in 1 Cor. xiii. Nor is it as if the genitive would necessarily be a plurality (as Hoffmann objects); on the contrary, the τελειότης according to its nature and to the context is a collective idea, with which the conception of a σύνδεσμος well corresponds. It might, moreover, occasion surprise, that love, which is withal the principle and presupposition of the virtues enumerated, is mentioned last, and described as being added; but this was rendered necessary by the figurative representation, because love, from its nature, in so far as it includes in principle the collective virtues and comprehends them in itself, necessarily had assigned to it in the figure of putting on garments the place of the upper garment, so that Paul rightly proceeds in his description from the under garments to the upper one which holds all the others together, and with whose function love corresponds. Accordingly the absolute ἡ ἁγάπη is not to be taken in any other sense than the general and habitual one of Christian brotherly love (i. 8, ii. 2; 1 Cor. xiii.; Phil. i. 9); nor yet in any sort of reference limiting it to special qualities, e.g. as by de Wette: "as active, beneficent, perfecting love." — 3 (see the critical remarks), which, namely love, conceived of as neuter, as in our "that is." Comp. on εξ ου, ii. 19. — σύνδεσμος τῆς τελείοτης bond of perfection, i.e. what binds together the Christian moral perfection into the totality of its nature, συνδεσμεύει, Polyb. iii. 42. 8; ξυνδεῖ καὶ χυμπλέκει, Plat. Polit. p. 309 B. Chrysostom (though mingling with it the foreign figure of the root) aptly says: συγκράτησις τῶν τῆς τελειότητα ποιῶντων. Comp. Theophylact: πάντα ἑκεῖνα, φησιν, αὕτη συσφηγγεί παροῦσα ἀπολύει δὲ διαλύουσι καὶ ἐλέγχονται ἑπόκρισιν ἄτομα καὶ οὐδεν. The genitive, which is that of the object, denotes (it is otherwise in Eph. iv. 3; comp. Acts viii. 23; LXX. Isa. Iviii. 6) that

1 Comp. Clem. Cor. I. 49 f.
which is held together by the bond. Comp. Plat. Rep. p. 616 C: εὐνα ἦρ τοῦ τὸ φῶς ξύνθεσιν τοῦ σύμφων… πᾶσαν ξύνθεσην τῆν περιφοράν, also p. 520 A: τὸν ξύνθεσιν τῆς πόλεως, Polit. p. 310 A: τὸν ξύνθεσιν ἀρετῆς μερᾶς φύσεως ἀνομοῖον. Taken as the genitive of quality, it would yield the adjective sense: the perfect bond, "animos sc. conjungens," Grotius. So also Erasmus, Vatablus, Calovius, Estius, Wolf, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Flatt, and others. But how arbitrary this would be in itself, and especially in view of the fact that, in the event of τ. τελειότης being disposed of as an adjective, the more precise definition of σύνθεσις would have to be gratuitously introduced! Taken as the genitivus causae (Schenkel), it would not correspond with the figure, though it is in substance correct that that, which as a bond embraces perfection, only thereby brings about its existence (comp. above). According to Huther, the sense is: "by man's putting on love he is girt with perfection; whosoever lives in love is perfect." Thus the genitive would have to be conceived as genitive of opposition, which would yield an incongruous analysis of the figure, induced by the opinion that δ it does not refer to the ἀγάπη itself, but to the ἐνδόσασθαι τὴν ἀγάπην.1 According to Hofmann (comp. Ellicott), the genitive is meant to be that of the subject, and the τελειότης is to indicate the completeness of the Christian state, of which love is the bond, inasmuch as it binds Christians together among themselves, wherever that completeness exists (John xiii. 35). This is erroneous; for if in some curious fashion the abstract ἡ τελειότης (consequently an aggregate of attributes) were to be the acting subject, which makes use of love as a bond (consequently for the purpose of binding), yet the Christians among themselves could not be conceived as the object of that binding, but only the πάντα ταῦτα in accordance with the immediate context (ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ

1 σύνθεσις, namely, would apply to the girdle, as Clericus, Ewald, and Schenkel make it do. But to that view the infinitēs to be supplied would be contextually less suitable (comp. Eph. vi. 14); while after what has gone before the reader would most naturally think of love simply as a garment, and not as the girdle, "which holds together all individual efforts towards perfection" (Ewald). Besides, it would not at all be easy to see why Paul should not have used the definite word ζών instead of σύνθεσις.
τούτους). The apostle would have been able to express the tenor of thought forced upon him by Hofmann simply and clearly by some such phrase as δὲ (or ὅσι, or ἦτοι) ἐστι σύνδεσμος τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ τελείων (comp. i. 28). Others take it as the sum of perfection. So Bengel, Zachariae, Usteri, Böhmer, Steiger, de Wette, Olshausen ("inasmuch as it comprehends in itself—bears, as it were, bound up in itself—all the individual aspects of the perfect life, all virtues"). Comp. on the subject-matter, Rom. xiii. 10. This explanation cannot be justified linguistically (not even by Simplic. Epictet. p. 208, according to which the Pythagoreans termed friendship: σύνδεσμον πασῶν τῶν ἅρπατῶν, i.e. the bond which knits all the virtues together), unless we take σύνδεσμος in the sense of a bundle, as Herodian uses it, iv. 12. 11 (πάντα τῶν σύνδεσμον τῶν ἑπιστολῶν), which, however, even apart from the singular form of the conception in itself, would be unsuitable to the context, since love is to be added to all the previously enumerated elements of perfection, and may therefore well be termed the bond that holds them together, but not their bundle, not the sum of them. The word σύνδεσμος itself, which except in our two parallel epistles does not occur in Paul's writings, is too hastily assigned by Holtzmann "to the range of language of the Auctor ad Ephesios." As if we had the whole linguistic range of the copious apostle in the few epistles which bear his name! Indeed, even εἰς τὰς δὲ τούτους (comp. Eph. vi. 16) is alleged to betray the auctor in question. — In opposition to the Catholic use of our passage to support the justificatio operum, it is enough to observe that the entire exhortation has justification as its presupposition (ver. 12), and concerns the moral life of those who are already justified. Irrelevantly, however, it is urged in the Apol. Conf. Aug. 3, p. 104 f. (comp. Calovius and others), in opposition to the Catholics, that τελευτής is the integritas ecclesiae, and that through love the church is kept in harmony, as Erasmus, Melanchthon, and others also explained it.

Ver. 15. All these virtues, however, along with the love which binds them together, must have their deep living foundation in the peace of Christ, which reigns in the heart,
and their abiding incitement in *gratitude* towards God for the salvation received in Christ. Hence now the further summons—appended by the simple *καί*—to the readers, to let that *peace* reign in their hearts and to be *thankful*. The *εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ* is the holy *satisfaction of mind* wrought by Christ through the Spirit, the blessed inner rest, of which the atonement and justification appropriated in faith (Rom. v. 1) are the presupposition and condition. See on Phil. iv. 7. Comp. Luther, Bengel, and others, including Flatt, Bähr, Olshausen, Huther, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, Bleek, Hofmann. To understand the peace of mutual *concord* (the Greek Fathers, Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, Calvovius, and many others, also Reiche, *Comm. Crit.* p. 297), is less in accordance with the universality of the connection, which here descends to the deepest ground of the Christian life in the heart; and besides, the concord in question already *follows of itself* on the virtues recommended. Moreover, there is implied in *βασιλεία* the determining and regulating power, the *supreme authority*, which the peace of Christ is to have in the Christian heart, which suits most fully the above interpretation alone.—*βασιλεύτω*] *βασιλεύω* only found here in the N. T., but as little un-Pauline as *καταβασιλεύ* in ii. 18 (in opposition to Holtzmann); it means primarily: to arrange and conduct the contest (Wisd. x. 12, and Grimm in *loc.*); then: to confer the *prize of victory*, to be *βασιλεύω*, i.e. umpire (Plut. *Mor.* p. 960 A; Diod. Sic. xiii. 53); finally: to *govern* generally. See for the last signification especially Dem. 36. 7, 1231. 19; Eur. *Hel.* 1079; Isocr. *Areop.* p. 144 B; Polyb. vi. 4. 3, xiii. 1. 5, xxvii. 14. 4, *et al.*; passages from Josephus in Krebs, and from Philo in Loesner. Considering its very frequent occurrence in the latter sense, and its appropriateness in that sense to *ἐν τ. καρδ. ὑμ.* and seeing that any reference to the Messianic *βασιλεύω* (comp. ii. 18) is foreign to the context, the majority of modern expositors have rightly interpreted it: the peace of Christ must *rule, govern* in your hearts. So Luther (“let it be master and keep you in all tribulation”), Castalio, Beza, Bengel, and many others, including Flatt, Bähr, Olshausen,

1 The Vulgate incorrectly renders: *exulėt*. So also the Gothic.
Steiger, Huther, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Dalmer, and Bleek. The conception involves the superintending, arranging, and administering activity, and that in supreme deciding competence (comp. Ewald and Hofmann), as it ought to be exercised by the εἰρήνη τ. Χ. in the heart, quite like the German verfügen [to dispose of]. Bremer says aptly, ad Dem. Ol. p. 179, Goth.: it is not simply equivalent to διουκεῖν, "sed pleno jure et ex arbitrio διουκεῖν." Chrysostom and his followers have retained the meaning: to confer the prize of victory, but with ideas introduced to which nothing in the text points. Theophylact: ὑβρισθημεν πολλάκις ἐπὶ τινος· ἀγωνίζονται παρ' ἡμῖν λογισμὸν δύο, ὦ μὲν εἰς ἄμιθος κινῶν, ὦ δὲ εἰς μακροθυμίαν. 'Εαν εἰρήνη τ. Θεοῦ στῇ ἐν ἡμῖν, ὁστερ τις βραβεύετης δίκαιος, τούτου πριτῆς καὶ ἁγωνοθέτης, καὶ δὴ τὸ βραβείων τῆς νίκης τῷ κελεύοντι μακροθυμεῖν, παύσεται ὁ ἀναγωνισθής. Comp. also Erasmus, Vatablus, and Calvin, who, however, explain it erroneously: palmam ferat. Grotius: "dijudicet, nempe si quid est inter vos controversum." So also, substantially, Hammond, Kypke, and others; similarly, Melanchthon: "gubernet omnia certamina." Comp. βραβεῖον ἔρων (Plut. Rom. 9) and the like. See Dorville, ad Charit. p. 445. But the context points to deeper matters than disputes, upon which the peace of Christ in the heart is to decide. — εἰς ἡν κ. ἐκχ. κ.τ.λ. argumentative, supporting the exhortation just uttered; for which ye also (καὶ expressing the corresponding relation) were called, etc.; εἰς ἡν, in behalf of which, i.e. to possess which peace, is not the final aim of the calling, which is rather participation in the Messianic kingdom, but a mediate aim. Comp. 1 Pet. ii. 21. — ἐν ἐν σώματι] not instead of εἰς ἐν σώμα (Grotius, Flatt, and many others); nor yet: "as growing to be members of a single body" (Hofmann, gratuitously importing), but (comp. Ellicott and Bleek) as the result of ἐκλήθητε, announcing the relation of fellowship, into which the individuals are translated through their calling, and in which they now find themselves continuously. This abiding condition was the predominant conception; hence the pregnancy of the expression (Kühner, II. 1, p. 469); so that ye are in one body, namely, as its members. The element of unity, added with
emphasis, and that quite in Pauline form (Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17; in opposition to Holtzmann), stands in appropriate reference to the entire requirement. To have become by the calling one body with those who share in that calling, and yet not to let the holy moral disposition, for the sake of which we are called, be the common ruling power of life—what a contradiction! In that case there would be wanting to the σῶμα the ἐν πνεύμα accordant with the calling (Eph. iv. 4; 1 Cor. xii. 13).—The mention of this calling—the great blessing which makes everything, that is at variance with what has hitherto been demanded (ver. 12 ff.), appear as ingratitude towards God—induces the apostle to add still further the highest motive of all for every Christian virtue (comp. ii. 7, i. 12): κ. εἰκάριως γινέσθε; and become ye thankful (comp. on Eph. iv. 32); in which the γινέσθε (not equivalent to ἐστὶ) requires the constant striving after this exalted aim as something not yet attained; comp. e.g. John xv. 8. It was nothing but a misconception of that inner connection and of this significance of γινέσθε, which led to the taking εἰκάρ. as aмābulε, friendly, and the like (comp. Eph. iv. 32; Prov. xi. 15). So Jerome, Erasmus (not in the Paraphr.), Calvin, Vatablus, Beza, (beneficii), Cornelius a Lapide, Wolf, Krebs, and many others, including Bähr, Steiger, Olshausen, and Reiche. The linguistic use of εἰκάριωτος in this sense in the classical writers is well known (Xen. Cyr. ii. 2. 1, Oec. v. 10), but equally so is also its use in the sense of thankful (Xen. Cyr. viii. 3. 49; Herodian, ii. 3. 14; Diod. Sic. xviii. 28); and the N. T., in which, moreover, the adjective is nowhere else found, has, like the Apocrypha, εἰκαριωτεύς and εἰκαριωτικά only in the latter signification (comp. ver. 17), the reference of which in our passage to God after εἰς ἐν κ. ἐκληθ. (it is God who calls) is self-evident, but not (in opposition to Grotius and Calovius) the mutua gratitudo. The ascription of the words κ. εἰκάρ. γίν. to the interpolator, who is also supposed to have inserted ἐν εἰκαριωτικά in iv. 2 (Holtzmann), is destitute of ground either in the language or in the matter of the passage. It is not at all easy to see why εἰκάριωτος should be "as un-Pauline as ἐσπλαγχνος in Eph. iv. 32."
Ver. 16 f. The series of exhortations begun in ver. 12 is now closed,¹ and Paul proceeds to give, before going on in ver. 18 to the duties of particular callings, an encouraging allusion to the Christian means of grace for furthering the common life of piety, namely, the word of Christ. This ought to dwell richly among them, so that they might by means of its operation (1) instruct and admonish each other in all wisdom with psalms, etc.; (2) by the divine grace sing to God in their hearts; and (3) let all that they do, in word or deed, be done in the name of Jesus with thanksgiving to God. Accordingly, the previous parenthesis by no means ends in a "loose aggregation" (as Hofmann objects), but in a well-weighed, steadily-progressive, and connected conclusion on the basis of the λόγος of Christ² placed at the very beginning. According to Hofmann, ver. 16 f. is only meant to be an amplification of the εὐχάριστος γίνεσθαι in ver. 15. This would be a disproportionate amplification—especially as εὐχ. γίν. is not the leading thought in the foregoing—and could only be plausibly upheld by misinterpretations in the details; see below.—δ λόγος τ. Χριστοῦ] i.e. the gospel. The genitive is that of the subject; Christ causes it to be proclaimed, He Himself speaks in the proclaimers (2 Cor. xiii. 3), and has revealed it specially to Paul (Gal. iv. 11 f.); it is His word. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 8, iv. 15; 2 Thess. iii. 1; Heb. vi. 1. The designation of it, according to its principal author: δ λ. τού Θεοῦ, is more current.—ἐνουκέλτωσεν ἐν ἵματί not: among you (Luther and many others), which would not be in keeping with the conception of indwelling; nor yet: in animis vestris (Theodore, Melanchthon, Beza, Zanchius, and others, including Flatt, Böhmer, and Olshausen), so that the indwelling which

¹ Lachmann and Steiger have put δ λόγος...συνεχίσων in a parenthesis, which just as arbitrarily sets aside the new and regulative idea introduced by δ λόγος, as it very unnecessarily comes to the help of the construction.

² This applies also in opposition to his Holtzm an, p. 54 f., who finds in ver. 16 an echo of Eph. v. 19, which at the same time interrupts the entire connection, and presents something un-Pauline almost in every word (p. 164). Un-Pauline, in his view, is δ λόγος τ. Χριστοῦ (but see 1 Thess. i. 8, iv. 15); un-Pauline the juxtaposition of ψαλμοίς, ἡμεῖς, γίνεσθαι (the reason why it is so, is not plain); un-Pauline the γίνεσθαι itself, and even the adverb συνεχίσων. How strangely has the apostle, so rich in diction, become impoverished!
depends on knowledge and faith would be meant, since the subsequent modal definition is of an oral nature: but in your church, the ἰμαεία, as a whole, being compared to a house, in which the word has the seat of its abiding operation and rule (comp. Rom. viii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 5). — πλουσίωσις is ample measure. In proportion as the gospel is recognised much or little in a church as the common living source and contents of mutual instruction, quickening, discipline, and edification, its dwelling there is quantitatively various. De Wette explains it, not comprehensively enough, in accordance with what follows: “so that many come forward as teachers, and often.” In another way Hofmann limits it arbitrarily: the letting the word of Christ dwell richly in them is conceived as an act of gratitude. How easy it would have been for Paul to have indicated this intelligibly! But the new point which he wishes to urge upon his readers, namely, to let the divinely-powerful means of Christian life dwell richly in them, is placed by him without any link of connection, and independently, at the head of his closing exhortation. — The following ἐν πῶσῃ... τῷ Θεῷ is the modal definition of the foregoing: so that ye, etc.; construction according to the logical subject, as in ii. 2.—ἐν πῶσῃ σοφία] Since what precedes has its defining epithet in πλουσίωσις, and that with all the emphasis of the adverb put at the end, and since, moreover, the symmetry of the following participial clauses, each of which begins with ἐν (ἐν πῶσῃ σοφίᾳ... ἐν τ. χάριν), ought not to be abandoned without some special reason, the ἐν τ. σοφ. is to be referred to what follows (so Bos, Bengel, Storr, Flatt, Bähr, Steiger, Olshausen, Huther, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, Dalmer, Reiche, Bleek, Hofmann, and others; Böhmer hesitates, and Beza permits this reference), and not to what precedes (so Syriac, Chrysostom, Luther, and many others). Comp. i. 28. Every sort of (Christian) wisdom is to be active in the mutual instruction and admonition. Regarding the details, see on i. 28. — ἑαυτούς] mutually, among yourselves, comp. ver. 13. — ψαλμοῖς κ.τ.λ.] modal definition of the mutual διδασκαλίαν and νουθετεῖν, which are to take place by means of (see below, ἐν χάρ. διδούτες κ.τ.λ.) psalms, etc. It
is all the more arbitrary to refer it merely to *nuvther.* (de
Wette), seeing that the position of *kauros* binds the two par-
ticiples together, and seeing that inspired songs by no means
exclude a *doctrinal* purport. The conceivableness of a didactic-
activity in mutual *singing* (in opposition to Schenkel and
Hofmann), and that without confounding things radically
different, is still clearly enough recognisable in many of our
best church songs, especially in those born of the fresh spirit
of the Reformation. Storr and Flatt, Schenkel and Hofmann
join the words with *dounes,* although the latter has already a
definition both before and after it, and although one does not
say *vcalmois* *κ.τ.λ.,* *doun* (*dative*), but *vcalmois* *κ.τ.λ.* (*accusative*),
as in Ex. xiv. 32; Plat. Symp. 197 E, Rep. p. 388 D,
and in all Greek authors. The *dative of the instrument* with
*doun* would be appropriate, if it had along with it an *accusative*
of the object praised (as *e.g.* Eur. Ion. 1091). See,
moreover, on Eph. v. 19. Concerning the distinction between
*vcalmou* (religious songs after the manner of the Psalms of the
O. T., to be regarded partly as Christian songs already in use,
partly as improvised effusions, 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26) and *vmon* (*songs*
of praise), to both of which *vXal pneumatikal* (*i.e.* songs
inspired by the Holy Spirit) are then added as the general
category,1 see on Eph. v. 19. Observe, moreover, that Paul is
here also (comp. Eph. l.c.) speaking not of *divine worship*2 in
the proper sense of the term, since the teaching and admonition
in question are required from the readers *generally* and *mutu-
ally,* and that as a proof of their *abundant* possession of the
word of Christ, but rather of the *communication one with
another in religious intercourse* (*e.g.* at meals, in the agapae
and other meetings, in family circles, etc.)—in which enthusiasm
makes the fulness of the heart pass from mouth to mouth, and
brotherly instruction and admonition thus find expression in
the higher form of psalms, etc., whether these may have been

1 Many arbitrary more special distinctions are to be found in expositors. See
Bähr. Even Steiger distinguishes them very precariously into (1) songs accom-
panied by stringed instruments; (2) solemn church songs; (3) songs sung in the
house and at work.

2 This applies also in opposition to Holtzmann, who discovers here and in
Eph. v. 19 an already *far advanced stage* of worship.
songs already well known, or extemporized according to the peculiar character and productive capacity of the individual enthusiasm, whether they may have been sung by individuals alone (especially if they were improvised), or chorally, or in the form of alternating chants (Plin. Ep. x. 97). How common religious singing was in the ancient church, even apart from divine service proper, may be seen in Suicer, Thes. II. p. 1568 f. The existence of a multitude of rhythmic songs, composed ἀν' ἀρχής by Christians, is attested by Eusa. H. E. ii. 17, v. 28. Regarding singing in the agape, see Tertullian, Apol. 39: "post aquam manualem et lumina, ut quasque de scripturis sanctis vel proprio ingenio potest, provocation in medium Deo canere." See generally, Augusti, Denkw. II. p. 110 ff. — The *asynthetic* (see the critical remarks) juxtaposition of ψαλμος, δομης, and φοινικας πν. renders the discourse more urgent and animated. — ἐν τῇ χρυσίι̣δοις κ.τ.λ.] is commonly regarded as subordinate to what goes before; as if Paul would say: the heart also is to take part in their singing, των ἄνθρωπων τῆς στοματικῆς διαλεκτῆς, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, εἰ ἔστι μετὰ προσοχής. Theophylact. But Paul himself has not in the least expressed any such contrasting reference; and how superfluous, nay, even inappropriate, would such an injunction be, seeing that the διδάσκειν and νουθετεῖν takes place in fact by the ψαλμος κ.τ.λ., and this is to be the outcome of the abundant indwelling of the gospel; and seeing, further, that there is no mention at all of a stated common worship (where, possibly, lip-service might intrude), but, on the contrary, of mutual edifying intercourse! The entire view is based upon the unfounded supposition of a degeneracy of worship in the apostolic age, which, even though it were true in itself, would be totally inapplicable here. Moreover, we should expect the idea, that the singing is to be the expression of the emotion of the heart, to be represented not by ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, but by ἐκ τῶν καρδίων (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 22; Matt. xii. 34) or ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ. Comp. Wis. viii. 21, also classical expressions like ἐκ φρονεσθα, and the like. No, the participial clause is *co-ordinate* with the preceding one (as also at Eph. v. 19, see in loc.), and conveys —after the audible singing for the purpose of teaching and
admonition, to be done mutually—as a further element of the pious life in virtue of the rich indwelling of the word of Christ, the still singing of the heart, which each one must offer to God for himself inwardly; i.e. the silent praising of God, which belongs to self-edification in the inner man. Chrysostom already indicates this view, but mixes it up, notwithstanding, with the usual one; Theophylact quotes it as another (ἕλλος), giving to it, moreover, the inappropriate antithesis: μη πρὸς ἐπιδειξιν, but adding with Chrysostom the correct illustration: κἀν γὰρ ἐν ἀγορᾷ ἡς, δύνασαι κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἄδειαν μηδὲν ἄκοινοντος. Bengel well describes the two parallel definitions ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ κ.τ.λ. and ἐν χάριτι κ.τ.λ. as distributio of the πλουρας, and that mutuo et seorsim. — ἐν τῇ χάριτι] does not belong to ἐδακὶ πνευμ. (Luther: “with spiritual pleasant songs,” also Calvin), but to ἰδοντες as the parallel element to ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ. In the same way, namely, as the teaching and admonition above mentioned are to take place by means of every wisdom, which communicates and operates outwardly through them, so the still singing of the heart now spoken of is to take place by means of the divine grace, which stirs and moves and impels men’s minds,—a more precise definition, which is so far from being useless and idle (as Hofmann objects), that it, on the contrary, excludes everything that is selfish, vain, fanatical, and the like. Chrysostom says rightly: ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ πνεύματος, φησι, ἰδοντες κ.τ.λ.; comp. Oecumenius: διὰ τῆς παρὰ τοῦ ἄγιου πνεύματος δοθέντος χάριτος, also Estius and Steiger. Hofmann’s view is erroneous: that ἄδεια ἐν τινι means to sing of something, thus making the grace experienced the subject-matter of the songs. This it does not mean even in the LXX. Ps. cxxxviii. 5, where ἂς is taken in a local sense.¹ The subject-matter of the singing would have been expressed by an accusative (as μην ἄδεια), or with εἰς.² Inappropriate as

¹ As in the Vulgate, and by Luther.
² Nevertheless, Holtzmann, p. 164, adopts the linguistically quite incorrect explanation of Hofmann: he thinks that it alone yields a tolerable sense, but that it is foreign to the linguistic usage of Paul (no, it is foreign to all linguistic usage).
to sense (since the discourse concerns singing in the heart) is the view of others: with gracefulness. So Theophylact (who, however, permits a choice between this and the true explanation), Erasmus, Luther, Melanchthon ("sine confusione, εὑρίσκων"), Castalio, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Calvius, Cornelius a Lapide, Wetstein, Bengel, and others, including Bähr, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schenkel, Reiche. Even though the singing in public worship were spoken of, the injunction to sing gracefully, and especially with the emphasis of being placed first, would touch on too singular an element. Anselm, and in more modern times Böhmer, Huther, de Wette, and Bleek take it: with thankfulness, in which case the article, which Bleek rejects (see the critical remarks), would denote not the gratitude already required in ver. 15 (so Huther), but that which is due. But the summons to general thanksgiving towards God (in ver. 15, grateful conduct was meant by εὐχαρίστησιν, γνώσις) only follows in ver. 17; and inasmuch as the interpretation which takes it of the divine grace is highly suitable both to the connection and to the use of the article (which sets forth the χάρισμα as a conception formally set apart), and places an admirably characteristic element in the foreground, there is no reason for assuming here a call to thanksgiving.—As ἐν ταῖς καρδιαῖς ἡμῶν was contrasted with the preceding oral singing, so is τῷ Θεῷ contrasted with the destination for others; the still heart-singer sings to God. It is just for this reason that the otherwise superfluous τῷ Θεῷ is added. Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 28.

Ver. 17. The apostle having announced in ver. 16 the first way in which the abundant indwelling of the word of Christ must manifest itself by ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ διδάσκοντες . . . πνευματικοῖς, and having set forth as the second the ἐν τῷ χάριτι, ἀδοκίμασιν κ.τ.λ., now adds the third, and that, indeed, as one embracing the entire conduct of life; the καί, ἀνά, attaches it to the two participial clauses in ver. 16, not, however, introducing another participial mode of expression conformed to the foregoing, but leading over, through the verb to be supplied, into the direct form of discourse: And whatsoever ye do by word or by work, do all in the name of Jesus. The πᾶν ἡ,
τι ἐν ποιητε... ἔργῳ is the absolute nominative, placed at the beginning with rhetorical emphasis, and syntactically independent. See Kühner, II. 1, p. 42; Winer, p. 534 [E. T. 718]. — ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ] Comp. Aesch. Prom. 659: τι χρὴ ἔργῳ ἢ λέγοντα δαίμονι πράσσεις φίλα. See Pflugk, ad Eur. Hec. 373: “Dictis factisque omnis continetur actio.” For instances of λόγος and ἔργον associated in that order and conversely, see Bornemann, ad Xen. Mem. ii. 3. 6; Lobeck, Paral. p. 64 f. — πάντα] again emphatically prefixed, not, however, taking up again the previous πάν, but rather: in the case of everything which is done by word or deed, all is to take place in the name of Jesus;¹ no element of the doing is to be out of this sphere! The imperative ποιητε is to be supplied from the context. Comp. on Eph. v. 21. — ἐν ὀνόματι.] Not: with invocation of (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Melanchthon, and others), but: so that the name is the holy moral element, in which the action proceeds, inasmuch, namely, as this name, as the sum of the faith which moulds the new life, fills the consciousness, and gives to the action its specific Christian quality and consecration. Ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ would not be substantially different. Comp. on Eph. v. 20; Phil. ii. 10; John xiv. 13. “Illum sapiat, illum sonet, illum spiret omnis vestra vita,” Erasmus. The ideal character of the requirement is misapprehended, when, with Cornelius a Lapide, it is lowered to a mere consilium. See, on the contrary, Calovius.—ἐὐχάριστος τῷ Θεῷ κ.τ.λ.] accompanying definition: whilst ye at the same time give thanks, etc. Comp. ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ in ii. 7, iv. 2, i. 12; Phil. iv. 6. In the apostle’s view, there belongs essentially to the devoutness of Christian life the self-expressing piety of thankfulness for all Christian bliss, in the consciousness, assurance, and experience of which one does everything in the name of Jesus. Since εὐχαρίστευω denotes thanksgiving, Grotius ought not to have taken the participle in a declaratory sense (“quid sit in nomine Christi omnia facere et loqui”); a misinterpretation, which

¹ Paul, as is well known, is fond of placing close beside each other different forms of πάντα with different references. See Wilke, Rhetor. p. 381; comp. also on Phil. iv. 12.
Hofmann rightly rejects, but substitutes another explanation which neglects the verbal import of εἰχάριστoν: namely, that Paul declares the doing here required to be a thanksgiving, etc., doing, which is practical thanks. Εἰχάριστoν is never in the N. T. equivalent to χάριν ἀνοδούναι, gratias referre.—πατρ[ Father of Jesus.—δι' αὐτοῦ] For Jesus, as the personal historical mediator of Messianic bliss through the work of atonement, is therewith for the Christian consciousness the mediator of thanksgiving; He it is, through whose benefit the Christian can and does give thanks. Comp. Rom. i. 8, vii. 25, al. Hence in Eph. v. 20: ἐν οὖν ὁμοιωθεὶς κ.τ.λ. Both the thought and expression were so habitually in use and belonged so essentially to the circumstances of the case, that the hypothesis of a contrast to the mediation of angels (Theodoret, Bengel, and many others, including Bähr) is unfounded, more especially seeing that the entire context has no polemical reference.

Ver. 18 to iv. 1. Instructions for the different portions of the household. Why Paul should have given to the churches such a table of household rules only in this Epistle and in that to the Ephesians (comp. also 1 Tim. and Tit.), must be left wholly undecided (Chrysostom exhausts himself in conjectures). They are not polemical; but possibly, in the presence of a theosophico-ascetic atmosphere, the practical rules of healthy domestic life seemed to him the more seasonable. They do not contain traces of a later development of church-life (Holtzmann). The circumstance that the precepts for the several forms of domestic society uniformly (vv. 18, 20, 22 f.) begin with the subordinate party, as also at Eph. v. 21 ff., is to be

---

1 This domestic code is held by Holtzmann to be an insertion of the interpolator from Eph. v. 21–vi. 9. He groundlessly questions the genuineness of the expressions ιδιότης, ἰδιώτης, ἱδιώτης, ἰδίωτα, τι ἱδιόν, ἰδιός τὸ καρδίας, and even appeals to the use of ἀναστάσις, ἀναστάσιος, and the formula τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦς as direct evidence against its Pauline origin. Might not, however, the word ἀναστάσις have been sufficiently familiar to Paul from the LXX. (Ps. liii. 5) and otherwise (Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 621), and have been used by him in the two parallel epistles? Is not ἄνωθεν a term in general use since Thucydides? Is not "to serve the Lord Christ" a Pauline idea, and even (comp. Rom. xvi. 18) literal expression? The danger of a petitio principiis only too easily steals upon even the cautious and sober critic in such points of detail. He finds what he seeks.
regarded as having occurred without any set purpose; the idea of obedience was primarily present to the writer's mind. If Paul's aim had been to counteract the abuse of Christian freedom and equality, or in other words, perverse desires for emancipation, he would not have considered so weighty a purpose sufficiently met by the mere mode of arrangement, but would have entered upon the matter itself (in opposition to Huther and de Wette); and this we should have to assume that he would have done also in the event of his having had in view an attitude of resistance on the part of those bound to obedience as the thing most to be feared (in opposition to Hofmann). Just as much might such an attitude be a thing to be feared from the stronger party. Respecting the nominatives in the address, see especially Stallbaum, ad Plat. Symp. p. 172 A. — ὡς ἀνήκειν] not the perfect (with present signification), as Huther thinks and Bleek does not disapprove, but the imperfect, which has its logical reference in the ἐν κυρίῳ to be connected with it: as was fitting in the Lord, i.e. as was becoming in the relation of the ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι (Philem. 8), as was appropriate to the Christian state, but had not yet been in this way realized. The imperfect (comp. Acts xxii. 22) denotes, therefore, as also in χρησιν and ἐδει, the incomplete condition, which extends even into the present. See Kühner, II. 1, p. 176 f.; Bernhardy, p. 373. Similarly, Winer, p. 254 [E. T. 338]. Comp. also Buttman, p. 187 [E. T. 216]. We are not to think of an omission of ἄν; see Kühner, l.c. The connection of ἐν κυρίῳ with ὑπόταξεσθε (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Estius, Rosenmüller, Hofmann, and others)—in which case Hofmann imparts into ὡς ἀνήκειν the abstract idea: as was already in itself fitting—is opposed by the position of the words themselves, as well as by the parallel in ver. 20: εὐδαιμονίαν ἕστη ἐν κυρίῳ.

LXX. Ex. xvi. 20; Ruth i. 20; 3 Esdr. iv. 31; ἐπικραίνεσθαι των, Herod. v. 62.

Ver. 20 f. Comp. Eph. vi. 1-4, where likewise is given a characteristic development in fuller detail of what is here only succinctly stated. — κατὰ πάντα] not to be restricted; for Paul is quoting the rule, that which holds good principaliter in the relation of children, while possible exceptional cases obviously come under the principle of obeying God rather than man (Oecumenius: διὰ τῶν εἰς ἀσέβειαν φερόντων). Comp. Eph. v. 24.—εὐφρεστῶν ἔστω ἐν κυρίῳ] In connection with this reading (see the critical remarks), to supply τῷ Ἡσαῦ to εὐφρ. is arbitrary (in opposition to de Wette and Baumgarten-Crusius), since this is not suggested by the context as in Rom. xii. 1, 2; nor is ἐν κυρίῳ to be taken as instead of the dative (Flatt, Bähr, Bleek), or in the sense: coram Domino (Böhmer), but rather as in ver. 18. We have to leave εὐφρ. without any other more precise definition than what is contained in ἐν κυρίῳ, so that it is affirmed of childlike obedience, that it is well-pleasing, and that indeed not in a worldly fashion apart from Christ, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως μόνης (Chrysostom), but in a definite Christian character; consequently the Christian ethical beauty, in which the Δικαίων (Eph. vi. 1) of that virtue manifests itself. Comp. προσφιλή in Phil. iv. 8. It would be a perfectly groundless violence to couple, with Hofmann, ἐν κυρίῳ with ἑπάκουστε τ. γ. κ. π., notwithstanding the clause which is introduced by γάρ.—Ver. 21. οἱ πατέρες] they, and not the mothers, are addressed as holding the government of the household, also in reference to education. Comp. on Eph. vi. 4.—ἐρεθίζετε] irritate, very frequent in the classics and LXX., especially in connection with anger, as here (comp. Eph. vi. 4). This irritation takes place through unjust or over-severe (ἔστιν δπου καὶ συγχωρεῖ ὁφείλετε, Chrysostom) treatment, which the child, provoked thereby to anger, must bear without being able to get satisfaction for its injured sense of justice; whereby it becomes liable to a spiritless and sullen, and therefore immoral, resignation, a despair paralysing all moral power of will; hence ἵνα μὴ ἄθροισθω. This verb is only found here in the N. T., but frequently in
LXX., also Judith vii. 22; 1 Macc. iv. 27; and in classic writers from the time of Thucydides (v. 91. 1, vii. 21, al.). Its opposite is ἑαρρεῖν. Bengel aptly says: "fractus animus pestis juventutis."

Ver. 22. Comp. Eph. vi. 5 ff. The minuteness with which Paul enters into this point in comparison with the others, may naturally have been caused by the flight and conversion of Onesimus, who was a Colossian slave. — τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίων] the masters, who are so after a fleshly manner, i.e. in respect to material-human nature; a description, which presupposes another relation belonging to the higher pneumatic sphere, in which, namely, Christ is (ver. 24) the master. Comp. Rom. ix. 3. — μὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμῷ, ὡς ἀνθρωπόταρ.] See on Eph. vi. 6. The obedience of Christian slaves becomes men-pleasing, and, to appearance, eye-service, when it is not subordinated to, and normally conditioned by, the fear of Christ (2 Cor. v. 11) as the higher Master. See below, where ἐν ἀπλότ. καρδίας (see on Eph. vi. 5) corresponds to the ἐν ὀφθαλμοδουλῷ, and φοβοῦμ. τ. κύριον to the ὡς ἀνθρωπόταρ. Eye-service presupposes insincerity of heart, and men-pleasing takes for granted a want of the fear of Christ. Comp. on the latter, Gal. i. 10.

Ver. 23 f. More precise explanation of the ἐν ἀπλότ. καρδ., φοβοῦμ. τ. κύρ. just required. — ποιῆτε] in your service. — ἐκ ψυχῆς] metà εἰνολα, μὴ μετά σοφικῆς ἀνάγκης, ἀλλὰ μετὰ εὐθείας καὶ προαιρέσεως, Chrysostom. Comp. on Eph. vi. 6. — ἐργάζεσθε] execute, carry out, not equivalent to ποιῆτε, but correlative with it, hence also not in the narrower sense: labour (as e.g. in Xen. Oec. iii. 4 with reference to slaves). — ὡς τῷ κυρ.] Point of view of the ἐργάζεσθε; this is to be regarded as taking place for Christ, rendered as a service to Him. Comp. Eph. vi. 6 f. And the relation to the human masters, to whom the slaves belong, is in this higher aspect of the service thrown so much into the background as not to be taken into account at all, in accordance with the principle that no man can serve two masters; hence οὐκ is not relatively, but absolutely negative. Respecting the contrast of ἄνθρ. and Ἱσραήλ, see on Gal. i. 1. — εἰδότες κ.τ.λ.] Ground of the
obligation in one's own consciousness for the ὄς τῷ κυρίῳ κ. οὐκ ἀνδρ.: since ye know that ye shall receive from the Lord, etc. On ἐδότες, comp. iv. 1.—ἀντὶ κυρίου, excluding the human recompense, stands first with emphasis, and ἀντὶ (on the part of) denotes, not expressly the direct giving (παρὰ), through which the recompense is received, but generally the issuing, proceeding from the Lord, who is the possessor and bestower, although the receiving of the recompense at the judgment will be in reality direct (Eph. vi. 8; 2 Tim. i. 18). Comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 23; Winer, p. 347 [E. T. 463]. —τῆς εἰρηνομίας. In the Messianic εἰρηνομία, i.e. in the future possession of eternal bliss (see on Gal. iii. 18; Eph. i. 11; Col. i. 12; Rom. iv. 13), the reward consists. The motive for its purposely-chosen designation by this particular term lies in the fact, that in human relations slaves are not usually heirs, comp. Gen. xxi. 10. Hence also this closing word, next to the ἀντὶ κυρίου, has special emphasis: from the Lord ye shall receive the recompense of the inheritance. Comp. as to substance, Ignat. ad Polyc. 4: ἵνα κρείττωνος εὐθερίας ἀπὸ Θεοῦ τόχον. —On ἀνταπόδοσις (only found here in the N. T.), comp. Thuc. iv. 81. 1 (where, however, the sense is different); Plut. Mor. p. 72 F; Polyb. vi. 5. 3, xx. 7. 2, xxxii. 13. 6; passages from Diod. Sic. in Munthe's Ἑραι. p. 390; and from the LXX. in Schlesner, i. p. 296; also ἀνταπόδοµα in Rom. xi. 9.—τῷ κυρίῳ Χ. δουλεύετε] without γάρ (see the critical remarks) embraces succinctly the whole summary of the Christian duty of slaves in accordance with the principle already laid down in the ὄς τῷ κυρίῳ κ. οὐκ ἀνθρώπως; Χριστῷ is not to be taken as appositionally equivalent to δι' ἐστίν Χριστός (Hofmann), but in accordance with the quite common usage; hence: to the Lord Christ be serviceable! It is properly rendered thus imperatively in the Vulgate; also by Ewald, Dalmer, Schenkel, and Bleek. The whole significant emphasis lies upon τῷ κυρίῳ. Χριστῷ; His slaves they are to be in the relation of human service. Where the γάρ is regarded as not genuine,1 the indicative interpretation (the

1 The decisive preponderance of the witnesses omitting this γάρ renders it quite impossible to uphold it by subjective criticism (in opposition to Hofmann),
usual one) makes the utterance—which, moreover, would be superfluous after ver. 23—vapid, especially without the addition of an ἀπει.

Ver. 25. Ground of encouragement (γάρ, see the critical remarks) to fulfil the precept τῇ κυρ. Χ. δουλεύετε: for he who does wrong shall carry off (the penal recompense of) what wrong he has done,—a locus communis, of which the slaves were to make the application, that the unjust treatment which they experienced from their masters would not go unpunished; hence they could not but feel themselves the more encouraged to be in their relation of servitude slaves of no other than Christ, and to permit no unjust treatment to make them deviate from that principle. Paul therefore adds for their further encouragement: 1 καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν προσωπολογία, and there is no partiality, of which likewise general proposition the intended application is, that in that requital the impartial Judge (Christ, comp. ver. 24) will not favour the masters, and will not injure the slaves, comp. Eph. vi. 9. The correct view is held substantially by Theodoret, Beza, Calvin, Estius, Zachariae, Ewald, and others. Others have understood ἀδικέων as referring to the slave who violates his duty, in which case ἀδικέων is taken either in the strict sense of the trespass of him who intentionally injures his master (Hofmann, comp. Philem. 18), or loosely and generally in the sense of doing wrong, comp. Rev. xxii. 11 (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Bengel, Heinrichs, Storr, Flatt, Steiger, and others). But against this view the κ. οὐκ ἐστιν προσωπολ. may be decisively urged,

proceeding on the supposition that its omission may be traced to an artificial combination of ideas, which is imputed to the copyists. Just as little is the Recepta 31 (instead of γάρ) in ver. 25 to be defended.

1 Hofmann finds it incredible that Paul should have closed the section referring to the slaves with a proposition couched in such general terms as ver. 25, which applies not to the slaves, but to the masters. This, however, is an erroneous view. For in vv. 22–24 the apostle has instructed the slaves regarding their active bearing in service, and he is now, in the general proposition of ver. 25, suggesting for their reflection and deliberate consideration the proper soothing and elevating point of view regarding their passive bearing in service also. Thus ver. 25 also applies to the slaves, and forms merely the transition to the precept for the masters in iv. 1. This applies also in opposition to the doubts expressed by Holtzmann, p. 44 f.
which assumes that the subject to be punished is higher, of superior rank; for the idea which has been imported into the passage is purely fanciful: "Tenues saepe putant, sibi propter tenuitatem ipsorum esse parcendum; id negatur," Bengel, in connection with which Theophylact appeals to Lev. xix. 15. And if on account of οὐκ ἐστὶ προσωπολα the unjust masters must be taken as meant by ὁ ἀδικῶν in the application of the sentence, the reference to both parties, to the masters and the slaves (Erasmus, Grotius, and others, including Bähr, Huther, Baumgarten-Crusius, and Bleek, following Jerome and Pelagius), is thereby excluded, since προσωπολα is appropriate only to the masters. — κομλοεραι] shall carry off for himself (sibi), refers to the Messianic judgment, and ἰδιαωσε to that which he, who is now ἀδικῶν (present), has (shall have) then done. On the expression κομλεοθαι κ.τ.λ., used to express the idea of a recompense equivalent to the deed in respect of its guilt, comp. Eph. vi. 8, and on 2 Cor. v. 10. — Respecting προσωποληψια, see on Gal. ii. 6.
CHAPTER IV.

Ver. 1. ὑπανθή] Lachm. and Tisch. read ὑπανω, following A B C D* min. vss. Clem. Or. Damascus. The plural is from Eph. vi. 9. — Ver. 3. ἀυτή] Lachm. reads ἀυτή, following B F G. Not attested strongly enough, especially as after τ. χριστοῦ the masculine involuntarily suggested itself. — Ver. 8. γνῶρι τὰ περὶ ἢμῶν] A B D* F G min. Aeth. It., and some Fathers have γνῶρι τὰ περὶ ἢμῶν. 1 Recommended by Griesb., received by Scholz, Lachm. and Tisch. 8, approved also by Rinck and Reiche; and rightly, because it has preponderant attestation, and is so necessary as regards the context that it must not be regarded as an alteration from Eph. vi. 22 (comp. in loc.). The Recepta is to be regarded as having arisen through the omission of the syllable Τά before Τά. — Ver. 12. Instead of στήρι Tisch. 8 has στήσθης, only on the authority of A* B and some min. — πεπληρωμένοι] A B C D* F G min. have πεπληρωμένου. Recommended by Griesb., received by Lachm. and Tisch., and justly; the familiar πεπληρωμή, crept in involuntarily, or by way of gloss. — Ver. 13. ζηλοῦ πολῶν] Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. Reiche read πολέων πόσων, following A B C D** Κ 80, Copt., while D* F G have πολέων πόσων, and Vulg. It.: multum laborem. Accordingly the Recepta is at any rate to be rejected, and πολέω πόσων to be preferred as having decisive attestation; πόσων was glossed partly by πόσων, partly by ζηλοῦ (πόσων and ἄγων are also found in codd.). Neither ζηλοῦ nor πόσων would have given occasion for a gloss; and in the N. T. πόσως only further occurs in the Apocalypse. — Ver. 15. αὐτῶν] A C P Ν min. have αὐτῶν; B: αὐτῆς. The latter is the reading of Lachm., who with B** instead of Νυμφᾶν accents Νυμφᾶ. The αὐτῶν, which is received by Tisch. 8, is to be held as original; the plural not being understood was corrected, according as the name Νυμφᾶ was reckoned masculine or feminine, into αὐτῶν or αὐτῆς.

Ver. 1. Τῷ ισότητα] not: equity, for the word signifies aequalitas, not aequitas, i.e. éπεικεία (in opposition to Steiger,

1 Κ* has γνώρι τι τα περὶ ήμων; Κ** deletes the τι, and is thus a witness for the Recepta.
Huther, de Wette, Ewald, Bleek, and most expositors), but: equality (2 Cor. viii. 13 f.; very often in Plato, Polyb. ii. 38. 8, vi. 8. 4; Lucian, Herm. 22, Zeno. 5, also the passages from Philo in Wetstein, and the LXX. Job xxxvi. 29; Zech. iv. 7), so that ye, namely, regard and treat the slaves as your equals. What is herein required, therefore, is not a quality of the master, and in particular not the freedom from moral unevenness, which is equivalent to δικαιοσύνη (Hofmann), but a quality of the relation, which is to be conceded; it is not at all, however, the equalization of the outward relation, which would be a de facto abolition of slavery, but rather the equality, which, amidst a continued subsistence of all the outward diversity, is brought about in the Christian community by kindly treatment. While τὸ δίκαιον (what is right) expresses that which, according to the Christian consciousness of right, belongs as matter of right to the slave, ἴσος ἴσος requires the concession of the parity (égalité) implied in the Christian δικαιοσύνη. Paul has in view (in opposition to Hofmann) merely Christian slaves (whom he has exhorted in iii. 22 f.) otherwise, in fact, the conception of ἴσος would be not at all appropriate. It is just by the Christian status of both parties that he desires to see their inequality in other respects ethically counterbalanced. A commentary on τὴν ἴσον ἴσοις is supplied by Philem. 16. At variance with the context, Erasmus, Melanchthon, Vatablus, Cornelius a Lapide, Böhmer, and others understand the equality of impartial treatment, according to which the master does not prefer one slave to another. This would not in fact yield any definite moral character of the treatment in itself, nor would it suit all the

1 This conception, coincident with δικαιοσύνη, does not pertain to ἴσος at all; and just as little to ἴσος in Soph. Phil. 635, where ἴσος is γένος ἴσοι is nothing else than par inter partes, namely, to his friends a friend, to his foes a foe. Comp. Schneidewin in loc. At many other passages ἴσος denotes the equality of right, that which is impartial, and is hence often combined with ἴσος (righteousness in the narrower sense). But ἴσος is always (even in Polyb. ii. 33. 8) equality; see e.g. Plato, Rep. 658 C, where it is said of the democracy: ἴσον ἴσον ἴσον ἴσος ἴσος τὸ καθός ἴσος διαφέρεται, that is, it distributes uniformly to equal and unequal a certain equality. In such passages the conception of égalité comes into view with special clearness. Hofmann has explained our passage as if ἴσος and ἴσος, or ἴσος (levelness), were identical conceptions.
cases where there is only one slave. As to the middle παρευξέσθε (Tit. ii. 7; Acts xix. 24), observe that it is based simply on the conception of the 'self-activity of the subject; Kühner, II. 1, p. 97. — ἐιδότες] consciousness, that serves as a motive, as in iii. 24. — καὶ ὃμεῖς κ.τ.λ.] Theophylact says correctly: ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνοι ὑμᾶς, σὺνάκαὶ ὃμεῖς ἔχετε κύριον, and that in heaven, namely Christ.

Vv. 2–6. After having already concluded the general exhortations at iii. 17, Paul now subjoins some by way of supplement, and that in aphoristic epistolary fashion, concerning prayer along with intercession for himself (vv. 2–4), and demeanour towards non-Christians (vv. 5, 6). How special was the importance of both under the circumstances then existing!

Ver. 2. To prayer apply yourselves perseveringly; comp. Rom. xii. 12; Eph. vi. 18; Acts i. 14; also 1 Thess. v. 17: διαλείπτωσιν προσεύχεσθε, which is substantially the same thing. Comp. Luke xviii. 1. — γρηγορ. ἐν αἰρή] modal definition of the προσκαρπείν: so that ye are watchful (that is, alacres, mentally attentive and alert, not weary and distracted, comp. 1 Thess. v. 6; Eph. vi. 18; 1 Pet. iv. 7, v. 7 f.; Matt. xxvi. 41) in the same. ἐν, not to be taken as instrumental, is meant of the business, in the execution of which they are to be vigilant, since it is prayer in itself, as an expression of the spiritual life, and not as an aid to moral activity, that is spoken of. Hence we must not interpret it, with Hofmann, as indicating how Christian watchfulness ought to be (namely, a watching in prayer), but rather how one ought to be in praying (namely, watchful therein). The point of the precept is the praying; and hence it is continued by προσεύχομενοι. — ἐν εὐχαρ.] accompanying attitude, belonging to γρηγ. ἐν αἰρή; with thanksgiving, amidst thanksgiving, namely, for the benefits already received. Comp. i. 12, ii. 7, iii. 17; Phil. iv. 6; 1 Thess. v. 17. This is the essential element of the piety of prayer: 

1 But Olahusen incorrectly says: "the prayer of the Christian at all times, in the consciousness of the grace which he has experienced, can only be a prayer of thanksgiving." He holds the more general προσεύχατο to be more precisely
THE EPISODE OF PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS.

Ver. 3. Comp. Eph. vi. 19 f. — ἡμα καὶ περὶ ἦμ.] while your prayer takes place at the same time also (not merely for yourselves, for others, and about whatever other affairs, but at the same time also) for us, includes us also. This ἦμων, not to be referred to Paul alone, like the singular δέδειμα subsequently and ver. 4, applies to him and Timothy, i. 1. — ἡμα] contents of the prayer expressed as its purpose, as in i. 9 and frequently. — θύραν τ. λόγου] is not equivalent to στόμα (Beza, Calvin, Zanchius, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Bengel, and others, comp. Storr and Böhmer)—a singular appellation which Eph. vi. 7 does not warrant us to assume—but is rather a figurative way of indicating the thought: unhindered operation in the preaching of the gospel. So long as this does not exist, there is not opened to the preachers a door for the word, through which they may let it go forth. Comp. i Cor. xvi. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 12; Dion. Hal. de vi Dem. p. 1026. 14: οὐδὲ θύρας ἱδὼν λόγος, also Pind. Ol. vi. 44; πτολ. ἦμων ἀναπτύναμεν, Bacchyl. fr. xiv. 2. The παρθένος of the preaching (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact), however, lies not in the θύρα and its opening, but in what follows. Hofmann incorrectly holds that the closed door is conceived as being on the side of those, to whom the preachers wished to preach the word, so that it could not enter in. This conception is decidedly at variance with the immediately following λαλήσαι κ.τ.λ., according to which the hindrance portrayed (the door to be opened) exists on the side of the preachers. Moreover, in this ἡμα ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ. the wish of the apostle, as regards his own person, is certainly directed to liberation from his captivity (comp. Philem. 22), not, however, to this in itself, but to the free working which depended on it. It was not the preaching in the prison which Paul meant, for that he had; but he defined by ἦμων. Against this view the very ver. 3 is decisive, where, in fact, Paul does not mean a prayer of thanks.
longed after the opening of a θύρα τοῦ λόγου; God was to give it to him. Perhaps the thought of liberation suggested to himself the choice of the expression. Nor is the plural ἰμῶν and ἰμῶν, embracing others with himself, at variance with this view (as Hofmann holds); for by the captivity of the apostle his faithful friend and fellow-labourer Timothy, who was with him, was, as a matter of course, also hindered in the freedom of working, to which he might otherwise have devoted himself. This was involved in the nature of their personal and official fellowship. Observe how it is only with δέεμα that Paul makes, and must make, a transition to the singular. This transition by no means betrays (in opposition to Hitzig and Holtzmann) the words δι' ὑπὸ καὶ δέεμα, ἵνα φαν. αὐτῷ to be an interpolation from Eph. vi. 20. The fact, that Paul elsewhere (Rom. vii. 2; 1 Cor. vii. 27, 39) has δέεω in the figurative sense, cannot matter; comp., on the contrary, the δεσμός and δέσμιος which he so often uses.—λαλήσαι κ.τ.λ.] infinitive of the aim: in order to speak the mystery of Christ. The emphasis is on λαλήσαι: not to suppress it, but to let it be proclaimed. Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 6; 2 Cor. iv. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 2.—τοῦ Χριστοῦ] genitive of the subject, the divine mystery contained in the appearance and redemptive act of Christ (comp. Eph. iii. 4), in so far, namely, as the divine counsel of redemption, concealed previously to its being made known by the gospel, was accomplished in Christ's mission and work (i. 26, ii. 2; Eph. i. 9; Rom. xvi. 25). Thus the μυστήριον of God in ii. 2 is, because Christ was the bearer and accomplisher of it, the μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ.—δι' ὑπὸ καὶ δέεμα] δι' ὑπὸ applies to the μυστήρ. ; and the whole clause serves to justify the intercession desired. When, namely, Paul wishes λαλήσαι τὸ μυστήρ. τ. Χ., he therewith desires that, which is in such sense his entire destination, that on account of this mystery—because, namely, he has made it known—he also bears his fetters. This καὶ is consequently the also of the corresponding relation, quite common with relatives (Baemlein, Partik. p. 152).

Ver. 4. Ἰνα κ.τ.λ.] cannot, seeing that the preceding Ἰνα ὁ Θεὸς ἀνοίξῃ κ.τ.λ. means the free preaching outside of the COL.
prison, be dependent either on δόξα (Bengel, Hofmann, comp. Theodor) or on τροπευτήματα, so that it would run parallel with τὰς in ver 3 (Beza, Bahr, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Dalmer, and others); it is the aim of the λαλήσει τῷ μνημ. τ. χ.: in order that I may make it manifest (by preaching) as I must speak it. Comp. also Bleek, who, however, less simply attaches it already to τὰς ὑπὸ θεοῦ ἀναίρεσε κ.τ.λ. The significant weight of this clause expressing the aim lies in the specification of mode ὡς δεῖ με λαλήσας, in which δεῖ has the emphasis. To give forth his preaching in such measure, as it was the necessity of his apostolic destiny to do (δεῖ)—so frankly and without reserve, so free from hindrance, so far and wide from land to land, with such liberty to form churches and to combat erroneous teachings, and so forth—Paul was unable, so long as he was in captivity, even when others were allowed access to him. There is a tragic trait in this ὡς δεῖ με λαλήσας, the feeling of the hindered present. The traditional explanation is that of Chrysostom: μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς παρήγορίας καὶ μορφῶν ὑποστύλαμεν, namely, in captivity, where Paul longed to speak in the right way (de Wette; so usually), or conformably to higher necessity (Bahr, Huther, comp. Beza, 1 Cor. ix. 16), or without allowing himself to be disturbed in his preaching as apostle to the Gentiles by his imprisonment occasioned by Jewish-Christian hostility (Hofmann). But in opposition to the reference of the whole intercession to the ministry in prison, see on ver. 3. The wish and the hope of working once more in freedom were so necessarily bound up in Paul with the consciousness of his comprehensive apostolic task, that we can least of all suppose him to have given it up already in Caesarea, where he appealed to the emperor. Even in the Epistle to the Philippians (i. 25, ii. 24), his expectation is still in fact directed to renewed freedom of working.

Ver. 5 f. Another exhortation, for which Paul must still have had occasion, although we need not seek its link of connection with the preceding one. Comp. Eph. v. 15 f., where the injunction here given in reference to the non-Christians is couched in a general form. — ἐν σοφίᾳ] Practical
Christian wisdom (not mere prudence; Chrysostom aptly quotes Matt. x. 16) is to be the element, in which their walk amidst their intercourse with the non-Christians moves. πρός of the social direction, Bernhardy, p. 205. As to αἰὲν ἤχω, see on 1 Cor. v. 12. Comp. 1 Thess. iv. 12. — τοὺς καυρὸν ἢ κατηρορ.] definition of the mode in which that injunction is to be carried out: so that ye make the right point of time your own (see on Eph. v. 16), allow it not to pass unemployed. For what? is to be inferred solely from the context; namely, for all the activities in which that same wise demeanour in intercourse with the non-Christians finds expression—which, consequently, may be according to the circumstances very diversified. Individual limitations of the reference are gratuitously introduced, such as "ad ejusmodi homines meliora docendos," Heinrichs, comp. Erasmus, Beza, Calovius, and others, including Flatt and Böhmer; or: "in reference to the furtherance of the kingdom of God," Huther, Hofmann. There is likewise gratuitously imported the idea of the shortness of time, on account of which it is to be well applied (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Castalio, and others, including Bähr), as also the view that the καυρός, which signifies the αἰὲν ὅρος, is not the property of the Christian, but belongs τοὺς ἤχω, and is to be made by Christians their own through good deeds (Theodore, comp. Oecumenius), or by peaceful demeanour towards the non-Christians (Theophylact). Lastly, there is also imported the idea of an evil time from Eph. v. 16, in connection with which expositors have in turn lighted on very different definitions of the meaning; e.g. Calvin: "in tanta saeculi corruptela eripiendam esse benefaciendi occasionem et cum obstaculia luctandum;" Grotius: "effugientes pericula." — Ver. 6. ὅ λαβ. ὑμ.] what ye speak, namely, πρὸς τοὺς ἤχω; the more groundless, therefore, is the position of Holtzmann, that ver. 6 is a supplement inserted at a later place, when it should have properly come in at chap. iii. between vv. 8 and 9. ἐστοι is to be supplied, as is evident from the preceding imperative περιτέωτε. — ἐν χάρων] denotes that with which their speech is to be furnished, with grace, pleasantness. Comp. on Luke iv. 22; Eccles. xxvi. 16, xxxvii. 21; Hom. Od. viii. 175; Dem. 51. 9. This
χαριτωτὸς εἶναι of speaking (comp. Plato, Prot. p. 344 B, Rep. p. 331 A) is very different from the χαριτογλωσσεῖν of Aesch. Prom. 294. — ἔλατι ἵρτυµ.] seasoned with salt, a figurative representation of speech as an article of food, which is communicated. The salt is emblem of wisdom, as is placed beyond doubt by the context in ver. 5, and is in keeping with the sense of the following εἰδεῖνα κ.τ.λ. (comp. Matt. v. 13; Mark ix. 49, 50). As an article of food seasoned with salt is thereby rendered palatable, so what is spoken receives through wisdom (in contents and form) its morally attracting, exciting, and stimulating quality. Its opposite is the stale, ethically insipid (not the morally rotten and corrupt, as Beza, Böhmer, and others hold) quality of speech, the μῶρον, μεσολογεῖν, in which the moral stimulus is wanting. The designation of νότι by ἄλς (ἄλες) among the later Greeks (Plut. Moral. p. 685 A; Athen. ix. p. 366 C) is derived from the pungent power of salt, and is not relevant here. Moreover, the relation between the two requirements, ἐν χάριτι and ἔλατι ἵρτυµεν, is not to be distinguished in such a way that the former shall mean the good and the latter the correct impression (so, arbitrarily, Hofmann); but the former depicts the character of the speech more generally, and the latter more specially. The good and correct impression is yielded by both. — εἰδεῖνα κ.τ.λ.] taken groundlessly by Hofmann in an imperative sense (see on Rom. xii. 15; Phil. iii. 16), is, as if ὡς stood alongside of it, the epexegetical infinitive for more precise definition: so that ye know; see Matthiae, § 532 f., p. 1235 f.; Winer, p. 296 [E. T. 398]. This εἰδεῖναι (to understand how, see on Phil. iv. 12) is, in fact, just an ability, which would not be found in the absence of the previously-described quality of speech, but is actually existent through the same. — πῶς] which may be in very different ways, according to the varieties of individuality in the questioners. Hance: ἐνι ἐκάστῳ, “nam haec pars est non ultima prudentiae, singulorum habere respectum,” Calvin. — ἀποκρίνεσθαι] We may conceive reference to be

1 The poets use ἄρνειν often of articles of food or wines, which are prepared in such a way as to provoke the palate. Soph. Fragm. 601, Dind.; Athen. ii. p. 68 A; Theoph. de odor. 51; Symm. Cant. viii. 2. Hence ἄρνημα, spice.
made to questions as to points of faith and doctrine, as to moral principles, topics of constitution and organization, historical matters, and so forth, which, in the intercourse of Christians with non-Christians, might be put, sometimes innocently, sometimes maliciously (comp. 1 Pet. iii. 1), to the former, and required answer. Paul does not use the word elsewhere. Comp. as to the thing itself, his own example at Athens, Acts xvii.; before Felix and Festus; before the Jews in Rome, Acts xxviii. 20, and so forth; and also his testimony to his own procedure, 1 Cor. ix. 20–22. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Calvisius, and others, inappropriately mix up believers as included in ἐν ἔκαστῳ, in opposition to ver. 5.

Vv. 7–9. Sending of Tychicus, and also of Onesimus. Comp. on Eph. vi. 21 f. — By ἀδελφ. Paul expresses the relation of Tychicus as a Christian brother generally; by διάκονος, his special relation as the apostle's official servant, in which very capacity he employs him for such missions; and by σύνδεσμος (i. 7) he delicately, as a mark of honour, places him as to official category on a footing of equality with himself; while ἐν κυρίῳ, belonging to the two latter predicates, marks the specific definite character, according to which nothing else than simply Christ—His person, word, and work—is the sphere in which these relations of service are active. Comp. Eph. vi. 21. — εἰς αὐτὸ τὸντο [for this very object, having a retrospective reference as in Rom. xiii. 6, 2 Cor. v. 5 (in opposition to Hofmann), in order, namely, that ye may learn from him all that concerns me. The following ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ πρὸς ὑμῶν (see the critical remarks) is explicative; πάντα ὑμ. γνωρ. τὰ δῦνε in ver. 9 then corresponds to both. Comp. on Eph. vi. 22. — παρακαλ.] may comfort, in your anxiety concerning me, respecting my position. With the reading γνῷ τὰ πρὸς ὑμῶν, the reference would be to the sufferings of the readers; δείκνυτο καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν πειρασμοῖς δύνατα καὶ παρακλίσεως χρήζωντας, Theophylact, comp. Chrysostom.— σὺν Ὀνέμωρι [belonging to ἐπεμψα. As to this slave of Philemon, see

1 ἔκαστος and τὸς τὸς are also connected by the common attribute τὸς, and separated from ἀδελφ., which has its special adjective. Chrysostom, moreover, aptly remarks on the different predicates: τὸ ἐξίσοντος στάγησιν. 
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Introd. to the Epistle to Philemon. Paul commends him as his faithful (μισθός, as in ver. 7, not: having become a believer, as Bahr would render it) and beloved brother, and designates him then as Colossian, not in order to do honour to their city (Chrysostom, Theophylact), but in order to bespeak their special sympathy for Onesimus, the particulars as to whom, especially as regards his conversion, he leaves to be communicated orally. — ἐγὼ ὑμῶν] As a Colossian he was from among them, that is, one belonging to their church. Comp. ver. 12. — τὰ διὸ] the state of matters here, to which τὰ κατ᾽ ἐμέ, ver. 7, especially belonged.

Ver. 10. Sending of salutations down to ver. 14. — Ἀπλα-ταργος] a Thessalian, known from Acts xix. 29, xx. 4, xxvii. 2, Phil. 24, was with Paul at Caesarea, when the latter had appealed to the emperor, and travelled with him to Rome, Acts xxvii. 2. — ὁ συναυξαμέλωτος μου] Οἶδαν τοῖς τοῦ ἐγκυμονοῦ μείζων, Chrysostom. In the contemporary letter to Philemon at ver. 24, the same Aristarchus is enumerated among the συναργοῖ; and, on the other hand, at ver. 23 Epaphras, of whose sharing the captivity our Epistle makes no mention (see i. 7), is designated as συναυξαμέλωτος, so that in Phil. i.c. the συναυξαμέλωτος is expressly distinguished from the mere συναργοῖ, and the former is not affirmed of Aristarchus. Hence various interpreters have taken it to refer not to a proper, enforced sharing of the captivity, but to a voluntary one, it being assumed, namely, that friends of the apostle allowed themselves to be temporarily shut up with him in prison, in order to be with him and to minister to him not merely as visitors, but continuously day and night. Comp. Huther, de Wette, and Fritzsch, ad Rom. l. p. xxi. According to this view, such friends changed places from time to time, so that, when the apostle wrote our letter, Aristarchus, and when he wrote that to Philemon, Epaphras, shared his captivity. But such a relation could the less be gathered by the readers from the mere συναυξαμέλωτος (comp. Lucian,

1 And how wisely and kindly, after what had happened with Onesimus! Yet Holtzmann holds that of the whole verse only the name Onesimus is characteristic, and reckons the verse to owe its existence to that name.
As. 27), seeing that Paul himself was a prisoner, and consequently they could not but find in σωκρεμάλ. simply the entirely similar position of Aristarchus as a σωκρεμάτης (Plat. Rep. p. 516 C; Thuc. vi. 60. 2), and that as being so at the same time, not, as in Rom. xvi. 7, at some earlier period. Hence we must assume that now Aristarchus, but when the Epistle to Philemon was written, Epaphras, lay in prison at the same time with the apostle,—an imprisonment which is to be regarded as detention for trial, and the change of persons in the case must have had its explanation in circumstances to us unknown but yet, notwithstanding the proximity of the two letters in point of time, sufficiently conceivable. It is to be observed, moreover, that as αἱμαλ. always denotes captivity in war (see on Eph. iv. 8; also Luke iv. 18), Paul by σωκρεμαλ. sets himself forth as a captive warrior (in the service of Christ). Comp. σοφοταξιώτης, Phil. ii. 25; Philem. 2. Hofmann (comp. also on Rom. xvi. 7) is of opinion that we should think "of the war-captive state of one won by Christ from the kingdom of darkness," so that σωκρεμαλατος would be an appellation for fellow-Christian; but this is an aberration, which ought least of all to have been put forth in the presence of a letter, which Paul wrote in the very character of a prisoner. — Upon ἀνεψιος, consobrinus, cousin: Herod. vii. 5. 82, ix. 10; Plat. Legg. xi. p. 925 A; Xen. Anab. viii. 8. 9, Tob. vii. 22, Num. xxxvi. 11; see Andoc. i. 47; Pollux, iii. 28. Not to be confounded either with ἄνεψω (ἀελπυ-δος) or with ἀνεψιαδυς, cousin's son, in the classical writers, ἀνεψιαν παῖς. See generally, Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 506. To take it in a wider sense, like our "kinsman, relative" (so in Hom. Η. ix. 464, who, however, also uses it in the strict sense as in x. 519), there is the less reason, seeing that Paul does not use the word elsewhere. Moreover, as no other Mark at all occurs in the N. T., there is no sufficient ground for the supposition of Hofmann, that Paul had by δ. ἀνεψια. Bapr. merely wished to signify which Mark he meant. Chrysostom and Theophylact already rightly perceived that the relationship with the highly-esteemed Barnabas was designed to redound to the commendation of Mark. — ἤπλον ὑπὸ ἔλαβ. ἔντολα.
in respect of whom (Mark) ye have received injunctions—a remark which seems to be made not without a design of reminding them as to their execution. What injunctions are meant, by whom and through whom they were given, and whether orally or in writing, Paul does not say; but the recalling of them makes it probable that they proceeded from himself, and were given ἀγράφως διὰ τινος (Oecumenius). Ewald conjectures that they were given in the letter to the Laodiceans, and related to love-offerings for Jerusalem, which Mark was finally to fetch and attend to. But the work of collection was probably closed with the last journey of the apostle to Jerusalem. Others hold, contrary to the notion of εντολή, that letters of recommendation are meant from Barnabas (Grotius), or from the Roman church (Estius); while others think that the following ἐὰν ἔλθῃ κ.τ.λ. forms the contents of εντολάς (Calvin—who, with Syriac, Ambrosiaster, and some codd., reads subsequently δέξασθαι,—comp. Beza, Castalio, Bengel, Bähr, and Baumgarten-Crusius),—a view against which may be urged the plural εντολάς and the absence of the article. Hofmann incorrectly maintains that πρὶς ὃς ἔλαβ. εντολάς is to be taken along with ἐὰν ἔλθῃ π. ἵμ.: respecting whom ye have obtained instructions for the case of his coming to you. This the words could not mean; for ἐὰν ἔλθῃ π. ἵμ. signifies nothing else than: if he shall have come to you, and this accords not with ἔλαβ. εντολ., but only with δέξασθε αὐτόν, which Hofmann makes an exclamation annexed with—

1 ὁ Πιπ. ὃς is not to be referred to Barnabas, as, following Theophylact and Cajetanus (the former of whom, however, explains as if ἡμ. ὃς were read), Otto, Pastoralor. p. 259 ff., has again done. The latter understands under the εντολάς instructions formerly issued to the Pauline churches not to receive Barnabas, which were now no longer to be applied. As if the προευθυποτίς of Acts xvi. 39 could have induced the apostle to issue such an anathema to his churches against the highly-esteemed Barnabas, who was accounted of apostolic dignity! Paul did not act so unjustly and imprudently. Comp., on the contrary, Gal. ii. 9 and (notwithstanding what is narrated at Gal. ii. 11) 1 Cor. ix. 6.

2 In 1 Tim. iii. 14 f., a passage to which Hofmann, with very little ground, appeals, the verb of the chief clause is, in fact, a present (γράφων), not, as would be the case here, a praeterite, which expresses an act of the past (λαβέντι). There the meaning is : In the case of my departure being delayed, however, this my letter has the object, etc. But here, if the conditional clause were to be annexed to the past act λαβέντι, the circumstance conditioning the latter would logically
out connecting link (that is, with singular abruptness) — ἓν ἔλθη κ.τ.λ.] Parenthesis; Mark must therefore have had in view a journey, which was to bring him to Colossae. δέχεσθαι of hospitable reception, as often in the N. T. (Matt. x. 14; John iv. 45) and in classical authors (Xen. Anab. iv. 8. 23). From the circumstance, however, that δέχασθε stands without special modal definition, it is not to be inferred that Paul was apprehensive lest the readers should not, without this summons, have recognised Mark (on account of Acts xv. 38 f.) as an apostolic associate (Wieseler, Chronol. des apost. Zeitalt. p. 567). Not the simple δέχασθε, but a more precise definition, would have been called for in the event of such an apprehension.

Ver. 11. Of this Jesus nothing further is known. — oἱ ὄντες ἐκ περὶτ. is to be attached, with Lachmann (comp. also Steiger, Huther, Bleek), to what follows, so that a full stop is not to be inserted (as is usually done) after περὶτ. Otherwise oἱ ὄντες ἐκ περὶτ. would be purposeless, and the following οὗτοι μόνοι κ.τ.λ. too general to be true, and in fact at variance with the subsequent mention of Epaphras and Luke (vv. 12–14). It is accordingly to be explained: Of those, who are from the circumcision, these alone (simply these three, and no others) are such fellow-labourers for the kingdom of the Messiah, as have become a comfort to me. The Jewish-Christian teachers, consequently, worked even at Caesarea to a great extent in an anti-Pauline sense. Comp. the complaint from Rome, Phil. i. 15, 17. The nominative oἱ ὄντες ἐκ περὶτ. puts the generic subject at the head; but as something is to be affirmed not of the genus, but of a special part of it, that general subject remains without being followed out, and by means of the μετάβασις εἷς μέρος the special subject is introduced with οὗτοι, so that the verb (here the εἴπῃ to be supplied) now attaches itself to the latter. A phenomenon of partitive apposition, which is current also in classical authors. See Kühner, II. 1, p. 246; Nägelsbach and Faesi on Hom. Η. iii.

have to be conceived and expressed in oblique form (from the point of view of the person giving the injunction), in some such form, therefore, as: εἶ πάντων ἐπὶ ὑμᾶς (comp. Acts xxiv. 19, xxvii. 39; Klotz, ad Devar. p. 491 f.).
211. Comp. Matthiae, p. 1307. Hence there is the less reason for breaking up the passage, which runs on simply, after the fashion adopted by Hofmann, who treats εκ περιτομής οὗτος μόνος as inserted parenthetically between οἱ δυστέρες and συνεργολ. The complimentary affirmation is to be referred to all the three previously named, without arbitrary exclusion of Aristarchus (in opposition to Hofmann). At any rate, Caesarea was a city so important for the Christian mission, that many teachers, Jewish-Christian and Gentile-Christian, must have frequented it, especially while Paul was a prisoner there; and consequently the notice in the passage before us need not point us to Rome as the place of writing. — παρηγορία consolation, comfort, only here in the N. T.; more frequently in Plutarch; see Kyrke. Μέγατον ἄγαμον τὸ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ γενέσθαι θυμηδίας πρὸς εὐνοοῦν, Theodoret. Bengel imposes an arbitrary limitation: "in forensi periculo."

Ver. 12. Ἐπαφρᾶς] See i. 7 and Introd. — It is to be observed that, according to ver. 11, Epaphras, Luke, and Demas (ver. 14) were no Jewish-Christians, whereas Tiele in the Stud. u. Krit. 1858, p. 765, holding Luke to be by birth a Jew, has recourse to forced expedients, and wishes arbitrarily to read between the lines. Hofmann, refining groundlessly (see on ver. 14), but with a view to favour his presupposition that all the N. T. writings were of Israelite origin,¹ thinks that our passage contributes nothing towards the solution of the question as to Luke's descent; comp. on Luke, Introd. § 1. — ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν] as in ver. 9, exciting the affectionate special interest of the readers; ἑπέρ ὑμῶν afterwards thoughtfully corresponds. — δοῦλος Χ. is to be taken together with πάντοτε ἀγαθοὶ, but ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν is not to be connected with δοῦλος (Hofmann); on the contrary, it is to be taken by itself as a special element of recommendation (as in ver. 9): Epaphras, your own, a servant of Christ who is always striving, etc.—ἀγαθοὶ] Comp. Rom. xv. 30. The more fervent the prayer for any one is, the more is it a striving for him, namely, in opposition to the dangers which threaten him, and which are present to the vivid conception

¹ This postulate, wholly without proof, is also assumed by Grau, Entwicklungsgeesch. d. neuest. Schrifth. I. p. 56.
of him who wrestles in prayer. Comp. also ii. 1. The striving of Epaphras in prayer certainly had reference not merely to the heretical temptations to which the Colossians, of whose church he was a member, were exposed, but—as is evident from ἵνα στήτευ κ.τ.λ. (purpose of the διὸ γινεῖ κ.τ.λ.)—to everything generally, which endangered the right Christian frame in them. — στήτευ] designation of steadfast perseverance; in which there is neither wavering, nor falling, nor giving way. To this belongs ἐν πνεύμα θελήμα τ. Θ., expressing wherein (comp. 1 Pet. v. 12) they are to maintain steadfastness; in every will of God, that is, in all that God wills. Comp. on στήναι ἐν in this sense, John viii. 44.; Rom. v. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 1, xvi. 13. This connection (comp. Bengel and Bleek) recommends itself on account of its frequent occurrence, and because it completes and rounds off the whole expression; for στήτευ now has not merely a modal definition, τελ. κ. πεπεληρ., but also a local definition, which admirably corresponds to the figurative conception of standing. This applies, at the same time, in opposition to the usual mode of construction with τελ. κ. πεπεληρ., followed also by Hofmann, according to which ἐν π. θελ. τ. Θ. would be the moral sphere, “within which the perfection and firm conviction are to take place,” Huther.¹— τέλειας καὶ πεπεληροφορημέναι] perfect and with full conviction (comp. ii. 2; Rom. iv. 21, xiv. 5; and see on Luke i. 1) obtain through the context (στήτευ ἐν π. θελ. τ. Θ.) their more definite meaning; the former as moral perfection, such as the true Christian ought to have (i. 28); and the latter, as steadfastness of conscience, which excludes all scruples as to what God’s will requires, and is of decisive importance for the τελειωτής of the Christian life; comp. Rom. xiv. 5, 22 f.

¹ If we follow the Recepta πεπεληρωμένον (see the critical remarks), on the other hand, we must join, as is usually done, following Chrysostom and Luther, τελ. τ. Θεοῦ τ. πνεύμα. : filled with every will of God, which, instead of being transformed into “voluntatis divinæ veræ et integrae cognitio” (Reiche, comp. Beza), is rather to be understood as denoting that the heart is to be full of all that God wills, and that in no matter, consequently, is any other will than the divine to rule in the believer. Respecting is, comp. on Eph. v. 18. Bähr incorrectly renders: “by virtue of the whole counsel of God,” which is not possible on account of the very absence of the article in the case of πνεύμα. Grotius, Heinrichs, Platt, and others, erroneously hold that is is equivalent to si.
Ver. 13. General testimony in confirmation of the particular statement made regarding Epaphras in πάντοτε κ.τ.λ.; on which account there is the less reason to ascribe to the interpolator the more precise definition of ὁγγυξ. ἐπ. ἠμ., which is given by ἐν ταῖς προσευχ. (Holtzmann). The γάρ is sufficiently clear and logical. — πολίν πάνω (see the critical remarks); much toil, which is to be understood of the exertion of mental activity—of earnest working with its cares, hopes, wishes, fears, temptations, dangers, and so forth. The word is purposely chosen, in keeping with the conception of the conflict (ver. 12); for πάνω is formally used of the toil and trouble of conflict. See Herod. vi. 114, viii. 89; Plat. Phaedr. p. 247 B; Dem. 637. 18; Eur. Suppl. 317; Soph. Trach. 21. 169; often so in Homer as Η. i. 467, and Nägelsbach in loc.; comp. Rev. xxi. 4. — καὶ τῶν ἐν Δαοδ. κ. τ. ἐν Ἰεραπ. Epaphras had certainly laboured in these adjoining towns, as in Colossae, which was probably his headquarters, as founder, or, at least, as an eminent teacher of the churches.

Ver. 14. Luke the physician, the (by me) beloved, is the Evangelist—a point which, in presence of the tradition current from Iren. iii. 14. 1 onward, is as little to be doubted as that the Mark of ver. 10 is the Evangelist. Luke was with Paul at Cæsarea (Philem. 24), and travelled with him to Rome (Acts xxvii. 1), accompanying him, however, not as physician (as if μοῦ or ἡμῶν had been appended), but as an associate in teaching, as συνεργός, Philem. 24. Hofmann calls this in question, in order to avoid the inference from ver. 11, that Luke was a non-Israelite. The addition, moreover, of ὁ ἰατρός is simply to be explained after the analogy of all the previous salutations sent, by assuming that Paul has appended to each of the persons named a special characteristic description by way of recommendation.1 The case of Αὐτάρκης is the only exception; on which account it is the more probable that the latter had

1 In the case of Luke, the attachment of the honourable professional designation ἰατρός to the name suggested itself so naturally and spontaneously—considering the peculiarity of his professional position, to which there was probably nothing similar in the case of any other ἰατρός—that there is no reason to assume any special purpose in the selection (Chrysostom, Erasmus, and many, suggest that the object was to distinguish Luke from others of the same name).
even at this time (at the date of 2 Tim. iv. 10 he has abandoned him) seemed to the apostle not quite surely entitled to a commendatory description, although he still, at Philem. 24, adduces him among his συνεργός, to whose number he still belonged. Hence the assumption of such a probability is not strange, but is to be preferred to the altogether precarious opinion of Hofmann, that Demas was the amanuensis of the letter, and had, with the permission of the apostle, inserted his name (comp. Bengel’s suggestion). Whence was the reader to know that? How very different is it at Rom. xvi. 22! The name itself is not Hebrew (in opposition to Schoettgen), but Greek; see Boeckh, Corp. inscrip. 1085; Becker, Anecd. 714.

Ver. 15. Messages down to ver. 17.—The first καὶ is: and especially, and in particular, so that of the Christians at Laodicea (τοὺς ἐν Λαοδ. ἀδελφ.). Nymphas is specially¹ singled out for salutation by name. In the following καὶ τὴν κατ’ οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλ., the church which is in their house, the plural αὐτῶν (see the critical remarks) cannot without violence receive any other reference than to τοὺς ἐν Λαοδ. ἀδελφοῖς κ. Νυμφᾶν. Paul must therefore (and his readers were more precisely aware how this matter stood) indicate a church different from the Laodicean church, a foreign one, which, however, was in filial association with that church, and held its meetings in the same house wherein the Laodiceans assembled. If we adopt the reading αὐτοῦ, we should have to think, not of the family of Nymphas (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Calvin, and others), but, in accordance with Rom. xvi. 5, 1 Cor. xvi. 19, Philem. 2, of a portion of the Laodicean church, which held its separate meetings in the house of Nymphas. In that case, however, the persons here saluted would have been already included among τοὺς ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ ἀδελφοῖς. The plural αὐτῶν by no means warrants the ascribing the origin of ver. 15 to an unseasonable reminiscence of 1 Cor. xvi. 19 and Rom. xvi. 5, perhaps also of Philem. 2 (Holtzmann). What a mechanical procedure

¹ Nymphas appears to have been specially well known to the apostle, and on friendly terms with him; perhaps a συνεργός, who was now for a season labouring in the church at Laodicea.
would that be!—The *personal name* Nymphas itself, which some with extreme arbitrariness would take as a symbolic name (Hitzig, comp. Holtzmann), is not elsewhere preserved, but we find *Nymphaeus, Nymphodorus, Nymphodotus, and Nymphius*, also *Nymphis*.

Ver. 16. This message presupposes essentially similar circumstances in the two churches.—ι ἐκστασίας is, as a matter of course, the present Epistle now before us; Winer, p. 102 [E. T. 133]. Comp. Rom. xvi. 22; 1 Thess. v. 27—ποιήσατε, τις] procure, that. The expression rests on the conception: to be active, in order that something may happen, John xi. 37. Comp. Herod. i. 8: πολεις, δυκας κ.τ.λ., i. 209; Xen. Cyrop. vi. 3. 18. The following κα τὴν ἐκ Λαοδ. κ.τ.λ. is, with emphatic prefixing of the object, likewise dependent on ποιήσατε, not co-ordinated with the latter as an independent imperative sentence like Eph. v. 33—a forced invention of Hofmann, which, besides, is quite inappropriate on account of the stern command which it would yield. —τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας] not: that written to me from Laodicea. So τις in Chrysostom, who himself gives no decisive voice, as also Syriac, Theodoret, Photius in Oecumenius, Erasmus, Beza, Vatablus, Calvin, Calovius, Wolf, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, Storr, and others, as also again Baumgarten-Crusius. This is at variance with the context, according to which κα τις ἰμένις, pursuant to the parallel of the first clause of the verse, presupposes the Laodiceans, not as the *senders* of the letter, but as the *receivers* of the


2 Hofmann needed, certainly, some such artificial expedient, wholly without warrant in the words of the text, to favour his presupposition that the Epistle to the Ephesians was meant, and that it was a circular letter. For a circular letter goes through the circuit destined for it of itself, and there is no occasion to ask or to send for it in order to procure, that (ποιήσατε, τις) people may get it to read. But the effect of the forced separation of the second τις from ποιήσατε is, that the words τις ἐκ Λαοδικείας are supposed only to affirm that the letter "will come" from Laodicea to Colosse, that it "will reach" them, and they ought to read it. In this way the text must be strained to suit what is a priori put into it. This applies also in opposition to Sabatier, Rap. Paul, p. 201, who entirely ignores the connection with ποιήσατε ("la lettre qui vous viendra de Laod.").
letter, by whom it was _read_. How unsuitable also would be
the form of the message by _ποιήσατε_! Paul must, in fact,
have _sent_ to them the letter. Lastly, neither the object aimed at
(Theophylact already aptly remarks: _διὰ λογίου ὄντα, τί ἄν ἐκεῖνος_
—namely, that alleged letter of the Laodiceans—_ἐδει αὐτοῖς πρὸς βελτίωσιν_), nor even the _propriety_ of the matter would be
manifest. Purely fanciful is the opinion of Jablonsky, that
Paul means a letter of the _Laodiceans to the Colossian overseers_,
as well as that of Theophylact: _ἡ πρὸς Τιμόθεων πρώτη ἀντὶ_
γρὰ ἐκ _Δαυδιελάς ἐγράφη_. So also a scholion in _Matthæi_.
In accordance with the context—although Lange, _Apost._
_Zeitalt._ I. p. 211 ff., denounces the idea as a "fiction," and
Hofmann declares it as excluded by the very salutations with
which the Colossians are charged to the Laodiceans—we can
only understand it to refer to a letter of _Paul to the Laodiceans_,
which not merely these, to whom it was written, but _also the_
_Colossians_ (_καί ὑμεῖς_) were to read, just as the letter to the
Colossians was to be read not merely by the latter, but also in
the Laodicean church. The _mode of expression_, _ἡ πρὸς Δαυδις-
κελάς_, is the very usual form of attraction in the case of pre-
positions with the article (comp. _Matt._ xxiv. 17; _Luke_ xi. 13),
so that the two elements are therein comprehended: the letter
to be found in _Laodicea_, and to be _claimed or fetched from_
_Laodicea to Colossae_. See generally, Kühner, II. 1, p. 473 ff.,
and _ad Xen. Mem._ iii. 6. 11, _ad Anab._ i. 1. 5; Stallbaum, _ad_
_Plut._ _Apol._ p. 32 B; _Winer_, p. 584 [E. T. 784]. This letter
written to the Laodiceans has, like various other letters of the
apostle, been lost.\(^1\) In opposition to the old opinion held by
Marcion, and in modern times still favoured especially by such
as hold the Epistle to the Ephesians to be a circular letter

\(^1\) The apocryphal letter to the Laodiceans, the Greek text of which, we may
mention, originated with Elias Hutter (1599), who translated it from the Latin,
may be seen in _Fabricius, Codex apocr._ p. 873 ff., _Anger_, p. 142 ff. The whole
letter,—highly esteemed, on the suggestion of Gregory I., during the Middle Ages
in the West, although prohibited in the second Council of Nice, 787 (to be found
also in pre-Lutheran German Bibles),—which is doubtless a still later fabrication
than that already rejected in the Canon _Muratorianus_, consists only of twenty
verses, the author of which does not even play the part of a definite situation.
Erasmus rightly characterizes it: "quae nihil habeat Pauli præter voculas
aliquot ex ceteris ejus epistolis mendicatas."
(Böhmer, Böttger, Bähr, Steiger, Anger, Reuss, Lange, Bleek, Dalmer, Sabatier, Hofmann, Hitzig, and others), that the Epistle to the Ephesians is to be understood as that referred to, see Introd. to Eph. § 1; Wieseler, Chronol. d. apost. Zeitalt. p. 435 ff.; Sartori, l.c.; Reiche, Comm. crit. ad Eph. i. 1; Laurent in the Jahrb. f. D. Theol. 1866, p. 131 ff. The hypothesis that the Epistle to Philemon is meant (so Wieseler, also Thiersch, Hist. Standp. p. 424; and some older expositors, see in Calovius and in Anger, p. 35) finds no confirmation either in the nature and contents of this private letter,¹ or in the expressions of our passage, which, according to the analogy of the context, presuppose a letter to the whole church and for it. Even the Epistle to the Hebrews (Schulthess, Stein, in his Comm. z. Luk., appendix) has been fallen upon in the vain search after the lost! According to Holtzmann, the words are intended to refer to the Epistle to the Ephesians, but καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαόδικας ἣν κ. ὑμ. ἀναγιν. is an insertion of the interpolator;² comp. Hitzig.

REMARK.—It is to be assumed that the Epistle to the Laodicceans was composed at the same time with that to the Colossians, inasmuch as the injunction that they should be mutually read in the churches can only have been founded on the similarity of the circumstances of the two churches as they stood at the time. Comp. ii. 1, where the καὶ τῶν ἐκ Λαόδικας, specially added to ἐπὶ ὑμῖν, expresses the similar and simultaneous character of the need, and, when compared with our passage, is to be referred to the consciousness that the apostle was writing

¹ For, although it is in form addressed to several persons, and even to the church in the house (see on Philem. 1, 2), it is at any rate in substance clear, as Jerome already remarks: “Paulum tantummodo ad Philemonem scribere, et unum cum suo sermocinari.” Besides, it is to be inferred from the contents of the Colossian letter, that the Laodiccean letter meant was also doctrinal in contents, and that the reciprocal use of the two letters had reference to this, in accordance with the essentially similar needs of the two neighbouring churches.

² Because, if we annex ἵνα toὑμῖν, an awkward sense arises, “seeing that the Colossians can only cause that they get the letter to read, but not that they read it.” That is a subtlety, which does injustice to the popular style of the letter. But if we take ἵνα independently (as Hofmann does), then Holtzmann is further of opinion that the author of Eph. iv. 29, v. 27, 33, is immediately betrayed—an unfounded inference (comp. Winer, p. 295 [E. T. 396]), in which, besides, only the comparison of Eph. v. 33 would be relevant, and that would be balanced by 2 Cor. viii. 7.
to both churches. And the expression τῷ ἐν Λαόδικιας produces the impression that, when the Colossians received their letter, the Laodiceans would already have theirs. At the same time the expression is such, that Paul does not expressly inform the Colossians that he had written also to the Laodiceans, but speaks of this letter as of something known to the readers, evidently reckoning upon the oral communication of Tychicus. The result, accordingly, seems as follows: Tychicus was the bearer of both letters, and travelled by way of Laodicea to Colossae, so that the letter for that church was already in Laodicea when the Colossians got theirs from the hands of Tychicus, and they were now in a position, according to the directions given in our passage, to have the Laodicean letter forwarded to them, and to send their own (after it was publicly read in their own church) to Laodicea.

Ver. 17. The particular circumstances which lay at the root of this emphatic admonitory utterance¹ cannot be ascertained, nor do we even know whether the διακονία is to be understood in the narrower sense of the office of deacon (Primasius), or of any other office relating to the church (possibly the office of presbyter), or of the calling of an evangelist, or of some individual business relating to the service of the church. We cannot gather from ἐν κυρίῳ any more precise definition of the Christian διακονία. Ewald conjectures that Archippus was a still younger man (Bengel holds him to have been sick or weak through age), an overseer of the church, who had been during the absence of Epaphras too indulgent towards the false teachers. Even Fathers like Jerome and the older expositors regard him as bishop (so also Döllinger, Christenthum u. Kirche, ed. 2, p. 308), or as substitute for the bishop during the absence of Epaphras (similarly Bleek), whose successor he had also become (Cornelius a Lapide and Estius). Comp. further as to this Colossian,² on Philem. 2. — The special motive for this precise

¹ Bengel: "Vos meis verbis dicite tamquam testes. Hoc magis moverat, quam si ipsum Archippum appellaret."

² Theodoret already with reason declares himself against the opinion that Archippus had been a Laodicean teacher (so Theodore of Mopsuestia, Michaelis, and Storr), just as the Constitt. apost. vii. 46. 2 make him appointed by Paul as bishop of Laodicea. Recently it has been defended by Wieseler, Chronol. des COL.
form of reminding him of his duty is not clear. But what merits attention is the relation of disciplinary admonitive authority, in which, according to these words, the church stood to the office-bearers, and which should here be the less called in question with Hofmann, since Paul in the letter to Philemon addressed jointly to Archippus would doubtless himself have given the admonition, if he had not conceded and recognised in the church that authority of which he invokes the exercise—and that even in the case, which cannot be proved, of the διακονία having been the service of an evangelist. The expedient to which Occumenius and others have recourse can only be looked upon as flowing from the later hierarchical feeling: ἵνα ὅταν ἐπιτιμᾶ Ἄρχιππος αὐτοῖς, μὴ ἐκεῖσιν ἐγκαλεῖν ἐκεῖνον ὡς πικρῶ... ἐπελ ἄλλως ἀποτοῦ τοῖς μαθηταῖς περὶ τοῦ διδασκαλοῦ διαλέγεσθαι (Theophylact). — βλέπε κ.τ.λ.] Grotius, Wolf, Flatt, Bähr, and many, take the construction to be: βλέπε, ἵνα τὴν διακ. ἦν παρέλ. ἐν κυρ., πληροῖ, from which arbitrary view the very αὐτή should have precluded them. The words are not to be taken otherwise than as they stand: Look to the service (have it in thy apost. Zeitalt. p. 452, and Laurent in the Jahrb. f. D. Th. 1866, p. 130, arguing that, if Archippus had been a Colossian, it is not easy to see why Paul, in ver. 17, makes him be admonished by others; and also that ver. 17 is joined by σαί to ver. 15 f., where the Laodiceans are spoken of. But the form of exhortation in ver. 17 has a motive not known to us at all; and the reason based on σαί in ver. 17 would only be relevant in the event of ver. 17 following immediately after ver. 15. Lastly, we should expect, after the analogy of ver. 15, that if Archippus had not dwelt in Colossae, Paul would have caused a salutation to be sent to him as to Nymphas. Besides, it would be altogether very surprising that Paul should have conveyed the warning admonition to Archippus through a strange church, the more especially when he had written at the same time to himself jointly addressed with Philemon (Philem. 2).

1 Hitzig, p. 31 (who holds also vv. 9, 15, 16 to be not genuine), gives it as his opinion that Archippus is indebted for this exhortation, not to the apostle, but to the manipulator, who knew the man indeed from Philem. 2, but probably had in his mind the Flavius Archippus, well known from Plin. Ep. x, 65-68, and the proconsul Paulus, when he adjusted for himself the relation between the Apostle Paul and his fellow-warrior Archippus (Philem. 2). I do not understand how any one could ascribe even to an interpolator so singular an anachronistic confusion of persons. Yet Holtzmann finds the grounds of Hitzig so cogent, that he ultimately regards vv. 15-17 as the inter, “by means of which the Auctor ad Ephesios has made a connected triad out of his own work, the interpolated Colossian epistle, and the letter to Philemon.”
view), which thou hast undertaken in the Lord, in order that thou mayest fulfil it, mayest meet its obligations; ἵνα αἰτ. πληρ. is the purpose, which is to be present in the βλέπειν τ. διακ. κ.τ.λ. Comp. 2 John 8. On πληροῖς, comp. Acts xii. 25; 1 Macc. ii. 55; Liban. Ep. 359; Philo, in Flacc. p. 988: τὴν διακονίαν ἐκπλήσσαντες. — ἐν κυρίῳ not: from the Lord (Bähr); not: for the sake of the Lord (Flatt); not: secundum Domini praecepta (Grotius). Christ, who is served by the διακονία (1 Cor. xii. 5), is conceived as the sphere, in which the act of the παραλαμβάνειν τὴν διακονίαν is accomplished objectively, as well as in the consciousness of the person concerned; he is in that act not out of Christ, but living and acting in Him. The ἐν κυρίῳ conveys the element of holy obligation. The less reason is there for joining it, with Grotius, Steiger, and Dalmer, to the following ἵνα αἰτ. πληρ.

Ver. 18. Conclusion written with his own hand; comp. 2 Thess. iii. 17. See on 1 Cor. xvi. 21. — Be mindful for me of my bonds, a closing exhortation, deeply touching in its simplicity, in which there is not a mere request for intercession (ver. 3), or a hint even at the giving of aid, but the whole pious affection of grateful love is claimed, the whole strength of his example for imparting consolation and stedfastness is asserted, and the whole authority of the martyr is thrown into the words. Every limitation is unwarranted. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἰκανὸν εἰς πάντα αὐτοῖς προτέρασθαι, καὶ γεναιοτέρως ποιῆσαι πρὸς τοὺς ἀγώνας ἄρα καὶ οἰκειοτέρως αὐτοῖς ἐποίησε καὶ τὸν φόβον ἑλευ. Oecumenius, comp. Chrysostom. — ἡ χάρις] καὶ ἐξοχήν: the grace of God bestowed in Christ. Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 22; Tit. iii. 5. Comp. on Eph. vi. 24.
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